MANAGERIAL CONTROL OF FACULTY BY PHYSICAL EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTORATE OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

HEALTH SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

BY

BRIAN A. SATHER, B.A., B.S., M.S.

DENTON, TEXAS
AUGUST 2004
To the Dean of the Graduate School:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Brian A. Sather entitled “Managerial Control of Faculty by Physical Education Department Chairpersons.” I have examined this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Kinesiology.

Bettye Myers, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

Department Chair

Dean of College/School

Accepted:

[Signature]
Managerial control in university academic departments is problematic because professors are specialized workers who require a unique managerial approach (Abbott, 1988; Alvesson, 1993; Freidson, 1986; Raelin, 1991, 2003). The purpose of the study was to analyze and explain the current managerial control practices of chairpersons in university physical education departments and to determine the perceived outcomes of these practices. To accomplish this, the researcher collected qualitative data at five universities in the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities that offer doctoral degrees in physical education. The researcher conducted semistructured interviews with department chairpersons, faculty, and administrative assistants. Each interview was digitally audio recorded and transcribed soon after the interview. The researcher identified common managerial control practices in the departments using a qualitative inductive analysis technique and triangulation. Six major themes emerged from the analysis: (a) Department chairpersons relied on existing controls in higher education and initiated very few innovative or unique managerial control procedures; (b) formal control procedures were mandated by administrators above the department chairperson level and were seen as a required formality by both faculty and
chairpersons; (c) the departments continued to operate and flourish under the current paradigm of management control in higher education although faculty voiced some concerns about management processes; (d) faculty admired chairpersons who exhibited characteristics of a facilitator rather than a controller; (e) faculty and chairpersons failed to work as a cohesive group toward development and accomplishment of departmental mission and goals; (f) measuring department progress and outcomes along with providing feedback varied greatly between and among the institutions studied. The researcher recommends two managerial control models for physical education departments: Raelin’s (2003) distribution of autonomy and Gmelch and Miskin’s (1993) model of planning, implementation, and evaluation. Furthermore, both faculty and staff would benefit from a more faculty-inclusive approach to management, particularly with departmental planning. Efforts should also be made to diminish the separating effects of subdisciplines. The researcher provides a list of best practices found in the study as examples for other departments. Chairpersons of physical education departments should improve their managerial control techniques to accommodate the current atmosphere of accountability in higher education.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Successful managers increase their effectiveness by systematically undertaking their responsibilities (Pride, Hughes, & Kapoor, 2005). Often this includes adopting managerial methods that have been carefully developed by management researchers and practitioners. Control is an important responsibility of managers that deserves attention, particularly in higher education. Most managerial control theories focus on “traditional” employees in industries that produce a material product. In this work environment, measuring performance expectations is clearly defined because performance is easily quantified in the form of profits (Corson, 1979). Over the years, managers have implemented models such as management by objective and total quality management along with various analysis techniques. Control measurements such as financial ratios (economic value added, return on equity, etc.) are formulas that yield quantitative information to help guide the manager in determining if the company’s goals are being met. The university setting is markedly different from industry because the primary product is the transference of knowledge to students. This is very difficult to measure; thus, arriving at a control method is more problematic.

Beginning in the 1970s, university president’s tenures began to decline and faculty tenure standards increased. Universities began seeing administrators introduce mainstream managerial methodology and higher education saw an increasing influence from the business sector (Hawkins, 1999). In the 1980s and 1990s, total quality management gained popularity in higher education (Madsen & Carlsson, 1995;
Marchese, 1991, 1993; Vazzana, Elfrink, & Bachmann, 1997, 2000). The increasing influence of business in higher education has coupled with the need for accountability in universities across the United States (Kahn, 1993; Millis, 1999; Raelin, 2003) to further emphasize the importance of sound managerial practices by university managers.

Currently, higher education managers use managerial techniques to varying degrees. Administrators such as presidents and vice-presidents deal with a variety of different units in the institution (e.g., food service, bookstore) that often lend themselves to the management practices used in industries. Those who focus on academics, such as deans and department chairpersons, implement different approaches because of the unique demands of their personnel (Freidson, 1986; Raelin, 1991). Some disciplines, such as engineering and business (Entin, 1993), have been more progressive than others at adopting new models for managerial control. Mullin and Wilson (2000) have provided a different view when they suggested that nothing has changed in education in recent years but did issue a challenge to higher education administrators to begin the process of change. Ironically, many university managers in academic departments ignore progressive managerial models and thus fail to practice what they espouse as professionals—change through the use of scientifically proven methods.

Managerial control at the academic level becomes problematic because university professors are professional employees (Abbott, 1988). Defining professional employees remains somewhat difficult (Abbott; Alvesson, 1993; Freidson, 1986), but key concepts that identify professionals are advanced training and specialized knowledge in a given area. Because of their unique status, professional employees require special
management considerations. Raelin (1991) identified six specific problems inherent in managing professionals:

1. Overspecialization: “Organizational compartmentalization of professionals who are required to perform fixed and standardized tasks apart from other professionals or managers” (p. 169).

2. Autonomy: Professionals demand autonomy over the ends as well as means. Many scholars and professionals agree this is the most critical issue.

3. Distaste for close supervision: Supervision is a nuisance that impedes progress.

4. Formalization: They exhibit a tendency to resist formal rules and regulations.

5. Real-world practice: Emphasis on individual initiative and commitment to high quality of life leads to little regard for real-world managerial practice.

6. Ethical responsibility: There is a conflict between professionals who maintain overriding interest in ethical responsibility and managers who strive for corporate efficiency.

Recently “knowledge work” has received attention in management (Davenport & Prusak, 1998) because of an increased emphasis on control of information, yet the identification of knowledge and its importance has been emphasized in higher education for years. Control in knowledge-intensive organizations can take two forms. One emphasis on control examines the management of the knowledge itself along with the available technologies that easily store, organize, and disseminate the information (Davenport & Prusak). Another area of control, which this paper focuses on, is the control of the knowledge worker or professional employee. Coincidentally, software has
been developed that enhances control of both information and employees at professional service firms (Cobbold, 2003).

Traditional control methods in industry are usually classified as bureaucratic. Many authors recommend against strictly using bureaucratic models for professional employees (Lowendahl, 1997). Instead of bureaucratic, a more professional oriented control process should include characteristics outlined in Table 1, which compares control methods for bureaucratic and knowledge workers. Another applicable structure is known as an adhocracy, in which temporary groups are formed to solve problems (Alvesson, 1995).

The uniqueness of university professors makes managerial control very difficult in the university setting. Since control is often associated with a negative connotation, Hershey, Blanchard, and Johnson (2001) recommended the use of the word “facilitating” or “training.” “Whatever words you choose, your overall effectiveness depends upon understanding, predicting, and influencing the behavior of other people” (p. 17). The distain of control is especially present in professional employees, so university administrators will want to approach control with a viable plan. University professors value academic freedom. Yet, the idealistic mindset that the university is a haven for professors to freely practice and control their own profession has never really existed (Keller, 1983). University professors tend to think of their hierarchy as upside down, with themselves running it (Mintzberg, 1998). In fact, this is not the case. What exists is a medium somewhere between anarchy and rigid managerial control.

The department chairperson resides at the managerial front lines of the university. Usually department chairpersons take on their position without prior
leadership training or administrative experience (Wolverton, Gmelch, & Sorenson, 1998). This creates a predicament because they are asked to manage arguably the most important aspect of the university. Of the 12 tasks that department chairpersons place high importance (Gmelch & Miskin, 1995), 4 directly relate to control: evaluate faculty performance, manage department resources, develop and initiate long-range department goals, prepare and propose budgets. Based on a study of why faculty members become department chairpersons, increased control of their environment was the fourth ranking reason (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). This trailed personal development, drafted by dean or colleagues, and out of necessity as the top three reasons, respectively. These results highlight the importance of control, so one would assume a chairperson would systematically attempt to exert this control while functioning as chairperson.

Managerial control in universities continues to be an important task for department chairpersons. Control models implemented in higher education include the dual ladder and total quality management (TQM). Of these, TQM has received the most recent attention and considerable implementation in many aspects of university administration. A common control method in higher education is budgetary control, particularly because of the non-profit nature of the organization. Common evaluation techniques used in departments include student evaluations of teaching, peer evaluations, and supervisor evaluations by department chairpersons.

Purpose

There is a scarcity of data regarding the managerial practices of department chairpersons in public universities. No research could be located that involved
management control in physical education departments. The dearth of information may suggest that researchers see little value in the study of how physical education departments are managed. However, for physical education departments to flourish in an increasingly demanding environment of accountability in higher education both domestically (Kahn, 1993; Millis, 1999; Raelin, 2003) and internationally (Ibarra-Colado, 1996), department leaders must purposefully focus on their performance. In order to make informed decisions, empirical data is needed to guide managerial practices. Therefore, the purpose of this research project was to analyze and explain the nature of managerial control practices used in selected university physical education departments. A semistructured interview format was designed to gather authentic responses from department chairpersons, faculty members, and administrative assistants. Responses were assessed for comparable or contradictory themes.

Problem Statement

The purpose of the study was to analyze and explain the current managerial control practices of chairpersons in selected university physical education departments and to determine the perceived outcomes of these practices. To accomplish this, the researcher collected qualitative data at five universities in the Norwest Commission on Colleges and Universities that offer doctoral degrees in physical education. A semistructured interview technique was employed for the data collection. The researcher conducted interviews with the department chairperson, two faculty members, and the department administrative assistant at each school. Data were collected at the respective universities during the 2003-04 school year. The researcher examined
comparable and contradictory themes related to the nature of managerial control implemented in the departments.

The final result yielded a comprehensive description of managerial control techniques and their perceived outcomes, as administered by department chairpersons at universities in the Norwest Commission on Colleges and Universities with doctoral programs in physical education. Results of this study can help department chairpersons nationwide compare their current practices in managerial control to the departments studied. With this information, other university chairpersons can re-evaluate the effectiveness of their control procedures and possibly adopt techniques described in this study, where appropriate, for their department.

**Research Questions**

The interviews were designed to examine the managerial practices in physical education departments by answering the following questions:

1. Are physical education department chairpersons employing progressive methods or models of managerial control?

2. What managerial control concepts and techniques are commonly used in physical education departments?

3. What performance measurements are commonly used by physical education department chairpersons?

4. How are outcomes measured and feedback provided for faculty members and staff in physical education departments?
Definitions

The investigator adhered to the following definitions:

1. Administrative Assistant: The primary subordinate to the department chairperson whose main responsibilities include clerical, financial, and administrative assistance as assigned by the chairperson. Commonly referred to as the department secretary.

2. Discretionary Funds: Budgetary allocations to a specific employee that require no supervisor approval in the purchasing process.

3. Knowledge Work: Organizational setting that includes a complex environment of personnel who are highly qualified with a professional background and product, market, and personnel development are significant activities (Karreman, Sveningsson, & Alvesson, 2002).

4. Managerial Control (also Management Control): The assurance that managerial planning is being fulfilled.

5. Peer Evaluation: Assessment of a faculty member by colleagues who hold a similar status in the university personnel structure.

6. Professional Employee: “Exclusive occupational groups applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases” (Abbott, 1988, p. 8).

7. Strategic Plan: The process of deciding on the direction, mission, and objectives along with strategies for accomplishing these plans in an organization.

8. Student Evaluation of Instruction: Various methods of evaluation whereby student analyze their teacher. Most commonly a rating instrument filled out at the end of a term.
9. **Total Quality Management (TQM):** “What the organization does to ensure that its products or services satisfy the customer's quality requirements and comply with any regulations applicable to those products or services” (International Organization for Standardization, 2004).

**Delimitations**

The researcher chose the following delimitations in order to gather appropriate data to answer the research question:

1. The participants were department chairpersons, faculty members, and administrative assistants.
2. Only universities that offered doctoral degrees in physical education related fields were chosen for data collection.
3. Use of a semistructured interview to collect data.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

The researcher assumed that the department chairpersons were in the best position to provide information about the management practices in their department. Another assumption was that the chairpersons had control over management procedures in their department.

The study was subject to the following limitations:

1. An obvious limitation of the study was the self-reporting nature of the research. Department chairpersons, who probably had little background in the application of the management models, were asked to answer questions regarding their managerial practices. In order to help remedy this problem, the questionnaire was constructed to ask about specific aspects of managerial control.
2. Another limitation was the small number of participants made it more difficult to generalize the findings to other universities, particularly those in other regions and those that do not offer a doctoral program.

Significance of the Study

The researcher provided a description of the current managerial practices in university physical education departments. The depiction will help provide information for college physical educators as they assess the future “business” of physical education in higher education. By assessing the current status, university physical education administrators and professionals should realize what improvements can be made in management.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Management is “the process of using organization resources to achieve organizational objectives through the functions of planning, organizing and staffing, leading, and controlling” (DuBrin, 2000, p. 3). Each of these managerial tasks involves detailed strategy and an attention by managers. In this review, the author will specifically focus on the role of managerial control in dealing with professional employees—in particular, university professors.

Managerial Control

Early forms of management relied on shared knowledge between supervisors and subordinates (Clegg & Palmer, 1996). Also, early managers operated in close proximity to their subordinates prompting the term “super-vision.” This term literally came from the idea of a boss patrolling elevated platforms to watch their employees. Gradually, the advancement of knowledge in management lead to the conquering of time and space limitations along with the ability to manage at an intellectual distance. Eventually, this progression gave way to theories on modern management.

Defining Managerial Control

Various definitions of control exist but most authorities agree that managerial control is the assurance that managerial planning is being fulfilled. Anthony and Govindarajan (2004) defined control as, “The process by which manager’s influence other members of the organization to implement the organization’s strategies” (p. 7).
According to Hershey et al. (2001) control is the, “Feedback of results and follow-up to compare accomplishments with plans and to make appropriate adjustments where outcomes have deviated from expectations” (p. 13). Garrison and Noreen (2000) provided a slightly different definition of control in the following: “Those steps taken by management that attempt to increase the likelihood that the objectives set down at the planning stage are attained and to ensure that all parts of the organization function in a manner consistent with organizational policies” (p. 378). Macariello and Enteman’s (1974) definition of control was specific to universities: “A management control procedure (or system) is one which provides the information an institution requires to allocate its resources to the programs that are most productive in fulfilling its objectives” (p. 594).

*Elements of Control*

Control methods are separated into three different types of control in relation to the time of implementation. Preventative control (precontrol) occurs prior to the performance of the activity. Concurrent control monitors activities as they occur. Feedback controls (postcontrols) are evaluations of performance after the activity is completed.

Another distinction is external versus internal control strategies (DuBrin, 2000). External strategies are based on the assumption that employees need extrinsic motivation in order to be successful. This is consistent with Theory X philosophy. On the other hand, internal control strategy is based on the belief that employees can be motivated by building their commitment to the organization. This internal motivation view is consistent with Theory Y management styles. The ladder style would also seem to be
more conducive to professional employees because of their intrinsic motivation (Raelin, 1991).

According to Anthony and Govindarajan (2004), “Elements of management control systems include strategic planning; budgeting; resource allocation; performance measurement, evaluation, and reward; responsibility center allocation; and transfer pricing” (p. 1). Furthermore every control system has at least four components: a detector, an assessor, an effector, and a communications network. The detector is a sensor that measures what is actually happening. The assessor is a device that determines the significance of what is happening and compares it to an expectation standard. The effector is a feedback that alters behavior if the assessor indicates a need for change. Finally, the communications network is a mode of transmitting information between detector and assessor and between the assessor and effector.

A different way of examining control is to view it on a continuum between tight and loose control. Tight control is characterized by short-term goals and extensive management involvement while loose control includes more limited management involvement in daily operations (Kald, Nilsson, & Rapp, 2000). Furthermore, under tight control, budgets are viewed as a binding commitment while in a loose setting, budgets are merely a planning tool that may be deviated from if justified.

Another aspect of control includes outcome and driver measurements (Anthony & Govindarajan, 2004).

Outcome measurements indicate the result of a strategy (e.g., increased revenue). These measures typically are “lagging indicators:” they tell management what has happened. By contrast, driver measures are “leading
indicators;” they show the progress of key areas in implementing a strategy. Cycle time is an example of a driver. Whereas outcome measures indicate only the final result, driver measures can be used at a lower level and indicate incremental changes that will ultimately affect the outcome. (pp. 496-497)

Professional Employees

University professors fall under a broad category of workers called professionals. As alluded to previously, professional employees prefer not to have others supervise them and make their decisions (Lowendahl, 1997). This makes management of these types of employees challenging.

Defining Professions

Abbott (1988) loosely defined professions as, “exclusive occupational groups applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases” (p. 8). Furthermore, Freidson (1986) claimed the word profession, “implies a method of gaining a living while serving as an agent of formal knowledge and implies as well the fact that bodies of formal knowledge, or disciplines, are differentiated into specialized occupations” (p. 20). Arriving at a true definition for a profession remains, at best, arbitrary due to the evolving view and changing nature of professions (Abbott; Freidson; Alvesson, 1993, 1995). In fact, Abbott argued that, “a firm definition of profession is both unnecessary and dangerous; one needs only a definition strong enough to support one’s theoretical machinery” (p. 318). “Self-interest and efforts to attain social closure--preventing other people from the right to certain jobs or tasks--is crucial for professions” (Alvesson, 1993, p. 999). Despite the varying opinions about what constitutes a profession, there is little
doubt that university professors—the focus of this research—are considered professional employees.

According to Lowendahl (1997), a professional service includes the following characteristics:

1. It is highly knowledge intensive, delivered by people with higher education, and frequently closely linked to scientific knowledge development within the relevant area of expertise.
2. It involves a high degree of customization.
3. It involves a high degree of discretionary effort and personal judgment by the expert(s) delivering the service.
4. It typically requires substantial interaction with the client firm representatives involved.
5. It is delivered within the constraints of professional norms of conduct, including setting client needs higher than profits and respecting the limits of professional expertise. (p. 20)

Table 2 provides a more detailed description of characteristics of professions.

Defining Knowledge Work

Identifying professions remains rather arbitrary. According to Alvesson (1993), many traditional professions fail to live up to a strict definition of professionals. Furthermore, contemporary professions share the same characteristics with occupations that are not considered professions. In fact, a number of groups have attempted to call their work a profession because of the higher esteem they can receive from this distinction, but have failed (Lowendahl, 1997). Some authors recommend “knowledge-
intensive" work as a better term. Yet, it remains difficult to establish criteria even for this term (Alvesson, 1995). The advantage of using the term “knowledge-intensive” is that there is no cut-off point, like there is between professionals and nonprofessionals. Rather than categorize two distinct groups, “knowledge worker” allows for a continuum. “. . . [Knowledge work] indicates a looser categorization, the idea being that some jobs and organizations call for more (formal) knowledge (longer education for the personnel) than others” (Alvesson, 1993, p. 1000).

Arriving at a definition for “knowledge workers” is difficult similar to defining “professional employees” (Blackler, 1995; Alvesson, 1993). Karreman et al. (2002) offered the following definition of knowledge intensive firms:

Typically, the literature suggests that the concept applies to organizational settings that share the following common denominators: (1) Personnel are highly qualified and have professional backgrounds (i.e., academic or other comparable pre-employment training and education); (2) products and services are complex and/or non-standard; and (3) product, market, and personnel development are significant activities within the organization. (p. 72)

Knowledge is distinct from data, which is a set of discrete and objective facts, and information, a message usually in the form of a document or verbal communication. Knowledge is deeper than both data and information according to Davenport and Prusak (1998):

Knowledge is a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insight that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information. It originates and is applied in the minds of
knowers. In organizations, it often becomes embedded not only in documents or repositories but also in organizational routines, processes, practices, and norms.

(p. 5)

The concept of knowledge is ambiguous and the role it plays in knowledge intensive firms is likewise ambiguous (Alvesson, 1993, 1995). Because there is so much breadth in the idea of knowledge work, Blackler (1995) further organized knowledge work into four categories based on a summary of literature: These include knowledge-routinized organizations, communication-intensive organizations, expert-dependent organization, and symbolic-analyst-dependent organizations. Cook and Brown (1999) presented a model that examined knowledge in terms of explicit, tacit, individual, and group as four distinct and equal forms of knowledge. Since knowledge workers often are assigned jobs in which their narrow expertise yields little help, perhaps other talents yield success more than the knowledge itself. Alvesson (1993) recommended a more appropriate term may be “ambiguity-intensive” work. Blackler (1995) offered a solution to this problem: “Rather than regarding knowledge as something that people have, it is suggested that knowing is better regarded as something that they do” (p. 1023).

Although it is commonly accepted that university professors are professional employees, their status as knowledge workers may be in question. Professors, along with doctors, may more appropriately be classified as workers in professional bureaucracies rather than knowledge intensive organizations. A distinction between these two is that, given a good labor market, these knowledgeable people can be replaced. However, many knowledge-intensive firms such as a consulting agency include employees who possess special knowledge like an understanding of important
customers for the organization. Thus, loyalty and commitment are more important to these organizations than they would be in a professional bureaucracy (Alvesson, 1995).

Managing Professionals

Traditional controls for professional work are the schools that train them, examinations that test them, licensure, and ethics codes that professionals presume to obey (Abbott, 1988). These traditional controls help ensure that only qualified individual join the profession. At the management level, working with professionals requires unique strategies that address professionals that have already attained their professional status. Unlike equipment or capital, professionals cannot be allocated to an area that a manager feels needs attention in the organization. Instead, the professional employee must see value in the project and personally choose to undertake it (Lowendahl, 1997). Thus, the manager should negotiate and persuade the employee. Furthermore, the way in which the manager seeks to exert control over the professional must be examined to fit the demands of their status. These specific control techniques will be addressed in more detail below.

Abbott (1988) outlined his theory on professions in detail as follows:

The social structure of professions is thus neither fixed nor uniformly beneficial. . . . The fundamental assumption of the professionalization literature is incorrect; there is no fixed limit of structure towards which all professions tend. It is clear from the brief discussion here that the mature profession is constantly subdividing under the various pressures of market demands, specialization, and interprofessional competition. Some competitive conditions favor the less, some the more organized.
The central organizing reality of professional life is control of tasks. The tasks themselves are defined in the professions’ cultural work. Control over them is established, as we have seen, by competitive claims in public media, in legal discourse, and in workplace negotiations. A variety of settlements, none of them permanent, but some more precarious than others, create temporary stabilities in their process of competition. Those settlements reflect in some ways the social structures of the professions involved, but also depend on the many variables making for strength and weakness of jurisdiction. When taken together, all these factors tell us more than how a profession defines and acquires its jurisdictions. They imply that the professions as a group will develop in the structured pattern that I shall call the system of professions. (pp. 84-45)

Control in Universities

Planning and control from a general university perspective focuses on the economic variables of revenues and expenses (Maciariello & Enteman, 1974). Revenues include tuition, gifts, grants, and endowments. Expenditures include compensation, supplies and services, and capital expenditures. To exert control of revenues and expenses requires tracking of movement, interrelationships, and feedback over time. Control at the academic levels mainly focuses on control of the personnel in the departments and schools. These control methods will be discussed later in this review.

The hierarchy of most universities makes institution-wide management philosophies impractical. Generally two parallel organizations report to the president, the staff and the faculty (Corson, 1979). On the one hand, staff usually have a more vertical
organizational structure that lends itself to more bureaucratic control methods. By contrast, faculty members are usually organized in a more horizontal fashion requiring organic systems of control, which are often imprecise and ambiguous.

Academic freedom is an important concern in higher education. Ambrose’s (1988) survey of academic administrators, department chairpersons, and full-time faculty members revealed that all three groups share a high opinion of academic freedom. Differences were found between groups in defining the scope of academic freedom. The different interpretations of freedom contribute to conflicts and challenges on campuses regarding the extent of control that should exist.

Teachers, like many professionals, have always been heteronomous (Abbott, 1988); in other words, subject to something or someone else. Some teachers are solo practitioners but they are exceptions. According to Abbott, most teachers lack control of their setting of work. Despite the heteronomous nature of teaching, university professors maintain distaste for authority, planning, organization behavior, and modern management (Keller, 1983). University professors do maintain a higher degree of freedom than their elementary and secondary school colleagues (Feidson, 1986), but are nonetheless subject to managerial control in their work. So how does a manager control university faculty members? Some modern managerial techniques, such as TQM, can be observed in higher university management. These will be discussed later.

Deans and department chairpersons often lack management training because they are promoted from professor to administrative positions with very little training for the position. In essence, the chairperson moves away from the collegial bond of their peers to a position of authority whereby he or she is required to exercise managerial
duties without the appropriate training. Their appointed status, whether they like it or not, makes it very difficult to maintain their previous status as a colleague and academician. A conflict develops between collegiality and administrative responsibilities that is a difficult transition to make. “Department chairmen have a special difficulty with management because they often believe they are spokesmen for their colleagues in the department to the deans and presidents ‘upstairs’ rather than managers of their departments’ future, innovativeness, and quality” (Keller, 1983, p. 124).

The majority of research about managing professional employees focuses on technical professionals, such as scientists and engineers (Raelin, 1991). Unfortunately, very little research examines managerial control of university teachers. In addition, the researchers largely ignore recommendations for control models specifically for university professors. Nevertheless, there is a growing need for control in universities because of increasing accountability due to budget shortfalls, growing consumer expectations, less governmental support (Raelin, 2003), and state initiative to increase the quality of education (Vazzana et al., 2000). Because of the noticeable dearth in research publications regarding managerial control of university professors and the apparent need for focus in this area, the researcher’s study focused on management control in universities.

Much has been said about the managerial planning process in literature. An in-depth study of this is beyond the scope of this review. Instead, the focus will turn to the aspects of the control system that control.
Management Control Models for Professional Employees and Universities

Gmelch and Miskin Model

Gmelch and Miskin (1993) outlined a model of control for department chairpersons. The first step is department planning. This includes developing a mission and measurable outcomes and goals, both short-term and long-term. Second entails implementation which involves individual faculty and staff goals and action plans. Finally, evaluation and control complete the process in the model. “The term ‘control’ should not mean a monitoring or checking up on daily activities and assignments. The purpose of control should be instead to help individuals become more productive in accomplishing personal goals and contributing to the achievement of department success” (p. 80).

Gmelch and Miskin go on to outline specific aspects of the control process:

1. Recognize individual achievement and contribution to department mission and key outcomes,
2. Encourage individual goal performance specifically in relation to department goals, and
3. Suggest, assist or require the development of individual action plans in areas identified for emphasis, planning or improvement. (p. 80)

Planning and implementation are the most important aspects of the model because they outline what is to be controlled. The control process includes monitoring long-term department success, individual goals, and action plans. Beyond monitoring and performance evaluation, recognition and encouragement of faculty is most important. This should take place at an annual review and during informal meetings in the department.
Distributive Autonomy

Joseph Raelin has extensively published works in the area of faculty control in higher education. In his recent article “Should faculty be ‘Managed?’” (2003) he concluded, “It would seem that business-management solutions are not among the best ways to address problems of university governance, let alone those of industrial practice. The pressures and potential discord facing the university campus are nevertheless real and require managerial attention” (¶ 12). Based on his research, Raelin presented a model of control that distinguishes between the levels of control that exist in the university setting.

Before the model can be implemented it is important that administrators understand the culture of the professors. “Faculty believe they are the driving force behind the university’s success and cannot tolerate direct orders from those outside the select community. Change must come from the bottom up. Collegiality and persuasion must reign over bureaucratic control” (¶ 14). Along these lines, the overriding concern of faculty is their “right” to academic freedom.

In his model, Raelin attempted to achieve a balance between autonomy and control. He proposed three levels of autonomy: strategic, administrative, and operational. The university board of trustees, presidents, and vice presidents should maintain a level of strategic autonomy, which is the freedom to select goals and policies that govern the institution. The elite administrative staff at a university is responsible for strategic planning and guidance of the university in the scheme of the university constituents and public.
University deans and chairpersons should be able to maintain *administrative autonomy* in managing the unit in which they are responsible. These managers need this autonomy because they also deal with outside agents (business community) and internal agents (other departments). They also must implement the strategic objectives from their superiors.

Finally, the faculty members should maintain *operational autonomy*. This included, “Having the freedom, once the goal or problem has been set, to attack it by means determined by oneself but within organizational resource and strategic constraints” (¶ 24). The professors are able to carry out their duties, yet recognize the authoritative function of their superiors.

In this model, Raelin allowed for roles from time to time to intermingle. In some situations, administrators may need to prevail over a professor’s work and some situations may allow for faculty to serve in an administrative capacity. He recommends that administrators should open a dialogue about exceptions to the different roles. “The role of the administrator, however, is generally one of clarifying task boundaries or providing support and resources to assist professional constituencies in conducting their own operations and interacting with one another” (¶ 26).

An advantage of this system is that it synthesizes the control versus autonomy issue into a practical way to meet the needs of both management and the professional employee. Another advantage of this model is that it requires no additional cost to the university to implement other than the education and emphasis for the model. To implement this model, universities do not have to reorganize their structure or purchase special products, which can be very expensive. The university can continue with the
traditional and long-standing methods of operating their business. Change is very
difficult for university professors because they are ensconced in tradition (Satterlee,
1996) and Raelin’s model accommodates this convention. Still another advantage of
distributive autonomy is that it is flexible enough to allow for intermingling of different roles.

A disadvantage to this system is that it relies mostly on the attitudes of the employees and administrators. There is no particular control mechanism to use to ensure the employees and administrators abide by these principles.

_Dual Ladder_

The dual ladder is an organizational framework for professional employees that has been used primarily in the science and engineering fields but largely has been ignored in higher education management. Because of the following reasons outlined by Shepard (1988), the dual ladder is worth considering in university management:

As a technical organization grows in size, problems of coordination, control, evaluation, program formulation, personnel maintenance, decision-making, and the provision of administrative services become more complex and burdensome. A managerial class develops which is concerned primarily with these matters. The class is hierarchically differentiated as is the custom in most large-scale organizations. Since its responsibility entails control over the activities of scientists and engineers, it is logical that technical competence be one criterion to entry into the class. However, entering the managerial class removes the technical man from direct participation in technical work, and he comes to devote himself to many matters not recognized as technical. When a good scientist is
made a manager a good scientist is lost. Yet, promotion to management is the reward for competence in scientific work. (p. 511)

The reward structure of traditional management systems often conflicts with the career aspirations of professional employees. In the dual ladder, promotion and pay increases follow two ladders. One ladder includes a hierarchy providing employees with managerial responsibilities while the other provides professional (technical) advancement, but both follow parallel paths with equal status and rewards (Kaufman, 1975). According to Shepard (1988), the basic structure of the managerial ladder includes dividing each department into sections under the supervision of section heads, and each section is further subdivided into work groups under the control of group heads. The technical ladder roughly parallels the department head, section head, and group head positions in terms of salary, job luxuries, and freedom of decision on work matters. Terms must be invented to label these positions. A main difference in the technical ladder is that no managerial responsibilities are inherent in the positions. This system effectively accommodates professionals who desire managerial careers and those who desire to stay active in their professional interests. Dual ladders have become very popular in professional settings especially as organizations become more horizontal (Katz, Tushman, & Allen, 1995). A key to the success of the ladder is the attitude of the professionals: “Unless scientists are able to participate responsibly in decision-making, to use each other’s resources, to engage in mutual evaluation, and to work autonomously, a controlling, centralized management is necessary” (Shepard, p. 515).

An obvious advantage of the dual ladder is the premise under which it was invented—namely, to alleviate the requirement of professionals to enter management
positions if they want promotion and appropriate pay increases. “Dual ladders try to maintain the productivity of highly innovative scientists and engineers by rewarding them with prestige, freedom, and appropriate job perquisites [sic]” (Katz, 1995, p. 849). Aside from the obvious advantage, another is that professional employees are not required to enter a position in which they perform managerial tasks, but have no formal managerial training.

One major disadvantage of the dual ladder is that many employees may not choose the technical ladder. Allen and Katz (1986; 1990) demonstrated that scientists and engineers more frequently chose management or special project assignments when asked to make a decision between the technical and managerial ladder. However, in another study, Allen and Katz (1991) found that education level influenced a professional employee’s decision to choose the technical ladder. Engineers with a PhD had a stronger preference toward the professional ladder than those without a doctorate.

Another disadvantage Allen and Katz (1991) identified was the danger in a conflict between values. “Few firms can truly afford to support employees whose principal goals are publishing and theory development. Even in industry these may be fine as secondary goals, but the primary goals must be developing products that will allow the company to remain in business” (p. 355). Promoting employees (primarily those with PhDs) into the technical rung of the ladder results in the reinforcement of their academic values, which often contradict the company’s mission and goals. Thus, the conflict is between the professional’s idealistic standards and the standards necessary to keep the company in business.
A somewhat related problem with the above drawback is that separating the employees results in a risk of increasing the chasm between management and professional employees (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). The fact that the two ladders are staffed with individuals of different educational backgrounds, values, preferences, and attitudes creates a potentially volatile situation. Furthermore, Shepard (1988) indicated a decrease in productivity following appointment to a technical ladder position because of the formal isolation that occurs, even within the technical ladder.

Allen and Katz (1986) outlined other key problems with the implementation of the dual ladder. For one, there is a preexisting cultural value that attaches prestige to managerial advancement but not technical advancement. Also, one ingredient is noticeably absent from technical advancement, power. With technical promotion, number of subordinates and visible power do not increase like they do with managerial promotion. For some of these reasons, the dual ladder concept has rarely been adopted in higher education.

Total Quality Management

An emphasis on quality control in industries has evolved and adapted over time (Garvin, 1999). The concepts of total quality management (TQM) grew from the ideas of Josephy Juran, Armand Feigenbaum, Edwards Deming, Phillip Crosby, and Kaoru Ishikawa among others. The movement became very popular in United States when Ford, Motorola, Xerox, and IBM found success in adopting TQM. One of the recent standards used to assess TQM is the Malcolm Baldrige Award criteria which defines core values used in the assessment of for the National Quality Award (Marchese, 1991). The Baldrige Award organizers have added a category for recognizing TQM in
educational institutions (Costin, 1999). Specific criteria for evaluating TQM in education were developed to aid in determining the recipients.

Total quality management (TQM) was a process used in higher education beginning in the 1980s and greatly expanded in popularity in the 1990s (Marchese, 1993). Furthermore, it has dominated discussions in various higher education association meetings since its inception (Marchese, 1991). The principles of TQM are applicable to higher education, particularly the principle of customer orientation (Owlia & Aspinwall, 1996) Participants at an international meeting concluded TQM was just as relevant in educational institutions as any other enterprise (Madsen & Carlsson, 1995).

A high level of TQM use by administrative, support, and academic departments (38%-50%) was found in 1995 and 1998 (Vazzana et al., 1997, 2000). In 1995, 72 percent and in 1998, 78 percent of institutions studied involved employers, students and business leaders in developing curriculum. Forty percent used training techniques in TQM. However, only a small number of institutions, 17% in 1995 and 15% in 1998, were employing a complete TQM model.

Schools that adopted TQM included research universities such as Oregon State, Wisconsin, Penn, Harvard, Carnegie Mellon, Maryland, Wyoming, Clemson, and Miami (Marchese, 1991). Edwin Coate, the president who first brought TQM to Oregon State, outlined his plan in the book Strategies for Quality Improvement (Coate, 1999). Oregon State abandoned TQM following the departure of Coate (Aly & Akpovi, 2001). Also, many community colleges have successfully undertaken total quality initiatives but liberal arts colleges have been noticeably underrepresented in the adoption of TQM. In the California University System, over half of 22 universities used TQM. Of these, only 6%
were implementing TQM in their departments while 76% were implementing the concept in administrative services. (Aly & Akpovi). Some call the process continuous quality improvement (CQI), total quality improvement (TQI), or total quality (TQ) but all focus on the concepts of total quality management. TQM is practiced in the United States far more than in Europe (Madsen & Carlsson, 1995).

Vazzana, et al. (2000) identified three uses of TQM in higher education:

1. TQM in the curriculum: Most commonly taught in engineering and business schools.

2. TQM in nonacademic functions: Administrative and support departments use the process for maintenance, contractors, etc.

3. TQM in academic administration: Process is used in academic administration and tends to focus on discrete projects.

4. TQM in the core curriculum: Some classrooms have been organized to follow the principles of TQM in the student's learning. This approach is also used to integrate learning across the curriculum.

Although TQM can be applied to any of these areas, the focus of this research is related to TQM for administrators managing faculty. Various concepts have been applied to the application of TQM in postsecondary schools. For example, Brigham (1993) identified three cornerstones: employee involvement, the improvement of processes linked to results, and an enduring focus on the customer. Marchese (1991) characterized the culture as quality-driven, customer-oriented, avid about improvement, and marked by teamwork.

Marchese (1993) outlined six specific concepts for applying a TQM model to
higher education:

1. Customer Focus: External customers are businesses and donors while internal customers include students and support staff. One must exercise good judgment when deciding what customer demands will be met. Managers and professors must clearly identify their customers and systematically listen to them. Judge quality by measuring the degree to which customer needs are met because needs are knowable and trackable. (Note: University professors most often ranked students as the number one customer followed by employers, society/government, faculty members, and families [Owlia & Aspinwall, 1996]. Despite arguments that universities’ customers are something other than the students [Bailey & Bennett, 1996], other research supports the view that students are the primary customers [Madsen & Carlsson, 1995; Wallace, 1999].)

2. Continuous improvement: Teaching and learning should be continuously improved. Avoid personal excuses like “that takes more time,” and strive for the professional need for improvement. Despite good intentions, many professors fail to follow through on improving student learning.

3. Management by fact: Everyone should focus on the central mission of the university. Use facts to find out what the problems are and fix them. Academic administration is largely too informal, and loosely coupled, when solving problems.

4. Benchmarking: Identify key work processes and then find the school that does the best job at those tasks for a comparison. After finding the “best practice,” study it, adopt it, and try to match it or do better. Many cost-effective academic processes have been developed over the years that have not been adopted by other schools. A major factor holding universities back from benchmarking is a detrimental focus on
uniqueness. Universities are too introspective and status driven.

5. People: Humans are the most important asset of the institutions and should be given the tools and power to achieve their best.

In TQM, 85 percent of the problems that arise in the course of work are attributable to the organization’s systems, just 15 percent to the shortcomings of individual employees. The manager’s job, then, is to improve constantly the work systems of the organization, to drive out blaming and fear, to remove obstacles in the system that prevent persons or teams from doing their best work. (Marchese, 1993, ¶ 22)

6. Organizational structures: The structure should be based on the needs of the customer. Universities tend to be too hierarchical and compartmentalized to accomplish this. Any collaboration between departments in enhancing the student’s education seems to be feeble.

How can these principles be applied? In one example, Vazzana and Winter (1997) described their implementation of the TQM concept of continuous process improvement (CPI) at Central Missouri State University. In applying the above concepts, the department relied heavily on the mission statement to arrive at outcomes for graduates. In support of the “customer-driven” concept, they involved students, graduates, and business executives in establishing curricular validity and recommendations. A specific feedback control used was a behaviorally anchored criteria to assess teaching and learning to help determine areas needing improvement. Furthermore, students (the customers) were asked how the learning process should be enhanced.
A major advantage of TQM is that it operates on the principle that employees intrinsically want to do their best (Marchese, 1993). This concept directly supports professional employees' intrinsic motivation. Another advantage is the adaptability of TQM. Marchese (1992a) concludes that no two applications of TQM are alike, despite the widespread use in many different industries. Since each campus works with its own culture and set of problems, the adaptability of TQM fits perfectly in higher education.

Over time, TQM has proven to yield some success. Connecticut Colleges increased faculty grades handed in on time from 30 to 98 percent (Marchese, 1991). Fox Valley Technical College (WI) experienced numerous benefits including increased morale, making it a benchmark for other schools adopting total quality. Aly and Akpovi (2001) reported that over half of the California University System schools using TQM have reported improvements in their managing process. Twenty-four percent indicate TQM improved morale and created a greater team atmosphere. However, from the academic perspective only 12 percent reported quality improvements. They conclude little effort had been made to improve customer service in the classroom. The main challenge is the resistance to change from faculty members, administrators, and staff. Other challenges included a lack of resources and lack of leadership.

TQM can be an advantageous approach for administrators faced with accreditation issues. When faced with increasing demands of accreditation, “quality” is a vague term that is difficult for administrators to quantify. “TQM, on the other hand, is very clear about the quality it wants, has explicit ways of getting at performance improvement, and right now enjoys wide corporate and governmental support” (Marchese, 1992b, p. 4).
One potential problem with TQM in higher education is the limited use of the feedback control tools. Vazzana, et al. (2000) indicated only 23 percent of schools studied used scientific tools such as statistical analysis to measure the effectiveness of the process. They were surprised by the irony that university teachers rely so much on scientific analysis in their teaching, yet failed to rely on the scientific analysis tools to evaluate their effectiveness.

Before higher education authorities adopt TQM, it is important to note that TQM has suffered many failures in industry. Although many companies stay loyal to TQM, many other companies have abandoned the concept due to early inflated expectations (Mathews & Katel, 1992). TQM has gone through a significant change when applied to different industries and will diverge even farther when applied to education. Higher education must be wary because of evidence that the service industries have been less successful than manufacturing when implementing TQM (Brigham, 1993).

Harari (1997) concluded from the research that about one-fifth of TQM projects in the United States and Europe failed to achieve significant improvements. He then went on to suggest 10 reasons TQM yields such poor results. Among these are TQM’s overemphasis on internal processes rather than external results, an overemphasis on minimum standards, and a tendency to drain innovation from the organizational culture. On the other hand, Becker (1993) refutes Harari’s claims in his article titled “TQM does work: Ten Reasons why misguided attempts fail.” Beck accuses Harari of assuming his 10 reasons are consistent with TQM, and since they led to failure, he errantly assumed that TQM is a failure.
Koch and Fisher (1998) also provided evidence showing TQMs disappointing results in higher education and argue against its implementation. Despite the popularity of TQM in the California School System, 41 percent of the schools (Aly & Akpovi, 2001) studied had dropped some aspect of the TQM program due primarily to unsatisfactory results or changes in leadership. Oregon State University, one of the original school to implement TQM, stopped the effort immediately after the president left. With this in mind, it is important to learn from the failures in other situations and exercise caution regarding the use of TQM. Most of the gains have been related to the administrative aspects of universities not the academic. Marchese (1996) explains the reason for this as follows: “CQI’s emphasis on customer focus, data, teamwork, and systems thinking runs counter to the internally focused, opinionated, problem-chasing world of campus life. Crucially, most of American higher education doesn’t yet believe it has a quality or a productivity problem . . .” (¶ 6). Jauch and Orwig (1997) concluded that TQM should not be involved in the academic processes of higher education.

Another major disadvantage is the potential high cost. More specifically, the process provides little protection against economic slumps (Mathews & Katel, 1992). TQM is not a way to cut costs and save money; rather, it is aimed at improving quality and putting the customer first (Marchese, 1991). Patience and an atmosphere of employee support for administration are important for making TQM work. These detrimental factors are not promising with higher education’s current financial challenges. However, when faced with slow initial financial results, the Japanese patiently continued with TQM until it eventually yielded financial success in the industrial sector. Patience may be the factor that solves the financial concern of initiating TQM but
few programs in higher education have withstood the test of time to produce results that can serve as an example for other institutions to follow.

A further concern of TQM is the likelihood it is just another fad like Management by Objective (MBO) and Zero-Based Budgeting (Marchese, 1991). Typically fads arrive at higher education 5 years after their initial trial in business. Adopting TQM may be a financial gamble if the concept soon disappears. However, some management fads stick, like marketing and strategic planning. The research indicates that TQM continues to maintain stability as a management process in universities over the past 20 years.

_Bureaucratic Control of Professionals_

Karreman et al. (2002) argued that bureaucratic control warrants consideration in professional work environments. Most theory about management of knowledge intensive firms (KIF), such as universities, operates under the assumption that the employees require unique management consideration. Based on examination of a management consultancy firm and a pharmaceutical company, Karreman et al. reason that traditional bureaucratic forms of management have maintained usefulness and even fill a vital role. “The two prominent examples of knowledge-intensive companies show significant features of bureaucracy, the emphasis on rules, standards, centralization of vital functions, fine-tuned hierarchical differentiation, and the like” (p. 89).

It is important to know that Karreman et al. found that the bureaucratic control were used more to support the workers while the core values remained more flexible at the management consultancy firm. The bureaucratic features tended to be more symbolic and aimed at providing an understanding of what was important and shared. At the pharmaceutical company, bureaucratic control methods followed a format more
similar to traditional control methods. Both managers and researchers embraced the structure of the research and design process. In this situation, managerial knowledge was valued along with the technical knowledge of the employees. Although both organizations showed bureaucraticization, neither showed tendencies toward complete bureaucracies. Karreman et al. concluded that the workers required space for individual discretion due to the complexity, uncertainty, and ambiguity in the workers’ tasks.

Evaluation of Faculty Performance

In the 1970s postwar expansion began to ease in universities and availability of tenure-track positions diminished. This, coupled with the swell of women and minorities entering the faculty, caused an increasingly structured evaluation process in higher education (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). More recently, evaluation continues to be an important concern in higher education. In 1994, the Carnegie Foundation surveyed chief academic officers at four-year institutions in the United States (Glassick et al.). Eighty percent indicated they had recently examined their system of roles and rewards for faculty members or planned to do so in the near future.

Our survey found a remarkably similar range of issues under consideration on most campuses. More than half of all institutions wanted to clarify their goals in order to strike a better balance between institutional mission and faculty rewards. At least three-quarters of all institutions hoped to find ways to improve the balance of time and effort faculty spend on various tasks. The most widely embraced goal was to redefine such traditional faculty roles as teaching, research, and service. (p. 12)
Department chairpersons, because of their roles in administration, have been affected by this emphasis on evaluation. The number one factor that chairpersons felt they needed training for was evaluation of faculty performance (Gmelch & Miskin, 1995). Evaluating faculty members remains difficult because of the ambiguity of results produced in their type of work (Alvesson, 1993). Evaluation of some aspects of professors, such as teaching, remains difficult to measure because effectiveness can present itself in many different ways (Kahn, 1993).

Various administrative styles present themselves in higher education and Kahn (1993) provided some summative comments about the results in the following statements:

But the crucial ingredient in developing successful evaluation strategies, according to much of this literature, is faculty participation and leadership. Also important are clear, written criteria, developed by faculty and communicated to those being evaluated. Criteria should take into account the complexity and variety of teaching and learning and be appropriate to the context and the purposes of the evaluation. (p. 114)

Faculty acceptance is the foundation of any successful teaching evaluation program. It is faculty who must carry out the evaluations, interpret the results, plan for improvements, and make recommendations on tenure, promotion, and other personnel matters. The most effective evaluation programs—not just bureaucratic exercise, but real efforts to enhance teaching and learning—are thus designed and controlled by the faculty. (p. 124)
There are two purposes for evaluation, called formative and summative (Cavanagh, 1996; Centra, 1993; Kahn, 1993). These terms were introduced by Michael Scriven (1973) and have become generally adopted in discourse on teacher evaluation (Chism, 1999). Formative evaluation aims to provide information to help the faculty member become better while the purpose of summative evaluation is to make personnel decisions. Department chairpersons may use both types of evaluation in the control process. The two evaluations are generally conducted differently and the information should be separately stored. In formative evaluation, the information should be confidential in order for the instructor to learn from the process, rather than fear repercussions on their job.

Centra (1993) proposed that four conditions must be met for formative evaluations to lead to improved teaching. First, new knowledge for the teacher must emerge from the evaluation process. This requires information from many sources along with a favorable perceptiveness from the teacher. Second, the teacher must respect the source and see value in the information. Third, a component must exist that describes how to change. This is the most frequently ignored aspect of evaluation. Fourth, a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors should motivate the teacher to improve teaching. Intrinsic motivation is more beneficial. Centra combines these factors for a model that promotes maximum change.

Strenkski (1995) outlined four schools of thought in evaluation of faculty. First, the consumer model holds that the students are expert customers and provide the best source for judging faculty. Second, those who subscribe to the managerial model believe that administrators have the right and responsibility to review performance according to
department objectives. Third, the *introspective model* derives information from self-evaluation because no one can know more about their performance than oneself.

Fourth, the *peer model* maintains that faculty in the same discipline or subdiscipline provide the most important and accurate judgments of and feedback to their colleagues. Saroyan and Amundsen (2001) presented their theory of teaching competency that includes interaction between conception and action within the teacher’s context to arrive at knowledge.

Based on their examination of evaluation procedures in higher education, Glassick et al. (1997) suggested the following standards be followed in the process:

*Clear goals*

Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

*Adequate preparation*

Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

*Appropriate methods*

Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to change in circumstances?
Significant results

Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar’s work open additional areas for further exploration?

Effective presentation

Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to his intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

Reflective critique

Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work? (p. 36)

Scholars concluded that arriving at an adequate evaluation of teaching requires multiple evaluation instruments and sources of data due to the complexity of teaching (Chism, 1999; Saroyan & Amundsen, 2001). These tools will be examined in following sections.

Traditional Model of Faculty Evaluations

Prior to the 19th century, teaching was the primary focus of university professors. The role of professors expanded along with growth in the United States after the turn of the century. The Morill Act linked technology and agriculture with universities following the Civil War prompting higher education to begin focusing outside the campus. The service emphasis combined with an emphasis on research that American scholars
brought with them from their education in Europe. Following World War II, research increased in importance at universities eventually achieving a role of paramount importance for university teachers (Glassick et al., 1997). These events contributed to the current model of faculty evaluation which focuses on three areas: teaching, research, and service.

Unfortunately, faculty over the last generation have received mixed messages about what work counts, leading to anxiety about the trustworthiness of the process. During this period, institutions maintained an official commitment to their traditional missions of teaching, research, and service. But many colleges and universities made deliberate efforts to enhance their reputations by recruiting faculty who showed promise of special achievement in research and, in effect, raised publication requirements. These shifting standards for employment and advancement were not always explicitly communicated nor consistently applied, engendering a climate of suspicion among faculty members who were left wondering about institutional goals. (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 51)

Currently, evaluation of research tends to be a more acceptable practice in academe whereas teaching evaluation is shunned. Centra (1993) offered the following explanation for this:

1. Faculty believe teaching is personal and subjective while research is widely accepted and objective.

2. Reviews of teaching are time consuming and possibly damaging to collegiality.

3. Teaching does not have a high priority at research institutions.
4. Teaching is typically only seen by students whereas research is on display for everyone. Chism (1999) also confirmed the private nature of teaching. Rarely do teachers ask advice about teaching and rarely are they evaluated in the classroom.

In 1994, a survey from the Carnegie Foundation (Glassick et al., 1997) examined the types of evaluations used to assess research, scholarship, and service (see Tables 3-5). Among the results, student evaluations were overwhelmingly used for evaluation of teaching, followed by self-evaluation. For evaluation of research, the methods employed at the majority of institutions were self-evaluation and judgments by colleagues within the institution. Self-evaluations were also used in the majority of institutions for evaluation of service.

In 1990, The Carnegie Foundation published the report Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. In this work, a new paradigm was presented which encouraged the scholarship of discovery, a holistic idea that encompasses teaching integration and application. The concepts of Boyer prompted a trend focused on re-examination of the traditional model of teaching, scholarship, and service. Glassick et al. (1997) reported the following:

About 80 percent of the provosts reported that the expanded definition of scholarship included the full range of activities in which faculty engage, and a similar number said that the definition of teaching included such activities as curriculum development, advising, and conducting instructional classroom research. At least half were beginning to distinguish applied scholarship (professional service or outreach) from campus and community citizenship. (p. 12)
Institutions studied showed widespread experimentations with new evaluation methods for faculty. A special emphasis was placed on different methods of evaluating teaching (69 percent of schools indicated this), while about one-third of schools had changed their methods of evaluating advising, research, creative work, applied scholarship, service to the college, and service to the profession.

However, the effort to broaden the meaning of scholarship has not been widely recognized in universities because administrators and professors fail to trust any areas of scholarship they cannot confidently judge (Glassick et al., 1997). The Carnegie Foundation was convinced that standards can be established for each kind of scholarly work.

Research Evaluation

Some institutions evaluate only the number of research publications while others are concerned also with the quality of publications. Citation counts are another important method of evaluation in use (Centra, 1993). This method uses an established index of bibliographies to count how many times that individual is cited in different sources. Some of the problems with this method include citations that are for negative reasons, authors citing a friend to help them out, and the time period for young faculty members to get their publications cited may be too short for adequate citations before tenure decisions.

Student Evaluation of Teaching

The most commonly used evaluation method, student course ratings, provide a measure of overt teaching actions and students’ perceptions concerning the effect of these actions on their learning experience. Course rating questionnaires focus on a very limited aspect of teaching; that of delivery of instruction and, to
some extent, the planning which precedes it and the evaluation of learning which follows it. A whole range of underlying processes of teaching that are not observable remain unexplored. (Saroyan & Amundsen, 2001, p. 341)

Research on student evaluation of teaching instruments is prevalent in the literature (Chism, 1999), probably due to the popularity of student evaluation of teaching and the impact it has on professors’ careers. Based on a review of literature, Greenwald (1997) concluded that researchers disagree on many of the popular aspects of teachers’ evaluation including the validity of their use as an actual measure of a teacher’s performance.

A further complication of using student evaluations is the differences in perceptions by faculty and students. According to research by Sojka, Gupta, and Deeter-Schmelz (2002), faculty members tend to feel entertaining instructors receive higher ratings and that students do not take the evaluations seriously. On the other hand, students are less likely to agree that student evaluations encourage more lenient grading and have an influence on the teachers’ career, or lead to changes in the teaching. If faculty are to feel confident in this control method, there ought to be more accurate perceptions of the value of the instrument.

Based on Wachtel’s (1998) review of literature, he concluded, “After nearly seven decades of research on the use of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, it can safely be stated that the majority of researchers believe that student ratings are a valid, reliable, and worthwhile means of evaluating teaching” (¶ 8). In his review, he concluded the following:

1. The feedback can help improve instruction.
2. The ratings increase the likelihood that excellence in teaching is rewarded.

3. Student ratings positively correlate with student learning and achievements.

4. Students and faculty generally agree on what constitutes effective teaching.

5. Student ratings are positively correlated with ratings by alumni.

Despite the conclusions in the research, Wachtel observed that faculty continued to harbor hostility and cynicism toward student ratings. Among the reasons include the loss of class time for administering the instrument, artistic nature of teaching, reduction of faculty morale, and the inappropriateness of the instrument. Wachtel goes on to identify important characteristics of student evaluations that should be considered in the process of administering the evaluations. The information is worth noting for administrators who rely on student evaluations as a control method.

Sproule (2002) sets out to prove through a rational scientific argument that use of student evaluations for evaluation of instructor performance is an example of underdetermination. That is, based on literature reviews that fail to support the validity of student evaluations, assuming that student evaluations accurately measure teachers’ ability to teach is a breech of scientific philosophy. Furthermore, the use of student evaluation only in measurement of a teacher’s effectiveness is unscientific.

The United States Air Force Academy relied on more than just in-class evaluation of teachers (Millis, 1999). Structured student interviews were utilized in the form of focus groups and small group instructional diagnosis. All of the approaches involved four steps: initial interview, the evaluation session, feedback, and then the faculty shared the data with students for discussion of how to strengthen the course.
For the small group analysis, students filled out a feedback form. Then a faculty facilitator came in the room, explains the process, and then organizes students into groups of six to eight. Groups discussed the questions on the form and a recorder wrote down key points from the group. Then the groups collaborated to develop a written consensus from everyone.

For the interactive focus groups, a facilitator lead out in open ended and round-robin (each student answers in turn) questions. The evaluator also broke groups up into brainstorming sessions to generate ideas about how to make the class better. Two consultants were needed so one can audiotape responses. It is this consultant’s task to prepare a transcript following the data analysis.

The US Air Force Academy also used a unique technique of having each student write a single word or phrase that describes their perception of the course. In addition, they wrote a number from 1 (low) to 5 (high) that describes their satisfaction with the course. Then all students read off what they wrote so the facilitator could quickly get a sense of what the class felt and a more open atmosphere is promoted in the students. The numbers give a measurable mean for the course over time and the results are shared with the teachers.

Centra (1993) suggested the following when using student evaluations of instruction:

1. Specify how the evaluation results will be used.
2. Use the student evaluations along with other sources of information about teaching such as a colleagues report.
3. Use several results over time from different courses.
4. Make sure the evaluations have a high percentage of responses.

5. Consider characteristics such as class size, subject, and relationship of the course to the students’ program.

6. Use comparative data because evaluations are usually skewed.

7. Avoid overestimating small differences.

8. Use global evaluation items for personnel decisions because these tend to correlate better with student achievement.

9. Use the ratings to help teachers determine what areas need improvement.

10. Standardize procedures for administering evaluations.

11. Allow teachers to provide input on their evaluation results.

12. Limit the use of the rating forms to avoid affecting the way students approach the evaluations.

Student evaluations of instruction represent a narrow view of a college teacher’s effectiveness and should only be used along with other evaluation sources (Kahn, 1993).

Peer Evaluation

In knowledge intensive work, results are very difficult to evaluate, except by those with similar expertise (Alvesson, 1993). One important area of control in academic administration is evaluation among peers. The use of peers in the review process is based on the assumption that colleagues, because of their shared experiences, are in a better position to judge the abilities of their fellow professionals (Strenski, 1995). Peer review of teaching has become an increasingly popular method of evaluation and feedback (Osborne, 1998).
The information can be used for judgmental purposes in promotion, tenure, and annual merit reviews or for professional development (formative) to improve teacher effectiveness.

Summative faculty peer review of teaching are assessments of the teaching efforts of a faculty member by colleagues in his or her scholarly field, unit, school, or college, which are done to compare or rank that individual within a unit or profession for the purpose of personnel decisions such as appointment, promotion, tenure, or salary. Formative faculty peer review of teaching are assessments of the teaching efforts of a faculty member by the colleagues in his or her scholarly field, unit, school, or college, which are done with the primary goal of improving an individual's teaching efforts and the resulting student learning. (Cavanagh, 1996, p. 236)

In summative evaluation the faculty member’s career is on the line while in formative evaluation, nothing is at stake except improving teaching (Strenski, 1995).

Research on peer review of teaching suggests that formative is a better application of peer evaluation than summative (Kahn, 1993). There must be clear distinctions between the summative and formative evaluation (Cavanagh, 1996).

According to Morehead and Shedd (1997), formative evaluation by peers creates a dichotomy. When a faculty member evaluates a teacher, the experience should focus on growth of both faculty members. On the other hand, if the intent is to evaluate for summative reasons, the proper atmosphere is unattainable. For administrators to accept peer review as a control model, it is necessary for them to see the reviews as summative. According to Morehead and Shedd, a further problem is possible
contentions between faculty members when peer review is performed internally. They proposed a model that uses faculty on other campuses to gather data for summative evaluation and leaving on campus peer evaluation for formative purposes.

Chism (1999) outlines three arguments in favor of peer evaluation:

1. Teaching should be community property rather than individualistic and private.

2. Teaching must be considered a scholarly activity and must benefit from proven successful practices.

3. Since teaching is very complex, appropriately complex evaluation techniques should be used. Peer review can be part of this process.

Strenski (1995) highlights additional benefits of peer review in the following:

1. The common experiences shared by peers provide the opportunity to produce information and a means for using the information. A mechanism for processing the information can be developed along with policies and procedures for using the information.

2. Faculty morale can be built through the process by providing the opportunity for faculty to participate in college administration.

3. Peer review helps delegate the evaluation responsibilities on campus.

Conversely, according to Strenski the following negatives can result from peer review:

1. The conservative-self-replicating dynamic resists institutional change.

2. Potential to intimidate members of the group into conformity.
3. It can be perceived as an advocacy on behalf of a group, rather than an evaluation.

4. Eliminates accountability for incompetence because it broadly distributes responsibility for personnel decisions.

A major problem with the peer review system is the time involved by already busy faculty (Chism, 1999). Furthermore, there are no standards and a distinct problem exists in the validity and reliability in peer evaluation of teaching. Another major concern is the confidentiality of peer review contributions for formative evaluation and the fear of losing rapport with colleagues.

The department chairperson is an important agent in the development of a successful peer evaluation system (Chism, 1999). A recommended starting point is the development of a mission statement that supports and guides the process. Switkes (1999) provided an example of a prominent peer review system in The University of California system, which has nine campuses and produces 8 percent of Ph.D. recipients nationally. A peer faculty review system was established in the 1920s and continues today. What makes their system unique is that each faculty member, regardless of status, is reviewed every 2-4 years. A procedure of pre- and post-tenure review is conducted by the dean, a campus faculty committee, and colleagues and usually results in a merit increase. Merit increases may be one step up or accelerated increases may result in more than a step increase on ladder ranking system. The chairperson's role is to document the department faculty's discussion and vote. He or she may also add a personal letter to the file. The dean reviews the entire file and then presents the information to a campus-wide Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). This
committee reviews the files from the campus and sends a recommendation to the chancellor. The University of California utilizes letters from scholars around the world in the review process for promotion advancement from one rank to another.

In 1994, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) coordinated a project titled, “From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching” (Hutchings, 1994). The project operated on the premise that since academics highly regard peer input, particularly in research, and teaching is an important task, than teaching should also be peer reviewed. Furthermore, student evaluation of teaching is insufficient as an only means of evaluating teaching and there are certain aspects of teaching only suitable for faculty to judge. The project included 12 universities that formed peer groups within disciplines for the purpose of peer review of teaching. The project also emphasized that peer review was more than just evaluation of teaching by sitting in on classes. The evaluation process included documentation and detailed analysis of course construction, syllabi, and methodology.

Morehead and Shedd (1996) recommended using student interviews during the peer evaluation process. After the interview the peer meets with the teacher to discuss significant points by the student. Based on implementation of this model, the authors found the following benefits:

1. Creating an open and receptive climate that values the students opinions.
2. Encourages students to take an active role in the educational process.
3. The feedback from the colleague is more accurate for the peers.
4. A more beneficial relationship is built between students and teachers.
5. Students found it was easier to make frank comments to a peer rather than to the teacher.

Another method of peer evaluation is Integrated Assessment of Teaching (Osborne, 1998). This process includes a preliminary meeting with the teacher, an in-class assessment, and a feedback session with the teacher. Rather than just evaluate the teacher in class, the second step includes the evaluator leading out in group discussions with the class that examine the students' feelings about what helps and what hinders their learning in the course as well as suggestions for improving the course. Following this, the evaluator summarizes the students' responses and documents the responses in writing. After the course is over, the information is included in the instructor's personnel folder and can be used in promotion decisions as well as to help the teacher improve their teaching.

All of these methods appear to be viable plans for using peer evaluation in the control process. They may be initiated by faculty, chairpersons, deans, or upper administration. Unfortunately there is little support and few models for faculty peer review of teaching (Cavanagh, 1996). Furthermore there are concerns about ambiguity in what constitutes effective teaching. Cavanagh suggests the mission should be linked to the reward structure in the peer review process. Furthermore a collaborative mentoring environment must exist that promotes enhancement of teaching. Ways to accomplish this include reciprocating observations, ongoing evaluations (rather than just single observations), and reinforcing positive behavior (Millis, 1999).
Teaching Portfolios

A teaching portfolio is a collection of information regarding the teaching competency of a faculty member. “These portfolios aim for a brief but comprehensive account of teaching activity over a defined period of time” (Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991, p. 3). Developed in the mid-1980s (Centra, 1993; Chism, 1999), teaching portfolios can be used for a variety of reasons. Some universities have used them for promotion and tenure decisions while others use them to improve the quality of teaching on campus.

The case for portfolios as an evaluations method is summed in the following:

1. Portfolios capture the complexities of teaching.
2. Portfolios place responsibility for evaluating teaching in the hands of faculty.
3. Portfolios can prompt more reflective practice and improvement.
4. Portfolios can foster a culture of teaching and a new discourse about it.

(Edgerton et al., 1991, pp. 4-6)

There are many ideas about what should be included in a teaching portfolio. Edgerton et al. suggested samples of teaching performance and reflective commentary on samples organized carefully around categories that represent key dimensions of scholarship at the university. Examples of items in a portfolio include work by students, documentation of help given to students, descriptions of how multimedia was used in teaching, statements from colleagues, and written comments from a student committee. Some of the criteria for examining a proposal should include completeness, consistency, reflection, credibility and reliability, and quality (Chism, 1999).
Centra (1993) examined a teaching portfolio used for summative evaluation at a university. The following categories were included in the portfolio: motivational skills (e.g., commitment to teaching, reward orientation), interpersonal skills (e.g., active listening, rapport), and intellectual skills (e.g., knowledge, innovation). Each of the sub-categories was rated on a 6-point scale by a dean, a peer selected by the dean, and a peer selected by the evaluated faculty. Centra found that peers did not agree on their ratings and the peer selected by the evaluated faculty member was more lenient. From what he learned in the study, Centra suggested discussion among evaluators about the criteria and standards. Also, portfolios should be compiled over a period of years and include only a few categories.

Based on the practice of schools using portfolios, Edgerton et al. (1991) identified two useful lessons about evaluation using portfolios. For one, portfolio evaluators were able to score the portfolios after looking at only a few entries in each category. Beyond that, the evaluative work was redundant. Second, holistic evaluation can be a more helpful scoring method because it avoids the mess of intricate evaluations. This method would be preferred for formative evaluations aimed at individual improvement. On the other hand, if the campus is going to rely on evaluation for faculty promotion or tenure, developing a group of readers with expertise at portfolio evaluation was recommended. Other Evaluations

Self-evaluation is another form of evaluation. Examples include asking the teacher to develop a philosophy and goal statements (Kahn, 1993) or reflective essays (Glassick et al., 1997) about their teaching. Common methods of self-reports include annual reports where a teacher “brags” about their accomplishments for the year.
(Centra, 1993). Other methods include gathering materials to present to a promotion committee or completing a rating instrument that quantifies their performance. An examination of the research suggests self-evaluations should not be used for summative reasons because teachers tend to overate their teaching abilities and their estimates of student learning (Centra). However, for instructional improvement this can be useful.

Wagner (1999) outlined a method of using student journals in the teacher evaluation process. Students in a graduate diploma course in Sydney were required to keep a journal where they linked theory and practice and reflected on practice for personal development. Students gave consent to use their journals for evaluation of the teacher. Those that agreed removed information that identified their names and released it to the evaluator. Evaluators then used the information as part of the teacher’s evaluation. As the journals were analyzed key words and phrases were identified to better arrive at broad themes. During the process, the evaluators could determine from the themes whether course objectives were met.

According to Wagner, the advantages of using student journals included the immediacy of the information in relation to when it happened. Course evaluations at the end of the term fail to do this. Also, since journals are not specifically written for the evaluator, the journals provided a more honest assessment of the class. Another advantage was that it is relatively easy to collect because it is gathered from existing sources.

An obvious concern about using student journals is the volume of information that must be examined by evaluators. Other concerns included validity of self-reporting and quantitative nature of the data. Triangulation was sought to help alleviate this
problem. The author recommended using a journal essay only rather than a whole journal.

Traditional assessment processes have not been modified to account for web resources developed by faculty (Marine, 2002), despite its popularity. Sometimes internet sources are ignored for considerations in promotion (Young, 2002). The Modern Lanaguages Association (MLA) introduced the following guidelines for evaluating digital media productions by faculty for decisions in appointment, promotion, and tenure:

1. Engage qualified reviewers.
2. Review work in the medium in which it was produced.
3. Seek interdisciplinary advice

Evaluation Tools

The different modes of evaluation previously discussed, such as peer and student evaluation, may rely on various instruments to collect data during the evaluation process. These tools help quantify and objectify the evaluation process. Of the various types of evaluation instruments, Centra (1993) recommended that department chairpersons rank faculty members on different areas rather than using a numerical rating.

Knowledge Survey. The knowledge survey is a method of evaluation that may be useful for department chairpersons in control. Knowledge surveys assess changes in knowledge of students throughout a class (Nuhfer & Knipp, 2003). The survey is designed to assess course learning objectives by having students answer questions
before and after the information has been taught. Rather than asking students to answer questions, knowledge surveys ask for students to rate their perceived competence in answering the questions that are provided. The following is a sample excerpt from a knowledge survey instructions:

In this knowledge survey, don’t actually try to answer any of the questions provided. Instead rate (on a three-point scale) your confidence to answer the questions with your present knowledge. . . .

Mark an “A” as response if you feel confident that you can now answer the question sufficiently for graded test purposes.

Mark a “B” response to the question if you can now answer at least 50% of it or if you know precisely where you could quickly get the information needed and could return here in 20 minutes or less to provide a complete answer for graded test purposes.

Mark a “C” as response to the question if you are not confident that you could adequately answer the question for graded test purposes at this time.

(p. 61)

According to Nuhfer and Knipp (2003), knowledge surveys offer the advantage of covering an entire course in depth. Traditional student ratings offer a summative evaluation of the instructor, while the knowledge survey assesses learning more in depth. Based on their experiences and research with knowledge surveys, Nuhfer and Knipp also concluded that students perceived confidence aligned closely with actual performance on exams. Thus, if student learning is an objective in the department’s
strategic plan, the knowledge survey can be a viable assessment tool in the control process by the department chairperson.

**Matrix Model for Assessing Scholarship.** Boyer (1990) argued that scholarship should be broadly defined to embrace the full range of academic work. The four interrelated functions include discovery, integration, application, and teaching. This approach marks a departure in thinking from the distinctions between the traditional approach to service, teaching, and administration, and scholarship. Instead, Boyer proposed that all three areas should be viewed as scholarship. Glassick et al., (1997) expanded Boyer’s ideas to established six criteria for assessing scholarship. These include clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

Bush, Maid, and Roen (2003) introduce a matrix model that combined the two previously mentioned ideas in assessing teaching in e-learning environments. In the matrix, Boyer’s four categories are at the top while Glassick’s et al. assessments of scholarship are on the left. This matrix is based on the premise that both e-learning and traditional learning environments deserve the same considerations in assessment. Their work focuses on university teachers using this matrix for self-evaluation in design of the e-learning courses. This assessment tool may be useful for other evaluators such as peers or supervisors.

**Peer Evaluation.** Chism (1999) includes a number of resource materials that can be used during the peer evaluation process. For evaluating course materials, review forms were included that examined areas such as the syllabus, instruments for student feedback, course bibliographies, tests, and teacher’s feedback to students. Chism also
includes forms for use during the pre- and post-conferences along with the in-class evaluation instrument.

*Portfolio Evaluation.* Both Chism (1999) and Edgerton et al. (1991) included sample evaluation instruments to use in the portfolio evaluation process.

**Measuring Department Performance**

One aspect that is important to control is measurement of performance. This becomes very difficult for a department chairperson because they cannot rely on industrial performance measures like return on investment or cost-profit margin. Based on the available literature, Owlia and Aspinwall (1996) concluded there is little focus on measurement of quality in education. They suggest this is due to the lack of agreed conceptual framework for and the novelty of quality management in education. The respondents to the survey advocated measurement but there was no consensus on their methods and characteristics of such measurement.

**Controlling Behavior**

Managers seek to influence behavior of their subordinates by providing incentives. The major problem with tying rewards to performance is the difficult task of assessing performance of college teachers (Jauch & Orwig, 1997). Determining the teacher’s level of influence on a student is very difficult. Measuring performance in research is easier.

As the research model came to prevail, faculty members were too seldom recognized for their expertise in teaching or in applying knowledge in the service of society.
Professors downplayed matters of curriculum and pedagogy to respond to a reward system that stressed research and publication. . . . Many colleges and universities have been loath to bestow academic rewards on faculty members who concentrate on applying knowledge instead of discovering it. (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 8)

Leslie (2002) found that given reasonable security and pay, generally faculty would prefer to teach rather than seek higher paying opportunities for research and publication. Faculty received intrinsic satisfaction from teaching. However, the reward structure factors research productivity. Leslie recommended encouraging research by providing release time.

A survey of 245 head of education divisions (Marchant & Newman, 1991) revealed they believed tenure has a greater effect on faculty behavior than merit pay, contract renewal, promotion, internal satisfaction and desire for a reputation. Additionally, administrators at larger universities viewed desire for reputation as more motivating. Department chairpersons believed that internal department satisfaction was more of a motivating factor than deans. Deans rated merit pay, contract renewal, promotion, and tenure higher as a motivator than did department heads. Merit pay was considered significantly less effective than other variables affecting faculty behavior. Department heads and deans are most actively involved in faculty evaluation and reward decisions. Faculty committees were less likely to be involved. Faculty committees were more likely to be involved in tenure and promotion decisions than in merit pay or contract renewal decisions.
As Wergin (2001) indicated, a focus on external incentives may have the opposite effect because faculty value autonomy, community, recognition, and efficacy. Rewards that act as incentives are not the answer. As long as salaries are considered reasonable, professional employees generally enjoy their work based on challenges available, not monetary incentives (Lowendahl, 1997).

From results of their survey, Glassick et al. (1997) listed reward structures that were in place specifically for teaching (see Table 6). Among these, travel funds for teaching improvement and special awards for teaching excellence were the most popular currently employed incentives. Other popular methods included sabbaticals, grants, and release time aimed to improve teaching. Some universities give rewards to entire departments as incentives (Wergin, 1993).

Using Budgets for Control

“The budget is the cornerstone of the MCS [management control system] process” (Maciariello & Enteman, 1974, p. 601). Gmelch and Miskin (1995) identify the political and rational budget types as two distinct models. The political relies on administrative skills of bargaining, advocating, compromising, and negotiating. Data for budgeting is usually represented as a percentage increase based on the previous year’s budget. Under this method, only increases need to be justified by the department chairperson. Both internal and external comparisons are the basis of the budgeting system. On the other hand, rational models focus on objectives of the organization. Thus, when turning in budget requests to the dean, one must sell that the request will meet the college or institution goals. It is important for department chairpersons to understand the basis of their budgeting system.
The organization must be broken down into responsibility centers in order to implement the control system. According to Maciariello and Enteman (1974), each unit in the university should be identified as a cost center, financial contribution center, or investment center. A cost center will budget and control for only the cost variables. These include the provost office and all academic departments. Each institution should include a financial contribution center which has control over both revenue and expense variables. These are areas like the development office where activities can be budgeted on the basis of net contributions. Finally, investment centers include the president’s office or any other office where control exists for net contribution and investment performance.

A further consideration in budgeting is the decision making levels of budgetary control. Gmelch and Miskin (1995) identify the following levels:

1. Initial funding source (private sponsors/state and federal agencies)
2. Institutional level (universities/colleges)
3. General discipline level (schools/colleges/division)
4. Operational level (departments/programs/centers)
5. Individual level (faculty) (p. 85)

Of these, the latter two levels are especially applicable to department chairpersons. At the operational level, department chairpersons request resources that will best meet the needs of the department while at the individual level, faculty members request resources of the department chairperson for their individual needs.

Whatever the case, budgetary decisions should be based on well-established department goals (Gmelch and Miskin, 1995). Along with this, the chairperson must
decide who will help accomplish the goals. “You want to encourage faculty to propose and plan their own goals, but you must help them to connect their goals to the proposals and plans of the department” (p. 102).

Following the establishing of goals for budgetary planning, the chairperson should develop an action plan (Drucker 1974; Randolph & Posner; 1988; Steiner, 1979). This includes identifying specific activities, completion dates, and the specific person or persons required to accomplish a given goal or objective. Gmelch and Miskin (1995) claimed the action plan provides three benefits: initiative and impetus, improved communication, and meaningful priorities for budget decisions. The primary method of controlling this action plan is the chairperson’s authority to approve resource allocation.

A key component to the action plan is its voluntary nature so faculty do not perceive the implementation as a formality for close supervision. Instead of requiring the action plans, chairpersons should encourage them. According to Gmelch and Miskin’s recommendations, action plans are simply a tool in the control process that can be recommended at the discretion of the chairperson but are complete voluntary. Trust in the faculty’s authority to set their own goals is a basis for this thought.

Gmelch and Miskin (1995) recommended using a dual system of budgeting. The base budget included the bare-bones necessities. A developmental budget would be a stretch budget that is awarded as a block grant that departments or programs compete for on a one, two, or three year cycle. The purpose is to encourage collaborative work in program planning, course teaching, research, and service.
Conclusions

The previously discussed control frameworks are realistic models for implementation in universities. Raelin’s distributive autonomy model is relatively new and thus yields little definitive practical examples by which to judge its effectiveness. The dual ladder approach has been implemented for decades. Yet, despite various authors’ recommendation for use in higher education, it has still been largely ignored in universities. On the other hand, TQM has recently moved into the management procedures in many higher education institutions. Although it has suffered some disappointing results, it is the most notable managerial concept to receive attention in recent years.

Although Mullin and Wilson (2000) focus their article on control processes for student learning, their observation and suggestions are noteworthy in dealing with faculty control.

Indeed, serious faculty efforts to engage outcomes-driven processes have failed to produce significant changes in teaching and learning because such processes are overlaid on the existing system and are not controlling. Student completion of a set of course credits remains the system’s controlling criterion rather than student demonstration of competence on a set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (KSAs) outcomes. The organizing principle or criterion of system design and control is unchanged (p. 227).

In order to change, the university must first examine the current paradigm of the course credit model. Mullin and Wilson (2000) suggest a change using a TQM model that replaces the entire system, rather than just partial and incremental improvements of
the existing stable system. If physical education departments are to progressively change, there should be a scientific approach to change based on appropriate managerial research. Physical educators are scientists, but do they rely on scientific approaches to management? This study will examine the extent to which this is done.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of the study was to (a) analyze and explain the current managerial control practices of chairpersons in university physical education departments and (b) to determine the perceived outcomes of these practices. The researcher gathered qualitative information from interviews of department chairpersons, faculty members, and administrative assistants at five major universities in the Northwest area of the United States.

A number of strategies outlined by McMillan and Schumacher (2001) were used. Multi-method strategies are defined as the use of several data collection techniques to permit triangulation of the data. One way the researcher accomplished this was by interviewing multiple individuals in each department. Instead of relying on descriptions strictly from the department chairperson, faculty and staff were interviewed to provide multiple perspectives of the managerial control practices in each department. Verbatim accounts and the use of digital recorder data were also strategies used to increase validity. Each account was recorded and transcribed by the researcher in the exact words of each participant to ensure accuracy.

Selection of the Method

A qualitative style of research was chosen to ensure depth of information would be gathered at each site for each participant. First person interviews were conducted for the benefit of face-to-face data gathering. This type of field research is labeled
interactive qualitative research (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). An advantage of qualitative research is that a researcher, through inductive reasoning, avoids imparting preexisting expectations on the results of the study (Mertens, 1998).

Mertens (1998) identified three reasons for choosing qualitative research: researcher’s view of the world, nature of the research question, and practical reasons. The researcher held a constructivist philosophy whereby multiple realities exist that are time and context dependent (Mertens, McMillan, & Schumacher, 2001). The qualitative method allowed for collection of information directly from each participant’s perspective. The aim of the current research was to analyze and explain managerial control. This phenomenon can be better understood through the rich nature of qualitative data. A positivist approach is simply too narrowly focused to adequately understand the nature of management. The practical rationale for the current research was another concern in selecting the qualitative method. No standardized measures were located that could be used to comprehensively assess the management control in higher education from a quantitative perspective. Furthermore, education is a very personal field relying primarily on written and oral communication. Consequently, this research concurs with the culture of education. Furthermore, this method afforded the researcher more flexibility to guide the participants in answering questions related to managerial control better than a paper instrument could have. Since physical education department chairpersons, faculty, and administrative assistants likely had little formal training in management, terms related to managerial control could be misunderstood. Face-to-face interaction helped overcome this potential limitation.
Participants

The participants were selected according to a purposeful sampling design (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001) to facilitate the accuracy of information. The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (www.nwccu.org) is a regional accrediting body for higher education institutions in Alaska, Montana, Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Nevada, and Utah. The colleges and universities in this region contain a limited number of schools with physical education departments. Of these schools, a very select few offer graduate degrees in the field of physical education. Thirteen schools offer masters degrees only while five offer doctoral degrees. The researcher chose to study the latter because schools with doctoral degrees generally have a higher number of faculty members who are very specialized. Since organizations with more employees require more formal control (Anthony & Govindarajan, 2004), it is more likely that chairpersons in physical education departments with masters and doctoral degrees will demonstrate more overt management control techniques than smaller departments.

Names of all institutions meeting the criteria were obtained from a graduate program search on the Petersons.com website by selecting all of the following search words: “exercise and sports science,” “kinesiology and movement studies,” “physical education,” “sport psychology,” and “sports administration.” These results were confirmed using the GradSchools.com website search for “kinesiology,” “physical education,” “sports administration,” and “sports psychology” under the “sports & physical education” subject drop-down menu.

Demographic data on each of the departments are presented in Table 7. The researcher collected information from one private and four public universities from three
different states. The participating institutions ranged from 12,067 to 32,771 in total student enrollment. The smallest department included nine full-time faculty members, 300 undergraduate students, and 45 graduate students. The largest department housed 30 full-time faculty members and 1,082 undergraduate students. Their 56 graduate students were fewer than two other departments that had 64 and 70 graduate students respectively.

Descriptive data for participants are presented in Table 8. Department chairpersons ranged from 52 to 67 years old. One participant had been chairperson for 17 years and another 9 years. The other three had been in their positions fewer than 5 years. Each chairperson had been employed at their institution for a substantial amount of time, ranging from 16 to 37 years. The tenured faculty participants’ ages ranged from 41 to 60, while tenure-track faculty members ranged from 36 to 48. Administrative assistants had a larger age range (27 to 49) and each had been at their institution for a relatively short time (3 to 6 years).

The researcher interviewed the department chairperson at each school. In addition, two full-time faculty members were randomly selected for interview to gain information regarding the perceptions of the chairperson’s management control techniques. One faculty member was a tenure-track employee who had not yet achieved tenure. The other faculty member was tenured. These criteria provided a varied perspective related to control and outcomes. The faculty member who was working toward tenure would logically see more elements of control than a tenured faculty member. In addition, the department administrative assistant was interviewed for a third perspective of control and outcomes. In one department, the administrative assistant
declined to participate and the department chairperson granted only one faculty member interview.

Procedures were followed to protect the rights of participants. Collection of data began following approval from the Graduate School of Texas Woman’s University, and the Human Subjects Review Committee. Each potential participant was sent an email requesting their participation (see Appendix A). Before each interview was conducted, participants read and signed consent forms that included specific information about their potential risks (see Appendix B). Furthermore, the researcher ensured anonymity in written work by omitting information that could potential allow someone to identify a participant, changing actual names to pseudonyms, and not including universities’ names. Furthermore, standardized gender pronouns were used to eliminate the ability of one to identify a person because of their gender. All department chairpersons and tenured faculty members were referred to as male and all administrative assistants and tenure-track faculty members as female.

Instruments

Interview questions were developed for the department chairperson (see Appendix C) and for each faculty member and administrative assistant interview (see Appendix D). The questions were based on elements and activities of management control identified by Anthony and Govindarajan (2004): strategic planning, budgeting, resource allocation, performance measurement and evaluation, communicating, deciding, and influencing. Furthermore, the elements of the control process (DuBrin, 2000) were also incorporated in the questioning: planning, measuring, and feedback.
Each question on the in-depth interview instrument was designed as open-ended questions to illicit data rich responses (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Furthermore, probes were added to ensure adequate descriptions were obtained for each question. “Interview probes elicit elaboration of detail, further explanations, and clarification of responses” (p. 448).

Pilot Study

Well-designed interviews are first field tested (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). This was accomplished by a pilot study, which was conducted at a university that offered a physical education masters degree in the same accreditation region used in the actual study. Participants were the department chairperson, administrative assistant, and a tenured faculty member. Each person was interviewed in person using a semistructured questionnaire. The interviews were audio recorded using an Olympus DM-1 digital voice recorder. A GE microcassette audio recorder Model No. 3-5373A was used as a backup. Following the interview, the audio files were downloaded to a computer using DSS Player 2000 (Version 1.0.7) software. Using this software, the audio files were then converted to WAV files. These files were played on Dictation Buddy (Version 2.2) software for the researcher to type a transcript of the interviews using Microsoft Word 2000 (Version 9).

Feedback and Revisions

At the completion of each interview, the participant was asked to provide feedback about the questions and the interview process. Each participant provided verbal feedback that yielded useful information for modifying the instrument and procedures used in the actual study.
The pilot study was used to improve the quality of the instrument by assessing the clarity of each question and identifying potential modifications. During the interviews, both the administrative assistant and faculty member asked the researcher to rephrase one of the questions because they did not understand it. The question read, “Describe any attempts at behavioral change of faculty/staff you have witnessed from your department chair?” Based on this feedback, the question was reworded to read, “Describe the techniques you have witnessed the department chairperson use to change unwanted faculty/staff behavior.” In addition, the faculty participant in the study thought it would be important to have a question that addressed feedback to faculty in the control process. Since feedback is an important aspect of control systems (Anthony & Govindarajan, 2004; DuBrin, 2000), probe questions were added that specifically addressed feedback (see question numbers 2 and 4 in Appendix C and Appendix D).

Another suggestion, by the chairperson, was to ask a general question, “What is your philosophy of control?” This question was added to the actual study to compliment the existing questions, which were aimed to target areas of control that would yield themes that accurately described each chairperson’s control philosophy. Adding a final question on philosophy of control would contribute to the validity of the themes by adding another source for triangulation.

The pilot study also aided in improving the interview procedure. During the interviews, the researcher realized one question seemed to be more appropriate to be included earlier in the interview so questions were reordered. Another thought that occurred to the researcher was that the department chairperson may be confused about whether the questions should be answered regarding the staff or the faculty member.
Furthermore, the researcher discovered that two of the participants in the pilot study assumed the interview would be over the telephone. Based on this discovery, the researcher ensured that subsequent participants clearly understood that the interview would be in person.

Other minor adjustments, based on the pilot study, included a revision to the introductory information of the field notes form. Subsequent interviews also adhered to suggestions by the pilot study participants such as adding more prompting statements of the nature, “Please explain more.” Another participant suggested that the researcher provide examples ready for a participant who wants more explanation for a question. The researcher also noted that there might be a semantic problem with words such as “strategic plan.” One of the participants equated this with “program review,” which the chairperson clearly indicated was different from the strategic plan. Also, while contacting the department chairperson for the pilot study, the researcher was informed the secretary was actually an “administrative assistant.” From personal experience and this response, the researcher concluded using the word “secretary” might carry some connotations that are not preferred by the “assistant” to the chairperson. In subsequent work, the researcher used “administrative assistant” to refer to the secretary of the department chairperson.

Initially, the researcher contacted a different university than the one used in the final pilot study. This university was not used because the chairperson was an interim in their first semester in the position. Both the researcher and the interim chairperson thought it would not be an accurate department to collect data from due to the tenuous nature of their managerial situation. This interim situation raised caution about what
should be done if a department in the actual study had been in a similar transition period. Rather than eliminate a school from the study, the researcher determined the best option would be to examine the situation and develop an appropriate plan for collecting information at that school. At the school that was initially contacted for the pilot study, the previous chairperson been promoted to associate dean. If the actual study had a similar circumstance, the previous chairperson could have been interviewed since the managerial practices would still have been current in his or her mind and the minds of the faculty and staff. Other situations would need to be examined individually to ensure that the data collection would be accurate, based on the managerial control practices implemented in the department.

Procedures

Based on the pilot study, the researcher concluded that data collection utilizing a semistructured interview technique was appropriate in this investigation. The interviews occurred on the campus of each school in the respective offices of the participants being interviewed. In some cases, a conference room was used for the administrative assistant. If necessary, probe questions were asked to prompt the subject to provide additional information. The researcher attempted to clarify any misunderstood responses from the participants and explained that additional comments would be welcomed at any time.

The researcher made notations on a field notes form (see Appendix E) during the interview and immediately following the interview. Each interview was digitally audio recorded and transcribed soon after the interview using the same technique and equipment employed in the pilot study.
At the outset of the interview, each respondent was asked to sign a consent form (see Appendix B) that had previously been emailed to them to read in advance. The consent form included the following:

1. Research information and purpose of study.
2. Potential risk.
3. Questions.

**Design and Analysis**

Based on listening to the interviews and reading the transcripts, the researcher identified themes from the information that described the common managerial control practices in the departments. Data reduction is the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming data. The data were analyzed using inductive analysis which, “means that categories and patterns emerge from the data rather than being imposed on data prior to data collection” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, p. 14). The researcher followed a process recommended by McMillan and Schumacher that uses an ordered pattern as follows: field work, data, topics, categories, patterns, and narrative structure. The researcher is free to circle back and address multiple aspects of the process before arriving at the final analysis. “The ultimate goal of qualitative research is to make general statements about relationships among categories by discovering patterns in the data” (p. 476). Based on these patterns the researcher developed a list of assertions that summarized the findings from the research.

The validity of the themes were confirmed by using triangulation. Since there were multiple participants at each school, findings were verified within each department
to ensure the information was accurate according to the perceptions of each participant. Furthermore, by collecting information from several departments, the researcher was able to verify themes across institutions to arrive at more universal conclusions.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purpose of the study was to analyze and explain the current managerial control practices of chairpersons in university physical education departments and to determine the perceived outcomes of these practices. The researcher undertook an interview process to gather qualitative data from participants at five major universities. In this chapter, the data will be presented according to six major themes that the researcher extracted during the analysis based on an attempt to answer the research questions. These are cited beginning with the theme most frequently mentioned. The major themes presentations are followed by concluding data that supports minor themes and relates to additional findings.

Based on an analysis of the data, the researcher found consistent information within each department and strong similarities between departments that resulted in confident conclusions. Data gathered from each department was confirmed by at least two sources in the department to ensure the data were accurately presented. The information was presented from the viewpoints of department chairpersons, faculty, and administrative assistants in the various departments studied. The results are reflective of managerial control practices at major universities in the Northwest region of the United States.

All participants in the study appeared to be open and honest in their answers. The research concluded on the field notes that each participant displayed a calm,
relaxed, and confident demeanor. Some potential faculty participants chose not to participate in the study by failing to respond to initial emails requesting their participation. The participants seemed eager to provide information during their interviews, particularly the department chairpersons.

**THEME 1: CHAIRPERSONS INITIATED VERY FEW INNOVATIVE CONTROLS**

Department chairpersons relied on existing controls in higher education and initiated very few innovative or unique managerial control techniques. The main controls included budgetary controls, minimizing discretionary money for faculty, organizing strategic planning sessions when required by the institution, and periodic evaluations of faculty.

*Budgetary Control*

A common control technique used in all the departments studied was traditional budgetary controls. This finding supports the theory that the budget is the most important management control tool for financial activities within non-profit setting such as universities (Anthony & Govindarajan, 2004). The budgetary controls at the universities included annual allocations to the departments which were to be controlled by the department chairpersons. The budget seemed to be the most prominent area under the chairperson’s jurisdiction that he maintained complete dominion. Each department included subdisciplines for areas such as pedagogy, sport psychology, and exercise physiology. Generally, the heads of these subdisciplines provided input to the department chairpersons regarding their needs in the budget. The other faculty provided very little input into how the budget would be allocated. The budget generally followed a long-established pattern of allocation of funds. To control expenditures in these areas,
the department chairperson personally approved each request or had the administrative assistant approve requests. In most cases, larger purchases required the chairperson’s personal approval while minor expenses and travel allotments were handled by an administrative assistant.

All but one of the departments employed an administrative assistant to monitor and account for spending. This assistant maintained a spreadsheet on her computer to record expenses and provided periodic reports to the chairperson that detailed the department spending. The other department relied on reports from accounting rather than tracking expenditures in-house with staff employees. Two departments used an expense request form that was submitted when purchases were requested but one indicated that often these requests were taken care of through email. The other departments relied on verbal requests to either the chairperson or administrative assistant. If requests were approved, the administrative assistant recorded the expenditures and filled out the proper paperwork required by the university. One institution in the study was about to employ a university-wide electronic system of approving and tracking expenditures. Another university already had an online system in place for the administrative assistant and chairperson to track progress on their budget. Under this system, the faculty were able to purchase products directly from websites of their vendors and enter a university code that the administrative could easily enter in the system for billing.

The chairpersons maintained such strict control of the budgets that faculty had little discretion in expenditures. The only discretionary money faculty had control over included travel allotments and grants they had personally been awarded. One
department allowed each faculty a yearly amount of $250 to spend as they wished. In another department, one faculty participant indicated direct control of his spending for unique center because he had his own budget. Program heads of the subdisciplines at the same university maintained some discretionary control of some budget allotments and earmarked donations. One department significantly differed from the others with discretionary money by allowing each faculty $1,000 of discretionary money (e.g., travel), $1,700 for supplies and services (e.g., mail, phone), and freedom with spending of student fees that were generated from their classes. Aside from grants, travel, and some unique situations, each faculty member had to go through an approval process for any purchases.

A common method used in many businesses to track equipment and guide spending is an inventory. The inventory process in the departments was mainly informal for supplies and equipment. Office supplies were periodically assessed to determine what purchases needed to be made. No department had a unique formalized inventory process for lab and teaching equipment. Computers and some larger equipment in each department were inventoried formally by other university personnel on an annual basis.

*Performance Evaluation*

Performance evaluation focused on the traditional areas of faculty excellence: teaching, scholarship, and service (Boyer, 1990). In each department, the chairperson reviewed annual self-reports by faculty members that listed their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service. These self-reports included accomplishments throughout the school year except at one university, where accomplishments were evaluated during the calendar year.
For teaching, student evaluation of teaching was the primary source of information used to judge faculty effectiveness. This confirms evidence that in academia, teaching is evaluated by primarily relying on student evaluation of teaching instruments (Glassick et al., 1997; Saroyan & Amundsen, 2001). Most participants in the study indicated some apprehension over this method. At two institutions, participants indicated exceptionally low return rates for the recently implemented internet-based student evaluations of teaching. One school’s return rate was 29 percent while the other indicated 40 to 60 percent. Conversely, another institution’s internet-based evaluations yielded response rates that rivaled paper and pencil evaluations. The researcher viewed a printout feedback for a participant that included 60 of 76 student responses. Overall, the department had a 73 percent return. However, the faculty indicated she really emphasized the importance of filling out the evaluations. The university online system also had a feature that prompted students to fill out the evaluations before they could view their final grades. Three of the five institutions in the study had recently implemented internet-based evaluation forms.

Although it was used inconsistently, peer evaluation was another method of evaluating teaching. One department required at least two peers to visit the classroom to evaluate the instructor using a 1 to 5 rating scale but only for formal reviews in the third year and for tenure. Similar timing for peer review occurred at a different department that additionally required instructors to submit information such as the syllabus, notes, assignments, and exams to the peer reviewer before they visited the classroom. Based on the analysis, the reviewer would submit a letter to the teacher along with a copy to the chairperson or vice versa. These letters went in their personnel file and were part of
the portfolios developed for third year review and tenure review. The faculty members in
the department had recently decided to make peer review optional for post-tenure
review. One chairperson indicated he used peers, mentors, and himself for formative
evaluations in an attempt to improve teaching. However, he indicated this was
“marginally successful.” Most participants indicated the peer review process was very
sporadic in their departments. A chairperson attributed the unsystematic peer review
process to the labor intensive nature of peer review. One department included no peer
review other than some voluntary informal evaluations that contributed to improvement
of teaching. Some faculty and chairpersons expressed disappointment that peer reviews
of teaching was not used more prevalently.

Chairpersons also indicated that they periodically evaluated teaching by visiting
classrooms. Usually this was once or twice per faculty member, but mainly with newer
faculty member who were working toward tenure. The faculty participants in this study
failed to confirm this, as they revealed that they had not been evaluated by the current
chairperson. One chairperson indicated he only visited a classroom if there was a
problem identified with a teacher. Another chairperson described his evaluation of
classroom teaching as follows:

With my old-timers, who have been here, I don’t go in the classroom. With the
new faculty, I try to visit their classroom in the first year or two. Not a lot. Maybe
once or twice a semester just to get a feel for how they are doing. I learned that if
you have a problem, you will hear about it. The students will come in or I will hear
about it. For my best teachers, rarely does a student come in and tell me how
good a faculty is doing.
The evaluation of scholarship was mainly based on “numbers” of publications each year. Faculty and chairpersons generally agreed that evaluating the quality of publications was difficult due to the diversity of subdisciplines in physical education. For example, a committee member or chairperson that has a background in sport psychology lacks the expertise to judge a publication by an exercise physiologist. Because of this, attempts to assess the quality of scholarship were very subjective and often just relied on numbers of publications. Only one department utilized peers from outside the department to review a vita and publications to vote in the tenure and promotion process. Both chairpersons and faculty indicated another difficulty related to subdisciplines was interdisciplinary comparison of number of publications. Some subdisciplines allow greater turn-around time in the research and peer review while others progress more slowly.

A more quantitative scholarship assessment noted by the researcher was the use of impact factor at two of the institutions. Impact factor is a rating of number of times an author is cited in other journals. This number could be accessed through a paid service usually housed in the library. The use of impact factor scores was also problematic because of the diverse nature of the subdisciplines. Participants indicated that many of the physical education faculty published in journals that were not included in impact factor databases.

Grantsmanship proved to be a prominent factor within the scholarship component of the evaluations. Again, the faculty members’ subdisciplines were considered by evaluators because lab-based sciences tended to yield higher dollar amounts than social sciences. No chairperson indicated there was an expected dollar
amount; rather, they were more concerned about a persistent attempt to apply for grants.

The main component of service evaluation was reporting of different committees and offices held on campus. Participants largely ignored this component in their responses causing the researcher to conclude it held less importance than teaching and scholarship. One department chairperson outlined the importance of the three areas by stating: “. . .Academia is a very competitive network these days. It is publish or perish. We talk and give lip service to citizenship, teaching, and research or creative works. But the last one wags the other two.”

Evaluations in teaching, scholarship, and service followed an annual cycle. After the previously indicated evaluation processes, each chairperson submitted a letter to their school dean that summarized the evaluation of the faculty member. The tenure and promotion requirements seemed to be the driving force behind evaluation endeavors. Yearly reviews followed a more subjective evaluation process by department chairpersons while the third and fifth year reviews for tenure-track faculty were more formal and objective. These formal evaluations included other committees in addition to the chairperson. During tenure and promotion decisions, a letter from the chairperson was also provided to the promotion and tenure committee. One department included two committees for promotion and tenure. One peer committee was an advocate committee to help guide the faculty toward tenure while the other served to evaluate and, on approval, send information to the entire university faculty for a vote on tenure acceptance.
From the chairpersons’ perspectives, evaluations served to both guide tenure-track faculty in their progress toward tenure and make decisions on the allocation of merit pay. Consequently, tenured faculty members were not concerned about earning merit nor did they receive much attention from chairpersons in the evaluation processes in the departments. Essentially, evaluation was not purposeful or meaningful for tenured faculty. For the institutions that included tenure review, the faculty members’ tenured colleagues had more say in the evaluation process than the department chairperson.

After the evaluations were complete, feedback was provided to the faculty members by two means. Three of the departments performed required annual conferences between each faculty member and the chairperson. During this conference the department chairperson reviewed the faculty member’s performance. Other schools only included a letter that was personally delivered and discussed with each tenure-track faculty member during the formal reviews at the third year and fifth year. One department chairperson indicated he reviewed previous personal goals and wrote new goals for each faculty member. The writing of goals seemed to be inconsistent among faculty though.

The researcher discovered some unique evaluations techniques. One school used undergraduate and graduate student advisory committees during the evaluation process. These committees each had a vote during the evaluation process particularly regarding formal evaluations for tenure and promotion. One institution developed a ranking system that was later adopted by the entire college. This procedure is discussed in the section titled “Theme 6: A Variety of Measurement and Feedback” below.
Planning

Strategic planning was largely absent as a driving force in the departments studied. More formalized planning procedures were implemented by subdisciplines in the department. Some of the subdisciplines maintained significant strategic planning activity along with specific and measurable long-term and short-term objectives. On the other hand, when asked about department-wide goals and objectives, most faculty members indicated within the last couple of years, goals were developed but they could not remember exactly when it happened. Mostly, faculty could not recall specific departmental goals and objectives in the department. At least two of the departments had instituted some form of individual goal development but faculty members indicated some ambiguity on what these were and the nature of this process. Basically, the use of specific goals as a persistent force in the departments was noticeably absent.

The planning that did occur mainly consisted of sporadic planning session in which general goals were developed. No participants indicated their department included goals with discrete measurable outcomes. The following statement by a department chairperson characterized the mission and goal development that was present in most departments:

Our goal, in short, is to be the best department that we can. . . . On a routine basis, we evaluate what do we need to do now in order to meet the goals of that mission. We have a mission and I’m not sure we have a lot of objectives underneath that mission. That is to say, I don’t think we have written them down. I think there are some understood objectives and we say anything that causes us to be better at our mission, we are willing to talk about.
Participants in one department yearly assessed their mission and goals and decided if changes should be made. The importance of mission and goals in this department was more apparent than others studied. The department included framed mission and goal statements in faculty offices and in the main office of the department.

One school utilized various committees to help with financial decisions. For example, there were separate committees to make decisions on travel allotments, capital expenditures, and curriculum. Furthermore, ad hoc committees were formed to examine issues such as a department name change. The chairperson also utilized a department advisory board to help him make decisions. This same department included an assistant chairperson who was consulted on many decisions, sat on various departmental committees, and was responsible for evaluating staff.

THEME 2: CONTROL FROM ABOVE

Formal control procedures were mandated by administrators above the department chairperson level and were seen as a required formality by both faculty and chairpersons. These mandated initiatives were often driven by state education boards, new presidents, and new deans that seemed to follow a cyclical pattern, prompted by changes in upper administrators. Faculty, and to a greater degree chairpersons, appeared to be more reactionary to these changes rather than initiating departmental control techniques. In essence, “chairpersons were the ones being controlled, rather than the ones doing the controlling.” The following statement by a tenured faculty member provided evidence to support this finding:

Most of that feedback is given because those are the rules that govern the university. The problem is that as you get administrators at the higher level that
change, the rules change. So you are always in flux. They tell us student credit hours doesn’t mean much and then it does mean something. They tell us they are a graduate institution but then they are counting student credit hours. It depends on who is in power sometimes.

Rather than include the faculty in these managerial responsibilities, chairpersons were more apt to fulfill these duties on their own. In fact, faculty preferred for managerial duties to be left to the chairperson. As a result, chairpersons struggled in the daily bureaucratic responsibilities required by upper administration, detached from their previous roles as teaching and research faculty. Both faculty participants at one school indicated that the chairperson took on too much responsibility and the managerial pressure completely realigned his job description. At another school, the department chairperson struggled to relate his contributions toward the traditional areas of scholarship, teaching, and service:

Curriculum initiatives, I pretty much leave to those coordinators and faculty in those program areas. We probably could have done more in marketing if we had more time. As chair, the scholarship ink pin went dry as soon as I became chair. There is just no time to do scholarship. So that has suffered personally there. If I can create time for the faculty to do theirs, then that is my justification. I try to be very democratic. Open door policy. Faculty and students can come and go as they want, and they do. I would rather have them do that than have to make an appointment. I think collegiality, shared responsibility in leadership, I try to provide as much service to them as I can so they can do the things that they need to be doing.
Strategic Planning

Strategic planning processes were driven not by department but by the university or college. Two departments had not undergone a strategic plan since the universities required an institution-wide planning initiative. In three departments, strategic planning occurred approximately every 3 years depending on the feelings of the administration at the time while one department yearly assessed its plan. Only one department chairperson had initiated some strategic planning but indicated it had not been a reoccurring fixture in the way he managed the department. Furthermore, he indicated the college would be implementing strategic planning because of some recent department mergers in the college and a new dean. Another department chairperson indicated he had plans to initiate a new strategic planning session the upcoming summer. Strategic plans that were developed existed more as a formality and did not drive the daily activities in the department. One faculty member lamented,

We really don’t have a long-term strategic plan. It is something that the university wants us to develop. It is something we are doing because we are asked, but to be honest with you, we spend the time and put these goals together and they sit on a shelf and nothing happens. There is no real incentive to be involved.

A department chairperson expressed a desire to develop a good strategic plan but felt restricted by his current capabilities:

I didn’t have the authority or the money to say we are going to bring in a team or we are going to bring in a specialist and we are going to do the things that are necessary to do a good job of strategic planning. Consequently, to answer your question, the strategic planning here is not very good. Unless an academic
authority, the dean or the university, says you are going to do a full-scale strategic plan, then it pretty hard for somebody at my level of management to say we are going to do it.

Another chairperson clearly indicated strategic planning was generated by the university as a whole:

   The strategic planning process we have evolves from the university strategic planning process. As the university has obligations for us to record that in the college, usually they don't ask for departmental strategic plans, they ask for a college strategic plan. The college then will go to the different departments and ask for theirs and it is all incorporated into that process. It has been a few years since we engaged in that, I am estimating 4 or 5 years since the university went through a major strategic plan initiative. That is, on the global level. On the more minor or individual level for issues that develop in the department, that don't relate to the college or university strategic plan, it is almost like management by situation or crisis or whatever you want to call it. As an issue comes along, then we will deal with that issue.

   Furthermore, as one faculty member clearly indicated in the statement below, missions and goals that were developed revolved around survival, both for the department and for the individual:

   Most of the time the mission statement has to do with, what is the university mission statement. We are protective in the sense that we want to make sure we are doing something for the university so we don't lose our department. . . . We try to position ourselves so that we are an important cog in the university mission.
The goals are not, to become the best, but of course to not become the worst. I don’t know what written goals they might have. Faculty don’t look at it that way. Most goals are not departmental goals, they are individual goals. At a research one institution, the young faculty particularly have to have the goals of getting promoted and tenured which means you have to write grants, you have to publish articles, you have to do some teaching, and some service. Those are individual goals. They seem to override the departmental goals because that is survival.

A different university in the study required strategic planning during a decennially review. Other than this, the chairperson indicated the university tenure requirements contributed an intentional lack of consistency and faculty involvement in strategic planning. He said,

One thing that faculty people don’t like to do is waste their time. . . .What would make me decidedly unpopular as a department head would be to engage in something that is not question driven. Most of our professors are tenure-track but not tenured professors. The tenure qualifications on this campus are pretty rigorous. Most of my job is to protect these people’s time so they can be successful. Going back to the original question, our strategic planning process is for me to identify a certain number of issues. Those issues are not specific to me, other people on the faculty recognize that those issues exist, they are just not as important as their own individual survival. My job is to first of all try to identify some of those issues, check it off with those people, and then find a way to deal with those issues with as little time as possible.
Feedback

Along with planning, feedback on performance was also prompted by school protocol. The nature of this feedback is discussed in the previous theme. A tenure-track faculty member indicated,

You get feedback relative to the (department handbook), which are teaching, research, and service. That happens on a yearly basis. Other than that, there is no (feedback), and that is kind of a shame. There is not a sit down and tell me how you are doing and tell me what you need. All the documents we create are very form driven. Not that there is a form, but there is a method to the creation.

Incentives

All of the incentives were mainly under the control of the university. Chairpersons had some control over how merit was distributed but the tenuous nature of the budgets had recently made this an unpredictable incentive. The main incentive chairpersons were able to employ was the distribution of an allotment of merit. In one department, merit pay was determined within the college based on a ranking system in three major areas. Another was based within the department on a ranking system by a specially appointed merit committee that individually ranked faculty and then convened to arrive at a group decision on distribution of merit. Three schools indicated over the recent years merit pay had been temporarily abolished because of financial constraints within the university. Merit held little value for tenured faculty because the relative amount earned from merit was not worth the effort. This supports Marchant and Newman’s (1991) findings that merit was a relatively ineffective way to influence faculty behavior.
In addition to merit, one university maintained teaching grants as incentive for faculty but these were outside the control of the department. Due to its lucrative budget situation, one department allowed for ample faculty travel, help with scholarship and research, and financially assisted undergraduate students in attending conventions.

A university in the study included a departmental incentive to stay within budget. If one percent of the total budget remained at the end of the year, the following year would include a budget buffer of the same amount, of which the department could do anything they wished. However, if they did not use it that year, they lost it.

Evaluation

Evaluation procedures were essentially governed campuswide. Formal evaluations for tenure took place at the third and fifth years. Department chairpersons took part in this but were not the driving force behind these evaluations nor did their input appear to be a major factor in the decisions.

Three of the institutions required staff to undergo a yearly evaluation. This was the responsibility of the assistant department chairperson at one institution. Another school did not require annual evaluations of staff so the chairperson elected not to evaluate them. If a staff member was having problems, the chairperson would meet with the member and together outline an action plan for improvement.

Universities also governed controls regarding departmental performance. One university included a complex sampling of students to give feedback to individual departments regarding their overall performance in teaching. At least three universities generated reports citing student credit hours generated in the department. One university expected departments to contribute to a 2.5 enrollment growth and also
examined credit hours generated in junior and senior level classes. Each university also required student evaluations of teaching and tracked departmental averages.

*Expenditures*

As would be expected, universities required specific accounting and purchasing procedures to be followed in each department. Departmental budgets were “handed down” from the college deans. Furthermore, department chairpersons answered to their deans regarding progress meeting their budgets each year. One department was even asked to share budgeted allocations with other departments who were over budget within the college. Another department had only recently been charged with the responsibility of administering the budget. Two years earlier the budget was administered at the college level.

The researcher discovered other matters that the university controlled. One university had instituted a 3-year rotation for the purchase of new computers and any peripherals (e.g., scanners, printers) must have been purchased with a discretionary money. At the same university, capital expenditures were handled by a college committee, rather than within the department. Many other purchases were expected to be handled with grant money generated within the department instead of relying on the general university funds for this money.

**THEME 3: DEPARTMENTS FLOURISHED WITH A FEW FACULTY CONCERNS**

The departments continued to operate and flourish under the current paradigm of management control in higher education although faculty voiced some concerns about management processes. The researcher observed departments that were “running fairly smoothly.” Furthermore, the researcher noted that the departments involved in the study
were reputable leaders in the field of physical education. Their undergraduate and graduate degree programs had been offered for a number of years. At least two of the departments included former presidents of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD).

The current paradigm included a pragmatic approach to managing the department. Department chairpersons used whatever worked to keep the department as a viable component to the university. This involved mainly reactionary management decisions as described in Theme 2. Both a chairperson and a faculty participant at different institutions described the style as management by crisis. According to the faculty participant,

We talk about certain issues but normally we are only concerned when a crisis comes up rather than being prepared for the crisis. I'll give you an example: 5 years ago I kept saying we need more pedagogy. Now there are 120 jobs I see being advertised in pedagogy. We don't have enough students to even make a dent.

Many of the departments purposefully scheduled only a couple department meetings throughout the year because they considered more meetings to be inefficient and unproductive. One department chairperson explained a process he used to ensure the department meetings were productive. Based on his interaction with the faculty, the chairperson attempted to identify concerns and questions that needed to be addressed. When important questions arose, he presented these to the faculty to discuss in one-on-one interactions and sometimes small groups. After these informal discussions had occurred, a meeting was scheduled to arrive at firm decisions. In his words, “When we
get together decisions are made and there is not a lot of, 'Well what do you think about this? What do you think about that?' because all of that stuff has been done already before we get there.” Two department chairpersons emphasized that faculty enjoyed their philosophy of limiting faculty meetings.

Although very few formalized controls were initiated by the department chairpersons, participants in one department indicated that the chairperson always knew what was happening.

(The chairperson) doesn't come in to the classroom but he knows what goes on. He is an amazing person. You don’t see him in the hallway but he knows what is happening in your office. If you walked in there and asked him, he could tell you which offices are open most often in this hallway, which have the most students through them, what is going on in here, and yet you don’t see him do that but I know he has been outside the door once in a while because he can’t get the information he has. He talks to students too. He is very aware of what is going on even though you don’t see his presence there. And it is not like he is a watch dog or anything. I don’t feel like I am being tailed. I have never had anyone in the classroom. It has all come from students talking to him. I think he has somebody he asks very specific questions of especially grad students because their feedback is pretty dependable and on a bit higher level.

A consistent concern at three institutions was the financial restraints implemented by the state governments. The lack of funding put severe restrictions on travel and merit pay at each institution. One department even elected to limit expenditures on copy paper and basic supplies in order to maintain their travel
allotments. At this institution, faculty members paid for their own copies, printer paper, and supplies. Despite these financial constraints, the chairperson was not a subject of complaints because they were viewed as equally subject to governmental funding cuts. Furthermore, faculty members indicated that if something needed to be purchased, the chairperson was able to find the funds.

Despite the tight control of the budget indicated in theme 1, there seemed to be little concern by faculty over their individual control of spending. The researcher saw no indication that faculty members felt a pressing need for equipment or supplies that the university could not afford or would not allow them to purchase. If faculty members requested items, it was usually granted with no apparent concern for budget overexpenditures. The researcher found little evidence of significant power struggles over the allocation of monies in the departments studied.

Department chairpersons at four of the five institutions showed little concern for controlling expenditures because they felt their budgets were very lucrative. Two departments indicated that their budgets were more stable than other departments on campus. One of these departments relied on some important sources of income that were allowed within the university budget structure. A number of years previously, the activity class requirements on campus were taken away and the department lost the state funding that accompanied the requirement. When this happened, they were allowed a fee for each class that had eventually risen to $12 per student. Due to the popularity of these classes, the department brought in $50,000 to 60,000 a year from this source. Furthermore, summer school allowed the department to receive a direct budget line based on their productivity. The previous summer they had earned $35,000.
These two sources combined with some lucrative unrestricted contributions by alumni to provide ample funding in the department. All of this income was in addition to the state appropriated department funds. The result was a very lucrative budget even though the university was hurting financially. Likewise, another department also relied on summer school and donations as a source of discretionary money.

Each department was allocated a fixed amount of money in the budget. While this money was rather fixed, faculty members did have discretionary money allocated for grants they were awarded. In effect, this worked as an incentive not only to write grants, but to enjoy more personal discretion in spending for grants that were awarded. Two institutions emphasized gaining grants as a primary thrust of the department and school administration.

Faculty were critical of certain management processes. For example, one faculty member expressed frustration about having to “reinvent the wheel” every time something had to be purchased. Others felt the structure and practice in higher education did not adequately prepare chairpersons for management. Still another felt the structure within higher education repressed chairpersons, rather than reward them. They had to spend long stressful hours in their positions with little pay increase. The person wondered why someone would want be chairperson, when they could continue being a tenured faculty member, and enjoy freedom and flexibility. He indicated a tenured faculty member can make more money consulting. In some instances, he saw new chairpersons who were not yet tenured, who essentially took themselves out of the possibility of tenure because the demands of their job did not allow progress toward tenure.

Another point of contention was the strategic planning process:
I think that most educators are not good strategic planners. I think rather than being good innovators, watching trends, and being able to understand where the profession is going, we are more reactionary than we are forcing the issues and being aware of them. I’m not sure that that isn’t indicative of many departments in major institutions. We are behind the times.

Some faculty expressed concerns about the arbitrary nature of evaluation. A faculty member working toward tenure indicated, “Nobody has come right out and told me how many publications you need a year. They just want to see some type of scholarly productivity. That is another frustrating thing because it has not been quantified.” On the other hand, many faculty members indicated that they knew what needed to be done even though it was not quantified.

**THEME 4: FACULTY PREFER CHAIRPERSONS WHO ARE FACILITATORES**

Faculty admired chairpersons who exhibited characteristics of a facilitator rather than a controller. Many participants favorably described their chairperson's philosophy of control as “non-control.” One chairperson was described negatively as a micromanager even though he made no indication of this in his interview. Another chairperson was described as a servant leader and his philosophy indicated his desire to be such. One faculty member felt his chairperson was too democratic and should be more assertive.

A faculty working toward tenure characterized the department chairperson as a bus driver. The following statement was consistent with how other faculty members lauded the control tactics of their chairpersons:

I think his overall philosophy is teach them correct principles and let them govern themselves. Our former department chair was a lot the opposite. Our current
department chair is very much a mediator and a moderator. He is not controlling at all. He tries to maintain control of faculty meetings and other meetings in terms of not letting them get away. He is kind of like steering the bus. We are free to do whatever we want while we are on the bus. His philosophy of control is non-control. He steers the bus but lets us as faculty tell him where we want to go.

At another school a tenure-track faculty member commented,

The way our department works is, it is really left up to the individual faculty members. We have almost total control over what we do, how we spend our time, and what our activities are. It is less like having a boss and more like having a collaborator and somebody I can turn to when I need help and somebody who can help me figure out how to get done what I want to do.

In his role as a facilitator, one department chairperson expressed disgust with the situation in his university, wishing he could provide more leadership:

. . . I try to keep as much of the red tape off of the faculty as possible so they can do what we hire them to do, that is teach and research and service and advise.

. . . My philosophy of management of control (pause), I almost don’t like that word “control”, because I don’t view a university environment as control. When you hire people of these educational levels, you don’t have to control much. I think we have probably suffered not management wise but leadership wise. The university and the state requires so much “crap stuff” that we engage in that sometimes pure leadership and innovative thinking you almost don’t have time for.
When faced with a situation where the chairperson must change unwanted behavior, most chairpersons attempted to handle the situation with one-on-one meetings to resolve the conflict. One department chairperson was repeatedly referred to as a mediator in conflict situations. The covert approaches to handle discipline was confirmed by faculty, who did not recall seeing instances where someone was punished or reprimanded. Occasionally, general announcements in faculty meetings or emails or memos were delivered with general statements aimed to change behavior but most situations were dealt with individually in a discrete way.

At two institutions it was very apparent that the chairperson served as a facilitator to help faculty achieve promotion and tenure. Yearly interviews and evaluations served as feedback to help guide tenure-track faculty toward achieving tenure. One institution indicated that all their faculty members, under the current chairperson, who wanted to achieve tenure had successfully attained it. Those that did not continue toward tenure had chosen voluntarily to leave.

One tenured faculty eloquently described his leader:

I don’t think he has control in the sense that his philosophy has always been to support us. Robert Greenleaf wrote a book on servant leadership. Greenleaf says if you want to know whether or not a person is a good leader or not, you ask the followers, “Have you gotten better because of your experience?” And I would say that all of the people here have gotten better. We’ve all improved . . . I would classify (him) as a true servant leader. He doesn’t have his own agenda. What he does is he supports people in their agenda. Maybe that is a problem in the fact that we here are so strange. We are such diverse individuals and diverse pieces
of research are going on. The positive of all that is physical education is so highly regarded on this campus.

A chairperson indicated, “Under the academic aura and the university aura, they pretty much know what is expected of them and I see my role as encourage them, persuade them, help them, but no condemn them.”

Evidence provided by another chairperson suggested very little control is needed to manage personnel in their department. He had been chairperson for 17 years, and based on his experience he concluded:

Over time, it has been my observation (and I have been here for awhile), those that are struggling with higher education eventually get out or they move on to a different university or college that is less demanding and is not a research intensive land-grant university. It is a smaller college or a junior college were the environment is better for them. There has only been one faculty that I have had to put the kibosh to: “You have one more year and you are out of here.” It just was not going very well and I did the students a favor by doing that. Most of them will self-evaluate and matriculate themselves out. We have had a couple three that have done that. They were good people and not all that bad really. They just found that this environment wasn’t that good for them.

These findings support the research findings by Marchant and Newman (1991) that indicated chairpersons exhibit a high concern for internal satisfaction in their departments. With this as a goal, the chairpersons attempted to nurture and encourage faculty development while upper administration required more formalized differentiation between faculty performance. The chairpersons appeared to view themselves more on
the side of the faculty similar to a player/coach situation in athletics. While they still viewed themselves as colleagues of the faculty in their department, official duties required by the university (e.g., performance evaluation, strategic planning) created a structural separation from their colleagues. Despite this separation, chairpersons maintained their allegiance to the faculty by serving as an ally to help them achieve promotion and tenure. The chairperson’s de facto separation diminished with faculty after tenure. In many cases, tenured faculty contributed to managerial tasks, along with chairpersons, for evaluation of faculty and governance of the department within their subdisciplines.

THEME 5: LACK OF DEPARTMENT COHESION

Faculty and chairpersons failed to work as a cohesive group toward development and accomplishment of departmental mission and goals. Instead, goals and planning individually served the welfare of each specific faculty member. Many participants indicated the influence of subdisciplines in physical education contributed to a lack of cohesion. As previously discussed in this investigation, fairly judging publications was an issue because of the specialization within physical education departments. Participants at two departments clearly indicated that planning as an entire department was abandoned due to the diverse nature, agendas, and clientele of the subdisciplines. Many of the departments rarely met as a group. One department chairperson stated:

Consequently, in our department we have four programs. Within those programs it is very competitive for the release hour, the budget dollar, the capital equipment dollar, and among those four programs it is very competitive. So to strategically plan for the best for the department, it is very difficult because it is
the best I can do sometimes to keep those four programs from each other's throats. I blame it all on the competitive world to which they function.

To help minimize this problem, the chairperson regularly convened a committee of subdiscipline leaders to help make decisions in the department:

We (discipline heads) try to lift ourselves up from what the whole faculty is going through and try to give them direction or give them an avenue whereby what they want can be heard without always going through a town meeting.

Another chairperson indicated some difficulty in trying to get the faculty to “buy in” to the planning process:

There is something unifying in getting people to look at it but there is also a part of the faculty or each faculty member that has some skepticism with the process too because usually there is not any eye-opening revelations that come of it.

Based on the interviews, the researcher discovered that faculty had very little involvement in developing the departmental mission and goals. Furthermore, the mission and goals that did exist were somewhat ambiguous and failed to contribute to the daily activities and concerns of the faculty. Faculty and staff generally showed very little concern or understanding of the current mission statement. Chairpersons were clearly aware of the mission and goals as a driving force in the department but somehow the importance had not been realized by the faculty and staff. By contrast, any planning and goal development in the department mainly took place at the program level. Although department-wide strategic planning appeared ineffective, most participants indicated more successful planning of goals and missions at the program level.
One department appeared to be a departure from the rest in relation to cohesion. Participants indicated the faculty were very cohesive and demonstrated positive interaction and collaboration. The researcher noted some distinctive techniques described by the participants that may have contributed to the cohesion. The chairperson emphasized that he valued and protected the faculty’s time and intentionally kept meetings and unnecessary tasks to a minimum to ensure they were able to dedicate their energy to success in their job. He clearly articulated a philosophy of entrusting faculty with both money and decision making. Faculty in the department were given more freedom and control over discretionary money than other departments in the study. Participants indicated they collaborated with other faculty on how this money should be spent. As a caveat, the department did have a very lucrative budget from a wealth of grant money faculty had raised. Meetings were held over beer and pizza at a nearby restaurant to provide an informal atmosphere for faculty to discuss relevant topics. Another contributing factor may have been that this department was smaller, containing only nine full-time faculty. Each participant at the institution indicated the size probably contributed to their cohesion. Furthermore, the academic focus of the department was more specific to exercise physiology whereas other departments in the study included more diverse subdisciplines. Another point worth noting was that many faculty team-taught classes.

Many of the goals and objectives that faculty in the study followed were their own in relation to achieving tenure and promotion. Furthermore, evaluations of faculty and staff were individual evaluations. Departmental planning and evaluation was less important than development of individual faculty. The yearly evaluation interviews in one
department included individual goal development by both the faculty and the chairperson that served as a guide toward their progress each year.

THEME 6: A VARIETY OF MEASUREMENT AND FEEDBACK

Measuring department progress and outcomes along with providing feedback varied greatly between and among the institutions studied. Two departments utilized exit surveys of their senior and graduate students to illicit feedback in evaluating their programs. These were paper instruments that included numerical ratings and open-ended questions. Faculty and chairpersons in three departments indicated their institutions closely examined student credit hour generation for their departmental classes. Based on feedback that showed lower student credit hour ratios, a chairperson indicated he would look at faculty member’s teaching load and possibly involve those with a smaller load in one of the core courses with a high enrollment. Most chairpersons also examined departmental averages from student evaluation scores.

Other than a few common evaluation techniques above, most departments looked at unique indicators. The chairperson at the school that utilized a specific peer evaluation instrument utilized these scores as a department performance measurement. This chairperson also tracked impact factors and numbers of publications within the department as well as grant dollars generated. Another unique difference used by this department chairperson was the examination of graduate student productivity in terms of publications and presentation.

Another department was obligated to improve in specific areas mandated by the university. One example was a 2.5 percent enrollment growth university-wide to which the department also was expected to contribute. Another goal was to meet projected
increases in number of students in each class in the department. Furthermore, requirements were enforced to meet a certain number of students in junior and senior level courses. These controls, initiated by the university, had prompted the department chairperson to increase class sizes by 5 to 10 over the recent years.

In addition to student exit surveys, a department shared information about their unique outcome measurements that focused on student success. These included performance of undergraduates on certifying exams and program entrance exams. Each student in their program was also required to participate in internship experiences. The chairperson received feedback from intern supervisors on the students’ performance and readiness. This department chairperson also worked with the alumni office to gather surveys from their alumni. In the future, the chairperson intended to use senior level focus groups to help provide feedback.

Perhaps the most systematic model of evaluation was found in a university in the study that maintained a number of objective criteria that the chairperson could access online throughout the year. Among other variables, the chairperson revealed that indicators included number of students, length of attendance before graduation, overall grade point average, total number of student credit hour production, and efficiency ratio for student credit hour generated per FTE. These numbers were compared with data from 5 years previously in order to evaluate trends in the department. The chairperson also compared the numbers to departments within the college of similar size.

Although the faculty evaluations at each institution focused on teaching, scholarship, and service, the evaluation methods varied. At one school, promotion and tenure committees used numerical rating scales to assess the three different areas. The
average of those scores had to meet a pre-established mark in order to attain tenure or promotion. Each rank required a different score. Another school had four different evaluating components. These included an undergraduate student advisory committee, graduate student advisory committee, department advisory committee, department chairperson, college advisory committee, and the dean. Each committee or person was required to give approval or disapproval. If there was at least one unsatisfactory vote, then a final committee made of up individuals outside of the university also would vote. The evaluation was basically an analysis of the portfolio the faculty member submitted.

A department chairperson implemented a system of ranking faculty in the three areas. Based on self-evaluations (self-evaluations are optional but the faculty must submit the scholarship and service information), he anonymously assessed each area and ranked faculty from top to bottom. Then, he drew lines on the ranking system and each person above the line was a 5 and then below the next line represented a 4. This was done from top to bottom until each faculty received a score on a 5-point scale. The chairperson indicated that usually three or four would receive 5s and 4s respectively while the majority of faculty would receive a 3 score. In the words of the chairperson,

I have been here long enough that they trust me to know that I am here to help them and not to nail them to the cross. On the other hand, I have to discriminate for those who are most productive. I do my form, have those typed up, and then there is an eyeball-to-eyeball interview where I will show them the ranking of all the faculty. The faculty are not identified, just their alphabetical letter is there. They can see the ranking and who is the highest achiever for scholarship, service, and teaching. They will see where they are so they can compare
themselves with the rest of the anonymous faculty in the division. I always tell them that this is not cut and dried. We can negotiate this if you think that I have ranked you too low or too high. No one ever thinks they are ranked too high. On any given year with the 15 faculty that I have, there might be some minor adjustments to one or two—nothing major. When I first started, I thought that would be the worst part of the job but it has proven that that is not a problem anymore. You have a system and the faculty understand the system, I think they trust you that you are out to help them. It seems to work fairly smoothly to be honest with you.

Feedback

Most feedback to faculty was informal and unstructured. Furthermore, chairpersons focused more on giving feedback to newer faculty. Feedback for tenure and promotion decisions was previously demonstrated to follow more formal annual evaluations and typed letters. Other than the formal annual reviews, feedback to faculty by department chairpersons was largely informal or nonexistent. One non-tenured faculty member said,

. . . It depends on communication. The extent that I go and talk to him about what I am doing, the extent to which we share information, the extend to which he supports things I do so that I know I am moving forward in meeting some goals. So I think there is kind of the fuzzy path that just happens in a department of people knowing what people are doing and if we are on the right path. Then they try to, with the (department handbook), keep people really in line.
One chairperson made notations each semester on the student evaluations of teaching to help provide feedback to faculty but did not give structured feedback throughout the year on scholarship and service.

Because of the larger nature of the departments, as one faculty member indicated, faculty tended to only receive feedback when there was a problem. One department utilized a bulletin board for faculty to use like a “refrigerator.” They could put anything on it from publications to pictures of a new baby in the family. The chairperson also included special times during department meetings to publicly recognize faculty for their achievements.

Regarding strategic planning, some department chairpersons used faculty meetings to update the faculty on their progress in the areas of the strategic plan. Feedback on the budget was presented during faculty meetings in a couple departments. One department emailed detailed budget reports to each faculty member every four months.

Other Conclusions

The researcher found various misunderstandings about the management process in the departments. Many faculty, particularly tenured faculty, were unclear on the process by which merit allocations were determined. In another example, one administrative assistant believed an advisory committee helped the department chairperson with disciplinary problems while the department chairperson indicated otherwise. At the same institution, there were different understandings about who comprised the advisory committee. A tenure-track faculty indicated there were no peer evaluations of teaching but the department chairperson indicated it was occasionally
used. A written student evaluation form was generated by the college and the department chairperson deemed it unreliable while a faculty participant believed this was a unique evaluation instrument for the department that was very valuable in improving her teaching. In addition to the misunderstandings, many faculty in the study were unclear about the evaluation criteria, process, and how evaluations were used.

All department chairpersons were quick to respond about the strategic plan and the process in the department. On the other hand, many faculty believed there was no strategic plan or indicated they had little or no involvement in any strategic plan that may have existed.

Based on the participant responses and the field notes, the researcher concluded that the tenured faculty were farther removed from the department than other faculty and staff. Tenured faculty seemed to know less and demonstrated less interest in the day-to-day operations, managerial procedures, and performance evaluations within their departments.

A minor finding in the study was that administrative assistants tended to have much shorter interviews than each of the other participants, despite the researcher's use of probe questions to illicit more data-rich responses. On the other hand, the chairpersons were considerably more verbose than the other participants and had much longer interviews on the average with little need of probing by the researcher.

Aside from the standard questions for each participant, they were also given the opportunity to provide additional statements. Below is what a tenured faculty member added to his interview:
In general, I think higher education does a poor job of selecting administrators. We select many times the people who are available and want to be administrators and they may not be the best ones. What I mean by that is that we may select also, for a different criteria, somebody who has been very productive in writing and research and so forth, a detailed person who would make an administrator. We don’t understand that administrators, in my mind, have to be more people oriented, than number crunchers. Higher education has never figured that out.

Higher education is one of the dinosaurs of our society in terms of the bureaucracy. I don’t know if it will every change. I am not optimistic. It is not going to change before I retire. There are skills that are necessary for people to be good managers. Most of us don’t have that training. Another example is, we have teaching as a criteria at a level one research institutions. Yet, 75 percent of the teachers have never taken anything in pedagogy. They don’t know how to teach. They know how to research. So we give the teaching over to TAs who equally don’t know how to teach. Why would we think the bureaucracy of education would be progressive. It is not. It is regressive if anything. It is kind of backwards. Yet, it is a people oriented environment. I just kind of take a step back and shake my head sometimes and say, “What are we doing?” We are not helping the situation.

Deans are now hired by how many grant dollars faculty produce. What kind of nonsense is that? That takes away from the people orientation. Translate that all into the students. Where do the students fit in here? They are paying the
bill but they are not reaping the benefits. Not at research one institutions. You might have the brightest bulbs on the tree but they may not be good teachers. Yet we have to have students to continue the farce.
CHAPTER V  
DISCUSSION

The focus of this chapter is a discussion of the results from the study. A summary will be provided followed by the discussion, best practices, recommendations for managerial control in university physical education departments, recommendations for further research, and conclusions.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to analyze and explain the current managerial control practices of chairpersons in selected university physical education departments and to determine the perceived outcomes of these practices. To accomplish this purpose, the researcher collected qualitative data at major universities in the Northwest area of the United States that offered a doctoral degree in physical education in order to answer the following research questions:

1. Are physical education department chairpersons employing progressive methods or models of managerial control?

2. What managerial control concepts and techniques are commonly used in physical education departments?

3. What performance measurements are commonly used by physical education department chairpersons?

4. How are outcomes measured and feedback provided for faculty and staff in physical education departments?
A comprehensive review of literature provided a context for managerial control related to university academic departments. The researcher discussed findings in various sources regarding broad issues of management related to professional employees. Professionals are specialized workers with advanced training that require a unique managerial approach (Abbott, 1988; Alvesson, 1993; Freidson, 1986; Raelin, 1991). In the university setting, presidents and vice-presidents deal with diverse groups of employees, while department chairpersons must address unique concerns in their managerial circumstance, particularly related to controlling faculty (Freidson, 1986; Raelin, 1991). The researcher found very little research directly addressing managerial control at the academic department level in colleges and universities.

This study was designed to reveal comparisons and contrasts in managerial control techniques in selected university physical education departments. Participants included a department chairperson, a tenured and a non-tenured faculty, and an administrative assistant at five major universities that are accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. The researcher conducted semistructured interviews with each participant on their local campus at a site of their selection. The questions were based on elements and activities of management control identified by Anthony and Govindarajan (2004): strategic planning, budgeting, resource allocation, performance measurement and evaluation, communicating, deciding, and influencing. Each interview was digitally audio recorded and transcribed verbatim later.

The researcher analyzed the data using a qualitative analysis process of categorizing data to arrive at themes through inductive reasoning (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Six major themes emerged from the data:
1. Department chairpersons relied on existing controls in higher education and initiated very few innovative or unique managerial control techniques.

2. Formal control procedures were mandated by administrators above the department chairperson level and were seen as a required formality by both faculty and chairpersons.

3. The departments continued to operate and flourish under the current paradigm of management control in higher education although faculty voiced some concerns about management processes.

4. Faculty admired chairpersons who exhibited characteristics of a facilitator rather than a controller.

5. Faculty and chairpersons failed to work as a cohesive group toward development and accomplishment of departmental mission and goals.

6. Measuring department progress and outcomes along with providing feedback varied greatly between and among the institutions studied.

Discussion

Responses were so strikingly similar, the researcher believed one could easily interchange almost any department chairperson, faculty, or staff without much change in the daily operations of the department. Two participants, who previously held positions in national physical education organizations, in which they had interactive experience with faculty and chairpersons from many other departments, indicated the managerial control practices in their departments were similar to most other universities.

Faculty participants in the study exhibited intrinsic motivation characteristics similar to professional employees as described by Abbott (1988), Alvesson (1993),
Freidson (1986), Raelin (1991), and other authors. Each participant indicated a desire to achieve success and prominence in their field irrespective of controls exhibited by management. Many indicated resentment toward the evaluations procedures aimed to extrinsically motivate their efforts. Department chairpersons attempted to support faculty endeavors rather than foster an authoritative environment with complex control mechanisms. This attitude appeared to contribute to a lack of effort by chairpersons to initiate managerial control techniques within their department. Department chairpersons in this study worked within the control requirements at the universities to help their faculty achieve their professional aspirations, especially in advancement and tenure.

Interviews with each of the administrative assistants yielded valuable information for support of the themes that were developed. Their input helped confirm the management control techniques employed in the departments. The major services that staff provided in each department were clerical duties and financial tracking. Aside from this, very few similarities in duties and roles were found. Furthermore, the influence of administrative assistants on departmental management and planning was minimal.

The university control environments in this study were highly bureaucratic with higher administration enforcing procedures that both faculty and chairpersons resented. Because of the bureaucratic nature of universities, the department chairpersons took on the role as a buffer between the higher administration and the faculty by taking care of university requirements (i.e., planning, paperwork, evaluations). This theme supported Abbott’s (1988) assertion that many larger professional organizations have work that is both routine and non-routine. Professionals maintain an autonomous control of certain aspects of their work while other non-professionals or para-professionals control other
aspects. An example in high school teaching includes the separation of curriculum planning from classroom teaching. Abbott called this “degradation” of professional work. In fact, Abbott maintained that teaching is bureaucratic and has always been that way. Perhaps universities should be treated as “soft bureaucracies,” an idea that Courpasson (2000) suggested in a study of French organizations. That is, both centralized and entrepreneurial forms of an institution are combined to achieve a balance of control for managers and freedom for professionals.

The department chairperson appeared to play a pivotal role in the separation between administration and the academic departments in the universities. Department chairpersons offer a perspective that is unique from deans (Centra, 1993) because they have direct supervision of the heart of the university. In fact, the department chairpersons may serve an important role as an intermediary for faculty by helping them maintain their autonomy and avoid the bureaucratic drivel prevalent in the university structure. Marchant and Newman (1991) supported the idea that department chairpersons value internal satisfaction more than deans. Furthermore, Centra (1993) indicated chairpersons are seen more as a colleague than are other administrators. On the other hand, Keller (1983) called attention to the conflict between collegiality and administrative responsibilities that chairpersons face. The data from the current study tended to support a perception of collegiality by both chairpersons and faculty. Often the chairpersons were the ones being controlled, rather than the ones doing the controlling.

In an attempt to maintain internal satisfaction, department chairpersons made a conscious effort to fulfill managerial duties themselves. Furthermore, they worked as an ally for tenure-track faculty, guiding their preparation for formal promotion and tenure
decisions required by the university. Conversely, the chairpersons largely ignored tenured faculty from a control perspective. By doing this, chairpersons were able to foster internal satisfaction of their faculty and allow them the autonomy to pursue their own interests, unencumbered by the university bureaucracy.

The selfless nature of the department chairpersons contributed to faculty approval but at a personal price to the chairperson. Dealing with university requirements afforded little time for chairpersons to perform their traditional pursuits in academia. As one faculty indicated, this can be a very detrimental for chairpersons who have not yet achieved tenure. Furthermore, the change in job responsibilities may lead to a lack of job satisfaction.

Evaluation was a major area of control that each chairperson encountered. Evaluation took place both at the department level and with individual faculty. The study results indicated a noticeable diversity in evaluation techniques between universities. Although there was a disparity between evaluation techniques, there was a limited array of evaluations within each institution. For example, one department evaluated teaching using the student evaluation of teaching instrument only. This approach is contrary to recommendations that evaluation include a variety of evaluation tools to ensure validity (Centra, 1993; Glassick et al., 1997).

Individual faculty performance evaluation focused on the traditional areas of faculty excellence: teaching, scholarship, and service. Most faculty participants indicated very little apprehension about methods used for evaluation of research and service, even though these were very subjective in nature. Conversely, faculty were very adamant about problems in evaluation techniques for teaching. The critical focus on
teaching evaluation but not research confirms Centra’s (1993) assertions. The main concern was the validity of student evaluation of teaching instruments along with the limited scope of this evaluation. Physical education departments in this study relied primarily on student evaluations of teaching, much like departments at most other institutions (Saroyan & Amundsen, 2001). If departments and universities incorporated a more comprehensive evaluation of teaching as recommended in the literature (Centra, 1993; Glassick et al., 1997), faculty would perhaps have greater satisfaction with the evaluation process.

Since evaluation is so important as an indicator of department and faculty performance, the inconsistency of evaluation techniques reported was somewhat alarming. Many faculty members’ careers are affected by these evaluations. With possible liability concerns, universities would fare better to standardize or at least objectify evaluation procedures.

Poor evaluation, whether of students or of faculty, renders an unfair judgment and fails to reveal shortcomings in performance. Good evaluation, on the other hand, provides decision makers with the information necessary for informed choices, and teachers with useful feedback for improvement. (Centra, 1993, p. 1)

A more extensive evaluation approach could incorporate progressive evaluation techniques such as structured student interviews and focus groups (Millis, 1999), student journals (Wagner, 1999), peer review (Cavanagh, 1996; Hutchings, 1994; Morehead & Shedd, 1997; Osborne, 1998; Strenski, 1995; Switkes, 1999), teaching portfolios (Centra, 1993, Chism, 1999; Edgerton et al., 1991), and self-evaluation
(Glassick et al., 1997; Kahn, 1993). Other evaluation tools could be incorporated such as the knowledge survey (Nuhfer & Knipp, 2003) or a matrix (Bush et al., 2003)

The researcher was confident that each of the department chairpersons in the study successfully accomplished the following recommendations by Glassick et al. (1997):

A scholar’s trust in evaluation depends on what he or she believes is going on behind closed doors. Predictable methods should produce no surprises. Annual reviews for junior faculty should not amount to routine exercises. Instead, the evaluation should comment helpfully on progress toward reappointment and tenure. Likewise, a midcourse review for probationary faculty should function as a dress rehearsal for the tenure decision that looms on the horizon. The tenure decision itself should prepare a scholar for promotion reviews to follow and, in a growing number of institutions, for periodic post-tenure reviews. Most important, reviews each step of the way should be connected to each other and thus bolster confidence in the system. (p. 55)

Departmental evaluations focused on unique indicators at each institutions that were mainly identified by university administration. The most common indicators were student credit hour generation and exit surveys. The latter was mainly initiated by department chairpersons and used to guide curriculum decisions. Based on the assigned indicators, department chairpersons were obligated to make adjustments in their departments. If student credit hour numbers were low, then attempts were made to increase attendance by increasing class sizes and teaching loads for faculty.
Evaluation at both the departmental and individual level left some feelings of ambiguity within the faculty. Some indicated uncertainty in their requirements for tenure while others thought the university-wide criteria for department performance was inappropriate. Glassick et al. (1997) recommended that the evaluation process include clear expectations for both individual and institutional examination.

The subdisciplines within each department were found to lessen the cohesiveness in the department. Different agendas within these subdisciplines hampered department-wide planning, contributed to concerns in fair evaluation of faculty performance, and included inequities in grant opportunities, among other things. Based on this information, the fragmentation of the physical education field is an area that should receive attention by department chairpersons and national leaders in the discipline. Efforts should be made to diminish the dichotomous relationship that was found in this study.

As previously discussed in this paper, department chairpersons effectively worked as buffers for faculty to the university administration. While chairpersons fulfilled this role, they also maintained leadership and control within their departments. How to maintain a proper balance between acting as a both a peer and a supervisor was not clearly delineated by the department chairpersons. Possibly the best way to assess this dilemma is to examine information provided by participants in the department in the study that appeared to be the smoothest running and most cohesive. In this department, the chairperson had been in his position longer than any other chairperson in the study and appeared to have the most respect from the faculty and staff within the department. Furthermore, he was a very influential person within the college unit of the university.
One of his faculty provided some insight into the managerial nature of this successful department chairperson:

He is very subtle. He is a very military man, regimented. He is firm but we are very autonomous. I don’t feel like we have rules and regs set up that we have to follow, yet you know what is expected of you. It is a very subtle type of leadership. He is very powerful and we know that within the college. Very knowledgeable. Been around for a long time. Knows the system, knows the people. He is very well respected. Pretty much if he says you do it, you do it. If he says jump, you say how high. And you do it. Or, you jump and check later because what he says is what we need to do. There is a lot of trust and faith in him. When you do the right thing, things will happen the right way. And you learn that very quickly with him. He has never been here and said you have to do it this way or this way but when I meet with him he might say, “Hey, this might help you if you do something like this.” And it makes sense when he says it and you say, “I can do that.” So it is subtle, but firm. Quiet, nothing outright. I have never felt like I have been disciplined in front of anybody or made fun of or anything like that. Very respectful but he is an authority figure. He is definitely the leader.

In the opinion of the researcher, this was the most effectively functioning department of the five studied; yet, the faculty knew of no strategic plan nor did they have any involvement in developing strategic plans. The chairperson was a facilitator, but had a covert knowledge of everything that was happening in the department. Explicit control techniques that pervade in the research about management of professions were largely absent. The chairperson had full dominion of the evaluation process, yet he
rarely visited classrooms or had peers visit classrooms. Furthermore, faculty received very little feedback throughout the year on their performance. He maintained authoritative control of all purchase approvals, yet faculty were usually able to purchase what they wanted and get reimbursed for any professional travel they desired. The chairperson handled most of the controls and performance measurements implemented by the university while requiring very few quantitative objectives and performance outcomes for his faculty and staff. He described himself as a “pussycat” when asked of his philosophy of control, yet faculty described him as very firm. Based on this description of a manager, one might assume he was a poor manager. On the contrary, the faculty had a very low turnover, the budget was stable, the faculty and staff spoke very highly of the chairperson, only one full-time staff assisted him, and faculty felt free to explore their own initiatives. The department included six subdisciplines yet it appeared to be very cohesive and supportive. The previously described characteristics may yield longevity and success for physical education department chairpersons. In a system where subdisciplines may hinder managers, perhaps a key component of success for a chairperson is the ability to support the faculty in their own agendas.

The tenured faculty in this department stated:

(His approach) has been very successful for us because he has been a true servant leader. When you talk about strategic planning and all that, it doesn’t happen. It is like being in a monastery where everyone worships their own god. It is a real different experience here and that is why I am still here. If it hadn’t been that, (awhile back I spent one year with in a different organization), and I would have stayed. Because that gives you more opportunities. If I hadn’t had
autonomy, I wouldn’t have come back. We have autonomy under a servant leader. I can’t say enough good about the system for me because for my ability to make a difference in the world, has been because of this. It sounds like a real “loosie” system but it has been wonderful for my students and for me. Positive things; that is all I can say about it.

The managerial control by this chairperson and others in the study failed to follow any systematic managerial models. In 1974, Maciariello and Enteman wrote a statement about private schools as follows: “A management-control system for an institution must be highly situational and deal with the specific characteristics of each institution” (p. 595). If chairpersons in the current study approached management control with unique perspectives for their situation, one would expect differing managerial techniques to present themselves. However, the researcher found that most departments implemented very similar managerial control approaches. Most chairpersons in the study indicated a desire to implement more progressive managerial control techniques but indicated faculties’ inability to arrive at a consensus and lack of time as major limiting factors. In order for a change to take place that creates and sustains unique managerial practices in physical education departments, the entire department would need to subscribe to the process and contribute to the effort. This may be difficult considering that faculty generally maintain a distaste for involvement in management and planning (Keller, 1983).

On the other hand, are drastic changes really needed in management of physical education departments? In the current study, the researcher concluded the departments were successful, effective, and smooth running. Faculty voiced some concerns about
chairpersons’ managerial control procedures, but these were determined to be minor. Because most controls were implemented from higher administration, major complaints by faculty and chairpersons were aimed at these administrators. In order to significantly change approaches to and philosophies of control, a new method of evaluation, incentives, and other control elements would need to occur campus-wide. At the department level, chairpersons should also make realistic attempts to improve their control techniques. Suggestions for how to do this are listed later in this paper.

In the current study, department chairpersons exhibited managerial control techniques that were more pragmatic, intuitive, and reactionary. One chairperson called his approach to strategic planning “management by situation or crisis” and another only involved the department in planning on an “issue-by-issue” basis. “As Clegg and Palmer (1996) indicated, “Management is less a science and more like cookbook knowledge: it is knowledge of recipes and their application, we think. Many of the best-selling texts present management as a form of recipe knowledge” (p. 4). Mintzberg (1998) suggested, perhaps, the best control analogy for a manager of professionals is as an orchestra director.

When you reflect on it, the symphony orchestra is like many other professional organizations—for example, consulting firms and hospitals—in that it is structured around the work of highly trained individuals who know what they have to do and just do it. Such professionals hardly need in-house procedures or time-study analysts to tell them how to do their jobs. That fundamental reality challenges many preconceptions that we have about management and
leadership. Indeed, in such environments, covert leadership may matter more than overt leadership. (p. 140-141)

In the analogy, the conductor exhibits perfect control, starting everyone together with a signal and ending everyone in a similar manner. The musicians supply structure and coordination, often working in teams. Almost everything in the symphony is very standardized. Although each player is distinguished from the others, they play alongside each other in unison, without saying a thing, all with little supervision by the manager. The manager is not in complete control, nor is he powerless, but somewhere between these extremes (Mintzberg, 1998). The conductor does not use traditional managerial exercises. He just ensures that talented musicians come together to make beautiful music. “The fear of censure by the conductor is very powerful, [the conductor] explained, because ‘instruments are the extensions of their souls!’” (p. 142).

Many new management control styles tend to fail in higher education possibly because they attempt to change the culture. According to Mintzberg (1998), the leader takes his position with an already established culture in place. Instead of replacing the culture, the leader may enhance it. The workers, even new workers, know what to expect and what they need to do. The leader provides a sense of uniqueness compared to other groups.

Best Practices

Strategic Planning

The researcher concluded the best example for strategic planning was displayed by a chairperson that practiced intermittent planning. Based on his own intuition and through interaction with faculty, the chairperson made an attempt to determine the most
important issues affecting the faculty. If the issues were important enough to justify a faculty meeting, he formulated strategic questions that he disseminated to the faculty and charged them with the task of discussing the questions amongst themselves informally or formally in small groups. When he determined there had been sufficient discussion, he announced a meeting time whereby faculty should be fully prepared to resolve the issues and come to a consensus. Consequently, meetings were held at a local restaurant over beer and pizza to create an informal atmosphere for their discussions.

This approach was further supplemented by a decennial review of the department that was required by the university. The decennial review strategic planning and evaluation process was significantly more systematic and formalized. The data in the current study identified that similar formal reviews were mandated by higher administration at each university, albeit sporadically due to frequent changes of presidents, provosts, and deans. Participants in other departments studied lamented about the ineffectiveness of strategic planning. Because of these factors, the researcher recommends ongoing strategic planning that prepares the department for formalized planning required by the university.

The main advantage of the best practice example above proved to be the decentralized and intermittent nature of the planning rather than a highly structured single planning effort accompanied by little follow-up. This practice promotes a beneficial balance between autonomy and control that supports an organic managerial control approach recommended for professional organizations (Abbott, 1988; Freidson, 1986; Raelin, 1991, 2003). The chairperson effectively accomplished his philosophy of
protecting faculty members’ time by limiting the number of meetings and making them meaningful. As a result, meetings were a worthwhile investments of time by the faculty. Unfortunately, the practices in this department, like other departments studied, failed to establish specific objectives and an action plan as Gmelch and Miskin (1993) have suggested.

**Budgeting**

Two departments studied allocated a fixed amount of money for faculty to use at their discretion. The researcher deemed the practices in one department to be superior to the others studied. In this department, each faculty member was allotted $1,000 for discretionary money (e.g., travel) and $1,700 for supplies and services (e.g., mail, phone). In addition, faculty members were given discretion over the respective student fee money generated by their classes. This department, similar to the other departments studied, allowed faculty to have complete discretion over spending for grant money that they were personally awarded. In this exemplary example, the chairperson would send out periodic emails that detailed the department overall budget along with individual budgets. This served as feedback for the faculty so they could provide input or ask questions about the overall budget and also monitor the spending of their own allotments. Each of the faculty were entrusted with the control of their own discretionary money which created a good degree of autonomy while still allowing the chairperson to approve major spending in the department.

Budgetary control is usually tighter with limited funds and income. More than one department in the study had severe restrictions on spending because of cost cutting efforts within the institution. However, the department described above was fortunate to
have a lucrative budget; so looser control was a viable option. At least two departments relied on some very important sources of income to alleviate the funding burden. These departments relied on summer school to generate income that the chairperson could use at his discretion. Another important source of departmental income was student fees associated with various classes. One department generated substantial income from fees for their activity classes. These combined to serve as a major source of extra income that the department chairperson could disperse more freely.

A common technique used in all departments to monitor control of spending was the use of a single administrative assistant to process expenditures and record items on a budget ledger. The best practice was to have this assistant approve smaller expenditures but require the chairperson’s approval on all significant purchases.

Resource Allocation

The most important resource in an academic department is the faculty—more specifically their time. As indicated in the discussion of themes from the study, faculty valued chairpersons who worked to facilitate their success. The best practice found in the study was an intentional effort by the chairperson to allow faculty to pursue their own interests. This was accomplished by providing faculty with the necessary time and freedom to develop their own agendas. For example, one chairperson reduced the teaching load of a faculty member who was teaching classes outside of his specialty. In place of these classes, he was reassigned to more appropriate classes and allowed to start a special research center that is now internationally recognized. Another time saving approach by many chairpersons was intentionally limiting the number of faculty
meetings. Faculty participants repeatedly praised department chairpersons who protected their time and freedom through these efforts.

*Performance Evaluation, Feedback, and Reward*

*Individual.* One department chairperson in the study employed a faculty evaluation technique that really stood out. Using a ranking system, he anonymously evaluated the faculty in each of the three traditional areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. For each area, he ranked the faculty from top to bottom and then drew lines that grouped the faculty based on a 1 to 5 scale. The overall result was a score in each area similar to a traditional model for evaluating students (few receive an “A” grade, more receive a “B”, and most of the students receive a “C,” etc.) This allowed him to discriminate between and among faculty with only a few receiving the highest score of 5. He would provide feedback by allowing them to see where they ranked in each area and then encouraged dialogue, particularly if they disagreed with the ranking.

Faculty and staff also indicated that the chairperson would immediately inform someone if they were doing something wrong. Furthermore, this chairperson also provided feedback notes on the student evaluation forms each semester to help guide the faculty members with their teaching performance. These feedback techniques steered the faculty and staff during the year and avoided surprises at the required yearly evaluations.

While the above is a description of evaluation and feedback excellence by an individual chairperson, a different institution used a superb technique that supports recommendations (Centra, 1993; Glassick et al., 1997) that evaluation rely on a variety of sources. During formal evaluations at this institution, various groups of evaluators
contributed. These included an undergraduate student advisory committee, graduate student advisory committee, department advisory committee, department chairperson, college advisory committee, and the dean. Peers outside the university were also used in some committees for evaluation of research publications. Each committee or person was required to give approval or disapproval after evaluating the portfolio prepared by the faculty member. If there was at least one unsatisfactory vote, then a final committee comprised of individuals outside of the university would vote.

The ultimate reward that drove faculty members was the attainment of tenure. Thus, the efforts by departmental chairpersons during the evaluation process served to provide feedback that helped each tenure-track faculty member progress toward tenure. Merit decisions were found to be meaningless because faculty viewed the financial rewards as insignificant or, in some cases, there were no financial rewards. Consequently, the only consistent reward for each faculty member was their continued employment coupled with freedom to pursue their interests. The best chairpersons in the study made concerted efforts to improve these concerns for each faculty member.

*Departmental.* Chairpersons in the study utilized some common departmental performance evaluation measures and techniques. These included monitoring student credit hour generation along with credit hour generation in upper division classes. Other evaluation measures included student focus groups and graduation surveys, which chairpersons indicated helped with curriculum decisions. One department in particular engaged in additional performance measurement efforts. These included feedback from internship supervisors, alumni surveys, and performance of undergraduates on certifying exams and program entrance exams.
The most quantitative performance outcome measurement system utilized up-to-date online data to help the chairperson track performance. The outcomes included number of students, length of attendance before graduation, overall grade point average, total number of student credit hour production, and efficiency ratio for student credit hour generated per full-time equivalent (FTE). These outcomes were compared with numbers generated from past performance to examine trends. In addition, the numbers were also compared to other departments on campus, particularly those of similar size.

Managerial Control Recommendations

Since the 1990s, universities have experienced an increased emphasis on accountability (Kahn, 1993; Millis, 1999). One major challenge is a shift by accreditation agencies toward qualitative, outcome-based measures (Mullin & Wilson, 2000). In this environment, managerial control is important but it is also paramount to maintain an atmosphere of autonomy for university professors. As Abbott (1988) outlined, the teaching profession includes some aspects that are autonomous and other aspects that include more control. University professors tend to think they control the university (Mintzberg, 1998). In fact, this is not the case. What exists is a medium somewhere between anarchy and rigid managerial control. University managers must attempt to juggle control and autonomy and also determine what areas of the institution deserve more control than others. Raelin’s (2003) model of distributive autonomy corresponds with this concept of heteronomy in university teaching.
Two Recommended Models

The practice at universities in this study seemed to fall more toward Raelin’s (2003) philosophy of balance between control and autonomy in the university setting. Physical education departments should consider Raelin’s distributive autonomy model as a framework for managerial control. Department chairpersons should respect the strategic autonomy of higher administration to establish goals and policies that govern the institution because they have broad responsibilities to university constituents, the public, and boards. In turn, chairpersons should recognize their own administrative autonomy for managing the department. This may include initiating planning sessions with development of goals and objectives, modifications of university-required evaluation procedures, and team-building activities among other things. Faculty should recognize, acquiesce, and contribute to that department chairperson’s managerial duties because chairpersons have additional responsibilities required by their superiors and other internal and external agents.

The chairpersons should continue to emphasize and maintain operational autonomy for the faculty. This includes, “Having the freedom, once the goal or problem has been set, to attack it by means determined by oneself but within organizational resource and strategic constraints” (Raelin, 2003, ¶ 24). Chairpersons must accommodate the unique ambitions and values of university faculty to maintain departmental effectiveness and integrity. The important concern is for chairpersons to strike an appropriate balance between control and autonomy.

Raelin’s model should be complemented by Gmelch and Miskin’s (1993) model. This includes three steps: (a) developing a mission and measurable outcomes and
goals, both short-term and long-term; (b) implementation, which involves individual faculty and staff goals and action plans; and (c) evaluation and control complete the process in the model. “The term ‘control’ should not mean a monitoring or checking up on daily activities and assignments. The purpose of control should be instead to help individuals become more productive in accomplishing personal goals and contributing to the achievement of department success” (p. 80).

Chairpersons should start implementing this model by focusing on strategic planning, which chairpersons in the study often neglected. Gmelch and Miskin along with others (Anthony & Govindarajan, 2004; DuBrin, 2000) emphasized the importance of formal planning that outlines a clear mission and specific goals. Planning and implementation are the most important aspects of the model because they outline what is to be controlled. The control process includes monitoring long-term department success, individual goals, and action plans. Beyond monitoring and performance evaluation, recognition and encouragement of faculty are most important. This should take place at an annual review and during informal meetings in the department.

Both faculty and staff would benefit from a more faculty-inclusive approach to management. If department chairpersons were to include faculty more in the managerial process, they would alleviate some of their own managerial responsibilities while providing the opportunity to increase cohesiveness. Since faculty are already busy with their day-to-day activities, chairpersons would need to provide some type of incentive for faculty participation beyond just the collegiality benefits that would result from a team-like effort to achieve departmental success. These incentives might include periodic release time to work on management related projects. Another way to increase
participation is emphasizing management functions as an important contribution to the service component of evaluation. Since service was often neglected as a valued use of time, its importance could be emphasized as more equivalent to the other components of teaching and scholarship. Or, perhaps contributions to management should contribute to a more expanded interpretation of scholarship, as Boyer (1990) has suggested. The service component could be stressed especially for post-tenure review since tenured faculty offer a wealth of knowledge and experience to contribute to the community, the profession, and the governance of the department. By increasing the perceived value of functional management contributions, tenured faculty may contribute more and provide a resource that lessens the burden of administering the department thus enhancing the collegial peer relationship between chairpersons and faculty. Furthermore, faculty on the tenure track likely do not have the knowledge or available time to contribute to managerial functions due to the rigorous nature of working toward tenure.

Unfortunately, the academic literature provides few theoretical constructs for management control in academic departments. The above models by Raelin (2003) and Gmelch and Miskin (1993) offer the best approaches from this limited sphere of information. The total quality management model has received the most recent attention in higher education but the researcher does not recommend this model because of its limited success (Aly & Akpovi, 2001; Brigham, 1993; Harari, 1997; Koch & Fisher, 1998), inefficiency (Marchese, 1991; Mathews & Katel, 1992), and lack of application to academic departments (Marchese, 1996).
Specific Recommendations

Several specific recommendations are provided in the following discourse. The researcher found that objectively evaluating research publications was difficult due to the diverse nature of physical education subdisciplines. The researcher recommends that physical educators establish an objective criteria for evaluating the quality of publications that applies to all subdisciplines. This would aid department chairpersons and personnel committees in their evaluation process more than the current standard, which mainly includes counting the number of publications.

Due to the variety of subdisciplines that have developed in physical education, a splintering effect has potentially weakened the cohesiveness of physical education departments. Diminishing the segregation of subdisciplines may serve to increase cohesiveness in large physical education departments. The current structure found in all but one department included planning mainly taking place exclusively within subdisciplines. Department chairpersons should intentionally promote planning in interdisciplinary groups. The department in the study that exhibited the most cohesion utilized this approach. Although this was a smaller department, the approach may be equally successful for larger departments. Another way to encourage interaction between groups would be to locate offices in closer proximity and set-up common areas for interaction. Many of the departments had faculty offices in multiple buildings with no apparent areas that would appeal to interactive and informal dialogue among faculty.

Since department chairpersons generally feel unprepared and untrained for most of their tasks (Gmelch & Miskin, 1995), universities should institute some formalized managerial training for all chairpersons. The academic department is the heart of
administrative units because it is so closely acquainted with the students and is responsible for graduation. Because of this, “amateur” administration must end (Gmelch & Miskin, 1995).

Recommendations for Future Research

The researcher’s experiences and analysis of data collected in this study prompted recommendations for future research. Since the current study examined physical education departments in the Northwest area of the United States, similar research should target other regions in the United States. Furthermore, research should address managerial control in universities that do not offer a doctoral degree. Managerial control studies of this nature could also address departments in other disciplines. These research initiatives could be evaluated along with the current findings to arrive at more generalizable conclusions.

Due to the absence of research related to management in physical education departments, future research should also focus on other aspects of management to complement the current study. Other research could address areas such as leadership styles, chairpersons’ job responsibilities, public relations, fundraising, or financial management.

The current study identified a drawback to the influence of subdisciplines within a department. Further research should address this concern. Qualitative attempts to analyze and explain the relationship and cohesiveness between the physical education subdisciplines may prove to be beneficial to the long-term congruity of the field.
Conclusions

Although the chairpersons in the current study demonstrated successful departments could be maintained without instituting progressive managerial models, there should still be a continual effort to improve the performance of the department based on sound managerial theory and practices. Ironically, many university managers in academic departments ignore progressive managerial models and thus fail to practice what they espouse as professionals—change through the use of scientifically proven methods. Today’s climate in higher education emphasizes doing more with less (Glassick et al., 1997). Chairpersons of physical education departments should make an effort to improve their managerial control techniques to accommodate the current atmosphere in higher education.

Policy makers, legislators, and the media increasingly view higher education not as an investment in the collective public good but as a private benefit for individuals. Thus, the goals and procedures of educational institutions and even the nature of knowledge itself have become objectives of challenge and change. Assumptions that guided the academy for the last half-century no longer necessarily hold, underscoring a need to clarify campus missions and to relate the work of the faculty more directly to the realities of contemporary life” (Glasick et al., p. 6).

In order to thrive and be successful in this environment, physical education departments must continue to improve and adapt to this paradigm shift.
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Table 1

Knowledge-intensive Firm and the Bureaucratic-ideal Type: A Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key aspects</th>
<th>Bureaucratic ideal type</th>
<th>Knowledge-intensive firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode of production</td>
<td>Standardization</td>
<td>Ad hoc problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant control logic</td>
<td>Enforcement of rules</td>
<td>Negotiated order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental contingencies</td>
<td>Stable, anticipated change</td>
<td>Turbulent, disruptive change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing relative advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of product and services</td>
<td>Homogenous</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging capital</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of power</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Characteristics of Professions, Professionals, and Professional Firms

Characteristics of professions
The “profession” is seen as an ideal, but occupational groups may be more or less “professionalized” along each of the following dimensions:

1. Degree to which members are required to have a high level of education
2. Number of years of education
3. Extent of cooperation with or tightness of link to academic institutions
4. Extent of emphasis on altruistic problem solving for the client
5. Extent of emphasis on affective neutrality vis a vis clients
6. Extent of emphasis on problems of vital interest in society
7. Extent of professional norms guiding member behavior
8. Extent of peer reviews
9. Extent to which peer sanctions are enforced against members not respecting norms
10. Extent of limitations on expert authority

Characteristics of professionals (individuals)

1. Members of highly professionalized occupational group
2. Higher education
3. Emphasis on application and improvement of knowledge
4. Respect for professional norms of behavior, including altruistic problem solving for the client, affective neutrality, and the limitations of professional expertise

5. Respect for and willingness to participate in peer reviews and sanctions

Characteristics of profession organizations (firms)

1. More than 50% professional employees

2. High priority for professional goals: including altruistic problem solving for the client

3. High degree of respect for professional norms, including limitation of expertise

4. Emphasis on creation as well as application of knowledge

5. Professionals in charge of key decisions and activities

Table 3

Regarding Teaching, Which of the Following Methods of Evaluation are Generally Used at Your Institution for Purposes of Promotion and Tenure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Method</th>
<th>Currently in General Use</th>
<th>Not in General Use but Under Consideration</th>
<th>Not in General Use and Not under Consideration at This time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic student evaluations of classroom teaching</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of syllabi, examinations, and other teaching materials</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of classroom teaching</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of continuing student interest (i.e., majors, course enrollment)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni opinions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations of advising</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student achievement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the impact of teaching on research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the impact of teaching on applied scholarship</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

**Regarding Research, Which of the Following Methods of Evaluation are Generally Used in Faculty Evaluation at Your Institution?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Evaluation</th>
<th>Currently in General Use</th>
<th>Not in General Use but Under Consideration</th>
<th>Not in General Use and Not Under Consideration at This Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Securing a self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing judgments by colleagues within the institution</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting numbers of publications and presentations, weighted by type</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking reviewers to use specific qualitative criteria in their evaluations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of a research project’s impact on teaching</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing judgments by outside scholars</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in General Use</td>
<td>Not in General Use but Under Consideration at This Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student participation in a research project</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of a research project's impact on applied scholarship</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Regarding Applied Scholarship (Outreach), Which of the Following Methods of Evaluation are Generally Used at Your institution for Purposes of Promotion and Tenure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently in General Use</th>
<th>Not in General Use but Under Consideration</th>
<th>Not in General Use and Not Under Consideration at This Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation or personal statement</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client or user evaluation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student participation in a project</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the impact of applied scholarship on teaching</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations of the project by specialists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the impact of applied scholarship on future research</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

New Practice in Place or Being Considered to Reward Good Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Practice</th>
<th>Now in Place</th>
<th>Under Consideration</th>
<th>Not Under Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel fund for teaching improvement</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special awards for teaching excellence</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals for teaching improvement</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants for course development</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release time for course development</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit increases for teaching excellence</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using distinguished teachers as mentors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A center for teaching improvement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished chairs for teaching excellence</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7
Demographic Data for Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># of Full-time Dept.</th>
<th># of Students in Dept.</th>
<th>Total Univ. Graduate Students FT/PT</th>
<th>Total Univ. Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University A</td>
<td>21 / 1</td>
<td>644 / 64</td>
<td>1,163 / 1,240</td>
<td>12,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>30 / 2</td>
<td>1,082 / 56</td>
<td>1,872 / 982</td>
<td>32,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>13 / 1</td>
<td>360 / 43</td>
<td>2,543 / 936</td>
<td>18,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University D</td>
<td>17 / 3.5</td>
<td>700 / 70</td>
<td>3,981 / 1,443</td>
<td>27,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University E</td>
<td>9 / 2</td>
<td>300 / 45</td>
<td>3,398 / 1,028</td>
<td>18,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Years in Current Position</td>
<td>Years at Institution</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Director of Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Years in Current Position</td>
<td>Years at Institution</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admin. Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Department Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assistant to the Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS
Subject: Interview for Dissertation

I am currently a doctoral candidate at Texas Woman's University working on my dissertation. You have been selected as a potential participant in my study. Attached, you will find a copy of the consent form I will have you sign if you choose to participate. Below is a copy of the “Research Information” from this form:

The purpose of the study is to analyze and explain the current managerial control practices of chairpersons in physical education departments that offer doctoral programs and are accredited by the Norwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. Five universities have been selected for the study. For each, the researcher will interview the physical education department chair, two faculty, and the department secretary. Face-to-face interviews will take place on the campus of each school in the respective offices of the participant being interviewed. Notations will be made on a field notes sheet during the interview. Each interview will be audio tape recorded and transcribed soon after the interview. The total time commitment by each participant is approximately 1 hour.

Participation in the study is completely voluntary. If you are willing to participate, please reply to this email or call me at 541-962-3501 so we can set up a time to conduct the interview. You may also contact my research advisor, Dr. Bettye Myers, at (940) 898-2575. Thank you for considering my request.

Brian Sather
bsather@eou.edu
APPENDIX B

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Texas Woman’s University
Consent to Participate in Research

Title: Managerial Control Practices of Physical Education Department Chairpersons

Investigator: Brian Sather, B.S., B.A., M.S. ...................................................(541) 534-2041
Advisor: Bettye Myers, Ph.D. ................................................................. (940) 898-2575

Research Information

Brian Sather is asking you to participate in research for his dissertation at The Texas Woman’s University. The purpose of the study is to analyze and explain the current managerial control practices of chairpersons in physical education departments that offer doctoral programs and are accredited by the Norwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. Five universities have been selected for the study. For each, the researcher will interview the physical education department chair, two faculty, and the department secretary. Face-to-face interviews will take place on the campus of each school in the respective offices of the participant being interviewed. Notations will be made on a field notes sheet during the interview. Each interview will be audio tape recorded and transcribed soon after the interview. The total time commitment by each participant is approximately 1 hour.

Potential Risk

You will face a risk of losing confidentiality during the research process and may face repercussions from institution and/or institution personnel due to acknowledgement of position within an identified department and university. Your voice will be recorded by the investigator. Only the researcher, Brian Sather, and his advisor will have access to the recordings and all tapes will be erased shortly after the results have been written. The transcription and computer data will be stored in personal files at the researcher’s home. Within 5 years, this data will be deleted or destroyed. The final research publications will not include your personal name or the name of your university. Only the researcher and advisor will know your name.

Confidentiality will be protected to the extent that is allowed by law. The researchers will try to prevent any problem that could happen because of this research. You should let the researchers know at once if there is a problem and they will help you. However, TWU does not provide medical services or financial assistance for injuries that might happen because you are taking part in this research. Participation in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time without fear of repercussion.

Participant Initials
Questions

You will be given a copy of this signed and dated consent form to keep. If you have any questions about the research study you should ask the researchers; their phone numbers are at the top of this form. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this research or the way this study has been conducted, you may contact the Texas Woman’s University Office of Research and Grants at 940-898-3375 or via e-mail at IRB@twu.edu.

Benefits

Your participation helps further the knowledge base in the area of managerial control in physical education departments that offer doctoral degrees. A final copy of the work will be emailed to you within one month after the dissertation is approved. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

_______________________________  ______________
Signature of Participant   Date

The above consent form was read, discussed, and signed in my presence. In my opinion, the person signing said consent form did so freely and with full knowledge of its contents.

_______________________________  ______________
Signature of Investigator   Date
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON
Interview Questions for Department Chairperson

1. How would you describe the strategic planning process for your department?

   **Probes**
   
   How is the institutional or college/school strategic plan involved?
   
   What types of goals and objectives are formulated?
   
   How often is the department mission/philosophy re-examined?

2. Explain how you determine if the department is meeting its objectives?

   **Probes**
   
   How are specific outcomes measures identified in the strategic plan?
   
   What indicators do you review to ensure the department is on track?
   
   What feedback do you give to your faculty and staff regarding objectives?

3. How do you ensure the budget is balanced and resources are allocated appropriately?

   **Probes**
   
   How are purchases approved?
   
   Describe the ways faculty and staff have control of discretionary funds?
   
   What is the inventory process in the department/university?

4. How is each faculty member’s performance measured?

   **Probes**
   
   How are student evaluations used?
   
   How do you use peer evaluations?
   
   What personal evaluations do you do of faculty?
   
   In what ways does your evaluation of staff differ?
How do you provide feedback on performance?

5. Describe the techniques you use to influence faculty to change unwanted behavior?

Probes

What factors prompt the decision for action on your part?

What incentives do you use to influence faculties’ behavior?

If you have to reprimand a faculty or staff member, how would you describe your process?

6. Overall, how would you describe your philosophy of control?
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
Interview Questions for Faculty and Administrative Assistant

1. How would you describe the strategic planning process in your department?

Probes
How are faculty/staff involved?
How is the institutional or college/school strategic plan involved?
What types of goals and objectives are formulated (e.g. personal, department)?
How is the final strategic plan communicated to you?

2. How does the chairperson determine if the faculty/staff are meeting departmental objectives?

Probes
Are specific outcome measures identified in the strategic plan?
What type of feedback is provided to faculty/staff on progress toward objectives?

3. How are faculty/staff involved in developing the departmental budget?

Probes
How is spending monitored in the department to ensure the budget is balanced?
What process do you follow when you need something purchased?
How are your supplies inventoried?
What control do faculty have of discretionary funds?

4. How is faculty/staff performance measured?

Probes
How have faculty influenced the questions on the student evaluation instrument?
How do peer evaluations affect faculty/staff?
To what extent does your department chairperson personally evaluate the faculty/staff?
How do faculty/staff receive feedback?

5. Describe the techniques you have witnessed the department chairperson use to change unwanted faculty/staff behavior?

Probes

What incentives are in place to influence faculty/staff?

What disciplinary techniques have you observed being used by the chairperson with faculty/staff?

6. Overall, how would you describe the chairperson’s philosophy of control?
Field Note Form

Date: ______ Interview Location: ____________________________________________________

Interview subject name: __________________________ Title: ___________________

Age: _______ Years in Current Position: ________ Years at Institution: ________

Terminal Degree: __________________________ From: __________________________

Non Verbal Communication

Confidence:

Emotion:

Knowledge:

Mannerisms:

Posturing (Seated, standing, arms folded):

Voice Inflection:

Comments

Environment