



TIAA-CREF INSTITUTE: ADVANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

ATTRACTING AND DEVELOPING THE NEXT GENERATION OF SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

by Herman A. Berliner
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Lawrence Herbert Distinguished Professor
Hofstra University
TIAA-CREF Institute Fellow

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For us to be successful in recruiting the next generation of academic leadership, we need to fully understand the changes that have taken place in higher education. These changes begin with faculty who collectively have a desire and need to allocate more of their time to personal responsibilities (e.g., parenting and elder care.) These same faculty, to be successful professors, must now also meet substantially heightened expectations regarding scholarship. These heightened expectations are directly tied to the growth of accreditations and outcomes assessment. At the exact time as these factors are impacting the lives of faculty, the responsibilities of an academic administrator, especially at the senior level has demonstrably increased. These responsibilities now include a much more data driven and transparent decision making process, as well as a vastly increased need for fundraising. Taken together, the additional personal and professional demands on a faculty member and the added expectations on an administrator have made it more challenging to recruit faculty into critical administrative positions.

To respond successfully to this challenge requires us to provide added support to new senior administrators in terms of both mentoring and money. We have long mentored new faculty and we regularly reward faculty excellence, especially in research. To recruit highly capable administrators requires parity with faculty in both support as well as rewards. But this alone is not sufficient. We still need to identify individuals with potential and recognize that these



candidates can be internal or external, or non-traditional. The internal candidate has the benefit of being a known quantity, and the non-traditional candidate may not face the conflicting time pressures inherent in maintaining an active research agenda. In addition, we still need to provide effective ways of making administrative jobs more manageable, thereby making it possible to meet personal and other professional responsibilities. Splitting of jobs and delegating routine responsibilities facilitate a job being more manageable. If we meet the needs of academic administrators with the same determination and the same basic approach we have applied to faculty recruitment and retention, we will succeed in attracting new administrative leadership.

INTRODUCTION

A few weeks ago one of our most persuasive deans asked a newly tenured and promoted faculty member to meet with him. This faculty member has been and is outstanding in every area that counted; he is an excellent teacher; he is an active published scholar and he is very active in University service. As you would expect the faculty member promptly came in to see the dean, and the meeting was cordial, flattering to the faculty member, but didn't quite end the way the dean expected. The dean asked this faculty member to consider joining his office by applying for a newly created Associate Dean position. The faculty member listened very carefully, asked a few questions and before the meeting ended indicated that he was likely not to apply. Within the week, the faculty member called the dean to confirm his initial decision and gave two reasons. The first reason was that the administrative assignment, if the faculty member was chosen, would likely limit his research productivity and slow down achievement of his next goal, promotion to full professor. The second reason is that he had young children and valued his discretionary time.

Replaying this entire sequence in an earlier decade, the result would most likely have been different. For decades up to recently, many faculty looked forward to the opportunity to move "up" into an administrative position, and though there very well may have been a discussion focused on whether the reduction in teaching (especially extra teaching for extra compensation) and discretionary time would be fully compensated for, the decision would likely have been positive.

A CHANGING FACULTY IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

What changed? A lot, beginning with the faculty. The male dominated work world of higher education has thankfully changed, in part because many more women are receiving their doctorates. According to the Digest of Educational Statistics: 2006, in 1976-77, 25,036 males and 8,090 females received their doctorates; by 2004-2005, the numbers had changed dramatically with 26,973 males and 25,658 females receiving their doctorates. This change, together with the growth of higher education (from 11 million students in degree granting institutions in Fall 1976 to almost 17.5 million in Fall 2005) has resulted in many more opportunities for women (though there is no compelling evidence as yet that the glass ceiling, in faculty as well as administrative positions, has been universally shattered.) But the changes are more fundamental than just more women in the labor force, including the higher education labor force. In an article on dual earner couples by Elizabeth Kelleher in the March 21, 2007 issue of USINFO, Kelleher states that "the U.S. Labor Department reports that, in 57 percent of married couples, husbands and wives work." She goes on to report that "coping with two jobs and rearing children leaves many

couples...hard pressed to find time together.” In these relationships, according to Kelleher, women continue to do much of the housework; she notes, in addition, that “according to the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, men [now] do seven hours of housework per week, double what they did in 1968.” More women in higher education, but with many still fulfilling personal responsibilities (e.g., parenting and elder care) together with men who have taken on more personal responsibilities, will result in a population where a full-time administrative opportunity may not be that welcome (or family friendly.) With this population the greater time flexibility of faculty positions more clearly meets their needs.

Colleges and universities have also changed dramatically. In an increasingly competitive environment, more colleges and universities have sought additional external verification of their quality and stature. As a former business school dean, I can easily illustrate the growth of business school accreditations by showing the growth in AACSB (The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) accredited business schools. AACSB is the key business school verifier of quality and according to AACSB data, in 1970 there were 142 accredited business schools; in 1980 there were 210; this increased to 267 in 1990; to 393 in 2000; and is now up to 551 in 2007. Accreditations have provided this verification of overall high quality, but along with the benefits of third party endorsement, have come the requirements imposed by the various accrediting agencies. Initially these requirements were input driven: areas that needed to be covered in the curriculum; the number of faculty needed given a certain student population; how many of these faculty needed to be full time, and how many needed the terminal degree in the field. But as accrediting agencies have multiplied, both in the subject matter covered as well as the number of schools seeking external quality verification, so have the requirements that are inextricably part of the process. Input requirements have evolved into output expectations (learning goals) together with an actual assessment of what has been learned. Furthermore, assessment covers the faculty member’s relevance to teach what she or he is teaching, and in this assessment scholarship becomes the key long run determining factor.

CHANGING EXPECTATIONS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

As scholarship requirements in higher education have ratcheted up considerably, often led by the requirements of accrediting agencies (but over time evolving into new standards covering all fields in a college or university), faculty have become—by necessity—more involved with their discipline and more national and international in their scope. These scholars attend more national and regional meetings, present their work at these meetings and publish in venues with a national readership. They are much more tied to their disciplines and there is no choice. These external ties also lead to external opportunities which can help further a faculty member’s career in her or his discipline. But this comes at the expense of involvement in and perhaps interest in what is happening internally. If I am interested in not only staying relevant in my discipline but in moving ahead in my discipline (which could lead to a position at an even more highly ranked college or university), it will by definition limit my interest and my involvement internally.

Colleges and universities have also changed dramatically, and for the better, in terms of the process of awarding tenure and promotion. From a time not that many decades ago when tenure (or promotion) was at times based on whether you were a “nice guy” and a good fit with the rest of the department, or the decision was based on the dean (provost, president) wanting to grant

you tenure (or promotion), the decision has now become virtually transparent and in this area outcomes assessment is also prevalent. To demonstrate that a candidate for tenure is an excellent teacher we scrutinize student course and teacher evaluations; to demonstrate the person is an excellent scholar, we count the number of journal articles, rank the journals, and most likely ask external (to the college or university involved) reviewers to evaluate the quality of the work. Service is also very transparent and is evaluated by those in the know at every step of the process. And in most institutions the faculty member is provided with regular feedback on how he or she is doing so that mid-course corrections, if necessary, can be made.

The openness and transparency in the personnel process, the constant stream of feedback and the evidence based decision-making is all for the good. However, it has also resulted in vastly increased work, especially for the administrators involved in the process. Many more steps are involved in all facets of the personnel process, beginning with the hiring process. National searches have replaced what at not infrequent times in the past was a search for an already existing friend or colleague. And increased diversity is a mandate for all of us. Along with each of these steps, more documentation is also involved. It is no longer sufficient to say that a candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion is an excellent teacher—it needs to be proved; and it is no longer sufficient to say that a person is an excellent scholar (for promotion or tenure) or has the potential to be an excellent scholar—it also needs to have happened. Tenure is awarded on demonstrated scholarship or excellence in teaching and the crystal ball assessment of the future is now purely supplementary. To give one example of the steps involved, and this is not atypical, a candidate for tenure at Hofstra is first reviewed by a department committee (composed of the tenured faculty in the department involved), next by the department chairperson, followed by a Faculty Personnel Board representing the school or college involved, followed by the dean, next to a University Appeals Board representing the university (if there is any disagreement at any of the prior steps) followed by the provost who recommends to the president who makes his recommendation to the Board of Trustees for the actual decision. The materials submitted by the tenure candidate to begin the process often more than fill one milk crate and the recommendations in total cover more pages than the phone books for a typical American city. If the recommendation is that a person be denied reappointment, tenure or promotion, the paperwork is often even more comprehensive to make sure that the case is adequately made. And especially when there is a negative tenure decision, the odds are not insubstantial that litigation will follow shortly after the denial.

Along with the process being more open, fair, and objective (as well as time consuming), the power of the administrators involved in the process has declined correspondingly. The new reality is that the administrator is more a first among equals than ever. The work has increased, the bureaucracy has increased, and the absolute power has decreased.

A CHANGING WORKLOAD

Not only has the work increased in amount, it has also increased in scope. In my decades in administration, senior administrative positions have changed dramatically in scope. The need for and the responsibility for fundraising is perhaps the greatest change. This change has taken us from a time not that long ago, when fundraising was delegated to a development office plus the president's office, to today when most dean and other senior positions (especially for professional

schools) require deans and senior administrators to spend significant time courting and persuading donors. This is true for private institutions, where fundraising was part of the culture earlier, and for public institutions where as public financial support has declined, both higher tuition as well more fundraising initiatives have become a fact of life. The scope has changed in others areas as well. Academic administrators are often called upon to oversee admissions or athletics or to oversee student affairs, or to lead complex collective bargaining negotiations. The more an academic administrator is expected to handle responsibilities outside of her or his core area of academic expertise, the further away the person moves from faculty, teaching, research, and curricular issues, the more challenging the position becomes and also the broader the skill set required to succeed in all areas. I could be doing a terrific job in terms of faculty relations and curricular development, but if the overall job requirements also include substantial fundraising, my position could still be in jeopardy.

For some senior administrators, the job has increased in frustration as well. In talking to a parent recently, the mom told me that her son was doing terrifically well; she was enormously pleased but was at the same time confused as to how her son could have lost his academic scholarship. In looking into this situation, the reality was that the son was on probation and had withdrawn from a substantial number of his courses. The son was over 18 years old and had not filed a FERPA release allowing his school related personal and private information (including grades and academic progress) to be shared with the mom. I strongly believe in these privacy rights which the law requires us to protect and I strongly believe in treating an 18 year old as an adult. But other than saying to a mom in this situation that she needs to talk with her son and saying to the son separately that he really should talk honestly and openly with his mom, the administrators involved are often left with a feeling that they have not been as helpful as they would like to be.

A senior administrator also needs to be more careful in what he or she says or writes. From Larry Summers at Harvard to any other person in administration, both the law and peoples' sensitivities are more demanding. Once again, I view these changes for the better but they are another constraint which administrators especially need to strictly adhere to.

MENTORING AND MONEY

It is easy to list all the reasons why senior and other academic positions may be less desirable and consequently why it is much more difficult to remedy the situation. The reality is that there is no one remedy but there are a significant number of steps that can be taken which will make a very positive difference. The first two steps are mentoring and money. My first full-time administrative position was as Hofstra's Associate Dean of Advisement. The nature of the position was familiar to me in that I had already advised economics majors for a number of years and this new responsibility combined advising students (day as well as evening) in all majors (as well as those students who were undecided or were in the process of changing majors and those who had encountered academic difficulty) together with overseeing a number of assistant deans who also had many of the same responsibilities. My first day at work—which is still etched in my memory—consisted of the dean's secretary showing me where the office records were kept (pre-computerized record keeping); showing me how students made their appointments; and sharing with me some special requests made by department chairs (chairmen in those days.) The

orientation was brief and soon I was in my new office and ready to meet with students. The very first student was a non-traditional student—a French major—who with 12 credits left to graduate had decided that she should be majoring in business. She not only had decided on her new major, she was also determined to not take more than 12 credits. Two hours later this student was pleased with my advice and was seriously considering one of two reasonable options—a business minor that consisted of 18 credits and graduating with a French major or pursuing an MBA after graduation. A very time consuming first encounter in the new position but still somewhat familiar in terms of the academic advisement responsibility that I was carrying out. But what if I hadn't been familiar with advisement at Hofstra or what if the position was more complex (which it is today), how prepared would I have been to successfully carry out the responsibility? If we look at chairperson positions or advisement positions or dean positions or provost positions, unless you are familiar with the institution involved and/or familiar with the position being assumed, support needs to be there, ideally before you start, to ensure the greatest likelihood of your success. That support takes the form of mentoring and coaching. Coming from outside and needing quickly to become familiar with the faculty, other key administrators, students, important alumni and other critical stakeholders (including government and accrediting agencies), the budgeting process, important curricular and standards issues, and the particular nuances and rhythms of an institution is daunting without proper support. Can you succeed? Certainly many have and many will but if we are to maximize the chances for success (and the person's comfort level) in both the short term and the long term, the person assuming the position needs support/mentoring/coaching. Who should provide this support? It can be the person's immediate supervisor but often that is not the best solution. A new person in a senior position is striving to impress her or his supervisor. It is sometimes hard to be candid and ask questions which could reflect unfavorably on you, when the person at the receiving end is gauging your performance. A better solution is to have the lead mentor be someone who is familiar with the position but not part of your reporting line. For a dean position, another successful dean would be a highly suitable mentor; your predecessor—if the person was successful and left the position to take on another administrative position (other than the position to which you report) or return to the faculty or retire—can be very helpful; another senior person in the office you are entering who was not a candidate for your position or was not the champion of another candidate can also be very helpful. And the mentor should not be asked to take on these extra responsibilities pro bono—there will be substantial work involved and the amount of work and the important nature of the work should both be recognized. The same procedure works well for a department chair but what about a vice president, the provost or the president? Unless there is a successful former incumbent in the position who can assume the mentoring responsibility, it may be harder to find the appropriate person for this role. If such a person is not available, perhaps a leading vice president or dean or trustee (for a president) or some combination may fill this role.

EXTERNALITIES

The role of a mentor is not only key for getting acclimated and up-to-speed internally; it is also an important service for an accurate understanding of relevant external factors if a person is new to the area. Take the Long Island environment where Hofstra is located, there are over 125 different (autonomous) school districts, there are many more communities which together serve as home for almost 3 million people, and there are vastly different levels of services and

amenities combined with vastly different housing prices. Hofstra is also adjacent to New York City and we have many faculty, staff, and administrators who live in the city and in fact some who live in New Jersey and Westchester. Where should a person move; how does a person understand the sometimes very subtle and at other times not so subtle differences between communities/school districts? Here you are not only trying to accommodate the new administrator but often also her or her spouse or significant other as well as any other family members. Even if the internal experience is very successful, if the external factors are not a comfortable fit, you may not retain the administrator. And as we strive to increase diversity in senior administrative ranks, working to ensure a comfortable fit may well be even more essential. We recognize that understanding external factors may at times take longer than understanding the job requirements, and we also recognize that trying to do both at the same time may not be optimal. To build in more time and space, Hofstra has made available rental housing adjacent to the campus for key faculty and administrative hires. The rental housing is limited and it is available to the person only for her or his first year, but it can be an important safety valve that allows the person to concentrate on the job requirements while at the same time comfortably deferring another important priority.

Related to mentoring, the time of year a person starts in his or her senior position is also very important. The case is compelling that you should start if possible during a slower time of year, typically the early summer. Starting in June and working with a mentor could lead to a much more effective new senior administrator when the new academic year begins at the end of August.

MONEY MATTERS

Money is also an important factor, both the salary the person is hired at and the monetary recognition the person receives for a job well done. I grew up in administration when the guideline was that a person moving from full-time faculty to administration received a two-ninths addition to his or her salary (in recognition of the extra months worked outside of the typical nine month faculty teaching schedule.) For many associate or assistant dean positions today, that guideline is still being followed. But this change in compensation vastly underestimates the structured time commitment required of an administrator, especially a senior level administrator. Certainly being a full-time faculty member is hard work and certainly the time in class is just a fraction of the time required to do the job well. But a senior administrator, from my long term observation is often working more hours, dealing with more varied work related issues, while often having fewer factors under his or her control. A full-time faculty member has more discretionary time and more discretion in general. (And remember the environment is such that these administrative jobs have become less attractive over time for the reasons spelled out earlier.) There is no one salary formula that can be applied across the board to administrative positions but there is data available that can help set a fair compensation level. Very helpful and reliable bench marking data is available through sources such as NACUBO (National Association of College and University Business Officers) data and CUPA-HR (College and University Professionals Association for Human Resources.) Custom compiled data for peer groups is especially valuable and remember to adjust for regional differences. Also take into consideration that not every new administrator succeeds in his or her new position and there should be thought given as to what benefit—if any—should be provided to a person taking on an important administrative position, if that position does not work out. At one extreme, the person assuming

the administrative position may have been hired with tenure (if the person qualifies) and the ability to become a faculty member while at the other extreme there may be no benefits provided. If the goal is to convince the best candidate to take the administrative position offered, there needs to be a parachute provided if the administrative opportunity does not work out. It should also be noted that, though tenure is a wonderful fall-back position if the person brought in does not work out, it may not be in the institution's best interest to provide this benefit. Especially in a small college or university, an administrator who has been unsuccessful becoming a faculty member could have a less than positive impact on the overall faculty, and could make it more difficult for the new or interim person to successfully carry out his or her responsibilities. In such cases, when tenure is involved, it makes good sense to award the former administrator a period of time on leave (with pay) so as to give the new person time to establish herself or himself in the position. Ideally when an outside person comes in as a senior administrator, if there is a workable alternative to tenure which still allows you to attract a top candidate (such as a longer period of leave with pay) that alternative is preferable

RECOGNIZING POTENTIAL (INTERNAL) CANDIDATES

If your new senior administrator is internal to the institution, there are clear benefits to the person as well as to the institution involved. A person with this background starts by being respected (hopefully) as well as familiar with knowledgeable about the institution and also starts by being (hopefully) well situated in the area the college or university is located. Often for an academic administrative position, this person has tenure so there is also a built in parachute (which if needed could trigger the concerns noted above.) When the person moves from faculty to administrator, everyone agrees there needs to be an appropriate salary adjustment. But what about when the person decides to return to the faculty; what happens then to his or her salary? One easy solution (especially in a unionized environment) is to bring the person back to his or her faculty salary adjusted by the standard increases during the years the person has been an administrator. Such an approach works against the internal candidate accepting the administrative opportunity. If the person had remained a faculty member with the opportunity to receive merit increases (often based on scholarly productivity) this person could have been better off financially staying as a faculty member. Excellence in administration should be recognized the same way as excellence in research, or excellence in teaching; it should qualify you for merit salary increases as appropriate. Recognizing the importance of an administration position requires valuing the time spent and the accomplishments, much as research accomplishments are often now recognized by merit increases. One area where, from first hand experience as well as from talking to other provosts and deans, many of us are having difficulty is in finding and retaining excellent department chairpersons. (And since effective chairpersons who have been pleased with their positions, can be ideal candidates for a more senior position, this is a constituency that needs to be cultivated.) Many faculty are reluctant to assume the position and still others leave the positions at the first opportunity. In talking to many of these chairs and former chairs, it became clear that they don't feel appreciated and don't feel the compensation recognizes the work involved, and the possibly negative impact of this work on longer term research productivity as well as consulting opportunities. Acknowledging the validity in this position as well as the importance of the chair position, Hofstra last year implemented a system whereby a long term chair would have part of his or her chair's compensation incorporated into his or her base salary. In this way we have built a proactive mechanism for addressing the concerns of chairs. For someone internal assuming a dean or

associate dean role, this same consideration should be given. It is an investment in attracting the best candidates as well as recognition of the importance of these positions.

Excellent department chairs as noted above are clearly ideal candidates for more senior positions either on their own campus or at another college or university. But the pool of potential internal (or external) candidates worthy of consideration is much broader than just department chairs and includes assistant and associate deans, as well as directors of major programs or centers. For example, a successful graduate program director whose responsibilities often include recruiting students, allocating scholarships, working closely with faculty, overseeing curriculum and adhering to accreditation standards has clearly demonstrated a valuable skill set. Assistant and associate deans have carried out some or many of the same responsibilities. As part of the pool, I would also consider major grant recipients, leaders of university governance, and leaders of faculty unions. A major grant recipient has the proven ability to translate a proposal into reality, and has often managed people and budgets as well as deadlines; all highly sought after attributes in a senior level administrator. A leader of university governance or a leader of a faculty union with a track record of accomplishments has also demonstrated the ability to mobilize faculty, negotiate agreements, promote collegiality; and inspire confidence; once again all highly sought after attributes.

RECOGNIZING THE RESEARCH AGENDA

As I mentioned previously, a person taking an important administrative position, often does not have the time to actively work on his or her research agenda and this is and will continue to be an impediment in attracting top candidates to these position. In many colleges and universities, a faculty member is eligible for a one semester special leave (sabbatical) every five years. This is not normally an automatic entitlement—a quality proposal still needs to be submitted as to what would be accomplished—but receiving a leave is a very common occurrence. And this one semester block of time (when a person is still receiving his or her salary) allows for real progress in advancing a research agenda. If you look at administrative positions, there is often no such system (other than a chairperson usually receives the same leave opportunities as a full-time faculty member.) To successfully attract top candidates to these senior academic administrative positions, there must be real accommodation. And yet a semester away for a dean or a vice president or a provost or a president is hard to do and sometimes even harder to explain and justify to your constituencies. One option is to arrange the equivalent of leave or sabbatical time during the quieter parts of the year (though not everyone would agree that such times still exist.) For example the summer or the time between the fall and the spring semesters might provide some of the concentrated research time that is so valuable to a faculty member. Another alternative is for the person to take his or her leave two days a week for an extended period of time. The downside here is that it may be very hard to regularly take this time during the fall and spring semester. In those cases where a search is specifically targeting a person who has the credentials for appointment to a tenured faculty position together with the administrative position (which is the norm in a research university), the opportunities for that person to continue his or her research agenda should be showcased as part of the recruitment process. If a new administrator is expected to bring a distinguished research record, this person may also expect that a means would be provided to enhance that record. And as we provide these

opportunities, we may have to realistically adjust staffing in the offices involved or else this recommendation will not work.

Another alternative is to split certain administrative positions so that what one person did as a full-time administrator might be doable by two faculty each with a reduced teaching load and an adequate stipend recognizing the work involved. Normally you might be able to accomplish certain economies of scale and perhaps even better serve the needs of the students if the positions were combined into one position but attracting the best people to these positions is an effective counter-argument. A complex department with multiple graduate programs is a good example of how this would work. It might be best for this department to have one person directing all the graduate programs on a full time basis. In that way the person could be available a significant number of hours during the week to work with the students, prospective students, faculty, accrediting agencies and others. And for a prospective student, who has decided to pursue graduate work in this department, but is not yet sure in which area or what degree to pursue, this person would be ideal in meeting the student's needs regardless of what segment of the discipline he or she is interested in. And instead of multiple stipends and multiple reduced teaching loads, the one person involved would receive a large stipend and have even less teaching responsibility. But this may not work. A faculty member, especially a faculty member who teaches on the graduate level and does commensurate research may not be interested in anything approaching a full-time administrative assignment. These individuals may be great teachers or researchers, may be excellent advisers, and wonderful people to oversee your thesis or dissertation but lack interest in a full-time administrative position (while often acknowledging the importance of this position.) Dividing such positions may increase the pool of faculty willing to be involved.

Splitting positions has much greater applicability and various combinations should be further developed. A number of associate dean or associate or assistant vice president positions could lend themselves well to this model. For example, it is logical to have one person oversee accreditations and outcomes assessment for many colleges and universities given that these two areas have become so inextricably interwoven. The work involved is certainly interrelated; however here too you may be able to attract more and stronger candidates if the position was divided and the time requirements for each were more modest than the combined position. The divided positions could incorporate significant blocks of time for either research or personal needs or both, blocks of time unavailable in the combined position. Total costs may once again be greater but if the goal is to get the best people to do these jobs, splitting jobs may be the most effective way to proceed.

“ADMINISTRIVIA”

Closely tied into the splitting of jobs is another key factor in recruiting and retaining the best senior administrators. A long time colleague of mine who has served as both an associate dean and a long time department chair describes a significant amount of his work as “administrivia” and he regularly indicates with a passion how much he hates those responsibilities. What if we removed these responsibilities from the person's shoulders? It can certainly be done—two examples come to mind immediately. In many deans' offices and provosts' offices, there is a person who has budget/planning responsibilities. Part of these responsibilities often involves

monitoring the budgets and processing expenditures. Does this part of the job always need to be done by a faculty member serving as associate dean or associate provost? I don't think so, though clearly the planning responsibility needs to have high level faculty oversight. Another example, most department chairs have jobs that include recruiting and reviewing faculty, reviewing and revising curriculum, advising some or all student majors as well as preparing schedules, securing classrooms, approving a student's major, overseeing the department office plus the department website, and following up to see that all key department deadlines (for reappointment, promotion, tenure, curriculum revision and program review, etc.) are met. Many of these responsibilities do not require the skill set of a faculty department chair and can be handled very efficiently by a department administrator who works closely with the department chair (or in small departments, with a number of department chairs.) A chairperson or an associate dean or vice president may find a position much more to her or his liking (even if there is slightly lower compensation involved) if much of the "administrivia" is reduced. The reality is that virtually all of these important positions in higher education, and that would include vice president, provost and dean positions, have responsibilities that have become traditional and ingrained but are not a good use of that person's time. In removing these aspects from the senior administrative position, you may incur increased costs (perhaps for an additional support person or additional compensation for an existing support person who takes on additional responsibilities) but more importantly you will have fashioned a more attractive administrative opportunity which could attract a stronger applicant pool.

There is a related tradition in higher education which is being questioned and should be questioned more and more. That is the tradition of having many senior positions in administration filled by faculty or those with traditional faculty credentials. But is this the best staffing possible for these key positions and is this the best approach for developing the best pool of potential candidates? There are many senior administrative positions that have been and can be well filled by "non-traditional" candidates. These positions include presidents, deans of professional schools, as well as a number of key staff positions including associate and assistant dean positions. For example, a lead partner in a major law firm, or a CEO of a Fortune 500 firm, or a school superintendent, or a high level public official could potentially do an outstanding job in higher education. These individuals, people of major accomplishment, do not have to be lured from the ranks of the faculty. They don't start by coming from an environment where their reputation is tied to their scholarship or an environment where they have had substantial discretionary time. What they sometimes lack is a comprehensive understanding of how higher education works and doesn't work, and their success is highly correlated to how completely and quickly they develop this understanding. These are bright accomplished people; they may even have served on a board of trustees for a college or university but there is much they need to know quickly and here especially the mentor function becomes a key determinant in the person's success. If a non-academic is selected, the mentoring support certainly needs to be there and it needs to fully prepare the person to succeed. There is no substitute for this mentoring and no excuse for bringing a non-academic into one of these positions without doing everything possible to help the person succeed.

Another sometime tradition which also needs to be questioned is moving a faculty member from an area where there is a surplus of faculty (most likely because of enrollment shifts between

particular majors or areas) to an open administrative position. I support doing everything possible to retain the faculty member but just as we (the faculty and the administration) wouldn't support a person teaching in another department without the proper expertise, we should not place a person in an administrative role without the proper skill set.

ATTRACTING THE NEXT GENERATION

In looking to attract the next generation of college and university administrators, especially academic administrators, I recommend starting by acknowledging the situation is what it is. If we are dealing with a shortage of faculty in certain disciplines, we know exactly what must be done—the positions need to be made more attractive. In the short run this will help your institution attract more of these faculty who are in short supply (including those working outside of higher education.) Longer term, as these extra benefits (higher salary, merit recognition, lower teaching load, more start-up monies, more frequent sabbaticals, etc.) become not only more prevalent but also more visible, more students will likely enter the field. In this way, our future supply is to some extent determined by the present demand. If we are trying to attract candidates with the greatest potential into academic administration and they are coming from a faculty position, we need to make the administrative position more attractive using some of the same approaches (higher salaries, more time for research, more flexibility, merit salary recognition that is retained if the person returns to his or her faculty position, etc.) In that way more individuals will be drawn into the pool of potential administrators. Qualified non-academics should also be encouraged to enter this pool. And, of course, just as new faculty members should receive a full orientation and extra support in terms of being excellent teachers, applying successfully for grants, advising students, and learning how to stand successfully for tenure, administrators also need to know that a comprehensive mentoring program is available for them as well. Feeling that you have a better chance of succeeding, will provide added encouragement to undertake such a position. I have been in higher education administration a long time. Much has changed, mostly for the better. When I started, recruiting new administrators and attracting the best people to these positions was at times a challenge; it may be more of a challenge today but it can be done successfully if we define the qualifications/expectations realistically, provide support, and meet the needs of potential candidates with the same determination that we apply to meeting the faculty needs of the institution. Please remember that these needs are all inextricably interwoven and our shared destiny requires us all to very much be invested in all areas of recruitment for the future.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Herman A. Berliner is in his 38th year at Hofstra University. He became provost at Hofstra University in 1990 after having served for almost one year as the acting provost. The provost and senior vice president for academic affairs is second in command to the president at the University. Dr. Berliner has oversight responsibilities for all the Colleges, Schools and academic programs of the University, as well as the Libraries, The Hofstra Cultural Center, the Hofstra Museum, and the Saltzman Community Services Center. In this capacity and at the president's request, he also serves as the chair of the University negotiating team in collective bargaining with faculty.

Dr. Berliner joined Hofstra University in 1970 as an assistant professor of economics after having earned a Ph.D. in economics from the City University of New York Graduate School. He was awarded tenure in 1975, promoted to associate professor in 1978 and to professor in 1985. As a faculty member, Dr. Berliner has taught economics courses on both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and he has also served on a number of doctoral dissertation committees for the School of Education and Allied Human Services.

Dr. Berliner has served in a number of key administrative positions, including interim dean and dean of the School of Business (1980-1982 and 1983-1989), associate provost and associate dean of faculties (1978-1983), acting dean of the School of Education (1983-1984), associate dean of University Advisement (1975-1976) and assistant provost (1976-1977).

Dr. Berliner's areas of specialty as an economist include the economics of higher education. He is presently a TIAA-CREF Institute Fellow and he has served as an associate editor of *The American Economist*.