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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify and select a model for the analysis of autonomous schools of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Administration.

The problem was to ascertain what patterns of structure and characteristics emerged from an analysis of programs at three selected institutions.

A model based upon R. Campbell's operational areas of education administration and process elements of administration was devised. It divided H.R.I. education administration into the following operating areas: Alumni-Industry Relations, Curriculum and Instruction, Students, Faculty and Staff, Physical Facilities, Finance and Resource Allocation, Administrative Structure.

A questionnaire was then developed based upon the model. At least eight intensive interviews were conducted at each of the three autonomous programs of Hotel and Restaurant Administration in the United States. Data were transcribed and then condensed and analyzed within the framework of the model.

As expected, the model did serve as an adequate guide in documenting and analyzing the subject H.R.I. programs, and the data revealed strong patterns of similarity and dissimilarity among the structures and operations of the three programs.

The importance attached to autonomous status was the most striking pattern revealed in the data in terms of facilitating the operation of all of the programs. Such an outcome might have been expected.
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CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Education for HRI (Hotels, Restaurants and Institutions) has been a novelty. Consequently, the initial efforts have been toward the conceptualization and implementation of the very idea of HRI education. Considering the recency of the economic legitimacy of the service industries, it is not at all surprising that education for the field has groped first for identity and only now for significance. (65, 1978)

The first program of higher educational instruction in Hotel Administration in the Americas was founded in 1922. (16, 1968) Indeed, it may well have been the first of its kind in the world, for the European programs, while well accepted and established, have been based more on an institutionalized 'guild' system than a university program of study. Since this inception 60 years ago, the number of programs at four year institutions in the United States and Canada has grown to over eighty.

Because of the short duration of the existence of HRI Administration as a professional field of study and practice, there has been a relatively limited amount of formal research on HRI educational programs in either four or two year institutions of higher education. In the four years 1974 to 1978 there was a 56.2% increase in the number of hospitality baccalaureate degree programs, with another 10% increase from 1978 to 1981, for a total of 83 programs reporting in 1981. (25, 1978, p. 1); (43, 1981) Vincent wrote further that about 700 HRI degrees were granted to four year graduates in 1969, while in 1975 that number had increased to 1400, and to 3500 in 1981. (65, 1979, p. 7) and (43, 1981)
This relatively rapid expansion has continued, but generally with no direction and guidelines in terms of program design forthcoming from other institutions or from publications documenting the institutions' experiences with variation in program and organizational structure. Thus, directors of new programs were left to gather whatever information they can within the resource constraints of time and funding.

Statement of Purpose and the Problem

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to identify and select a model for the analysis of autonomous schools of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Administration.

Problem. Ascertain what patterns of structure and characteristics emerge from an analysis of programs at three selected institutions.

Significance of the Problem

Other professional university programs such as law, medicine, education and nursing, to cite a few, have been examined and compared with respect to their academic and administrative organizations. (See, for example, Thumm 59, 1971; Travelstead, 60, 1974; Woomer, 67, 1970.) Such research has been fragmentary, to the extent which it has been undertaken, for professional schools of hotel, restaurant and institutional administration.

The significance of addressing the problems cited herein was illustrated by the following considerations:
1. The designers of new and proposed HRI programs have had no place in the literature to turn for guidance in organization design; nor have the host institutions of those programs had any idea of what to expect when the programs were in place.

2. The faculties, students and administrators of continuing HRI programs usually have had only informal sources from which to solicit information on the progress and structure of other, possibly older programs for them to use in planning the further development of their own programs. For example, a school may be growing larger and may be contemplating organizational changes, but would like to profit from the experience of others in similar circumstances.

3. HRI educators have had no commonly accepted set of characteristics to use as a basis for discussion and comparison of schools of HRI administration. Research on the problem presented might contribute toward the development of such a set of descriptive characteristics.

4. Existing programs have had no real categories for criteria with which to examine themselves relative to other schools of hotel administration. Guyette (25, 1978), in his study on the perceptions of HRI educational leaders toward specialized accreditation, stated that:

\[\ldots\text{the magnitude of this (hospitality management programs') growth has produced a wide disparity in the relative quality of programs and qualifications of their faculty. Program leaders, recognizing that this rapid growth has resulted in a growing constituency concern for quality, have increasingly discussed whether some type of qualitative standardization would be viable through the accreditation process. (25, 1978, p. 6)}\]

Although this study did not have as a purpose to evaluate programs or their structural characteristics qualitatively, it did produce the
framework necessary for such a procedure.

5. Clients of HRI schools have often had a nebulous concept of what constitutes the non-curricular characteristics of the school with which they were becoming involved. Often prospective students have had only what they read in a catalogue or may have heard indirectly to decide whether or not to enter a particular institution's school.

6. There has been no real base or tool which could be used to research relationships within and among schools of hospitality administration. There has even been no common understanding of terms. This study might thus be significant in providing a foundation for future research and a host of new questions and hypotheses.

This research problem was discussed with two experts in HRI higher education and with an educator who was commissioned to and completed a proposal for a new program.

Dr. Thomas Powers, Director of the HRI School at the University of Guelph, Ontario, and Professor George T. Alley, Director of the School of Food, Hotel and Tourism Management at the Rochester Institute of Technology both confirmed that an in-depth study of selected HRI programs, detailing their organizational structure and institutional context would be a significant contribution to the paucity of literature which has been available for HRI educators.

Dr. Nicholas Washienko completed a proposal for a Hotel and Food Administration program at Boston University and then filled its directorate. He also confirmed some of the problems encountered in gathering information during his research, particularly since HRI Administration was not his professional or academic field. During his research, he contacted major program deans, chairmen and directors;
but, while he received valuable information, his task would have been facilitated by easily available documentation of some HRI programs.

The need for the research described herein was also discussed among participants at the annual conferences of the Council of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Educators at Dearborn in August, 1980, and in Montreal in 1981. There as well, while some members might take one specific approach or another to the problem, most agreed that the problem itself was significant.

Limitations

Certain limitations are important to consider when reviewing the findings of this study.

1. Full advantage was taken of the interview research method to observe individual behavior and the informal organization; however, it was not within the scope of the research to extensively study individual behavior or the workings of the informal organization.

2. The study was delimited to primarily study the formal structure and processes of the subject organizations.

Definition of Terms

Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional management referred to the field of study encompassed within the service industries including emphasis singularly or in combination upon hotel, inn, restaurant, institutional, tourism and club management. (1, 1978, p. 44)

Loose synonyms for Hotel Restaurant and Institutional (HRI) education included: Hotel Administration, Hospitality Management, Hospitality Service Management, Hotel and Restaurant Administration and Hotel and Restaurant Management.
Professional School, College or Institute referred to a section of the university devoted to teaching, service and research of a professional (applied) field of study, in this case, HRI administration.

Program referred to any educational unit which taught a course of study in HRI administration. Programs may have been housed in a college or school such as business administration, agriculture, human ecology, etc.. (They may or may not have been a department.)

Characteristics were descriptive variables such as size, span of control, work relationships, planning methods, recruiting practices and other variables which qualitatively and quantitatively convey the purpose, structure, operations, population and environments of an organization.

Autonomy was defined herein to mean that the program's director reported directly to a vice president for academic affairs, vice provost, provost and or equivalent university administrator; the HRI program is free-standing within the university and not housed within a business, human ecology, agriculture or other college, department or academic discipline unit.

Structure was a term which applied to the relationships which exist among the various activities performed in an organization. The purpose of structure is to provide an orderly arrangement among functions so that the objectives of the organization can be accomplished effectively. Structure implies system and pattern. (23, 1972, p. 40)

Process referred to the process elements of classical management and administration. This was expressed primarily in terms such as planning, organizing, directing and controlling with requirements and modifications.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature review was divided into three sections. First, a brief history of the background and development of HRI education, and a review of related research in hotel and restaurant administration education was presented. Secondly, an examination of appropriate organizational theory was provided. The final part was a review of appropriate higher education administration literature providing an underpinning for the design of the study itself.

HRI Education Development

Education for HRI (Hotels, Restaurants and Institutions) has been a novelty. Consequently, the initial efforts have been toward the conceptualization and implementation of the very idea of HRI education. Considering the recency of the economic legitimacy of the service industries, it is not at all surprising that education for the field has groped first for identity and only now for significance. (64, 1978)

Prior to the 1920's there was no formal program or even course in hotel and restaurant administration in the United States. Education was primarily through experience. (36, 1971, p. 93)

The School of Hotel Administration at Cornell University was founded in 1922. This was the first program of higher educational instruction in Hotel Administration in the Americas. (16, 1968) Indeed, it may well have been the first of its kind in the world, for the European programs, while well accepted and established, have been based more on an institutionalized 'guild' system and more recently on non university-housed professional schools than a university program of study. Since this inception 60 years ago, the number of programs at
The first formal program in the U.S. began with the growth of the American Hotel Association (AHA) immediately following World War I. By 1920, a nationwide shortage of hotel management talent became apparent. At the 1920 meeting of the American Hotel Association, Flora Rose, Assistant Dean of the College of Home Economics at Cornell University, spoke in positive terms of a relationship developing between industry and education. In response, the convention resolved to commission an investigation of the matter of education and training for the industry. The committee hired L.S. Hawkins, Assistant Director of the Federal Board of Vocational Education, to investigate the need and possibility of establishing hotel and restaurant training.

Hawkins' report actually recommended that a training program be established by using a 200 to 300 room hotel located in an urban area in conjunction with training which would not lead to a college degree. Indeed, almost the opposite turned out to be the course of action.

Cornell University, a land grant college, was chosen to house the program. Conditions were right for such a program at Cornell; Ezra Cornell's philosophy of offering instruction in any study seemed compatible; and the program had the support of the College of Home Economics, where it would be housed initially. (64, 1978, pp. 14-18)

Vallen postulated that there was no "bandwagon" following Cornell's lead perhaps because of the Depression and then the war. It was a concept ahead of its time. (64, 1978, p. 17) This statement notwithstanding, Michigan State University began a program in 1928 and in the latter 1930's the University of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania State
University, the University of New Hampshire and Washington State University began programs as well. Denver University and Florida State University followed suit shortly after World War II. (65, 1979, p. 6)

The mid 1960's saw the beginning of the fastest growth ever. Programs were initiated in Hawaii, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the University of Houston, Cal State Pomona, Florida International University and Stout State University in Wisconsin. The University of New Orleans instituted a program in 1975. (64, 1978, pp. 20,21) The latest additions were at Widener University, Brandywine Campus in 1980, and at Boston University in 1981. (54, 1982)

**Research Literature Related to Hotel, Restaurant & Institutional Education**

Research on HRI Education has been relatively limited until now. Much of it consisted of institutionally commissioned studies such as the Hawkins investigation referred to earlier. The Council of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Educators (CHRIE), the National Restaurant Association and the National Institute for the Food Service Industry have funded and performed data-gathering over the past couple of decades such as the "Directory of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional School" published in 1976, and "Senior College Programs in Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management in the United States". (14, 1976 and 43, 1981)

More recently the *Journal of Hospitality Education*, published by CHRIE since 1976, has been a vehicle for short articles and research studies on Hospitality Education.
Major academic research studies in this area have usually been forthcoming only from those individuals pursuing the doctorate or master's degree as further preparation for professorships in education programs of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Administration.


Several studies have been directed toward questions on curriculum development.

Dermody (16, 1968) investigated development of curriculum for the program at Cornell. Vincent (64, 1978) used a combination of techniques and previous research to investigate development of a Hotel and Restaurant Administration curriculum for Nicholls State University. She used Rappole's study presented in the Cornell Quarterly as a basis for developing an investigatory model. The new curriculum itself was the final outcome.

Guyette performed a most comprehensive study on professional accreditation for hospitality management programs. (25, 1978) The leading thrust of Guyette's study was to research the perceptions of the directors and deans of college and university HRI programs. The author concentrated upon the possible effects of the accreditation process itself and upon various structures which could contribute to its organization. Further he surveyed the respondents to determine what the functions of a specialized accrediting agency should be at the
school site and upon which areas in each school's program the accreditation should concentrate.

Interestingly, when he organized his sample's responses into categories of functions of the accrediting agency at each school, the author divided them into the following classification:

1. Public Responsibility
2. Instruction
3. Program
4. Industry

From the data, Guyette developed these as major focus areas of organizational function in HRI programs. Since the author made no mention of having derived the classification scheme from another source, it is assumed that he developed it directly from the data.

Vallen has written probably one of the most comprehensive dissertations on HRI administration to date. (64, 1978) His purpose, among others, was to identify curricula segments around which new courses could be developed for senior colleges' HRI programs by the year 2000. As part of the study he incorporated an extensive history of hotel and restaurant education, development of curricula and a comparison of goals which appear to guide that development. The author used the Delphi technique to elicit the data upon which to base professional and curricular development predictions.

Analysis of the scenarios emerging from the Delphi process revealed that HRI programs would realize "a coming of age in academe". There may be affiliations of convenience with other programs on the campus such as health care services and management and social services, as well as others. A cross-disciplinary philosophy may strengthen these bonds. The hotel/food service programs may be propelled through a
period of special recognition. They may then emerge from this meta-
morphic period as new Schools of Leisure and Public Service. (64, 1978,
pp. 132, 133)

Vallen and the Delphi respondents have frozen these new profes-
sional schools as offering programs which will recognize governmental
and institutional involvement as well as private sector management of
food, housing, transportation and leisure services. An integral part
of this thrust will be an understanding of and change in the organi-
zational structure of the existing HRI programs. (64, 1978, p. 135)

Cohen and Myers of the New School for Social Research prepared an
academic paper analyzing the occupational and professional focus of
university tourism and travel programs. While there appeared to be a
great deal of uncertainty concerning the term travel and tourism, there
was a direct link with HRI programs. In many cases one was a sub-pro-
gram of the other. (64, 1978; 12, 1979)

The Cohen study compiled demographic descriptions of the majority
of the programs in the United States and Canada, thus providing sub-
stantiation of similar data in other studies. They classified each
school's program according to degree level and then by "... Type of
Educational Division". (12, 1979, p. 6) Thus they found, for example,
that 8.1% of the Tourism and Travel Programs were free-standing within
their educational institutions. The Cohen study concluded that be-
cause of the diversity among programs there is some arbitrariness in
deciding upon classifications. Nevertheless, they suggested that anal-
ysis such as theirs provides insight for dialogue on further program
development. (12, 1979, pp. 6, 11, 12)
Indeed, both the Guyette study (25, 1978) and the Vincent curriculum study (65, 1979) contained extensive demographic data concerning age, location, curriculum, administration relationship to host institution and population of HRI programs throughout the country. Their data variously included vocational and all post secondary categories. These, together with the Cohen study and the data used to assemble the National Restaurant Association's senior college directory of HRI programs, provided somewhat complete resources for HRI program information. None of them, however, detailed, systematically, in depth information on the programs, other than what they researched for catalogues or survey questionnaires.

The foregoing studies represented major landmarks in the progress of HRI education research. Each dealt with either an organizational topic such as the Cohen study on programs nationwide or technical topics such as the Vincent study on curriculum. These studies provided some foundation as well as part of the framework and some data for this paper.

**Related Organization Theory**

The field of study loosely termed organizational theory forms the basis of organization research. It is a framework for building observations into theory, thus enabling the student and researcher to re-apply theory to other situations.

Classical and neoclassical theories of organization have been largely based upon Taylor's Scientific Management, Fayol's discourse on industrial administration and Weber's analysis of bureaucracy. These views evolved into a more organized and sophisticated, but still structural, theoretical view with the works of Urwick on administration,
Mooney on structural principles and Luther Gulick's mnemonic
POSDCoRB. (53, 1978, pp. 1-4)

Gulick developed the idea in response to a special committee investi­
gating what the work of the U.S. President was and how his office
might be organized. (8, 1977, p. 160) The essence of the classifi­
cation was actually based upon the work of Fayol. The mnemonic stands
for: Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Co-ordinating, Report­
ing and Budgeting. (18, 1973, pp. 119-120) These terms have been
used often in articles and textbooks, sometimes using other words, or
sometimes leaving out one term or another. This concept was crucial
to the research performed herein since a variation on it by R. Campbell
(8, 1977) provided part of the framework for constructing the interview
questionnaire, and indeed for giving insight into the processes involved
in higher education administration. Gulick explained them as follows:

Planning, that is working in broad outlines the things
that need to be done and the methods for doing them to ac­
complish the purpose set for the enterprise;
Organizing, that is, the establishment of the formal
structure of authority through which work subdivisions are
arranged, defined and co-ordinated for the defined objective;
Staffing, that is, the whole personnel function of
bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favourable
conditions of work;
Directing, that is, the continuous task of making de­
cisions and embodying them in specific and general orders
and instructions and serving as the leader of the enterprise;
Co-ordinating, that is the all-important duty of inter­
relating the various parts of the work;
Reporting, that is, keeping those to whom the executive is
responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus in­
cludes keeping himself and his subordinates informed through
records, research, and inspection;
Budgeting, with all that goes with budgeting in the form
of fiscal planning, accounting, and control. (18, 1973, p. 120)

Gulick observed that while he has cited these as functions of the Chief
Executive, they indeed represented what was meant by Administration and
Management. (53, 1978, p. 60)
Although Max Weber's work was published in the first part of this century, research questions using his conceptualization of varying organizational components into a bureaucratic type were not fully operationalized until more recently. The Aston group in England used the bureaucratic model as a basis for a comprehensive instrument with which to research industrial enterprises in the United Kingdom. (59, 1972) Blau and Schoenher also studied bureaucracy in the United States, but not in a public agency, using the case study method. (6, 1971) While not purely structural approaches, both of these research undertakings appear to have formed part of a bridge between the classical models of organizational structure and the recent contingency approaches to structure. The latter has involved the efforts of Blau and Schoenher (2, 1971) Burns and Stalker (6, 1961) and Perrow (44, 1973) among others.

Contingency views to organizational structure were well explained in the statement:

Since the type of activities that people in organizations engage in is different, it appears only reasonable that structure be adjusted to fit the situation. . . . it has only been during the past several decades that researchers have begun to ask why organizations are organized differently and if there is any relationship between the structure chosen and the success of the organization.

No longer are we trying to determine what the perfect organization should be. Rather, efforts have been directed at attempting to identify those situational variables that most influence the structure of an organization, its impact on member attitudes and behavior, and the resulting effect on the organization’s success or effectiveness. (48, 1979, p. 328)

The framework adopted for the research question addressed herein is predominately a structural one. The approach to the research of the organizations themselves involved comparing them on the basis of certain stipulated characteristics and variables which could be
classified into structural areas of administration for higher education. An elaboration of this follows later.

Comparative Administration

Chapter 1 of this study stated that the purpose was to study the characteristics of organizational structure in three autonomous educational programs of HRI Administration. Such an undertaking, it was hoped, would perhaps illuminate any similar pattern of structure as well as major organizational differences among the programs. Comparing organizations to each other in order to gain insight concerning their structure, operation and design is not a new concept.

Research comparing administrative organizations received much attention in the 1950's and began to take shape in the field of Public Administration. This was manifested in Riggs' work "Agraria and Industria", first published in 1957. Riggs and others at that time began to use the basic concepts of the sociologists Talcott Parsons and Marion Levy to study not political institutions as had been done in the past, but institutional structures and systems of structures. From this point of divergence, the study turned to administration itself. (18, 1973, pp. 137, 138)

Riggs observed that research employing the case study or history of one organization is an 'idiographic' approach. By contrast, one that seeks generalizations is a 'nomothetic' approach. "There is an intermediate approach which although idiographic rather than nomothetic is nevertheless comparative." Riggs names it the 'classified data' approach, "... (works which use that approach) are 'homological': they find similarities and differences of structure for constant function". Some studies could thus be 'homological idiographic'. The
use of such an approach in comparative administration would imply that
the resulting research would concentrate on organizations which have
similar functions and would apply idiographic techniques.

Comparative organizational analysis has been used in the field of
higher education administration as well. Burn in *Higher Education in
Nine Countries* wrote that "it is one of the axioms of institutional
evaluation that one does not proceed too far without examining the expe-
riences of other institutions of a similar kind and purpose". (5, 1971, p. 2) This Carnegie Commission study compared higher education
among countries, and used structure and organization, enrollment trends,
financing, institutional government, civil government relations, stu-
dents and planning as classification areas for study. It was further
noted that comparative study has permitted us to "observe alternative
solutions to problems in higher education . . . To study the varia-
tions found in different countries is to appreciate the flexibility of
the principles upon which all colleges and universities, including
those in America, were founded". (5, 1971, p. 1) Perhaps one of the
most cogent reasons the study cited for comparative analysis was that
planners will increasingly want to search out different approaches to
common problems. Indeed, this very notion was the major reason – the
centerpiece of the rationale for the present study.

The results of the Carnegie study were presented by describing
higher education in each of the nine countries. The final chapter
then summarized the major points of comparison and interest for all of
the countries and specifically drew conclusions for higher education
in the United States. For example, the researchers found that the
"co-ordinator's lot is not a happy one. First, those who are being
co-ordinated are rarely pleased with the co-ordinator or with the very fact of being co-ordinated. It was found on all campuses that the staff working under various co-ordinators were generally underpaid and unprepared for the kind of diplomacy needed to deal with touchy academics." (5, 1971, p. 352)

Finally, the study also resulted in "eight tests that are generally useful in evaluating the quality of higher education systems".

1. The quality of scholarship in international competition.
2. The ability to secure talent from the total population without regard to class or racial considerations.
3. The provision of technically trained persons to fill the needs of industry, agriculture, government and the welfare services.
4. The provision of an opportunity for a liberal education.
5. The quality and balance of service.
6. The quality and balance of constructive criticism of society.
7. The effectiveness of the governance of higher education.
8. The degree of popular support for higher education generally and from its alumni in particular.

The author cautioned that the question to ask is how effective is each educational system based upon these questions used as an index, rather than as an absolute - no one system is going to rank high on all eight criteria. (5, 1971, pp. 415)

Approaches to Classification

Use of various classification schemes in sorting and relating numerous variables has been important to the study of organizational behavior. (45, 1979) Sells has "outlined a design for a taxonomic approach to the study of organizations that utilizes three broad
categories of variables that determine organizational behavior: the characteristics of the organization itself, such as goals, tasks, groups structure, etc.; the characteristics of the physical environment; and the characteristics of the social environment". (45, 1979, p. 109) Further, taxonomical application to organizations should rely on formal structures. "Strategies of taxonomizing must, initially rely upon formal structures to guide the collection and aggregation of data. Although the formal structure is seldom a perfect surrogate for the informal, it is hoped that insights into the latter might be facilitated and improved by the conceptual and empirical work that would follow the classification of organizations into clusters." (45, 1979, p. 102)

Pinder and Moore argued for classification both of organizations and for the sub-units (or characteristics) of the organization. They contend that 'systems' theories and 'contingency' theories have severe drawbacks. Systems theories may be too general and universalistic at times. The clarity of contingency theories have often been clouded by the introduction of too vast an array of contingency or moderator variables. They proposed that the so called middle range or lower order theories were more workable. These called for investigation of a smaller class of organizations on a sub-set of variables. Eventually general theory might emerge from a "valid synthesis of bodies of lower order, midrange theories, which reveal meaningful similarities and which provide a good understanding of the organizational phenomena within their respective domains". (45, 1979, pp. 100, 107, 108) Thus 'midrange' observations and theories can be developed by limiting "the simple frame of analyses by sorting individuals, groups, or organizations into categories for subsequent analysis". Broadly based
predictive ability is one drawback to theory building in this manner. (45, 1979, p. 100)

Applied to the research question of this paper, a particular category of hotel education programs was selected for study - those which are autonomous. Then the task of operational areas and their functions for the programs' administrative structures were classified for comparison among the subject programs in the category. This approach has been amplified in Chapter 3.

Dunsire suggested that nearly all theorising based upon descriptive theory begins from a typology, a multidimensional classification. This is a "divination" of the order or pattern that actually underlies the appearances of the world or which at least seems to group them in a useful way for the purposes one has in mind. Typologies can either be serendipitously 'discovered' or can be developed from raw data by imposing a set of categories derived from some other source altogether. (18, 1973, pp. 209-210) He further observed that . . .

This is a mark of useful typology, that however many questions it may arouse in those who inspect it, however many philosophical and methodological challenges it may attract . . . yet it is suggestive, it stimulates people to try to improve it, to stand on the author's shoulders to see if they can get a better perspective on their own terrain. (18, 1973, p. 219)

The British educational sociologist, Hoyle, in his comprehensive essay on application of organization analysis to education concluded that "Typologies are valuable insofar as they yield hypotheses or focus attention upon the crucial patterns of interaction within the organization". (26, 1965, p. 102)
Some theory has been developed in the literature on organizations in higher education administration. While there has appeared to be no comprehensive theory, some of the work which has been done was used to operationalize research of the problem statement contained herein; this is particularly true for the questions which were devised for the interview instrument.

Hull undertook the development of a construct of organization and synthesis of a theory of organization for higher education. He concluded that "an adequate comprehensive theory of organization to account for the functioning of colleges and universities as complex organizations is lacking, and that organizational practices have outdistanced the development of an adequate theoretical base". (27, 1974 abstract) Indeed, after he observed that theory of organization is somewhat a newcomer to management thought he stated that there even is "at present... no one comprehensive theory of organization to account for the functioning of complex organizations". (27, 1974, p. 322) Organization theory is an eclectic compendium of the efforts of many researchers and writers bringing the strength of their own disciplines to bear on the problems of organizations. (27, 1974, p. 323)

As a major outcome of his study, however, Hull did compile what he termed a set of principles and recommendations for the organizational structure of institutions of higher learning. One of the recommendations he made as a result of the twenty-three principles was that higher education organizational structures should provide for the effective performance of the "five basic functions of management - planning, controlling, directing, organizing and staffing - in order that
the institution will achieve its educational objectives". (27, 1974, p. 335) Again, the work of Fayol and later Gulick has continued to be important as a tool in discussing organizational structure. Gross on the other hand, recognized the problem of lack of theory for higher education administration in 1968, and devised a study that would account for structural variables in universities. He and his associates devised a list of 47 goals for which various parts of universities could strive. Attainment of goals or ability to attain goals was seen as paramount in arriving at organizational structure. This list was sent in quest:e-nnaire form to over 15,000 respondents with each indicating his perception of how important the goal is for his institution and also how important he thinks it should be. The rankings of the goal statements were then correlated with certain global characteristics of the universities including type of control, prestige, degree of emphasis on graduate work, volume of contract research, and location. (22, 1968, p. 533) Control and prestige were the two most related factors to goals. The goals emphasized in a privately controlled university were more student-expressive (help them to be creative and express themselves) versus more student-productive (prepare them for careers) in the state universities. Power and the power structure were the other two main characteristics related to goals. (22, 1968, p. 538)

Gross's study was indeed considered and used by Hull (supra) but, while it was strongly predictive for the structural variables he tested, it didn't "assemble" these variables in a cohesive format.

Budig has assembled discourses on each of the component areas of university organization. (4, 1970) These included the presidency, dean of faculties, college deans, department chairs, the professors (faculty), dean of students, public relations, governmental relations,
research and planning and the budget director. Each section was
described by a major participant in that functional area of the univer-
sity. Budig did not indicate, however, how he arrived at these oper-
tional areas as a classification scheme within the university.

Millet (38, 1962) took a somewhat similar approach. The areas he
chose were faculty, students, alumni and administration. After pro-
viding some background thought on higher educational organization in
general, he then essayed on each area by breaking each down into
further component sub-units. The area "faculty", for example, was di-
vided into academic professional, academic organization, the depart-
ment, the college and the school, the university, the disciplines and
professions, and the academic environment. Faculty members were ex-
amined within each of these contexts. (38, 1962, pp. 65-105) Relative
to discussion and research of higher education Millet commented that:

In this discussion I am much more concerned to dwell upon
the internal organization of an individual college or university.
There are two reasons for this. First, I believe there is more
general misunderstanding about the subject of internal organi-
zation than about almost any other aspect of the American Col-
lege or university. Moreover, this misunderstanding is just as
widespread inside our colleges and universities as outside.
Secondly, the attempt to insulate the college and university
from the social passions of the moment has found its principal
method one of internal organization.

(Note that Millet viewed the university's ability to resist being
moved by "the social passions of the moment", as a positive value.
(38, 1962, p. 60)

Both Budig and Millet proposed that their works were essays on
organization in higher education institutions. Millet wrote from
years of observation, while Budig edited a work wherein he assembled
the essays of experts in each area into which he divided higher
education organization. Both authors have chosen a classification scheme by which to analyze or break down organization structure and relationships into component parts within the university setting. As seen above, both of their classification schemes bore a great deal of resemblance to each other and to Campbell's which was used as the model for the classification scheme of organizational characteristics in hotel schools which were studied herein. Campbell's classification for the task areas of education administration included school-community relationships, curriculum and instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, physical facilities, and finance and business management. The adaptation of his classification scheme for higher education has been explained in Chapter 3 which follows. (8, 1977, p. 116)

The works of both Budig and Millet served as aids in constructing the interview guide to be used in examining the HRI educational programs to be analyzed. A reading of both essays suggested particular questions which might be asked during an interview or which would have to be addressed in document searches in order to form an understanding of each component organizational area such as faculty, students, alumni, administration, etc..

For example, in Millet's section on 'Faculty', there was a subsection on 'The College or School'; "Ordinarily a dean occupies the formal position of leadership for the college or school. . . In some (professional) schools as in a law school, departmental jurisdiction may be relatively unimportant or even nonexistent; the role of department and of school may thus be merged. The instructional staff of the school becomes in effect a department as well". (38, 1962, p. 90) This was used to design questions in section 7 of the questionnaire
developed for this study such as: "Is the program departmentalized? Are there chairpersons?" (Appendix A, p. 15)

A. K. Rice, the English Organization Behaviorist developed several higher education organizational models, including a "Model Organization for Undergraduate Education". (47, 1970, p. 56) He presented this and the other conceptualizations graphically. Unfortunately, he made no suggestion concerning operationalization or research relative to these models; however the notion of conceptualizing organizational framework within a model is appealing, especially because it is so parsimonious.

Litchfield wrote a most comprehensive essay on faculty organization in large American universities. He raised several points which served as the basis for some of the questions in the interview questionnaire of the present study. His main thesis was that if universities are going to be increasingly more accountable to those whom they serve, they must use their resources especially faculty, as fruitfully as possible. He contended, however, that on many campuses the individual faculties tend to live in isolated proximity. (34, 1979, p. 464) His suggestion was that universities must put into practice the theory that they are communities of scholars.

The author made several proposals:

1. Make use of interdepartmental and interfaculty appointments.
2. Systematically develop interfaculty seminars.
3. Establish flexibility of faculty organizational structure as an objective.
4. Let the concept of departmental chairmanship be flexible.
5. Don't overburden academic administrators with clerical trivia at the expense of their academic pursuits.

6. Allow for the existence of concurrent organizational patterns (clusters, institutes, centers, etc.).

7. The disciplines must have a vital concern for the teaching and research problems of the professional schools.

8. Professional schools must draw upon the faculties of the disciplines for service courses either by having departments in the professional school (not duplicated elsewhere; e.g. tourism department in a hotel school) or by sending the professional school's students to the faculty of the discipline for courses.

9. Create inter-faculty planning committees in broad functional areas of the professional schools. (Such as business, hotel, hospital and educational administration, all of which have certain shared concerns).

10. Encourage close physical proximity of the schools or other units in these broad functional areas. (34, 1979, pp. 466-476)

Some of the suggestions which Litchfield made are clearly value laden. Nevertheless, he made cogent arguments for at least raising them. For that reason, they all have been included in the interview questionnaire curriculum and administration sections.

There has been considerable discussion over the past few years concerning a model for the conceptualization of higher education organization known as "organized anarchies". "Consider the concept of 'organized anarchy'. 'Organized anarchies' are organizations where goals and technologies (goals-means relations) are ambiguous, i.e. unclear, complex and conflicting; where sub-unit autonomy is substantial; where the
average participation level in the governance of the organization is irregular and rather low; and where the organizational decision structure is ambiguous and therefore open to different interpretations." (19, 1980, p. 237) While the descriptive power of this as a model might be questionable, it is a viewpoint which grappled with concepts such as decision making and shared authority which elude some of the structural organization models for higher education. The concepts which Enderud discussed were used as a basis for probe questions in the questionnaire with organization structures and faculty, and student and administration input to decision making.

Watson researched the influence of academic discipline, sex and rationality upon one's definition of the role of the head or chairman of a university department. Among other relationships, he found that the social sciences rejected leadership while favoring a co-ordinator whereas the natural sciences and professions favored the role of a leader rather than co-ordinator. (66, 1979, p. 19) This was used as a basis for questions to faculty in this study concerning the role of the dean as the faculty saw it.

**Research on Professional Schools**

Redman and Barley developed a conceptual scheme "On the Governance of University Schools of Nursing". (46, 1978, p. 27) The result was that they recommended a school or college framework with organizational structure taking the form of an accountable dean, a faculty well co-ordinated with the university faculty as whole and increased departmental organization. It appeared that the authors didn't really concretize their ideas into a useful paradigm.
King and Dietrich applied several concepts of organizational theory to schools of allied health. Their research resulted in their summarizing the bureaucratic model, the collegial model and the political model in terms of the organization of allied health schools. The authors then cited research which divided allied health schools into three formats or types of relationship with their university: autonomous (independent within the structure of the university), subordinate (part of a larger unit such as a medical school), and coordinated (faculty from several schools or departments report to a single administrative officer). They then suggested that allied health schools, depending upon their structural type (autonomous, subordinate, or co-ordinated) pass through various stages of collegial, bureaucratic and political models of functioning depending upon age and stage of the development of the program. The authors made recommendations for administration of the school based upon the assumption that each type (except the co-ordinated) would finally find itself with a political functioning model which could either be built upon or stagnate. These recommendations included such things as building successful coalitions to facilitate conflict management and selecting administrators who would be flexible, independent and would have a high tolerance for ambiguity. (28, 1970, p. 251)

A similar theme concerning the placement of professional programs in the university organization is treated by S. Bridgewater in "Organizational Autonomy for Nursing Education". (65, 1979) She observed that nursing programs have been established organizationally as "either autonomous education units, or as subordinate units, located within other autonomous units". (65, 1979, p. 5) Bridgewater brought data to
bear upon a somewhat impassioned argument for this autonomy: Indeed, she stated that:

It is the purpose of this paper to present data to support the recommendation that: (1) No collegiate nursing program be allowed to remain in a relationship of subordinance to another educational unit and (2) No further nursing programs be established without guarantee of autonomous status. (65, 1979, p. 5)

She presented this graphically in Figure 1 below.
Part of her argument turned on the problem that if nursing were located within another unit (or college) such as medicine, the philosophy of that college would have little, if any, commonality with nursing education; thus philosophical divergence would result in divergence of goals and purposes. She concluded that nursing programs submerged within other units have sacrificed professional autonomy and that the arguments she made supported her conclusion. (65, 1979, p. 7)

Kinnard wrote an article entitled "American Schools of Pharmacy: Their Organization and Administration". (29, 1980) He divided his examination into demographics, academics, administrative, special programs, outreach and externship programs, intra-university relationships and the deanship. The author's lack of a theoretical underpinning or model became quite apparent as his essay developed. None of the areas just listed coalesced in any cogent form.

He concluded that pharmacy schools' objectives were pursued via a "three armed organization. The three components could be termed: (1) academic policy formation and management; (2) resource management and borrowing the term from Galbraith..., (3) lateral process management". (29, 1980, p. 122)

It appeared that such a scheme may not have accounted for all the functional areas of a professional school of pharmacy with enough precision. The categories may have been too broad to be meaningful in developing powerful enough descriptions of the schools' organizations to be any assistance to planners and administrators.
Comparative Professional
School Studies

Griffith undertook to study the "organizational processes" of five baccalaureate nursing programs and identify recurrent patterns. She developed a model which divided the analysis of each school into the areas of: (1) goal orientation; (2) network of relations; (3) decision-making process; (4) reward system; and (5) institutional environment.

Her opening statement is most telling and quite clear.

Baccalaureate nursing education has existed for almost half a century, yet no one has stopped to identify similarities or differences in their organizational patterns. Organizational patterns may be defined as the interactions of persons brought together to accomplish the educational goals. Doing a conceptual framework, analysis of the organizational patterns within the baccalaureate nursing program will help us classify our existing knowledge, provide a model for comparison among programs, and provide a guide for further research. (21, 1980, p. 55)

Even though the model differed between Griffith's study and the present one, her aims and reasoning were almost exactly the same as for this professional hotel school study.

Her methodology involved conducting open-ended interviews with the chairperson or dean in each of the five nursing programs in New York state. Interestingly, she noted that she used the title dean or chairperson synonymously in referring to the administrators of the programs. It would appear that one reason for this was that she really had no selection criteria for deciding which programs to study, so that some were autonomous programs while others may have been in a department in some other unit.
In summarizing findings, she began by saying that variation rather than consistency was the rule in describing departments. One reason for this might well have been the selection of schools for study. One consistency, however, was that several deans thought that the faculty perceived them as autocratic. (21, 1980, p. 58) This was consistent with the findings of Watson cited earlier. (66, 1979) There did seem to be some difference of pattern between the programs that were in college settings versus the university settings. In a follow up study of the same five programs, it was found that recent graduates of the university programs were rated higher in the field than were graduates of the college programs. Griffith suggested that "organizational patterns of baccalaureate nursing programs strongly influenced the competency level of their graduates in the employment setting". (21, 1980, p. 60)

Canjar did a comparative study of five schools of engineering. His purpose was to determine how closely they fit a model for professional school of engineering constructed by another author, based somewhat upon a medical school model. The research involved analyzing transcripts of tapes from a meeting on Professionalism for Engineering Schools. He used these transcripts plus some subsequent enquiries to clarify details.

The five schools were analyzed within a five section model which consisted of: admissions criteria, nature and quality of the faculty, relevant intern or professional experience, jurisdiction and institutional autonomy. (9, 1972, p. 442) The author found that while none of the schools examined were professional schools after the pattern of medical schools, there was a trend toward such a development. (9, 1972, p. 444)
Klus and Jones researched engineering colleges in the United States and Europe. The study originally began with a Swedish engineering association to find out if Swedish engineering university programs were commensurate with others in countries of roughly equal size and similar technological development. They studied five Swedish universities, six United States universities, two in the Netherlands, and two in Switzerland. The research was executed by using a survey questionnaire in the first stage followed by meetings and discussion with representatives from each country. (30, 1981, p. 780) The study divided the information sought into broad categories of budget, faculty/students, curriculum and trends of technical development. There appeared to be no model, typology, or classification scheme for the research. Presumably the questionnaire was a priori.

Conclusions followed the pattern of the categories of questions. For example, they found that United States faculty spent more time in classroom than did the Europeans and were not as highly paid. On the other hand, faculty qualifications and student characteristics were similar. (30, 1981, p. 783)

Thumm did a most comprehensive comparative study of educational units in nursing in four year higher education institutions. (59, 1961) Her problem statement read: "The problem was to investigate the organization and academic functions of faculties in educational units in nursing in universities which offer programs leading to the baccalaureate and master's degree". (59, 1961, p. 4) Some of her main purposes included describing types of faculty organization in the programs and comparing organizational patterns of the programs.
The author initially sent out a questionnaire to all 16 (then) existing programs, eliciting demographic data. From these data she assigned each school's program to one or more of the following substructures of organizational pattern characteristics: committee, division, department, program or areas of instruction. She then selected a smaller sample from the patterns which emerged from the substructure analysis.

The subject schools were then studied by means of interviews in the field. The interview guide was based upon an amalgamation of organizational research and theory as opposed to some single model. The areas included: faculty organization, staff personnel and faculty functions including relation to students, curriculum, research, and equipment. (59, 1961, pp. 41, 42) Interviews were conducted at seven schools with the dean or director or one or more faculty member of the school. Additional data were collected from faculty meeting minutes, organization charts, handbooks, catalogues and accrediting reports.

Thumm reached some interesting conclusions. Standing committees were the most common working groups of the faculty organization. Six out of the seven programs had departmental organization. Faculty had some voice in selecting new faculty, though with different procedures. Evaluation for promotion and tenure was done through committee at all schools. Faculty members spent a great deal of time in meeting with very little being accomplished. Nursing faculty did not, themselves, engage in extensive research.

Gunne did a comparative study of the distribution of authority and governance patterns at six Pennsylvania higher education institutions. His purpose was to identify and describe decision making procedures and compare similarities and differences among the institutions.
Data were gathered through interviews at the institutions. The author used a six stage decision-making concept around which to structure the process questions. The issues chosen for study were academic appointments, promotions in rank, tenure awards, merit increases and curriculum development. Responses were categorized along a faculty/administration continuum containing five different authority zones (administrative dominance, administrative primacy, shared authority, faculty primacy and faculty dominance). (24, 1974, p. 7)

Gunne found that the state colleges were closer to shared authority than were the community colleges which were more administratively dominated. In terms of issues, faculty had most authority on matters of curriculum and least authority on merit increases. He did comparisons of results by specific institutions as well. (24, 1974, pp. 251-254)

Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature on HRI higher education, the major schools of organizational theory, higher education administration and professional school administration. The purpose was to provide a context for the study which was presented herein.

The study was of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional education institutions (professional schools); it was a comparative study, and it was based in classical, structural organizational theory.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Types and Philosophies of Research Method

Many in the social sciences have borrowed heavily from the mathematical and natural sciences to formulate research methodology. "The view that the methodology developed in the natural sciences is applicable to the study of social events and processes is usually referred to as positivism." (40, 1979, p. 3) Mishler continued, "mainstream tradition in the... social sciences derives from and depends upon the assumptions at the core of the positivist conception of science... these include the assumption of the unity of scientific method despite the diversity of subject matters, the ideal explanation as consisting in the subsumption of individual cases under general laws, and the formal structure of mathematical physics as a methodological ideal". (40, 1979, p. 3) The positivist approach to organizational research has often been referred to as empirical i.e., laws can be made (about the functioning of organizations) based upon observable, quantifiable events whose relationships can be accounted for - especially statistically. (56, 1978, pp. 582-584) In other words, use of statistically, quantitatively oriented research methods including sampling for the investigation of relationships among individual variables were not the only techniques which ought to have been considered for organizational research.

Other methods which varied in approach considerably from positivist methods, included what has been termed Action Research, (56, 1978)
direct or exploratory or descriptive research, (40, 1979) and phenomenological or ethnomethodological research. (40, 1979)

All of the authors cited above, Mishler, Mintzberg, and Susman and Evered observed that while positivist methodology has had its place in the study of organizations, the exclusive use of it by researchers has led to some serious problems. Usually, an important aspect of positivist research has been that laws hold if all other things are equal so that experimental design must control for, randomize or in other ways reduce the effects of other factors. The problem frequently in the study of organizations has been that "things are never equal, however elegant and rigorous the design". (40, 1979, p. 9) Mishler contended that research at times, must take into account the context dependence of organizational relationships. He suggested that phenomenological research could be an alternative method.

The function of observing in phenomenological inquiry is to constitute the multiple meanings of the phenomenon, while the function of recording the phenomenon is to reflect those meanings for the contemplation of the observer. (10, 1975, pp. 11, 12) . . . the process of documenting can move through several levels, which are not so much steps to be taken one after the other but rather represent a movement toward a fuller understanding of the multiple meanings of the phenomenon, that is of its coherence, durability and integrity. (40, 1979, p. 10)

Such research "permits the development of matrices or collections of significant dimensions . . . these matrices . . . both guide and refine continued observation (and) . . . can be used in a further stage of descriptive research". (40, 1979, p. 11) This was very similar to much of the material cited (supra pp. 19-21) in the literature search on classification, and taxonomy in terms of studying organizations and organizational structures. Thus, this descriptive research method fit
a research framework which used classification, as has been done in the present study.

A research method very similar to documentation was ethnography. Ethnography has sought to explicate the relationships among people, their actions and organizational structures; it was an extensive descriptive and interpretive effort at explaining complexity.

Mishler wrote that the similarities included an emphasis on observations in natural settings, on "thick" descriptions and on using participants' perspectives or definitions of the situation. Indeed, documentation might be considered as one type of ethnography. Magoon argued that educational research must take into account the fact that the subjects of the research are knowledgeable and that their behavior and organizations "might best be understood as being constructed purposely by the subjects themselves, and cannot adequately be studied without accounting for meaning and purposes". (37, 1977, p. 652) He called this a Constructivist Approach to research. "A constructivist approach, in brief, amounts to a refocusing of educational research on another part of the schooling phenomena and consequently taking an approach to it that is called ethnographic; that is, an extensive descriptive and interpretive effort at explaining the complexity." (37, 1977, p. 652)

Susman and Evered saw action research as a possible correction for what they termed deficiencies of positivist science. They contended that many of the findings in scholarly journals have been only remotely related to the real world of practicing managers (and administrators) and to the actual issues with which members of the organizations have been concerned. This was especially so when "the research has been carried out by the most rigorous methods of the prevailing conception
of science". (56, 1978, p. 582) Purely positivist researchers conceived research as:

... An accumulation of social facts that can be drawn on by practitioners. As a result, practitioners and their clients complain more and more frequently about the lack of relevance of published research for the problems they face and about the responsiveness of researchers to meeting their needs.

What appears at first to be a crisis of relevancy or usefulness of organizational science, is, we feel, really a crisis of epistemology. The crisis has risen, in our judgement, because organizational researchers have taken the positivist model of science which has had great heuristic value for the physical and biological sciences and some fields of social sciences, and have adopted it as the ultimate model of what is best for organizational science. By limiting its methods to what it claims is value free, logical, and empirical, the positivist model of science when applied to organizations produces a knowledge that may only inadvertently serve and sometimes undermine the values of organizational members. (56, 1978, pp. 583-593)

Action research, indeed, might be seen as at the other end of a methodological continuum from positivist research. It had its roots in Kurt Lewin's early research and was later adapted to the social sciences. It has been defined as comparative research on the conditions and effects of various forms of social action and research leading to social action. It has strived to contribute both to the aims of the subjects/clients in the immediate, practical situation as well as to the goals of social science. (53, 1978, p. 587) Action research has been future oriented, has been collaborative between researcher and client, has generated action grounded theory and has been situational. The process itself involved the steps of diagnosing, action planning, action taking, evaluating and specifying learning. (53. 1978, p. 589) This entire procedure was closely related to the school of organizational behavior termed organizational development. The process was cited here to illustrate the other end of the methodological continuum cited above, even though this method was not used in the design of the present research.
Susman and Evered further held that both deductive and inductive approaches to knowledge advancement have had serious shortcomings. Instead they argued that advances in knowledge have occurred when the inquirer has gone beyond the data, taking conceptual leaps to models and conjecture which can then be tested (by action) and further refined.

"... most of our significant knowledge about social systems has grown by conjecturing, e.g., by conceptualizing the social system as a biological cell (as in general systems theory) or as a machine (scientific management). We make assumptions about organizations by pattern recognition ... or by imagining the whole from knowledge of some of its parts." (56, 1978, p. 598)

The notion of pattern recognition among the organizational structures examined herein was an important analytic tool and was crucial to the analysis of data in the present study.

Mintzberg has made a clear and sensible case for considering research methodology other than the positivist approach. Based on his data and experience he suggested that more descriptive research is necessary to offset doubts raised about prescriptive research. Concerning positivist methodology he stated that, "The field of organization theory has, I believe, paid dearly for the obsession with rigor in the choice of methodology. Too many of the results have been significant only in the statistical sense of the word. In our work, we have always found that simpler, more direct methodologies have yielded more useful results ... What for example is wrong with samples of one? Why should researchers have to apologize for them?" (39, 1979, p. 583) He has called for more induction in research than has been the case. "There would be no interesting hypothesis to test if no one ever generalized beyond his or her data." (39, 1979, p. 584) He explained exploratory research:
There is no one-to-one correspondence between data and theory. The data do not generate the theory only researchers do that — anymore than the theory can be proven true in terms of data. All theories are false because all abstract from data and simplify the world they purport to describe. Our choice then is not between true and false theories so much as between more and less useful theories. And usefulness . . . stems from detective work well done, followed by creative leaps in relevant directions.

Call this research "exploratory" if you like, just so long as you don't use the term in a condescending sense . . . it seems that the more deeply we probe into this field of organizations, the more complex we find it to be, and the more we need to fall back on so called exploratory as opposed to rigorous research methodologies. (39, 1979, p. 584)

Mintzberg cautioned that all of this was not a license to 'fish' at random. The 'direct' research he discussed should be focused and systematic. (39, 1979, p. 585) Systematic would not mean detached. He made the case for the researcher not to examine just 'slices' of the organization but to investigate more holistically. The object would be to describe and understand the parts working together. Thus he argued not just focusing on only two variables at a time and holding all other things constant, (the economists' plague) since this cannot be done with the dynamic systems under investigation. (39, 1979, p. 588) The researcher must try to make a configuration of the many elements studied, arriving at patterns. Mitzberg suggested that it is human analysis and not electronic data reduction which would generate the configurations and pattern recognition. This was especially so because such an approach allowed for the use of anecdotal data to more fully understand, interpret and build upon the systematic data. He noted that in his opinion, "The researcher who never goes near the water, who collects quantitative data from a distance without anecdote to support them, will always have difficulty explaining interesting relationships (although he may uncover
them). (39, 1979, p. 587) Indeed, he commented that "Questionnaires often won't do. Nor will laboratory simulations . . . ". (39, 1979, p. 586)

Both Susman and Evered, (56, 1978) and Evered (20, 1976) wrote in very much the same vein as Mintzberg in terms of seeing a necessity for attempting a holistic understanding of a social system (organization) in trying to comprehend and explain its parts. They have borrowed the term hermeneutics from historians, anthropologists, and biblical scholars who have had to interpret their data in order to arrive at understanding and recognition of the relatedness of complex sets of events. "In the social sciences, the hermeneutical circle takes the form of attempting an initial holistic understanding of a social system, and then using this understanding as a basis for interpreting the parts of the system." (56, 1978, p. 595) Evered has taken the term hermeneutics to mean "the art of interpreting". (20, 1976, p. 270) Coupled with Mintzberg's notion of anecdotal analysis mentioned earlier, the power of the entire 'direct', exploratory research approach would be greatly increased over the strictly formal analysis of data categories.

The Research Approach for this Study

In summary, positivist research has been important to organizational investigation, but not exclusively and not pervasively. It has had the advantage of facilitating relatively easy data gathering and of allowing for the quantification and manipulation of variables, thus enabling the clear testing of hypotheses. Yet, to isolate variables, to quantify them, to look at only a small part of the organization before having understood the whole may give the researcher a false sense of understanding such a
complex and dynamic entity. Thus, at early stages of research, exploratory research methods might be more fruitful. This approach has had the advantages of directly involving the researcher with the subject organization and of allowing for in-depth study of one or a few organizations. It also has facilitated pattern recognition among organizational structures and relationships, especially when a classification scheme or typology of structure has been used as a systematic guide to the research. Finally, it has been directly applicable for practitioners and usable for model refinement and hypothesis generation for the research. It has had the disadvantage of making data gathering difficult, time consuming and expensive; the results have not always fit neatly into quantifiable paradigms; and, in the view of some, the lack of ability for broad generalization has also been a disadvantage.

The exploratory, 'direct' research approach was chosen for use in this study. In light of the statement of purposes and problem, especially the need for description, it appeared to be most propitious.

**Theoretical Basis for Design**

As mentioned in the literature review, organizational structure has been a complex constellation of concepts, for which no single theory appears to account. In comparison with the earlier references made in the literature search, however, it seemed that Roald Campbell has made one of the clearest attempts to concisely apply some of the major tenets of organizational theory to general education administration.

". . . the organization of the tasks (of education administration) into operational areas is a taxonomy. This classification . . . brings a certain order to the field which will prove useful to both student and practitioner of administration." (8, 1977, p. 116) In itself, the task
or operational area approach was not a highly developed theory, but a
taxonomy - a model which has facilitated both management and research.

The taxonomy included: school-community relationships; curriculum
and instruction; pupil personnel; staff personnel; physical facilities;
finance and business management. (8, 1977, p. 116) Campbell stated
that the achievement of these tasks "requires an organization of struc­
ture. The establishment of this structure represents, in a sense, an
additional task area. However, we have chosen to view the development
of such a structure as a way of implementing the tasks already suggested
rather than as a set of additional tasks." (8, 1977, p. 149) For the
purpose of this study administrative structure was included as a task
area, along with the other six, for clarity and for facilitating con­
struction of the interview questionnaire.

Each of the operational areas represented functions which must be
administered in order to operate the institution. Briefly, Campbell
made the following major points about what each of the seven areas in­
cluded:

1. School-Community Relationships
   - relationships the school has with local, state and national
     constituencies; publicity and public relations; role of the
     school in community.
2. Curriculum and Instruction
   - planning, execution and evaluation of the instructional
     program.
3. Pupil Personnel
   - integrating the personnel functions with instruction and
     coordinating various types of services.
4. Staff Personnel
   - developing personnel policies
   - recruit personnel
   - training
   - supervision
   - evaluation
5. Physical Facilities
   - the development, operation and maintenance of building,
     grounds, and equipment.
6. Finance and Business Management
   - budget making, securing revenue, managing expenditures
   and managing certificated personnel.

7. Organization Structure
   - the relationships of people as they work to achieve a
     common goal.
   - normal organization
   - controlling board
   - administrative organization
   - communication

(8, 1977, pp. 117-157)

While Campbell devised this taxonomy primarily for use in analyzing the organization of public school administration, it represented an excellent classification scheme for education administration in general. The functions remained basically the same; use of his taxonomy for higher education was a question of changing some of the terms, but leaving the categories substantially the same. That is, his taxonomy simply had to be applied to higher education administration for use in the current study.

Having defined areas of operation in education administration, Campbell added the dimension of administrative process to his theoretical framework or taxonomy of education administration. To be sure, the elements of the process were derived primarily from the work of earlier theorists such as Fayol, Bulick and Urwick (especially POSCDorB), Simon, Litchfield and Griffiths. Campbell combined some of these early constructs such as Gulick's POSCDorB with later developments postulated by Simon, Litchfield, and Griffiths, especially, who all added the decision making functions to the process of administration. His synthesis flowed from the structural theories discussed in the literature review. Thus, the process which Campbell derived for education administration included decision making, programming, stimulating, coordinating and appraising. He explained his reasoning for changing terms in some areas, such as
substituting the word 'programming' for 'organizing'. Usually, it was because he thought the new term would be more descriptive. (8, 1977, pp. 158-173)

Gulick's POSDCoRB was discussed in Chapter 2. (supra, p. 14) Recall that the mnemonic stands for Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Co-ordinating, Reporting and Budgeting. A comparison of Gulick's formulation of administrative processes and Campbell's derivation from it were not significantly different. A careful reading would reveal that Campbell has taken Gulick's two elements of staffing and budgeting and moved these over to his (Campbell's) taxonomical model discussed above into the operating areas of Staff Personnel and Finance and Business Management. Thus, Campbell has refined and made clear administrative theory which had its roots in the very first writings on organizational behavior.

The current study's framework and guide consisted of a synthesis - a matrix of an adapted version of Campbell's taxonomy of operational areas of education administration and the process elements of administration. This framework, adapted for higher education use, appears below as Figure 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Elements:</th>
<th>Decision Making &amp; Planning</th>
<th>Organizing</th>
<th>Stimulating</th>
<th>Coordinating</th>
<th>Appraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alumni/Industry Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty and Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Physical Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Finance &amp; Resource Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Administrative Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Matrix of Operational Areas by Process Elements
Population

The studies performed by Vincent (65, 1979) and Cohen and Myers (12, 1979) presented comprehensive, descriptive lists of HRI and related programs in the United States. These programs could be divided into four main categories of macro organizational relationships or relationships with their host university or college. The categories included:

1. Autonomous: A program having independent professional school or college status within the university whose director reports directly to the vice president for academic affairs or his equivalent.

2. Business Housed: A program housed in a college, school, or department of business, whose director reports to the dean or chairperson of the business administration college.

3. Home Economics Housed: A program housed in a college, school or department of home economics, including consumer and family sciences. (29, 1979, p. 59) The HRI program director reports to the dean or chairperson of the home economics college, school or department.

4. Other Housed: A program housed in some other college, school or department, different from those described above, including human development, food and natural resources, and agriculture, but not limited to these.

The category chosen as the subject for the current study was the autonomous category of hotel programs. Since these autonomous programs were self-contained, and since the problem and purpose statement called for description of hotel educational program organizational structure,
the autonomous category, a priori, would be the first logical category
with which to begin such investigation. Moreover, each of the schools
in that category was at least 10 years old and Cornell almost 60 years
old. This, combined with the fact that they had been granted autonomous
status by their respective academic communities suggested that they have
had an opportunity to develop, mature and realize a degree of establish­
ment and stability, and were supported, in all respects, by their host
institutions, student bodies and the professional communities whom they
serve.

The category contained four programs:

1. The Statler School of Hotel Administration,
   Cornell University
2. The School of Hospitality Management,
   Florida International University
3. Hilton Hotel and Restaurant Management College,
   University of Houston
4. The College of Hotel Administration,
   University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Widner University in Delaware established a four year, free standing
program on its Brandywine Campus in conjunction with a Sheraton Hotel
they purchased. (54, 1982) The fact that this program had just begun
operation precluded it from inclusion in the population to be studied in
the autonomous category. Johnson and Wales College in Rhode Island had
a program called Hospitality Management Center (43, 1980) In an inter­
view with a representative, it was unclear exactly to whom the program
head reported. They were omitted from this category.

The Rochester Institute of Technology had recently announced that
their program would henceforth be called the School of Food, Hotel and
Tourism Management, with the title of Director for its head. Never­
theless, the Director still reported to the Dean of the College of
Business rather than to the vice president or provost; thus, it was
not included in the autonomous category.

With one exception, then, the entire acceptable population of the
autonomous category (three schools) was the subject of this study.
The College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las
Vegas, had to be excluded, since the author was a member of its faculty.
It was used as a pilot, however, in revising the interview guide.

The autonomous category was also convenient in that its entire
population was only three usable institutions, thus, allowing for
study of the entire population with a goal of in-depth description.
Three schools was a workable number for such study in terms of time
and resources available. Sampling from a large population was thus
not an issue. Concurrently, no claim has been made to generalize the
findings to any of the other categories.

Within each program, the interviewees consisted of professional
administrators, including the program director and the assistant, at
least two faculty members, at least two classified staff, and the vice
president for academic affairs or his equivalent from the host univer­
sity.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation and analysis was based in great measure on the
inductive, heuristic approach to exploratory, descriptive research
already discussed in the first section of this chapter.

Interviewing was a research instrument which lent itself to such
an approach. Mitzberg commented that there were "two essential steps
in inductive research. The first is detective work, the tracking down of patterns, consistencies. One searches through a phenomenon looking for order . . . The second step is the creative leap . . . that breaking away from the expected to describe something new." (39, 1979, p. 583)

Lofland, whose work *Analyzing Social Settings* was used to design the interview instruments and data treatment techniques observed that:

The commitment to get close (to the organization being researched), to be factual, descriptive, and quotative, constitutes a significant commitment to represent the participants in their own terms . . . A major methodological consequence of these commitments is that the qualitative study of people in situ is a process of discovery . . . The scientific goal is that of explicit and articulate abstraction and generalization, or in other words, analysis.

. . . Since it is the job of the analyst to dwell upon their (subjects of the study) analytic order (while the participants are living it more than analyzing it), it becomes possible for him to provide a more articulate and clearer portrayal of that order than the participants are likely to work up. The qualitative analyst seeks to provide an explicit rendering of the structure, order and patterns found among a set of participants. (35, 1971, pp. 4-7)

The interviewing strategy used was the intensive interview with an interview guide. "Its object is not to elicit choices between alternative answers to pre-formed questions, but, rather, to elicit from the interviewer what he considers to be important questions relative to a given topic, his descriptions of some situation being explored." (35, 1971, p. 76)

Consistent with this strategy, the interviewer was open for information, thoughts, and observations which may not have been directly addressed in the questionnaire, but which the interviewee thought were important to him/her or to the organization. Leadership style, for example was one such phenomenon.
The actual contents of the interview guides were derived from and organized according to Campbell's classification of operational areas and administrative process elements as just discussed.

Following was the adaptation of Campbell's theoretical framework for higher (hotel) education administration.

Operational areas: 1. Alumni-Industry relationships
   2. Curriculum and instruction
   3. Students
   4. Faculty and Staff
   5. Physical facilities
   6. Finance and resource allocation
   7. Administrative structure

Administrative Process Elements: 1. Decision making and planning
   2. Organizing
   3. Stimulating
   4. Coordinating
   5. Appraising

In order to adapt the operational areas for higher education, the only area which involved substantial change was an expansion of what Campbell called 'school community relationships' to what has been termed 'Alumni-Industry relationships'. The relevance of industry and alumni was obvious for the operation of a professional school, and has been referred to or discussed by many of the authors referenced in the literature search, including Budig (4, 1970) Millet (38, 1962) and Vallen. (64, 1978) This was the logical place in the taxonomy for including the role and relationship with industry and alumni.
The other areas remained substantially the same, except for terminology with which higher education would be more comfortable, e.g., the term 'student' was much more appropriate to higher education than was 'pupil'.

The operational areas directed the particular interview question to a topic (i.e., by type) and served as a guide to generate questions insuring that the entire organizational structure was considered in the analysis. The process elements represented the subquestions into which each major operational area might be decomposed and guided the types of questions to be asked in each particular operational area.

One guide was developed, but certain operational areas were obviously not appropriate to some interviewees. (The director of physical plant would not have a great deal to say about appraisal of instruction or student admission planning.)

The interview guide was reviewed by four educational experts and a sociologist; it was tried in the College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Revisions were made to prepare the guide in its final form. The interview questionnaire was then again reviewed and items identified which should be obtained from sources other than interviews if available.

These sources included catalogues, institutional plans, accreditation reports, institutional reports, handbooks and histories.

The following schedules were operationalizations of Campbells' process elements of administration and the operating areas taxonomy. They were based directly on Campbell's major points presented above for each element and area. This was then used to devise the questionnaire which appears as Appendix A.
Schedule 1
Campbell's Process Areas of Administration

1. Decision Making and Planning
   a. Control future in direction of desired goals through decisions made on the basis of probable consequences and courses of action
   b. Problem analysis and decision making

2. Programming
   a. Arrangements for the selection and organization of staff for housing, equipment and budget must be made
   b. Organization - not one man
   c. Establishment of formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined and coordinated for the defined objective (5, 1977, p. 160)

3. Stimulating (directing, commanding)
   a. Elicit individual efforts and contributions in implementing organizational decisions
   b. Can exercise pressure upon an individual
   c. Create a set of conditions which inherently motivate people to act in the situation
   d. Communication
   e. Secure the general interest and individual interest
   f. Does not interfere with the general interest (61, 1944, p. 77)
   g. Rewards and sanctions
      1) Promotion
      2) Initiative (61, 1944)
   h. Motivation of behavior in terms of the desired outcomes (8, 1977, p. 163)
   i. Continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as leader of the enterprise (8, 1977, p. 160)

4. Coordinating
   a. Bringing into appropriate relationship the people and things necessary for the organization to achieve its purposes
b. The process of fitting together the various groups and operations into an integrated pattern of purpose-achieving work (8, 1977, p. 160)

c. Interrelating the various parts of the work

d. Secure that division of labor works smoothly (61, 1944, p. 44)

5. Appraisal

a. Are the objectives and the procedures chosen to achieve them consistent with one another?

b. Are the procedures operating as intended?

c. To what extent and how well have organizational objectives been met?

d. To what extent and how well has the organization been maintained?
Schedule 2

Taxonomy of Operational Areas of Higher Education Administration

1. Alumni-Industry Relationships
   a. Public relations - reporting to the alumni, and the industry, both local and national
   b. Ascertaining the role of the school
   c. Ascertaining the composition and character of the local industry community, determine the composition and character of the broader industry support community

2. Curriculum and instruction
   a. Those activities in which faculty and staff (and others) engage to plan, implement and evaluate an instructional program:
      1) Determination of objectives
      2) The development of a program of instruction
      3) The use of instructional procedures
      4) The appraising of instruction
   b. Instructional materials and facilities
   c. Evaluation
      1) Formation of objectives
      2) Definition of these objectives in behavioral terms
      3) Determination of places where these behaviors may be observed
      4) Development of instruments to record observed behavior
      5) Appraisal and interpretation of collected evidence

3. Students
   a. Recruitment of students
   b. Admissions and testing
   c. Counseling
   d. Residence while in attendance
   e. Quality control
   f. Demographics
   g. Financial aid
   h. Student organizations
   i. Professional recruitment procedures
4. Faculty and staff
   a. Recruitment-formulation of policy
   b. Faculty development/staff training
   c. Evaluation and compensation

5. Physical facilities
   a. Conventional classroom, independent study facilities, small group rooms, lecture presentation rooms
   b. Building-plans for expansion-futures-use of existing facilities
   c. Operations
   d. Maintenance

6. Finance and resource allocation
   a. Budget making
   b. Securing revenues
      1) State appropriations, endowments, fund-raising and contributions (relations, coordinating, etc.)

7. Administrative structure
   a. Relationships of people as they work to achieve a common goal
   b. Informal organization
   c. Organization chart
   d. Relationship to governing board
   e. Relationship with the host institute and its organization
   f. Purposes and goals stated in operational terms
   g. Job descriptions
   h. Agreed upon framework of administrative organization
   i. Characteristics
      1) Centralization vs. decentralization
      2) Line vs. staff
      3) Flat vs. pyramidal
      4) Span of control
      5) Horizontal vs. vertical (if applicable)
Gunne, (24, 1974) in his comparisons of authority at six colleges used very much the same interviewing approach as Lofland suggested and as was used herein. He noted that the interviewer should "... be steeped in the circumstances pertinent to the study". (24, 1974, p. 71) He also commented that this type of interview permitted the interviewer to vary the vocabulary and the sequence of asking substantially the same questions. Thus, the need for the interviewer to be familiar, to a certain extent, with the setting before beginning the interview. (24, 1974, p. 70) For this reason as many materials from each subject program as could be obtained in advance were reviewed before conducting the interviews.

**Procedures**

Prior to ever beginning the project itself, a pilot study, using Campbell's taxonomy of operational areas was conducted at two community colleges. Its purpose was to compare the organizational structure of both colleges (not just one program in each college). (37, 1980) This experience was used as a guide in developing the current study.

After the category of programs to be examined was determined, either the dean or assistant dean in each program was contacted. The researcher explained the nature of the study; immediate cooperation was assured by all three institutions. (In two of the cases, the project was discussed with representatives from the schools at the 1981 conference of CHRIE in Montreal). Follow up letters were mailed confirming the arrangements. Materials were reviewed from each school, and an interview schedule established — with the assistant dean in all three cases.

The interviews were scheduled so that the assistant dean was interviewed through the entire questionnaire, usually in two sessions, each
of about one and one-half hour duration. In this way, the interviewer received information on the entire interview question set totally from one person, which aided in consistency and comprehension. In each case the assistant dean was the first person interviewed. Thus, the researcher could phrase questions better and ask more succinct follow-up questions in the subsequent interviews, now having more detailed knowledge of the program. Interviews were then conducted with at least one student, two faculty members, and with those (faculty or administrators) in charge of admissions, physical plant, alumni and industry relations, financial and budgeting, and classified staff. Selection of the interviewees was variously a function of discussion between the assistant dean at each institution, and the researcher. The researcher was free to, and did conduct additional interviews and informal conversations with anyone whom he chose. It was ascertained that no function was overlooked in any of the three institutions, i.e., it was made certain by the end of the three days of interviews and observation that Campbell's model covered, in at least one of the operational areas, all of the tasks and functions performed by the program.

Each question on the interview schedule, then, was asked to at least two different people - the assistant dean and at least one of the others listed above. (Faculty, for example were interviewed on the student faculty, curriculum and administration sections.) If there was a serious discrepancy in the data on the same question from two interviewees, then a third interviewer was contacted and interviewed.

Toward the end of the three day session, the dean of each institution was interviewed. Since there was usually one, one and one-half hour session available for this, the first tier only of the questions
in the schedule were asked, highlighting each area. Probes were used only when there was need for clarification or exploring a new area, previously untouched. The interviews with the deans were thus somewhat more non-directive in the effort to "elicit from the interviewee what he considers to be important questions relative to a given topic."

(35, 1971, p. 76)

One of the last interviews was conducted with the immediate superior to the dean (vice provost, etc.). Again, this interview was relatively unstructured. The three major questions asked were: what is the role of the HRI program in the University: how do you view the program: and what is your role in relation to the program?

Finally, the last interview was a follow up session with the assistant dean. No guide was used here. Rather, the researcher asked two questions: have we covered all of the functions and structures at the school, and tell me about anything else you think I ought to know. This constituted a further check on the adequacy of the model and presented the interviewee with the opportunity to present rich, personal observations on both his institution and on the adequacy of the research project's approach.

With one exception, the interviewer received permission to electronically record each interview.

Treatment of Data

The tapes were transcribed by both the interviewer and assistants. Following Lofland's methods for treating data of this type, (35, 1971, pp. 117-132) the transcripts were copied. One set was left intact for each institution. The other set was color coded by institution and divided into operational areas of Campbell's taxonomy. Thus, one file,
for example, contained the transcripts pertaining to Curriculum for Cornell, Florida and Houston, each a different color code, and so forth. The analysis of these data, was presented in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 4
DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE HOTEL SCHOOLS

History of Hotel Education

The first hotel education program in the United States began at Cornell University. The events which preceded and surrounded the inception of the program at Cornell were discussed in Chapter 2. (supra, pp. 7-9)

The trend which ran through the first three decades of HRI education was twofold. First, each program, Cornell, Washington State, Michigan State\(^1\), Florida State and Pennsylvania State was founded at a land grant institution formed under the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890.

These land grant schools and their program heads formed the nucleus of hotel education. Usually the relationship with the host land grant institution meant being housed in the agriculture and home economics college or school at each university. (64, 1978, pp. 14-17) This was still evident today in that a number of these programs were still housed in those colleges. More importantly, the philosophy of land grant education would profoundly affect the philosophy and character of the hotel schools in terms of curriculum and of approach to education. Curriculum, for example, was heavily weighted toward the physical sciences in an applied setting after the agriculture and home economics models.

Secondly, in most of these early programs, industry and professional organizations played a major role in their founding and actual

\(^1\)Michigan State was founded in the College of Business and Public Service. (64, 1978, p. 17)
implementation. (64, 1978, pp. 14-20) Thus, the program heads had the task, especially at that time, of reconciling and building the program based upon the applied, scientific philosophy of the land grant institution on the one hand and the call for professional, technical knowledge and training by industry and professional organizations on the other hand. (15, 1959) Howard Meek, Cornell Hotel School's first Dean was selected by the American Hotel Association Educational Committee but established the program in the College of Home Economics. The early reports of the American Hotel Convention in Chicago in 1920, for example, indicated that there was great willingness on the parts of both education and industry to cooperate with each other. What resulted was "an innovative concept ahead of the vocational trend that was to come later". (64, 1978, p. 17)

Indeed, Flora Rose, who was Dean of the College of Home Economics at Cornell University addressed the annual American Hotel Association meeting in April, 1920. She told the group that the land grant colleges themselves got their start because there was a need for the development of engineers after the Civil War, and so the federal government funded such training nationally. Likewise, she noted, there was a great need for hoteliers nationally after 'The World War'. (23, 1975, p. 6)

Flora Rose further commented that:

When we began to analyze the methods which have produced the present very efficient hotel men in the country we found the same thing had happened in these earlier industries or professions, that is they began their training by the old apprenticeship method of training. The lawyer, the engineer, practically every profession that ranks as a profession today, began in the same way; that is the apprenticeship method, growing in the business, and the hotel men of today who rank first in the hotel business are the men who have grown up in that business. Now that is a splendid way in which to receive training, but it is slow, and the time has come in the hotel industry whereby with this method of training, you cannot train enough to meet
your needs. A vocation becomes a profession as soon as we begin to give to that vocation academic training, definite school work, the short cut to replace this method of growing up in the business, which is first, to give definite academic training for it, and the second shortcut is to organize a definite apprenticeship for this thing, if we are to follow historically the experience of the past.

We must have a good apprenticeship system as well as a good training system and the two go hand in hand. Where will the responsibility be placed for such training? Colleges and hotels have to work together. (23, 1975, p. 8)

The program heads, then, such as H. B. Meek who within two years after Flora Rose's speech was chairing a hotel program in her college at Cornell, had to build their programs and satisfy both constituencies. It appeared that they did this in very personal ways. "Like Cornell, those programs that did materialize, relied on the reputation of their directors. Individuals like Bradley, Greenaway, Meek, Proulx, Rovetta and Thompson became synonymous with the names of their respective offerings at Washington State, Cornell, Michigan State, Florida State and Pennsylvania State. These land grant schools formed the nucleus of early hotel/restaurant education, and these men formed the core of HRI educators." (64, 1978, p. 17)

In the years to come, programs were added, as discussed in Chapter 1. The status which the established and the new programs received within their host institutions varied. Cornell received autonomy. Michigan State became a strong department in the College of Business. Oklahoma has remained in Home Economics. Of the new group, (late 60's and early 70's) Florida International University and University of Houston began with autonomous status. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas' Hotel School began in the College of Business, but received autonomy within two years in 1969.
The remainder of this report compared the organization of three of these autonomous schools. First, a brief background has been presented for each school. Organizational structure of the three has been described and comparatively annotated, area by area of Campbell's taxonomy of operational areas as adapted for higher education and HRI schools in particular. The questionnaire appears as Appendix A. The analysis followed the order of the major questions on the questionnaire.

Background of the Schools

Cornell University

Professor H. B. Meek began the school as a department within what was, at the time, the School of Home Economics in the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University in 1922 with twenty-one students. (13, 1981, p. 3) Funding for this consisted of an $11,000 grant from the State of New York conditioned on Cornell's request and on support by the American Hotel Association and the New York State Hotel Association.

Even though the University was located in an isolated area of New York State, (the Finger Lakes Region of South Central New York) hotels in New York City and elsewhere offered the required practical training opportunities for students in the summers. (23, 1975, p. 10)

In 1928, the American Hotel Association announced it had no obligation to Cornell in any form and could not continue with financial support. In 1929, the Statler trust fund began to underwrite the cost of instruction and maintenance of the Cornell Hotel Course.

Statler continued support for the school during his lifetime; under the terms of his will, Statler Hall was constructed and opened in 1950 to house the formally established School of Hotel Administration.
Four years later in 1954, the School gained autonomous status within the University. It was separated from Home Economics and the statutory colleges and became an independent academic unit with its own faculty and dean, as defined in Chapter 1. \(^2\) (supra, p. 6)

H. B. Meek retired from active deanship in 1961. Robert A. Beck replaced him. During Dean Beck's tenure, the School increased its applicant pool, actual student body, and faculty. In 1973, the program's limited graduate offerings were expanded with the inauguration of the Master of Professional Studies degree. In 1981, John J. Clark, Jr. was chosen to replace Dean Beck.

Florida International University

The School of Hospitality Management began classes in September, 1972. The University itself, however, was formed in 1965 and planning took place from then to the University's opening in 1972. It was organized and operated by the State of Florida and governed by a Board of Regents. It consisted of two campuses in the Miami area with the Hotel Program located on the main campus.

The program opened with 200 students enrolled out of the initial enrollment of 5,000 on the campus. Dean Lattin noted that this was the largest entering class in the history of American higher education. (31, 1972, p. 112)

---

\(^2\) The structure of Cornell University has been unique. It has had both a set of academic units which were privately endowed and operated and a set of units which were New York State Statutory academic and a set of units such as agriculture, industrial and labor relations, etc. The School of Hotel Administration was established in the statutory partially publicly funded.
Those who were assembling the organization, faculty, students and plant of Florida International contacted Gerry Lattin who was Assistant Dean at Cornell University and who had been on the faculty at Cornell for over 20 years. They asked him to discuss with them the possibility of starting, from ground zero, a hotel school at F.I.U.. Lattin went to Florida "on a lark". The first question he asked during his meeting with Chuck Perry was, "Now how do you visualize your organization? Do you see a hotel school as being part of the business school? He said, 'No.' I said, 'Well now we can continue the conversation. Because if you had said 'yes' then we have nothing more to talk about.'" Further discussion revealed that Lattin's ideas for a hotel school were compatible with the overall University objectives. The primary objectives were:

1. To concentrate on the teaching of students.
2. To provide some international experience for each student; and
3. To be actively involved in community service. To emphasize this approach, President Perry stated very clearly that the old saying, "Publish or Perish" had no validity here, but the slogan, "Service or Silence" would be our guideline. (31, 1972, p. 12)

Additionally, both men agreed at the outset that a major objective was to have the program be national and international in scope rather than just a state or regional program.

Thus, there was no evolution toward tenuously founding a program as there was with Cornell in 1922. Indeed, the Cornell experience in a way provided the experience and ability for schools such as F.I.U, Houston, and the University of Nevada to gain status and more developed organizations much more rapidly than did Cornell.

Until 1981, F.I.U.'s program was upper division only; i.e., all its students were transfers from other institutions. In 1981, they
inaugurated the full four year program. The School also has granted the Master degree in a professionally oriented graduate program.

University of Houston

The University of Houston began as Houston Junior College in 1927. It developed over the fifty years to the current University consisting of 13 schools and colleges with 30,000 students. It was housed on an 85 acre campus three miles from downtown Houston. (62, n.d.)

James C. Taylor was Dean of the Continuing Education College on the downtown campus from 1947. In that capacity, he organized seminars for Texas hoteliers and restauranteurs, especially for the Texas Hotel Association, Texas Restaurant Association and the Texas Club Owners Association. During those next 25 years, he and they discussed the need for a four year degree granting hospitality administration program in the south-central part of the country and particularly in Texas. In addition, Taylor solicited the advice and support of the local chapter of the Cornell Society of Hotelmen (alumni of Cornell's School of Hotel Administration). They provided an experiential background for development of plans for the proposed School and its curriculum.

In the late 60's, Taylor began to talk with Eric Hilton about the possibility of the Hilton Foundation's providing support for the program. After a couple of years of discussion, Taylor simultaneously gave Eric Hilton a written proposal to take to the Foundation, and went to the President of the University. The President appointed an ad hoc, three person committee to study, determine and recommend to the administration concerning the efficacy of a hospitality management program's fitting into the role and scope of the University as an independent portion of it. The committee visited the Hotel Programs at Cornell and Michigan State. The committee gave unanimous approval.
The Hiltons offered $1.5 million; Taylor brought the offer to the University and they accepted. Taylor became Dean of the Hilton School of Hotel and Restaurant Management and of Continuing Education. Both programs would be housed in the same complex which opened in 1975, even though classes began on the main campus in 1969, the first year of the School's formal existence. In 1981, it was re-named the Hilton College of Hotel Restaurant Management.

Summary and Observations

It became quite apparent that Cornell, in one way or another was somewhat seminal to the way in which the other two programs were conceived. In one case, the Dean had been associated with the faculty and administration of Cornell for years. In the other case, Cornell alumni were instrumental in developing the program (at Houston) and a trip to the Cornell Campus convinced the University of Houston Committee to proceed with recommendation for the program.

During the interview with all three Deans about the history of their programs, former Dean Beck of Cornell, Dean Lattin of Florida International, and former Dean Taylor of Houston, all three, without hesitation or exception were adamant that their programs be autonomous on their respective campuses. The reasons were many, but especially included the need for separate identification, facility of administration and operation, and prestige. Such comments on their parts seemed logical in light of the fact that autonomous schools were chosen for the study.

Schedule 3 presented a demographic summary of the three programs. The previous paragraphs have outlined a brief history and development of the subject programs. Following is a presentation and analysis of the data gathered on those schools.
**SCHEDULE 3**

**SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE HRI PROGRAMS AS OF 1981**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cornell</th>
<th>FIU</th>
<th>Houston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Graduate Students</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Professors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Associate Professors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Assistant Professors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Instructors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Lecturers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Visiting and Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>3 (Visiting)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (Part-time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Year of Program</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester Tuition</td>
<td>$2965</td>
<td>$917(^1,2)</td>
<td>$768(^1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Non-resident, based upon 16 semester credit hours.

\(^2\) Florida allows students to obtain "in state" classification after 12 months. In state tuition would be $365.00.
Goals and Philosophy

Cornell
The School of Hotel Administration considers its primary goal to be excellence in the education as entrepreneurs for the hospitality industry. Important secondary goals include general educational and cultural enrichment, a rising of social consciousness, the imparting of a historical perspective, and a general business education.

(FIU
The purpose of the School is to prepare individuals for management careers in the American and international fields of hospitality management. In addition to traditional academic criteria, school policy requires each faculty member to have served in an executive position in industry

(Houston
The Conrad N. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management of the University of Houston Central Campus has become a reality as a result of the demand for professional training in the increasing complex hospitality industry. In meeting this demand, UHCC recognizes two major responsibilities to its students:

1. To prepare them for an effective and profitable role in their chosen economic endeavor, and

2. To offer them a cultural background which will enable them to take their places as productive members of society.

The curriculum is designed to prepare the individual to cope with changing business conditions and to present both theoretical and practical approaches to the diverse needs of the hospitality industry. Thus,
faculty members are selected from appropriate academic disciplines and from the professional community on the basis of their knowledge, teaching skills and practical experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Curriculum)</th>
<th>(Credit Hours)</th>
<th>Houston (62, 1980)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/General/Lodging Mgmt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Mgmt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Finance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage Mgmt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Mgmt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics, Marketing &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>FIU</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Science Electives 6</td>
<td>Social Sciences 6</td>
<td>Social Sciences 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math 3</td>
<td>Math 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education Electives 9</td>
<td>P.E. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship 3</td>
<td>Practicum 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUIRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Electives 13</td>
<td>Hotel Electives 15</td>
<td>Electives 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Electives 24</td>
<td>Free Electives 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CREDITS FOR GRADUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Based upon an interpretation of requirements applied to the new four year option.
Alumni-Industry Relations

Cornell

Corporate Recruiting

Recruitment of graduating students by industry was called placement by the School of Hotel Administration at Cornell. Virtually all student placement activities were self-contained in the Hotel School. There was a University Placement Service which was not used by the School. The rationale is that placement was more easily coordinated within the School since it involved primarily hospitality companies and only Hotel students. Thus, the recruiters contacted the Hotel School (and were solicited by the School) rather than the University.

Placement has been administered by various people and offices over the years; for several years it had been part of the School's Admission Office. Recently, it has been combined with the Alumni Office under one Director who was responsible for the placement, alumni, and public relations function. In 1981, there were over 65 companies who sent over 120 recruiters to conduct in excess of 1800 interviews with 200 of the 240 graduating students. (Those students who did not interview usually were entering the military or graduate school or family business.)

Students, at one time had been lining up at 2:00 or 3:00 A.M. the night before interview signup to secure a 'good chance' at the companies they wanted. Subsequently, students were registered for times to be at the Placement Office, for which there was still a line, to sign up for a maximum of five interviews per month. Secretaries from the Office administered the signing and checked students' files to ascertain that they were complete, including résumé. After one week, any open slots
with companies were released on a first come, first served basis. If there were still several unaccommodated student requests for a particular company, the Director would contact the company and ask if another interviewer could be sent.

Students all went through an orientation session with the Director concerning the interviewing process at the School in the beginning of the semester.

The Director scheduled all interviews, both for times and rooms assigned, usually in the Statler Inn section of the School. He also arranged the details for 'smokers' which the companies may wish to schedule. The firms paid the expenses for their guest rooms at the Inn as well as for the smokers. Generally, the Director attempted to invite each company to a meal (for which the School paid) at the Inn. Before the recruiters arrived on campus, they were sent an information packet about the School and, in some cases, students' resumes. They were provided with the student's entire placement file when they arrived on campus. If a student did not show for an interview, the remainder of his interviews were canceled.

Most of the companies were the large chain operations. There has been interest on the part of both the smaller and independent operations and on the part of the students, to accommodate the small hotels and restaurants for student placement. Since small firms would find financing an expedition to Ithaca, New York, to hire one assistant manager, for example, a bit excessive, the idea of having the company send a video tape of their property and requirements to the School's Placement Office for viewing by interested graduating students was being considered.
If there were more than one interviewer sent, one of them would frequently be a Cornellian. Companies have, however, moved away from sending all or a majority of Cornell alumni in order to gain a balanced view of the student candidates. Further, the Assistant Dean, when asked, indicated that he thought the presence of Cornell alumni in companies is of less importance than how successful Cornell graduates have been with their companies in influencing hiring decisions. He concluded, "So, I really think that the ultimate success of the recruiting program and the reason people come back is that they are happy with the graduates they've got."

No formal procedure was in place for placing students in local jobs in the Ithaca area. Local companies could recruit at the School by posting notices on the bulletin board.

There has been evaluation of segments of the placement function, but not a comprehensive evaluation, although one was soon expected. No formal student evaluation had been established until 1981. Then the Director compiled a questionnaire which he asked each student to fill out concerning the Placement Service and the company with whom they affiliated. They were distributed to the students, and placed in graduation packets. Follow-up letters were then sent. The return rate had been about 30%. The Director has also been soliciting from the companies information on offers, acceptances, compensation and job position information concerning the interviewees. The return rate has been in excess of 40%. Of course if there were serious problems, with students complaining about a company, or an interviewer with a complaint about a student, usually the party would make direct contact with the Director or Assistant Dean or even Dean.
Alumni Relations

The alumni of the School of Hotel Administration were formed into the Cornell Society of Hotelmen while the School was still in its infancy in the first part of this century. It was organized with a central organization housed in Ithaca and 38 local chapters scattered throughout the world. These chapters loosely coordinated with Ithaca through the Placement Director (just discussed) who was also the Director of Alumni Affairs. Until four years ago, this had been handled informally among faculty who were alumni and officers of the organization, through a permanent non-executive secretary, and through the Dean to a certain extent.

Chapters submitted a charter to the National Society Office, but were very autonomous, free to organize and do as they wish. In addition to organization by chapter, the alumni were organized by graduating class as well. The group numbers well over 5,000 people.

Chapters were authorized to form by the national organization. The main criterion in chartering chapters was that there be enough people involved to sustain the chapter. The Director gave an example of a recent chapter which formed in a fairly large American city, but which was comprised solely of people from one hotel company. Most of them were soon transferred and the chapter became defunct! The Director felt strongly that the success of the various chapters was very much a function of the individual members associated with it and the leadership role they were willing to assume.

The officers of the Society met twice a year. Expenses were paid by the individuals or their companies. The meetings served as a time for all, including School administrators to coordinate with each other
and for the President to work out and execute the direction, expressed in specifics, which the Society would take for that year. Routine day to day business was executed by the Director. The greatest part of that business included correspondence, membership billings, and editing the job placement bulletin which was sent weekly and had about 700 subscribers. He was also responsible for publishing a directory of alumni on a biennial basis. To facilitate coordination and administration of these functions, the Society's treasurer was usually an alumnus who was a faculty member, and the Director was also the secretary of the Society.

A good deal of the Society's activity was a coordinating function among alumni. This manifested itself especially in coordinating chapter activities both through the Bulletin of the Cornell Society of Hotelmen published quarterly and through the Director and others at the School, in a somewhat less structured fashion. If a faculty member, or the Dean or an officer of the Society knew he/she would be traveling to a given city on a given date, he would provide advance notice to that chapter so that if the chapter had been planning an event in that time period, the date could be coordinated and a visit made to the chapter membership. This seemed to provide organizational cohesiveness and a sense of unity among alumni and with the School.

Chapter activity was also coordinated through the Bulletin especially for publishing dates when a particular chapter would host a reception for Cornell Society members attending something like the National Restaurant Exposition. Class members' activities were reported upon by a class officer elected for each class who solicited information from classmates throughout the world. This was reported in the Bulletin by class twice annually.
### CORNELL SOCIETY OF HOTELMEN

**President** — William J. Callinn '56  
**First Vice President** — M. Theodore Nordahl '50  
**Secretary** — Harry R. Keller '56  
**Treasurer** — Dennis H. Ferguson '68

#### Regional Vice-Presidents
- **Eastern** — Thomas V. Pedulla '50
- **Southern** — James E. Pezinger '53
- **Midwest** — Adam T. Antonopoulos '69
- **West Coast** — Robert M. Foster '76

#### Eastern Overseas — Ichiro Inumaru '53  
#### Western Overseas — Pamela T. Kesler '66

#### Class Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>William W. Shields '33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Jacob S. Fassett '36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Henry L. Ruber '39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Lee E. Schonbrunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Charles W. Sitzer, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>John D. Leure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Mary R. Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Leon Keenan-Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Franklin W. Carney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Frederick A. Rufe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>John J. Dillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Albert W. Gentner, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>George M. Bautmanns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>John P. Caver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>John A. Norlander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Joan Carre Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>James E. Pezinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Donald J. Quinley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Thomas P. Root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Daniel P. Begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>F. H. &quot;Ted&quot; Wasken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Carl W. Vail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Gloria Jean McLain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>A. Bruce McFarland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Todd Clift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Robert L. Shover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>David A. Berins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Stephen Rushmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Susan M. Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Raymond J. Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Bridge E. Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Thomas J. Chagashe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Aladar B. Chenowith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Edward E. Mace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Laid M. Boles, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Richard A. Adele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Robert L. Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Benn E. Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Elizabeth Burgomaster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coming Events 1982

- **American Hotel and Motel Association Meeting**  
  October 10-14, 1982  
  Cornell Reception  
  October 11, 1982  
  October 12-16, 1982  
- **National Restaurant Association Convention and Educational Exposition**  
  May 23-27  
  Cornell Reception*  
  May 24  
  June 12, 1982  
  9:00—10:00 a.m.  
  Dean Clark's Office

#### The Bulletin of the Cornell Society of Hotelmen

**VOL. 1, JANUARY 1982**

---

*Function hosted by local Cornell Society of Hotelmen members. All Cornell Hotel Alumni are welcome to attend.
Also a major function of the Director and his Office was information processing - keeping up with location changes of a highly mobile group of people. Address files were maintained in a computer. Changes were solicited from members, and were also obtained from postal service address corrections.

All graduating seniors were enrolled in the Society and given complimentary first year dues. They received a "packet" prior to their leaving Cornell, and were encouraged to keep the Society office informed of relocations.

Two other functions of alumni have been discussed in later sections. The triad committee was an evaluation tool made up of students, faculty and alumni. One of its tasks was to evaluate curriculum. Also, the Admissions Office depended upon alumni for interviewing and recommending prospective students for admission.

Evaluation took place somewhat informally on an ongoing basis and at national level committee meetings. More has been said on evaluation of alumni officers at the end of this section.

Industry Relations

This, according to both the Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs and the Alumni/Placement Director was a very informally executed function of the School. Until recently, the industry relations function had been focused in the Dean. This had taken the form of travel and speaking engagements and alumni visitation. Faculty likewise have fostered relations with industry through consulting and speaking. Indeed, a web of contacts and relationships had grown over the years, but an informal one.
The Assistant Dean made the comment that keeping physical contact with industry was made more difficult, especially to attract visiting faculty and speakers because, "Ithaca, New York is not the easiest place in the world to get to. The other major hotel programs, autonomous programs, Las Vegas, Florida International and Houston are in the center of a metropolitan area and so they can get industry people in to guest lecture for a couple of hours on Tuesday (for example) without a lot of inconvenience." It was a bit easier to get alumni to Ithaca, but there was concern that too much of the public relations efforts have been directed toward alumni and not enough toward other industry people.

Funding was thus provided to get guest speakers. The speaker's maintenance was paid while in Ithaca, and he/she had the choice of an honorarium or transportation. Each lecturer was provided with a certificate from the School after delivering his first lecture on the campus. The faculty for whose course the lecturer was speaking was encouraged to dine with the guest at Statler Inn, providing further chance for communications and enhancement of relations. Visiting lecture dates have been coordinated through the Assistant Dean's Office, and a list published for the entire semester.

Both the Center for Professional Development and the Executive Education Program provided means for strengthening industry relationships. The Center was the administrative unit for summer classes at the Hotel School, opened to those who were in the industry and needed an update or wanted an introduction to a "new phase" of the industry.

The Executive Education Program administered seminars and workshops throughout the world. Most of these were contracted on a proprietary
basis and involved the faculty of the School with corporate level participants. Each of those programs had a Director from among the faculty.

The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly was operated by the School under a full time editor. It was a professional Journal, first published around 1960. In addition to the four issues per year, it published an annual bibliography of all hospitality articles, books, etc., regardless of where they appeared. The School librarian compiled it.

Hotel Ezra Cornell, was yet another structure almost as old as the School. Held each spring at the School, it has drawn industry representatives and friends of the School by invitation only. The student body has planned and executed this social/professional weekend event.

There was a University Public Relations Office. The School has used this primarily for laying out printing masters.

While the research was being performed, the decision was made to add an Assistant Dean for External Affairs to the then current organization structure of the School. At the time of the research, the functions described herein fell either under the Dean directly or under the Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs. (See Organizational Chart on p. 175, infra.) With the revised administrative arrangement, the new Assistant Dean was to oversee alumni affairs, placement, executive education, the Center for Professional Development and all external programs. One of these areas, fund raising, called development at Cornell, would be new for the School as a separate function and area of concentration. The area of external programs involved joint
programs the School did with institutions in other countries and has been discussed in the curriculum section.

It was stated that the new Assistant Dean would coordinate and plan and evaluate industry relations. One respondent felt this was crucial and stated, "I don't think we've done as much [public relations with industry] as we [could have] in the past. I think we tended to say 'Well, we're Cornell and we're the best and everybody comes to Mecca!' And I think we need to be more aggressive with industry."

Florida International University

Corporate Recruiting

The School of Hospitality Management referred to corporate recruiting as recruiting. Florida International University (F.I.U.) had a complete system of 'job placement'. The School, however did not avail itself of these services and ran the recruiting effort in the physical facility of the School with School personnel. For this reason, they used the term recruiting versus placement to avoid any confusion with the University Placement Service. The evaluation of the University's service and location was that it was too cold and impersonal. "We try to make recruiters feel they're part of our family. We ask, if possible that they [the corporations] send the same person every year."

The recruiting process was administered by a faculty member who had a reduced teaching load. (This same person, during the time of the study, also had charge of the Internship Program and much of the student counseling.) This faculty member was assisted by students from HFTA, the student organization.
The faculty member sent letters of invitation to companies listed in the Red Book and the annual 500 companies listed in Institutions Magazine, inviting them to recruit on campus. He then scheduled the interview day, trying to balance the types of companies (hotels, restaurants, etc.) that would be there on the same day.

Students signed up for time slots on interview sheets prepared separately for each company. The School had put into place, and was enforcing regulations concerning student no shows for interviews. If there were more students who wanted to sign than there were slots available, the faculty member in charge would call the company and ask if the stay could be extended or if they could send another interviewer. A packet was then sent to each company including a welcoming letter, an interview schedule, a map and a V.I.P. parking permit. Interviews were conducted in faculty and staff offices which were not in use on that particular day. (Schedules were pre-arranged with professors.) There was no other space available for the interviews. At this point, students from HFTA (the student organization) became involved in hosting the interviewers.

The faculty members and students saw to it that the offices were supplied with cup, saucer, cookies, pad and pencil. A student was then introduced by the faculty member in charge, to each recruiter. That student checked on the recruiter throughout the day to see if there was anything he/she needed. At noon, the student took the recruiter to lunch in the campus dining hall. This was funded by the School. The reasoning here was that the students were the ones seeking employment, and thus should have the most contact with the recruiters.
It was pointed out that many recruiters were personnel specialists anyway and thus may not have felt the need to meet a faculty member who was an accountant, for example; however, interaction between faculty and recruiters who knew each other or who would have common interests (two marketing types, for example) occurred on an informal basis.

At the end of the day, the student gave (his/her) recruiter a monogrammed School mug and a thank you. Usually, the faculty member in charge made a final greeting as well. A letter was sent the next day thanking them and asking for follow up, especially by sending copies of offers made to the students. Another set of letters went out later to solicit dates for the following semesters. This evaluation procedure has only recently been installed. Apparently there had been no formal evaluation of recruiting, especially of hiring reports in the past.

Alumni Relations

To a very great extent, alumni relations in this ten year old program were still relatively informal. At the time of the study, any structured alumni relations work was administered by the student organization (HFTA) or by the Dean of the School.

The students published a newsletter called Hotel Food and Travel Association\(^3\) on a quarterly basis. The newsletter was targeted toward alumni and industry executives and contained news of the School, student organization (HFTA) and the alumni organization.

\(^3\)The name of the School originally was the School of Hotel Food and Travel Services. Thus, some items such as the name of the student organization and course prefixes still reflected this.
The HFTA students also maintained the alumni roster of current addresses as well as received dues/donations ($15.00 annually) from alumni.

It was indicated that in the 1982-83 academic year, a new secretary position which the University was giving to the School would be used, part-time, for administration of Hotel alumni affairs.

The faculty member in charge of (corporate) recruiting also sent out a monthly listing of jobs to any alumnus who requested it. It usually contained about ten jobs and was usually requested by about 20 alumni at any one time. This appeared to be a rather informal undertaking, since it was also mentioned by another interviewee that one of the goals for the new alumni secretary would be to institute a job bulletin for alumni.

The actual Hotel alumni organization was very loose and informal at this stage, the 10th year of the School's operation. While no actual, formal chapters had been established, they had been designated in some large cities, and there was an alumnus "officer" of sorts in each of those cities. Coordination among those alumni and the faculty of the School was informal. If a faculty member traveled to one of those cities, he notified the alumnus contact, and a small social gathering might be arranged. Additionally, a reception for FIU Hotel Alumni was usually held in conjunction with the New York Hotel Show and the Chicago Restaurant Show.

The School was, thus, just focusing more attention on a formal Hotel alumni organization because there really had not been enough graduates to make it a worthwhile venture prior to the tenth year. The Associate Dean stated that the main alumni goals for the future would
include continuing education, a job bulletin and the creation of rapport among the alumni so that they could help each other professionally.

There was a University wide alumni service, but the School divorced itself from that service because the feeling was that it was not personal enough for the taste of the School of Hospitality Management.

**Industry Relations**

The Associate Dean capsulized the School's industry relation efforts as follows:

Well we are fortunate enough so that we have at least three faculty members who will ride the circuit and speak at most national meetings and company meetings and so forth, and they do a great deal of that for us in terms of public relations with the industry. For example, I'm giving a speech, I'm introduced from FIU - generally give some type of information about it during the speech as does Mike Hearst, as does Leonard Berkowitz, as does the Dean. So, in a sense, we have several people who are basically attending most of the national meetings as well as corporate meetings and corporate work and they do very well in this. Mike Hearst, for example is also Director of the NRA. (National Restaurant Association)

But in terms of funding, the great PR work with the industry is primarily to invite industry leaders here to campus to give speeches . . . like Pat Foley was here, [from] Hyatt, Bill Marriott, [from] Marriott. Sometimes we fund it, sometimes the HFTA student organization funds it and often times it's free. I would really presume that a great deal of our PR is done by our own students out in the field and through the circuit riding of these people who have been called nationally to present papers or speeches and seminars and workshops.

Industry relations were further carried out by the Dean as he traveled, especially for student recruiting, and with the industry advisory board which served the School.

The faculty member directing recruiting, counseling and internship, felt strongly that the internship program itself was also a tool

---

4Faculty Members
for fostering industry relations since there was a considerable number of hotels, restaurants, and clubs and other hospitality entities involved.5

As in the previous two areas the School chose not to use, to any great extent, the public relations services of the University. There was, however, a certain amount of coordination, on major items, between the Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University.

The Dean summed up the entire area of alumni-industry relations, including recruiting, very well. He saw faculty, student and administrative contact with industry, alumni and recruiters as crucial, albeit on an informal basis, depending on the circumstances. "I never take my hands off that [recruiting] function. I really think recruitment . . . , and alumni relations . . . are the number one and number two priorities."

University of Houston

Corporate Recruiting

Within the College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, the recruiting process was called corporate recruiting. The administration of this function for the College, was, however, with the Career Planning and Placement Center (CPPC) of the University. The Associate Dean indicated that because this was a State University, there was a strong emphasis on not having duplication of effort, thus the use of the University's central office for this function.

Coordination was therefore very important. Until 1981, it was primarily the Associate Dean who coordinated corporate recruiting

5The internship program has been explained in a later section.
between the College and the University. In 1981, it was turned over to a faculty member as an ancillary duty. This faculty member was termed HRM (Hotel and Restaurant Management) College liaison. If a company contacted the College, the faculty liaison discussed the College with the company, and then referred them to the University Career Planning and Placement Center. The Center then asked them for desired date for on-campus recruiting. The schedules were finalized by phone and confirmed by letter. An information packet was sent to new companies. There were some problems with hospitality companies calling late for dates and then not being ideally accommodated because the twenty interview rooms were already filled at the Center. Except for Hilton and Hilton International, there were no interviews conducted in the College's building.

A copy of the confirmation letter was forwarded to the College faculty liaison; he constructed a semester schedule from these letters. The semester schedule was posted in the College for students to examine. It was noted that sometimes the confirmation letter copies were, inadvertently not forwarded. It was therefore possible that the HRM College might not know about a company's coming to campus until two weeks before it was going to happen when the CPP Center published the recruiting schedule for the next two weeks.

Students could review the schedule at the HRM College, but must have signed up for interviews and brought their resumes to the CPP Center, no sooner than two weeks before the scheduled interview date. The Center did this in an attempt to prevent no-shows. The interviews were conducted in rooms at the CPP Center constructed for that purpose.

A copy of the sign-up sheet was forwarded to the faculty liaison who then sent one of several types of thank you letters to the company,
depending upon what kind of experience they had on campus. While they were on campus, he attempted to get to the Center to meet them, but this was not always possible. In some cases, if it were a new recruiter or company, and schedules worked out, he would attempt to have lunch with them. (The College would pay for the lunch if the recruiter did not offer to do so.) There were, therefore, some recruiters who came to campus and may not have met anyone from the College while they were there.

Several of the companies had 'smokers'. They make the arrangements themselves on or off campus.

The faculty liaison, when he did meet with recruiters, attempted to get an evaluation of the recruiting process and of the students. He also informally got evaluations from the students themselves. There has not been much formal feedback from companies to the College or the Center concerning positions offered, taken, etc.. The College saw this as something that was necessary.

There was a major evaluation of the entire corporate recruiting process in the summer and fall of 1981.

It was performed by the faculty liaison at the request of the Associate Dean. It outlined the recruiting function and process in detail and analyzed demographics such as company recruiting trends and so forth. Among its conclusions were that the College was quite pleased with the services of the CPP Center. The relationship was cordial between the two units. The Director of the Placement Center, in fact, taught a special career counseling course to the HRM students.

In the process of evaluation, the major recommendations made for corporate recruiting were:
1. That formal feedback be solicited from the companies

2. That the College also send an information and confirmation letter when the company sets a recruiting date

3. That the CPP Center notify the College of students who don't show for interviews

4. That the communication between the College and the Center be improved

5. That a Corporate Recruitment Office be formed in the College

Alumni Relations

The focus for alumni relations was the Conrad N. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management Alumni Association. This organization was headquartered at the College and, in practice, directed by one of the faculty members who is also an alumnus of the College and who held the office of secretary-treasurer in the Alumni Association.

Until about 1979, there was not a great deal of alumni activity. The Associate Dean was an 'alumni liaison' between the alumni and the Dean of the College. He had been dealing with various alumni on a fairly informal basis. As the program and number of alumni grew to the 700's in 1981, the numbers and resources were present to have a more formal organization. The major turning point for moving from what was primarily the group of alumni in Houston (estimated to be over 50% of the total 700) was a survey conducted of graduates by the College. The survey had excellent results in locating all but 30 of the graduates.

The Alumni Association still drew most of its officers from Houston but had also developed a broader geographic scope. The group of officers and the faculty member who was secretary-treasurer, in consultation with the Associate Dean, did most of the planning. Among the alumni in
industry, it was often many of the same people who provided leadership for the group; however, the observation was made by the secretary-treasurer that since the 'office' had been moved to the College, rather than at an alumnus' hotel or restaurant, a great deal more had been accomplished because of the greater, sustained interest at the College for this.

The first directory of the hotel alumni was published in 1981. It was a direct result of the survey. The plan was to publish a directory every two years.

The faculty/secretary-treasurer also oversaw the publishing of a newsletter on a quarterly basis. This was used as a communication device among faculty, alumni and students. A goal of the Alumni Association with the College was to, in the near future, publish a job bulletin.

At the time of the research, the College maintained a (physical) roster of jobs which were called in and were suitable for alumni. This was kept in the same book with a listing of part-time and non-supervisory, operative level jobs suitable for the students.

Several alumni functions were held each year in Houston. Each spring, there was an awards banquet to honor graduating seniors and an honorary alumnus. The alumni also presented a hospitality educator award at the Texas Hotel and Motel Association Annual Conference. They began an annual Christmas party in conjunction with one of the local hospitality corporations. It was primarily a social event and an opportunity for a short business meeting when the new officers were installed. Finally, the alumni were taking an increasingly more significant role in the College's Annual 'Gourmet Night'. This was discussed further in the following section. All interviewees noted that faculty participation in alumni events was very high.
Dues in the amount of $10.00 were charged, but all alumni received all communications. Only paid alumni were admitted to special functions. It was hoped to build paid membership in this way.

Because the College is so young, and because such a large proportion of the alumni were Houstonians, there had been no chapter activity. An immediate future goal was to establish a Dallas chapter. In the spring of 1982, the Houston alumni and the College hosted a dinner at the College for Hotel College alumni in the Houston area from their own College as well as from Cornell, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Florida International University, and Michigan State University. Well over 100 people were in attendance.

Some other goals for the immediate future were to establish class correspondents to solicit and organize information on classmates and secondly to establish the job bulletin and thirdly to establish some type of continuing education activity for alumni.

The College and its alumni association did a limited amount of coordination with the University's alumni group and appeared to keep that relationship a limited one. The feeling was that the goals of the two groups were significantly different. One comment was, "... there must be some mutual benefit to both the [University] alumni and members of our alumni association. Currently, it comes across to our alumni that all they're [the University alumni] really looking for is the money. And what they raise funds for and how they're used is questionable."

Yet, the College's alumni association provided the University Association with updated information on hotel alumni, while the University Alumni Association provided the College group with mailing envelopes for return mail response.
Industry Relations

The Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Administration was born out of a relationship nursed by former Dean Taylor among the University, the Texas Hotel and Motel Association, the Hilton Foundation and other Texas industry and professional groups. Communication, concern and support from and with industry has been crucial to the College. Until the time of the first Dean's (Dean Taylor's) retirement in 1981, he had been the focal point for industry relations, especially for fund raising, and one of his last acts before retiring was to prepare a proposal for the Hilton Foundation for them to further fund the College for a major expansion of faculty (both depth and breadth) and for physical facilities, especially a new laboratory complex.

The two main thrusts of industry relations were fund raising and consulting (including speeches and training sessions). For example, the week that this research was being conducted, the College was hosting a special reception for local industry which had some type of international connection. The purpose was to prepare them for fund raising to be used for the Hotel French course which was being developed.

Any fund raising activity must (by University policy) be coordinated with the University's central systems office on development to prevent two University entities from approaching the same potential funding source.

The Associate Dean indicated that he thought the College's fund raising activities should be more structured within the College so that all faculty would be kept informed and could perhaps coordinate efforts. This was discussed further under: Finance and Resource Allocation, University of Houston.
Summary and Observations

All three institutions considered the area of alumni industry relations to be most crucial. A pattern emerged that the order of structure of the sub-functional areas ranged from most structured to least structured from corporate recruiting, alumni relations to industry relations in that order. Perhaps this was due to the decreasing tangibility of each of those areas respectively and to the immediacy of need to accomplish clear objectives in recruiting for example, but more long term and hazy objectives in industry relations. It is easier to structure the recruiting effort - and to commit resources to that structure. The tendency with industry relations, at the other end of the scale, may be to 'let people (like faculty) handle it as the opportunity presents itself'. The environment and task of recruiting was quite certain, of alumni relations a bit less certain and of industry relations very uncertain and unpredictable. It was known from the literature that an unpredictable environment is better dealt with using a less highly structured administrative approach. (52, 1968)

Cornell was the oldest of the three schools, and had more staff and a more highly structured approach, especially to recruiting and alumni relations. It was also private and relatively well funded - and so could afford proportionately more staff for the same number of people being served. Its alumni group was almost 60 years old. This made a significant difference in the power of the network which they formed. Indeed, often times because the alumni at Cornell were so old, so big (over 50,000 living) and so well organized and steeped in tradition, they were one in the same with industry from some of the School's various perspectives. This appeared to even be a cause for a bit of concern
lest sight be lost of the broader industry picture. Nevertheless, recruiting, alumni and industry strength combined to make the Cornell Hotel School the legend which many perceived it to be.

Florida International was the youngest program of the three but has grown substantially. It was having a few problems with recruiting procedures, but was open to feedback and has turned the situation into a very positive one. Its alumni were becoming more nationally located, growing and were slowly organizing with impetus from the School and from a few key alumni. Industry relations were informally handled by all, but rested especially with the Dean and to a certain extent the Associate Dean.

The University of Houston's Hotel College, a couple of years older than Florida, was somewhat more localized in its approach. Part of this was due to the nature of the two host institutions. Houston's industry ties were very strong and the degree of alumni organization, while significantly less than Cornell was more structured than Florida. The reasons for this were the age of the program and the concentration of so many alumni in one geographic area - Houston. In terms of recruiting, one can easily observe a pattern shared by Cornell and Florida. Both keep recruiting in-house and tightly controlled. At Houston, the University Recruiting Office was used and thus the need for greater coordination among more levels and administration, and, indeed physical distance. Perhaps this was one reason for the extensive evaluation they recently performed.

All three hotel schools maintained their autonomous control over alumni relations and industry relations, interacting with their respective host institutions as little as possible.
Curriculum and Instruction

The curriculum of the Hotel School at Cornell was the first of its kind to be developed in the U.S.. It began as a department in the School of Home Economics. There was some influence on it, therefore, from the area of Home Economics. As the years went by, the curriculum evolved, responding to changes in the profession, in management, philosophy, changes in technology and growth of the service industries. The triad committee of the School has periodically evaluated curriculum. This joint input to planning and evaluation for curriculum was given by students, alumni and faculty.

Particular curriculum issues such as course offerings, descriptions, titles, and scheduling, until about 1979, had been left primarily to the faculty member involved, and to the Dean. Broader curricular issues were discussed by the faculty as a whole. In 1979, a School Curriculum Committee was established. It became a standing committee with members from each of the seven areas into which the School's curriculum is divided. At its inception, the role of the Committee was unclear. It had been chaired by the then Assistant Dean and operated on an ad hoc basis to handle problems as they arose. Several respondents indicated that it seemed to get involved in the mechanics of the curriculum and of instruction, including problems of course scheduling, and assignment of course sections, etc. Since the change in the School's administration, a new emphasis has been put on the role of this Committee. It was in the process (at the time of this research) of developing goals and guidelines for itself. It was now to review and coordinate substantive course changes. The
procedure was for the faculty member to discuss the issue with his/her
colleagues in the area of the curriculum where he/she taught. That
area coordinator would then forward the recommendation to the Curriculum
Committee. The Committee would review it, especially for overlap with
other courses. The Committee would then forward major issues to the
faculty as a whole for final discussion and approval.

Another function which some saw for the Committee was that it
would be a curriculum review committee, constantly evaluating the
School's curriculum. The committee met monthly.

It might be parenthetically added that not all in the School agreed
with the concept. One of the longer tenured, influential members in-
dicated that, "I think that the Curriculum Committee is a working com-
mittee that coordinates courses insofar as mechanics of time, of
scheduling too many or too few hours being offered; I would think that
when you're going to look at the quality of the curriculum that we
should have more that will come from the coordinators working with their
own areas and bouncing it against the faculty as a whole," This faculty
member appeared to be in agreement somewhat with the former statements
about the Committee; yet there seemed to be some differences in what
he expected of the Committee.

Nevertheless, it had been about ten years since a major curriculum
evaluation (the Broten Report), and it appeared that there was substan-
tial sentiment to move forward with broad curriculum evaluation in the
near future.

The Committee asked for and received course syllabi for all courses
but had not yet reviewed these. The new Dean had strongly indicated
that while he would like to give input to curricular decisions, he be-
lieved they were the prerogative of the faculty.
Curricular decisions were made within the School. There really was no University wide curriculum committee. Coordination, if at all, took place between the Dean and the Provost. Basically, if the School could financially cover the course and could demonstrate the necessity of the change, it would be affected. For example, the University English Department would not tailor a writing course to the needs of the Hotel School. The School decided to hire its own communications professor, take the Hotel students out of the English Department and teach the course in the School of Hotel Administration. They would notify English about this, but would not have to receive approval of a University wide curriculum committee. The same was done with Economics several years ago.

Several respondents expressed that the School should encourage students to take more elective courses out of the School. Foreign language was one mentioned as potentially beneficial to the students. One consideration for this type of thing at Cornell was that there were accessory costs of instruction. If a Hotel student would take a course in the Arts School, the Hotel must pay Arts for that student's instruction. Of course, the reverse was true as well. Usually, the School of Hotel Administration received a net inflow of accessory money. (The School has taught wine and typing courses which were popular as electives for non-hotel majors.) A University administrator indicated that he too would like to see Hotel students take more courses across campus to help them enjoy 'the Cornell experience'.

At the time of the research, cross-disciplinary faculty activity, such as collaboration, or joint teaching was done on an informal basis only.
The curriculum was sequenced and the School had its own registrar to ensure that students followed the sequence. Basically, the first two years at the School were tracked. That is, the schedule was almost a 'block' type schedule (reversed fall and spring). Therefore, many of the courses were scheduled for the same time, same room, same instructor each semester. Many electives were scheduled in the same fashion. Faculty often dealt directly with the School registrar for course room or time changes. The Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs assisted with serious scheduling or enrollment problems for courses.

The faculty have had complete discretion in instruction. There were no stipulated limits on printing and reproduction. The School operated its own reproduction center. All indicated that it was quite efficient. If materials were needed for courses, a request would be submitted to one of the two Assistant Deans, and they would invariably be approved.

Food laboratories were conducted both in labs in the School building as well as labs within the Inn. Even within the Inn, faculty had complete discretion for selecting menus for lab products which were going to be served to the public or University faculty. Food for laboratories was ordered through an Assistant who ordered the food and saw to it that it was in place for the lab session. There were virtually no limits on what could be used for the lab; i.e., if an instructor were doing a seafood lab, there would never be any pressure on him/her to use pollock as opposed to lobsters if the instructor needed the lobster to meet the goals of the course. The School asked that food orders for labs be placed one week in advance. But most (non specialty) items were stocked, and so could be provided on a shorter notice for emergencies.
The management internship program had been administered by the Assistant Dean for Business and Administration. At the time of the research, it was being moved to the Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs. The program consisted of a student being accepted by one of the participating properties and rotating through several positions at the property over a six month period. Each property was visited and received an information packet before students were sent. Then when a property had agreed, the positions were advertised within the School. The group for that semester was selected from among the applicants. The student stayed at the property and filed monthly reports and the management of the property filed out a monthly rating. If satisfactorily completed, the student received 12 credit hours.

The practice credit requirement entailed each student completing 800 hours of practical work experience (each 400 hours earned one practical - not academic - credit). Each student must have had two practice credits before the last term of residence. This was usually done over two summers; a written report must have accompanied each practice credit application. This process was administered by a committee.

External programs were conducted in conjunction with other institutions, primarily in South America. Usually, these were undergraduate, non-degree, certificate only. They were jointly taught (in the foreign country) by adjunct Cornell faculty and local faculty. The curriculum was designed and written by the faculty at the Cornell School of Hotel Administration.

There was one degree granting, graduate program, which was to have begun jointly on an experimental basis between the Cornell Hotel School,
and the graduate school of ESSEC, in Paris. This however, was subject
to approval by both the Regents of the State of New York and the French
authorities.

**Florida International University**

Dean Lattin began with a 'blank sheet' for curriculum when he ar-
rived from Cornell to inaugurate the Deanship at F.I.U.. His thrust
was to view the curriculum development from a marketing perspective.
He wanted to incorporate the needs of industry as much as possible.
This he balanced with the information which he had from the major (Bro-
ten) curriculum study which Cornell had just done three years before,
in the late 1960's. To this was added a review of curricula from other
institutions.

He got a rather long list of courses developed, but had to con-
dense it somewhat. (Recall that the School was upper division only
until 1981.) Lattin then sent the list to the School's industry advi-
sory board and asked them to rate which courses absolutely should be
included, which would be nice but not mandatory, etc.. There was 100%
return and high agreement on which were vital courses.

Because of policy of the University and the predilections of a
Vice President or two, Lattin was forced to come up with majors within
the program. He identified five majors, but the difference among
them was minimal, perhaps two or three courses.

In 1978, the Dean requested that a faculty committee convene to
review the curriculum. The committee basically recommended that the
curriculum convert to a single major concept with concentration areas.
The Dean and Associate Dean reviewed the committee's work, made some
minor modifications and brought it before the faculty as a whole who approved it with substantial agreement. One comment was, "... the difference between a restaurant major and a hotel major is bunk. So we decided we would like all people qualified to go either into restaurant, institutional feeding, or hotel and we've changed our entire structure now to emphasize these areas so that anybody who is leaving here leaves under the flag of competence."

The School waited until the 1981 academic year to make changes. In the Dean's words, the timing was then right. Some of the former Vice Presidents had left, the faculty had seemed ready and the University had been switching from the quarter system to the semester system.

There was a formal, on-going Curriculum Committee in the School. Curriculum matters, however, were discussed within each 'concentration area' and with the Dean or Associate Dean if necessary, on an informal basis. The School Curriculum Committee met on an as needed basis.

There was a University wide Curriculum Committee. Its main goal was to protect individual units from interference and duplication. One comment concerning this was, "of course you and I know that [University] Curriculum Committees deter progress because what they want to do is keep the wheel as the wheel was for 100 years, so we have found generally - make the descriptions in the course nice and vague and then you can do any damned thing you want inside of it. . . . We are constantly changing our curriculum based upon what's happening out in industry, rather than going to Curriculum Committee. . . . We find that is a necessary evil only when we are really changing something of such significance we can't get away with hiding it under an old title."
Most instructors used syllabi, but these were not reviewed or collected by the Deans or Curriculum Committee on a policy basis. The guiding goal for all courses was that the course meet the needs of the student as he will be operating within the profession. "[We] hire professionals and they're totally competent. [E.g.] you're job is to teach restaurant management - alright - give me the finest damned course you can give me in restaurant management. Now how you do it is your business - that's why we hired you."

There were University wide requirements which could be filled in the respective units where they were taught. The School encouraged its students to take elective courses across the campus, and guided them in the selection of these courses. The guide the School used in determining whether a course should be taught in the School or somewhere in the University was summarized as follows: "Any course we can teach here and do a better job than anybody else, we will grab and run with - such as accounting, such as marketing, such as law. We do not let the Business School get involved, we are not interested in teaching our students about shoe factories . . . now English courses will be taken in the English Department. They do a good job . . . [with all those type courses] we will let them do it because they do a good job. But when they don't do a good job, then we take it over and hire our own."

There was a limited amount of cross-campus joint teaching and other cooperative ventures. For example, the foods area in the Hotel School combined with the Theatre Department to do part of both their lab courses on a dinner theatre, and actually do practice dinner theatre.

Instruction was clearly within the purview of each faculty and each concentration area of the program. Generally, faculty were not limited
in any materials or resources they needed to teach their courses. Most course materials were photo reproduced or printed within the building where the School was housed. There virtually was no limit on the use of such a resource. Since the School aimed for a highly practical and applied curriculum orientation, a great deal of material was used for instruction in the form of handouts. Purchases other than for major equipment were approved by the Associate Dean on an as needed basis. He had never disapproved such a request.

Foods for the laboratories were ordered through a sort of purchasing agent called a Food Control Manager. He actually went out (mostly to retail outlets) to purchase the foods, and he maintained the labs and equipment. The faculty attempted to give him requisitions about twice a week to coincide with the days he was going off campus to purchase. He costed out the orders. Each course had a budget; however, if the budget was exceeded, the Associate Dean was usually willing to take the additional funds needed out of some other account.

Food was disposed of either by opening the dining room to the public two or three times per week (such as the food/theatre course) or was consumed by the students in the course. When the dining room was open, the School sometimes used it as a public/industry relations tool as well as an outlet for food. The courses which served food to the public were expected to break even.

Transfer students played a big role in the School and the curriculum. The School, until recently, was upper division only, thus serving only transfer students. The curriculum and requirements were designed with this in mind. In the foods area, for example, fulfillment of the curriculum is flexible and evaluated often on the basis of the student's
previous school. If, for example, the student were coming from the Culinary Institute, all foods (lab) courses would be waived. If the student were coming from a more 'home ec.' oriented program, further evaluation would be made. The foods faculty was in the process of devising a paper and pencil test to evaluate students' proficiency who transfer from schools unknown or of questionable professional/volume foods emphasis.

Course numbers generally indicated the sequence in which they should be taken; and, faculty advised students concerning this as well. Then scheduling of courses was done as a comprehensive joint effort between faculty and the Associate Dean. Certain required courses were taught by the faculty hired for those courses each semester. Elective courses were taught variably as noted and determined by the faculty member and his concentration area colleagues (accounting, foods, etc.) and the Associate Dean.

Courses were not block scheduled the same each semester or year. The Associate Dean's comment was, "No, no, no. That's just like planning a bus schedule!" It was then redistributed to the faculty and necessary changes made. For example, the food area must work lab times in on days when the student could fill in with a course or two on the opposite class day during the same time period. So, if he/she had a four hour lab on Tuesday afternoon, was there a class which could be taken on Thursday afternoon during the same time period. Any final problems were resolved by the Associate Dean.

Except for labs, the University assigned rooms. However, there was consensus that a specific room request by a faculty member had never been denied. One comment was, "The way you get special rooms is,
you go over and see the clerk, give her a bottle of wine, invite her to lunch, and you get whatever the hell you want!"

The internship and the practice work requirements had been at one time, two parts of one internship program. That has been changed, and there was, at the time of the research, an 800 hour practice work requirement and a structured internship.

The faculty member who administered the recruiting program also administered the internship and work experience. The 800 hours (not for academic credit) must have been completed before the student could enroll in the internship course. Eight hundred hours in any hospitality job was acceptable. The student must have furnished proof that he/she completed them. (Usually letter[s] from the employer[s]). There was no waiver of the requirement and the faculty member was the final authority. The internship consisted of 192 hours over a 12 week period, 16 hours per week, of structured observation/participation at a property in the Miami area. There were 110 participating businesses including clubs, airlines, institutions, cruise ships and, of course, restaurants and hotels. Each company was sent an information packet; each had the opportunity to interview the perspective student prior to accepting him. Each company sent an evaluation of the student at the end of the semester. Students filed weekly reports. The reports were used for evaluation both of student progress and of the student's writing ability.

University of Houston

The curriculum for the University of Houston was developed by former Dean, James Taylor in concert with local professional associations, and local industry professionals who were alumni of other
hotel schools, especially Cornell. Curricula at other hotel schools was surveyed as well. Taylor submitted the final curriculum for approval to the University of Houston.

From 1969 until 1972, some modest curriculum changes were made. From 1972 until the fall of 1981, the curriculum remained relatively untouched. The faculty, under the Associate Dean, began, in 1980, to review the curriculum, and submitted a report to the Dean. Apparently no action was taken. Later, in 1981, (during the period when there was only an Acting Dean), the faculty again discussed the document they had prepared and made some further modifications (because there were now some new members of the faculty).

The guiding emphasis and goal in the Houston curriculum was a liberal education approach and within hospitality courses, a management approach. Even with this in mind, it was a consensus that the student needed to have more hours of 130 to graduate be taken in the College rather than elsewhere in the University. Thus, a student would (under the revision) have to take 64 hours in the College (12 to 15 of which would be electives) as opposed to only 42 hours required under the previous curriculum.

Three tiered outlines were submitted by the faculty for the courses which they taught. The faculty, as a whole, reviewed the outlines to be sure there was no overlap between courses, and that nothing important was being overlooked. If a new faculty member joined, he was asked to adhere to those outlines until he made formal changes in them. All three faculty interviewed indicated that this decision was reached by consensus of the faculty. The three tiered outlines, according to one respondent, were, "... like a standardized recipe... submitted
from every faculty person who teaches a required course . . . [We] have a real knock-down-drag-out fight as to who is teaching what, not only to reduce redundancy but to strengthen the areas that we want . . . as a faculty . . . That, I think, is a significant thing if you have a turnover in your faculty and you've got the standardized recipe there, when the new person comes on board - here is what we've been teaching. This is what the faculty thinks needs to be taught in the course. Please teach this, not what you think to know best or do best, but this subject matter."

Because the College had a relatively small faculty, the College Curriculum Committee was comprised of the faculty sitting as a whole. As a faculty, they had ultimate decision-making power concerning the curriculum. A future goal was to involve industry and alumni more formally in curriculum input.

Curriculum decisions were then reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Sub-Committee of the University Undergraduate Council. The Sub-Committee reviewed the courses submitted for mechanics as well as for content insofar as it might more rightfully be better claimed by another academic unit on campus. One of the faculty members of the Hotel College happened to be the Chairman of the University Curriculum Sub-Committee at the time of the research and coincidently during the time when the major curriculum changes of the Hotel College would be coming up before the Committee.

While close to 50% of the Hotel students were transfer students, the College was not disposed to make extensive accommodations for them, although their special needs were considered in curriculum design.
Some significant effort had been made toward curriculum coordination between the Hotel College and other academic units on campus. This was particularly manifested by the relationship between Hotel and Foreign Language. This had been a joint effort to structure a course in German for Hotel majors, even to the point of having some of the students, during the summer, do work experiences in German hotels. The same cross-curriculum effort, at the time of the research was being made in French as well.

Resources for instruction were readily available. Course material reproduction was performed in the Continuing Education Section of the building and charged back to the Hotel College. There was, however, some disagreement among respondents concerning the purpose of material reproduction. Some faculty felt that handouts should be reproduced on a current basis, as news and other items develop during a course; while others, including the Associate Dean, felt that any course materials should be planned prior to the courses' beginning. There had not been, to date, any restrictions placed on faculty; their use of the reproduction facilities was monitored, however.

Since there were no food labs as part of the curriculum there was no procedure for lab use and material purchases. Occasionally, a faculty member did a demonstration lab, for which he requisitioned supplies from ARA, the food contractor in the Continuing Education Center, who in turn billed it to the Dean's Office (with his prior approval). The Gourmet Night food project was discussed in the Student Section.

Each faculty member was assigned a teaching assistant to use in any way he saw fit. Any other resources needed for course development
usually were provided by the College, if the faculty member submitted a written proposal concerning his ideas and needs.

Prerequisites and sequencing of courses were considered, either in the curriculum design and numbering system or as a matter of faculty advising with the student.

There was a 300 hour working requirement for students in an unstructured, approved learning situation. The students were evaluated by the employer who transmitted the evaluation to the faculty member in charge. In the new curriculum, the requirement was to be raised to 800 hours and would be for zero academic credits. This was called Internship and Practicum.

There had been an additional externship program begun, a few years ago, which placed the student in a structured work situation at a participating property, for which the student received pay and one semester's academic credit. There was an administrator in the Dean's Office in charge of the program (an elective course). Since she has left, while there was still participation, the number had dwindled to about six students from a high of 12 at one time. The Associate Dean indicated that an emphasis would be replaced on this in the future.

Summary and Observations

Faculty involvement with curriculum development was high at all three schools. In each case, the initial curriculum had been formulated, primarily, by the founding program head (Dean) with some input from industry and the host institution, but with the design work done primarily by himself. Both F.I.U. and Houston had other curricula, especially Cornell's, to use as a guide in designing their own.
In terms of curriculum change and development, the process at Cornell had only recently been formalized and standardized. To be sure there had been change, development and improvement over the School's first fifty years, but it happened in an informal way; ad hoc groups formed, such as the Broten Committee, and major curriculum decisions were made by the faculty as a whole. Only within the past few years has a formal, standing Curriculum Committee been established. Its operation was still in the formative stages as this research was being conducted. Houston and Florida International both have established an early precedent for curriculum change of relatively major proportions. Again, the discussion for this has been relatively informal at these Schools as well. At Florida, a faculty committee was empaneled to make recommendations to the Dean, who in turn brought them (with his minor revisions) to the faculty as a whole. At Houston, because of the smaller size, the faculty as a whole sat to make curriculum changes in development. A tremendous difference existed in the process of host institution approval at the three Schools. Cornell stood out the most. Because of the educational concept and the loosely coupled structure at Cornell, it was not necessary to have curricular change be approved by a University wide Curriculum Committee. The relationship to the University, in this respect was one of informing them of the actions of the Hotel School faculty. Florida has had to deal with a University Curriculum Committee, but appeared to have a strong position on campus and dealt with it effectively. Houston has had a demanding and strong University Curriculum Committee, with an apparent emphasis on having as little duplication of courses as possible. It was an interesting observation that a Hotel professor chaired that University Committee in the
year during which the Hotel College was making major curricular changes.

All three Schools perceived it as important to provide faculty with material resources in an unhesitating fashion within their means. These were approved by the Associate Dean at all three. At Cornell, requests were made on a simple form. At Florida, they were made verbally or in brief written form. At Houston, depending upon the item, a more formal, written request was required.

Library resources were coordinated between the Hotel Schools and main University libraries at Houston and Florida. At Cornell, the School of Hotel Administration operated and funded its own library which was part of the library system on campus.

Teaching assistants were used both at Cornell and Houston, generally in whatever fashion the professor saw fit, from paper grading to lab assistance. Florida distinctly avoided teaching assistants, and especially so in the classroom, as a matter of philosophy.

All three Schools were soon to have an 800 hour, no credit work requirement before a student could graduate. Cornell and Houston had work study type programs with students spending a structured semester at the work site, for credit. There were limited slots for both of these programs. Florida required an internship of its students for a semester. It was primarily an observational internship, non paid, for 16 hours per week as part of a regular semester credit load.
The focus for admissions' activities was with the Director of Admission in the School of Hotel Administration. This was a full-time position with an office staff of two other Assistants. The Director was responsible for all elements of the admission function.

The School had never made an active recruiting effort for students. One reason was that the number of applicants per seat available has been increasing annually in spite of rising tuition and other costs. In 1981, there were 1,065 undergraduate applicants, of which 193 were accepted and 165 actually enrolled. The Assistant Dean commented that the quality as well as the quantity has risen. While no in-depth studies have been done, one observer has it that, "... [with] the cost of education, people are looking for more specific professional education than the liberal arts." One repeated comment, however, was that the School's alumni were continually doing active but informal recruiting for the School. There was discussion concerning plans for future, more formal recruiting. So, in spite of an increase of total (graduate and undergraduate) enrollment from 473 students in 1968, to 745 students in 1981, the University published projections that the 18 to 21 year old U.S. population peaked at 17 million in 1980 and was expected to decline to 13 million by 1995, a 24 percent drop. Yet, these projections were modified for the professional schools where enrollments were expected to increase through the '80's. The School would take this into account in its plans as well as the mix of
students admitted: freshmen, transfers and graduates, and the impact that has on all other operational areas of the School, especially class sizes, and financial planning.

There was direct coordination with the University Admission Office. When the Hotel School had received an information request from a potential applicant, the Admission's Office would send a letter and a School catalogue. The University Admission's Office would then be requested to send an application packet. The School Admission's Director noted that they strived to be cordial and prompt with correspondents and, for example, send the catalogue by first class mail. "... Once that student does apply here, we want that student to want to come here more than any place in the world, and that, we try to accomplish from the first time we receive, even a post card, asking for information." When a student has applied, the application and supporting documentation would be collected by the University Admission's Office. The completed applicant's folder would then be forwarded to the School Admission's Office. In the interim, the student should have contacted the School Admission's Office. If the student were to live too far from Cornell, an arrangement would be made for an alumnus who lives close by to do the interview. As mentioned earlier, this also served to strengthen the link between the School and the alumni. One of the main purposes of the interview was to assess the applicant's attitude and motivation toward the profession. Indeed, this was a major criterion in determining the admission decision; it was also measured by any work experience the student may have had.

When the interview had been completed, it would be added to the completed applicant file. The applicants would then be voted upon by
a seven member admission's committee consisting of one faculty from each academic area of the School and the School Admission's Director. The members would individually read each folder as they were completed, rather than waiting for all of the applicants. They would then assign a score to the applicant based upon College Board scores, Wonderlick Test, personal interview, high school grades, letters of recommendations, and college grades if applicable. These criteria may be assigned various weights by the different committee members. Unanimous acceptances or denials would be returned to the Central Admissions Office so that they could notify the applicant. The committee would then meet as a group to discuss the applications which did not receive unanimous votes or which they wanted to hold for a while before deciding.

A major change on the Committee was that the new Dean was no longer to serve on the Committee as did the former Dean. A growing concern was that admissions not be made because of patronage. Several respondents commented that while acceptance of an unprepared student may satisfy a patron (alumnus, friend, etc.) in the short run, it was often detrimental to the student in the long run. The Dean would still be involved in such discussions on a limited basis. The University Administration could request special consideration for an applicant, but had no decision-making ability whatsoever in the admission process.

Correspondence was maintained by the School with new admits until the newly admitted students arrived for orientation. The School Director of Admissions personally responded to any requests for reasons of denial. An orientation program was scheduled for all arriving freshmen and transfer students. Parents were included if they came to campus. All students and parents were given a comprehensive "Student Handbook". Advisors were assigned by the School Admission's Office based either on
the concentration area the student desired, or upon some mutual interest or experience which the Director thought the student and a potential advisor would have.

**Advising and Registration**

New students were 'block scheduled', basically in two halves, and then rotated courses in the second semester. In a sense, this was a form of pre-registration since places were reserved for them by the School Registrar.

Continuing students pre-registered each semester. Again, second year continuing students were virtually 'tracked' into a block of courses in light of the structure of the curriculum and the number of seats available for various sections of the courses.

Each student was encouraged to meet with faculty advisor. Continuing students must have had their schedules signed by an advisor, and must have gone to the advisor's office at mid-term for grades. Most of the respondents observed, however, that this was a function of the individual advisors. Some have insisted on seeing the students, while others left the grades or pre-signed schedules with the secretary. Of course, it was just as much a function of the student and his or her motivation to see the advisor as it was the advisor's behavior.

The Dean expressed a strong desire for faculty development in the area of student advising and counseling and planned on committing professional training resources to aid in that development. Further, the administration evaluated advising based upon student feedback. 

"... If we find out that 20 students resigned from a certain advisor and went looking for another advisor, we get a clue that something is happening." The hope was not to devise a system of checks on faculty
advising, but to positively encourage development of good advising
techniques and attitudes.

The Director of Admissions did a good bit of advising, especially
for new students. The Dean's sentiments were that there were mis-
givings about having an exclusive professional counselor or advisor
and removing the function from faculty.

Graduating seniors' folders were prepared by the School Registrar
and voted upon by the faculty as a whole.

Financial Aid

Student financial aid was administered by a Financial Aid Officer
in the School. Planning for financial aid was done primarily by him
and then in concert with the Dean and the Assistant Dean for Business
and Administration. The University administered the investment of en-
dowments and projected endowment income. Financial aid budgets were
based upon these figures, as well as other variables such as tuition
and cost of living increases.

Cornell operated solely on needs based financial aid, for under-
graders, and operated the system independently of the admissions
process. The University Financial Aids Office was a clearinghouse
much as was the University Admission Office. The student initiated
his/her financial aid request there. That Office determined the amount
of need the student had. The student may have received certain federal
and state assistance through them. They forwarded the information to
the School Financial Aid Office, who in turn determined which of the
School's financial resources to award the student. All of the infor-
mation to do this matching of student with resource was programmed into
a computer located in the School Financial Aid Office.
There appeared to be some disagreement among respondents concerning the need for a complex system of financial aid within the School.

The new administration and especially the Dean were concerned about rising costs and financial resources. He planned to make substantial effort to obtain more income for financial aid. The University Deans' Council did not want to see the demographic mix change so that Cornell would be only for the wealthy, but was concerned about having enough resources to fill all the needs. There was discussion of moving from solely a needs based criterion for financial aid. The statement was made that no-need (quality based) scholarships should be used to attract outstanding scholars. One report stated that, "Colleges should have budget targets and make their own decisions about financial aid awards." (50, 1981)

Student Organization

Cornell was primarily a full-time, Ivy League campus. It was predominantly residential, on campus or nearby in 'college town' type housing. This made for high and protracted student presence on campus and at the School throughout the day and into the evening.

Student organizations included the national chapters of CMAA, IFSEA, and HSMA as well as the School organizations: A la Carte (newslaetter), Hotel Ezra Cornell (explained later), Student Faculty Committee (explained later) and Ye Hosts (honor society). Of course there were campus-wide organizations as well.

The Student-Faculty Committee was a budget coordinating committee for all student organizations. It basically approved proposed expenditures of each group; all of the groups were funded in great part by
the School. Each group had a (voluntary) faculty advisor who helped
the officers and members with planning, especially educational aspects.
The Student Faculty Committee did not act as an umbrella for all or­
ganizations, but purely as a budgeting approval function.

Hotel Ezra Cornell was almost as old as the School. It consisted
of a 'hotel for a weekend'. Students elected a student board of di­
rectors who, in turn, under the direction of a faculty advisor, de­
vised a program theme and was responsible for its total operation and
management. It included rooming (at Statler Inn or elsewhere in Ithaca),
feeding and entertaining the guests. Seminars were held on Saturday.
Guests included prominent hospitality professionals, many of whom were
alumni, as well as faculty, staff and their spouses.

Usually the Society of Hotelmen (alumni) had a board meeting
during the weekend. It was, indeed, a confluence of students, faculty,
alumni and industry people. The purposes which it served were many
fold beyond the obvious pedagogical and industry relations outcomes.

Florida International
University

Admissions

The procedural part of the admissions function was focused pri­
arily in the University Admissions Office. That Office received,
screened and processed applications. That Office then sent to the
School the information on those who had been admitted. The only time
the School got involved in the actual admission's procedure itself was
with problem cases such as some foreign students, or students who did
not meet the regular requirements and needed special consideration. The
Associate Dean's Office of the Hotel School administered the School's part of the admission function.

Until recently, the requirements for admission had been that a student have had two years of college (60 semester hours) at a 2.0 grade point average. Full credit was granted to these transfer students. Now that the School was moving to a full four year program, other freshmen admission criteria were to be imposed.

The School's philosophy on admission fit curriculum design and faculty emphasis to be a highly experientially based program using applied theory. The attempt was to be 'partners in education with the hospitality industry' and try to narrow the perceived gap between academe and practice of the profession. "I've seen too many theoreticians that have graduated and ended up in somebody else's business."

The Dean summed this well, "My feeling [is] that wherever possible the admissions door should swing open fairly easily and let the student [demonstrate if he] can or can't do the job. I want rigor in the program more quickly than I want all of this selectivity in admissions."

The Dean did observe, however, that the School's original goal of 500 students had been increased each year to the current 800. He was concerned about continued growth for two reasons. More students may mean a loss of what was "true in any hotel school I've ever visited. There's a certain espirit de corps, informality, friendly atmosphere that most other (non-hotel) schools would give their last dollar to have, but don't. There has to be a point where you get so big that you lose that. I don't know what the number is." Secondly, he was concerned that there could come a time when more graduates would be turned out than could be absorbed, although he did not see that for
quite a time to come. In light of the question of excessive growth, the School was considering a cap on enrollment by raising the grade point average requirement as one possibility; yet this contradicts the philosophy of relatively open admissions. Another respondent put it succinctly: "If you're a public institution you're here to serve the public. And you shouldn't care about what's getting out. If I had my way, I'd let them all in. If a student achieves and learns and meets our standards he gets out of here with a degree, if he doesn't - get the hell out. But admissions' standards are false things, false barriers put in the way of public education . . . ."

Recruiting for the Hospitality Management School at FIU was done primarily by the Dean and by the faculty who traveled to give lectures and seminars. The Dean specifically visited junior and community colleges each fall. He selected them based on whether he had contact there and on the number of students which the Hotel School had received from the particular community college in the past. He usually described the program and answered students' questions at these sessions, may have guest taught a class and met with faculty who advised these two year graduates on where they should transfer. The major selling points used to sell F.I.U. were the quality of the School's faculty, location and curriculum, as well as the high transfer rate of credits and the price. Out of state students paid out of state tuition the first year, but could qualify as Florida residents in their second year. The Dean commented that he had thought he personally would do the recruiting for only a couple of years, but, "they kept telling me, 'Gerry, you can't believe what the students say. From other universities we get representatives, but from F.I.U., the Dean comes.'"
The University provided a general orientation program for all incoming students. Hotel students were neither encouraged nor discouraged to attend. The School, per se, had no formal orientation. The Hotel student organization (HFTA) had a 'welcome back' event each year. A student officer described it as a "get to know your School, students and faculty party . . . I'd say without the welcome back party a lot of new students would not know what's available to them . . . as far as activities and professors except the professors they have in class." Faculty, students and administration have all been present at this event.

Advising and Registration

To insure consistency, two faculty were designated as primary counselors. They received a small reduction in teaching load and held longer office hours. The Associate Dean handled problem cases. All faculty were required to post office hours, but the counseling they did was primarily class related or informal and personal rather than curricular and academic. One faculty member's office was at the entrance to the main suite of the School's administrative offices. He did more counseling because of his physical location. One student's comment was that "between 5 to 7 the faculty take on most of the students and advise them." This essentially concurred with the Associate Dean's observations that an air of informality was fostered and that not all faculty were good counselors. Thus, students did not have to stay with a particular advisor, and two were always there on a more formal basis.

---

6 One of these was the same person who administered corporate recruiting, internship, and practice credit.
All faculty were asked to keep longer office hours during pre-registration. The advising process for pre-registration had been streamlined because of the new single major concept. Each student had his transfers evaluated and what courses he needed and how many electives he could take. Students were assigned a pre-registration date. They were able to pre-register on this date or after. The dates were assigned by seniority. The student went to the University Registrar's computer terminal and an operator entered the schedule into the computer. The School, therefore, did not get directly involved in the actual process itself.

Financial Aid

Students desiring financial aid could go to either the University Financial Aid Office or to the School itself. The University administered all of the state and federal aid, and was need based; the School administered private scholarships based to a large extent on merit or reward and some state and private funds based upon need. Work study, student assistancehip and tuition waivers constituted a form of aid as well. Again, the procedures at the School were somewhat more informal. If the student went to the School for financial aid, he or she could approach the Dean or Associate Dean, but often began with the Associate Dean, who in turn brought the request to the attention of the Dean.

Student Organizations

Students at the F.I.U. School of Hospitality Management appeared to occupy a central position in the operation of the School as well as its raison d'etre. The student body organization HFTA (Hotel, Food
and Travel Association)\(^7\) had both formal and informal status. The Associate Dean summed it up, "It is an organization which is our official one and we give them an office (and) . . . equipment, and we expect them to handle basically all kinds of student activities. They do an excellent job; we reward them." HFTA officers confirmed this unwritten policy and perception. The officers were generally rewarded with assistanceships or scholarships and a chance at a trip to one of the trade shows.

Approximately 500 of the 800 students joined.\(^8\) About 100 actively participated. More did so on an intermittent basis. The officers met twice weekly. Any student was free to address any issue during these meetings.

As the students saw it, a major goal of the group was communication with faculty and industry. There were voluntary faculty advisors. Beyond this, faculty were treated specially by HFTA. They were personally invited to functions and went as guests of HFTA. The students did not invite them to 'beer blast' type activities but in the words of one faculty, "Where it's classy we go - where it's not classy we don't go." The faculty in turn helped the students with advice and in getting contacts and resources.

HFTA coordinated with the campus student government and usually gained power in the University Student Government Association and attempted to get additional funding. The HFTA won an award as the student group of the year, on the campus in 1981.

\(^7\)The name was based upon the original name of the School before it was changed to Hospitality Management. The name has never been changed.

\(^8\)They paid a one time fee of $7.00 as of 1981.
HFTA's events included the welcoming party, graduation party (held on a yacht in 1981) and Epicurean dinners, among other things. The dinners served as a public relations device and went coordinated with the foods' faculty.

As mentioned earlier, the HFTA has administered a good part of the mechanics of the alumni relations function as well.

There were other Hotel student organizations such as Club Managers and (in planning) HSMA. While they were not compelled to coordinate under the umbrella of HFTA, they were encouraged to so.

The Associate Dean summarized the student organization's role well. "Their major goal [is] to satisfy the needs of these students. This is a non-residential campus. As a non-residential campus they need a forum to get together . . . this is the group that will come and tell me if there are problems."

The students were characterized as "basically middle class. . . Often times the first degree in the family - they went to a junior college - many of them without anticipating going on to the four years. They were successful so they decided to go on."

University of Houston

Admissions

The admissions function was executed almost entirely by the Central Admissions of the University. Students applied directly there. Criteria were University wide and included high school class rank and SAT scores. If they were transferring and had completed 30 semester hours they must have had a 2.0 grade point average.
The HRM College was considering raising the requirements somewhat for a student to be admitted to that College. No decisions had been made in terms of what criteria might be applied.

The University Admissions Office sent lists of matriculants to the College as they were admitted. The College then sent a letter encouraging the students to take the acceptance and telling them about the Hotel College. Approximately 60% took acceptance. There had been some problem with timeliness in the University Admission Office, especially in terms of notifying applicants of acceptance — so late in some cases that they were unable to come. The College (and other units on campus) were assured the problem was being addressed.

After the semester began, an analysis of the transcripts, for transfer students, was sent to the College's Admission's Analyst who maintained each student's degree plan and record.

The College did not engage in active recruiting other than addressing local groups on occasion about the College. The University did engage in some recruiting in the form of career days. The College was considering using the SAT interest check off to send material to those students who indicated an interest in hospitality programs. Targeting would be somewhat selective. About 40% of the College's students were from out of state, and many of them from the Northeast.

The University provided several orientation sessions during the summer for incoming students. During these sessions the College participated by greeting them, giving them information on the College and assisting them in pre-registration.

On a Saturday after the semester began, an orientation session was held at the College for matriculating students where faculty, and student leaders were introduced, and the degree plan explained. This was
followed by a barbecue catered by the student organization - HRMS, (Hotel, Restaurant Management Society).

Advising and Registration

Advisors were assigned to students alphabetically. The students were free, however, to use anyone whom they wished as an advisor. All faculty were asked to keep eight open office hours per week. Usually a student would get straight academic requirement information from the College's Admission's Analyst. If necessary, they saw a faculty member or went directly to a faculty member if the advice sought concerned something other than information on course requirements.

Students were encouraged to see advisors but were not required to do so. Faculty kept extended hours in a designated room at the College during pre-registration. Students made a class schedule on computer input cards (with or without advice) and then forwarded these to the Registrar. They were tallied by computer and the College, in turn, received enrollment figures for courses. The students eventually received confirmation of the schedule. There was then at the beginning of the semester a regular registration and a later registration. The College posted closed sections as they were notified by the University Registrar. Some desire was expressed on the part of the College to have more control over the registration process, particularly to have quicker feedback on section enrollment figures.

Financial Aid

Students applied for financial aid either at the University Financial Aid Office or at the College. The University essentially administered federal and state financial aid. The College administered
privately donated funds and some tuition waivers. The Dean's Office was the locus for financial aid in the College. Students submitted a letter giving reasons for the request as well as grade point average, letter(s) of reference and resume. The Dean and his Administrative Assistant made the award decision based upon need and or merit, depending upon the individual case. Faculty also, on occasion made recommendations for financial aid.

There was coordination between the Dean's Office and the University Financial Aid Office. They exchanged lists of recipients. The College made its awards independently of the University, while, for some forms of aid, the University may not have awarded (or given reduced award) if the student was a recipient from the College.

**Student Organizations**

The first student organization in the College was the Hotel and Restaurant Management Society. Its goals were "to get people involved in the College, to get students to know one another and more or less give support to other organizations."

There were also fairly active chapters of CMAA (Club Managers Association of America) and HSMA (Hotel Sales Management Association). The three organizations attempted to coordinate with each other. Indeed, some of the students while attending a convention spoke with students from the Hotel College at the University of Nevada, and learned that there, the student organization, the Hotel Association, acted as an umbrella for the other local chapters of National organizations such as CMAA, HSMA, IFSEA, etc., whereby the president of each 'sub' organization sat on an executive board of the main organization - the Hotel Association. Some of the students pushed
for this at Houston. In one student's opinion, it had not worked optimally because a completely new umbrella organization should have been created in order to accommodate the change. The Associate Dean viewed HRMS as "The (student) organization which represents the entire College, internally, within our College and the University and externally off the campus."

Nevertheless, the organizations did coordinate with each other. They coordinated with the University student government association only in so far as they wanted budget allocation or usage in the student center. Each of the specialty organizations (such as CMAA) had strong ties with its Houston senior chapter.

The students did many activities including the orientation barbecue, educational seminars, trips to trade shows, and a weekly student faculty coffee hour.

Once a year a fourth organization was formed, out of the other three and accountable to HRMS to produce "Gourmet Night". This has been a dining, entertainment and social affair in the conference center adjacent to the College. A student commented, "Gourmet Night is equivalent to more or less the College's Hotel Ezra Cornell. It is the student's song and dance routine... this is the one night of the year that students can supposedly get out and show industry and alumni and everybody else what they've done."

An executive staff of about fourteen students planned the event for about eight or nine months. Then many more of the students had become involved in the last two months in the actual production of this evening for 350 people including local hospitality professionals, and industry members, alumni, faculty and guests. The evening has been
financially backed by the student organizations, who would earn the
money back from the event.

Evaluation of student activities occurred more or less on a con­
tinuing basis, but especially after an event or when preparing budgets.
Such evaluations took place in the group, among the students, and then
directly with the Dean or the Associate Dean, depending upon the nature
of the discussion.

Summary and Observations

The procedures for admissions were distinctly dissimilar between
Cornell on the one hand and F.I.U. and Houston on the other. Cornell's
admissions decisions were made within the School, with the University
Admissions Office playing only a paper processing role. At F.I.U. and
Houston the University Admissions' Office made the decision and pro­
cessed all records. After the student was admitted, the list of admit­
tees and later their records were sent to the Hotel Schools. The
Schools got involved only to consider a denial who has petitioned,
foreign students, and to determine what courses would transfer into
the program. It certainly might be assumed that part of the reason for
this difference was that Cornell was private and the other two were
state institutions.

A pattern could be seen among all three programs whereby they all
made significant efforts to extend great cordiality to the students
who applied. This was true of Cornell which had over seven applicants
per seat and of Florida and Houston which had been still growing, al­
though F.I.U. was soon to cap that growth. The methods for capping
growth, i.e., selecting students seemed uncertain at all three. While
precise measures such as grade point or SAT scores could be used,
there have been no long term studies to indicate which student variable would correlate with an ultimately successful student-- and alumnus.

All three, and especially Cornell and F.I.U. placed great emphasis on the student's past work experiences. Both were looking for some indications that the student had had some exposure to the profession he was considering and had formed a positive attitude. Cornell did this with interviews. Florida did it by taking a high percentage of transfer students from two year programs.

Again, there was dissimilarity between Cornell on the one hand and F.I.U. and Houston on the other relative to registration. The process was almost completely self-contained at Cornell, while at the latter two it was administered (except for advising) almost totally by the host institution. Cornell had a more formal advising system than the other two. This may have been due to its maturity and larger number of faculty and administrators. The other two assigned advisers, but were very informal about enforcing that assignment. Students gravitated to those faculty with whom they felt comfortable or who had the particular expertise the student thought he needed to answer his question.

Financial aid was much more complex at Cornell-- perhaps a function of the number of various financial aid accounts accumulated. The Schools' portion of financial aid at F.I.U. and Houston was awarded based both on need and merit and appeared to be substantially controlled by the Dean in both cases; the student made direct contact with the Dean concerning the matter.

Clearly, the strongest pattern which has emerged thus far among all three Schools concerned students. Students occupied a central role and were the focal point at all three. This was evidenced by the time
and other resources committed to them by faculty and by the deans and associates. The relationships were direct, informal and intense. (Again, at Cornell, they were a bit less direct and somewhat more formal, but still crucial.) The schools prized themselves on the students' attitudes and involved them, to a substantial degree in the operation of the schools, especially with community, professional, industry and student relationships and activities. Student enthusiasm --almost clanishness was apparent both from interviews and observations. Student perceptions of the Schools and the host institutions were highly similar to those offered by faculty and administration. Perhaps one is a function of the other.

This focus on students appeared to be a crucial operational area for these schools.
Recruiting

For the past several years the process of faculty recruiting has been carried on, to a great extent, between a standing search committee and the Dean, with the committee recommending, and the Dean making the final decision. Faculty were divided into professorial and non-professorial faculty. The present discussion related to professorial faculty. The process itself had been fairly informal and had often been conducted on a somewhat ad hoc basis with little policy documented. Of particular concern to some of the faculty had been that the search for candidates had not been broad enough. Not enough candidates had been brought in for interviewing. Some thought that hiring had relied too heavily on Cornellsians and on the "old boy network" of hiring faculty whom the Dean or one of the other professors knew personally, would contact and bring aboard.

This had begun to change over the past few years, and then changed significantly with the recent change of administration.

With these changes, the request for a need for a new position (other than to replace a vacated one) now came from one of the academic areas in the School. It must have been justitified by them. One respondent noted that most faculty in the Hotel School were teaching between 10 and 12 credit hours per semester, whereas many other, more research oriented, parts of University taught six credits one semester and three credits the alternate semester. This was taken into consideration along with other responsibilities which were added and which changed demands on
faculty time. The Curriculum Committee might get involved and the Area Coordinator would discuss the proposal. The Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs would then go to the Dean who finally approved or disapproved. If there were budget funding available, University approval would be almost automatic.

The entire recruiting process was coordinated in the Office of the Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA). He co-chaired each search committee with the coordinator from the affected academic area. The Dean appointed a few other faculty from other areas (within the School) as well. The process was documented. All file information on a candidate was centralized in the ADAA's Office. A position description was advertised as broadly as possible. This, and the search procedures were reviewed by the University's Affirmative Action Office. The committee, with input from the academic area, decided which candidate would be brought in for interviewing. About five to seven candidates were invited to campus. The daily mechanics of coordinating the candidates' activities, meetings, lodging, feeding, etc. were performed by the Area Coordinator. The range of candidates could be fairly broad since the position description was not made extremely rigid, e.g. "in [recruiting] for marketing [position] we have said for the academic background, appropriate master's degree required, a Ph. D. is preferred . . . we prefer teaching experience . . . we prefer practical experience. . . . if we have a super hot ticket Ph. D. who has just gotten his Ph. D., we will go along with it, but we would rather have somebody with a few years experience." The position description sets parameters.

The individual candidate met with the academic area faculty, with the Dean, with the ADAA, and with any other faculty who desired to meet
him or her during a special time set aside during the visit. In addition, the candidate made a presentation in a seminar open to all faculty, all M.S., Ph. D. graduate students, and all teaching assistants in the particular academic area.

The search committee then got input from those who met with the candidate. It decided upon two or three recommendations in order of preference. The professorial faculty voted on the recommendations. They then went to the Dean who made the final decision. The Dean commented on his final decision making authority that it was beneficial since, "Sometimes I know things they don't know about the individual that I get, that I really don't feel everybody in the School should know about . . . if I have a question about the integrity of that individual -- that's something I don't really care to announce to the rest of the group."

The ADAA then made final negotiations for salary, etc. with the candidate finally selected.

Most interviewed thought the "new" process of recruiting was an improvement over the old, ad hoc, informal, more closed network procedures used for most of the School's history. "I think it's good because it gives more support to the faculty member when they (sic) come on board because faculty knows that this person was searched and it really is, in comparison to other candidates that-- the one we wanted is the best qualified. On the other hand, if we hired you, I think you would feel more comfortable coming here knowing that you have gone through a competitive selection process and that you were the selection of the faculty."
Some of the older faculty have seen the system swing from the "old boy" concept to the new approach to recruiting. "I think we have gone overboard, away from the old boy routine, to where we now have too many committees, we spend too much money, I think we are gilding the lily, I think we are doing things to make the record look good. Yes, we're getting better coverage, don't get me wrong, in other words we are doing better interviewing, we are hiring people whom no one ever heard of before [they] showed up for an interview . . . so I'm not criticizing it completely-- we've gone overboard on numbers of people we bring in here . . . ."

The Dean summarized the new process by noting that the philosophy was there, and was good; only the mechanical details, sometimes, needed to be refined. Joint appointments with another unit on campus had not previously been considered. The School was, however, considering it for a History of Foods course, using faculty members jointly appointed with the History Department. This was ongoing at the time of the research.

Staff recruiting was primarily a function of the Assistant Dean for Business and Administration, and was highly coordinated with the University Personnel Office.

Faculty Development

The focal point for faculty development was the Office of the ADAA. For most of the School's history, this had been administered by various people, usually the Dean or his Assistant on a predominately informal basis. There had been few formal guidelines except items such as, 'You may attend two meetings or conferences annually'. These had been broad,
and faculty indicated that there generally had been no difficulty in securing resources from the School (the Dean) for any legitimate reason including more than two trips, seminars, books, journals, etc.

The new administration was in the process of giving more structure to the area of faculty development. It continued to be coordinated by the ADAA who would approve one trip per year, but noted that he might if he saw something worthwhile, suggest more.

As indicated earlier, professionals were being brought in to give faculty and staff seminars concerning topics such as student counseling, state of the art (technical) computer application, management games, University Affirmative Action requirements and so forth.

Particular emphasis was being placed on development for new faculty in order to round them out. If one came in with good industry experience but with a weakness in academic credentials, that person would be assisted to do whatever is necessary. More often, some young faculty came to the School with the Ph. D., for example, but lack of experience or with a need for more experience in a particular area. The ADAA then arranged for them to spend a summer or two at an industry site working in these areas. The site paid living expenses and the School provided an additional summer stipend to the faculty member.

All faculty were being requested to report on meetings, seminars, etc. to the colleagues in their area or to the whole faculty, depending on the nature of the content.

The University provided orientation for new faculty, with the President and Provost. The main orientation took place at the School. Materials, including a faculty handbook were sent to new faculty in advance of their arrival. The handbook was produced by the School and
contained information, in detail, of concern to faculty including development, promotion and tenure procedures.

Upon arrival, they were assisted in getting settled, and were entertained by the ADAA and others on an informal basis. Formally, the ADAA met with them to explain areas of the School and answer questions. They were assigned to committees which would help to acquaint them with the School as quickly as possible. Finally, the ADAA and the Area Coordinator began to work out a development plan with them.

**Faculty Evaluation and Compensation**

Faculty compensation increases, in past years, had been based upon the pool of additional salary money which the University decided upon as a whole. (The entire pool was for merit -- there was no across the board raise, unless an academic unit so decided.) Usually, faculty had been notified by the Dean or the Assistant Dean of the amount of their raise or lack thereof. There were conflicting reports on the procedure. Some respondents said that if the pool had been 10%, the merit increases would not vary more than a percent or two across the board, while other respondents indicated that this had been indeed used as a reward tool and that there could be significant differences in raises in the same year among faculty. Likewise, there was conflict in reports of the process. Some indicated that the Dean or Assistant Dean had simply given the faculty member a "pat on the back" with notification of the raises. (There were also reports that in some instances, the merit adjustment notification had been done by memo, stating only the percentage of increase, and no comment on performance.) On the other hand, there were also reports that there had been discussion of performance. The
decisions on merit had been made by the Dean and the Assistant. They had both come up with a recommendation for each faculty member, each using his own (non-documented) evaluation method. These had been loosely based upon informal student input, informal colleague or Area Coordinator input and upon the Administrators' own observations and evaluations. Without exception, each interviewee had been pleased with previous raises, but rather uncommitted on how they felt about the review (or lack thereof) itself. One interviewee commented that it appeared that being visible had a good deal to do with getting a merit increase.

The new administration was in the process of formalizing and documenting the evaluation process in the Hotel School. The planning, at the time of the research, was for the new procedure to involve a faculty self-evaluation instrument to be completed by the beginning of the Spring semester. The Dean and Assistant Dean would then review the self-evaluation and solicit input from the Area Coordinators on what percentage above or below the average pool increase amount the individual should get. (The Area Coordinators did not and would not know the salaries of the faculty in their areas.) Input would also be solicited from committee chairpersons on whose committee the member served. The Dean and Assistant Dean would develop independent evaluations, and then arrive at a final decision. The Dean would then have a session with each professorial faculty member explaining the review. He stated, "I intend merit reviews to really be merit reviews. ... And so, I think the evaluation forms are critical; ... I think it's a difficult job to set up criteria and they can't be uniformly applied. But, I think ... net worth-- some definition of that can be
applied. And, I think that's... an important job of the Dean; with inputs from the right other people." He also stated that, "I have no qualms at all about looking someone straight in the eye and saying, 'You get sufficiently less than average... (or) I think you had a great year; I think you deserve sufficiently more than average.'"

Likewise, the question of tenure and promotion was linked to merit evaluations and to faculty development. In past years, the process for promotion was relatively informal. In the case of promotion, the procedure was ad hoc, with the Dean coordinating it and making the final decision directly with the affected faculty member. For tenure, a review committee was appointed which assembled materials and then took a vote of tenured faculty on the candidate. The Dean could overrule the vote of the tenured faculty if he desired. The decision would then go to the University Administration. Several years ago, the School had sent a memo to the University Administration stating what the Hotel School considered to be criteria for tenure (with teaching and consulting at the top of the list). The University approved it and it had been in use ever since.

Apparently, there had been only one case in which the recommendation of the School was refused by the University. The University quietly asked the School to withdraw the recommendation. The University informally handled it with the Assistant Dean and said they would take it to the trustees if the School refused to withdraw — and the University Administration indicated that they thought they could win.

The School's procedures for tenure and promotion were being revised. In addition to the School's being in transition with a new administration, The University was involved in the "Cornell 11" case whereby some women
faculty were suing the University for denial of tenure or promotion based upon sex discrimination. The case hinged in great part on lack of documented procedures.

The University had empaneled a committee to devise a documented appeals procedure in matters of tenure and promotion. This, in turn, pressured the academic units to devise documented basic promotion and tenure policies. The School was assembling these procedures to be included in the Faculty Handbook. Broad guidelines were contained in the University's Academic Appointment Manual. This was being used to arrive at the School's policies. The process of faculty development was to set the basis for evaluation for merit, promotion and tenure, especially for newer and younger faculty. Major criteria for evaluation were to include teaching, academic advising and research and publishing or other things. Consulting was seen as a way to keep current and return new knowledge to the classroom as well as an income supplement. Each faculty member, however, would work out a development plan with the Area Coordinator. The ADAA would then review it with those involved. It would be a sort of "Management By Objective" program. The Dean noted that, "I don't expect the track to look the same for all people because I think that would be very bad-- I don't want clones." People might have different emphases on which they would concentrate. "But, it should be a conscious effort on their (the faculty's) part . . . so that we can do advance planning to really feel that someone is saying, 'Gee, I really think my strength is . . . I really love the classroom and don't want to get involved in committee work.' Someone else can say, 'I'm OK as a teacher; I'm not as gifted as someone else is, but I think I'm super at this committee stuff and how to
organize.' And so, their track would be different; they would know and we would know -- there wouldn't be any surprises."

The annual evaluations would be based upon the criteria as outlined in general and specifically based on each faculty member's "track" or program. In turn, the evaluations were included in an individual's dossier when he was considered for tenure or promotion. Faculty typically were considered for promotion and tenure after six years. In the revised system, the Dean appointed a committee, unknown to the candidate except for the committee's chairperson. "The chairperson works with the candidate saying to the candidate, 'Please submit to me everything about yourself from A to Z. Tell me how great you are, as much material as you care to supply!' The dossier gets put together by the candidate and is submitted to the committee. They have many series of meetings; they could also poll students as part of the evaluation process; they poll alumni as part of the evaluation process; they write letters to workshop participants, so it's a pretty tough process . . . The final report comes to the full professorial group; the professorial group makes their vote." The Dean would then recommend and agree with the vote or would deny, based on some other information which he has. He noted that on a unanimous vote, it would be rare to contradict the committee; while, on a close vote, the decision would become more critical.
Other than for replacements, receiving authorization for new faculty positions was based on a combination of state formulae, including student count and F.T.E. numbers as seen in light of programmatical need. If programatical need could be demonstrated, the formula could be digressed from somewhat. The request for the additional line could begin in the particular academic area's faculty or with the Deans. The School was small enough so that this would be happening in informal discussions over the course of time. The Associate and the Dean then would justify and argue for it with the University at budget time.

The recruiting process itself was focused in the Dean's and Associate Dean's Office. They had a pool of candidates accumulated. This pool was augmented by advertising in the standard places as well as by personal contacts, phone calls and inquiries. Again, the informal network of information on candidates fed into the formal applicant pool. A search and screening committee was established for the vacancy. It was usually a cross section of the faculty, and the chairman might be a member of the academic area in which the search is being conducted. Physical arrangements for candidates were made by the Committee Chairman and the Associate Dean. The committee screened applications and finally recommended three candidates to the Dean for interviewing.

The three were interviewed by the committee, by the Deans and possibly by some of the other faculty in the particular academic area.
The final choice among the three candidates was made by the Dean with input and usually consensus from the committee on their reactions to the interviewing.

The Dean would get approval from the University Administration, but this had never been denied.

There had been no joint appointments with other academic units. The concern was that the jointly appointed faculty member would have divided loyalties and inputs and so would be placed in an unfair position. There also was little input from anywhere else on campus concerning candidates interviewing. One respondent commented, "I know there is some argument for including people from other disciplines [academic units in the University] - but we basically find out that those have been totally non-productive because they don't know their ass from their elbow."

It was pointed out that if a Hotel School faculty member (who was not on the committee), wanted to interview the candidate, arrangements would be made for him or her to do so.

Faculty Development

The overwhelming response to the question concerning faculty development was that the faculty was composed of highly capable professionals. These professionals each determined their own development programs for themselves, with their colleagues and with the Deans. The University was involved on a limited scale in terms of some occasionnal funding for various projects, including sabbaticals. But there was no campus-wide, encompassing program in which the School participated.
Specifically, faculty development took several forms for Hotel School faculty, depending upon where they were in their careers. The School assisted faculty in obtaining advanced degrees, especially by giving lighter teaching loads during the process. Industry participation was also encouraged in various forms, especially sabbatical leaves for faculty to work with industry for a semester. There was usually one faculty member on leave per semester. The School paid for trips to seminars and conferences as well as any books or publications which faculty deemed necessary.

Additionally, projects were funded, such as one completed by a faculty member to develop a film presentation on trends in foods. The presentation required contact, discussion and research with industry and was eventually delivered before the Club Managers Association.

The Associate Dean summed up, "Faculty development is where the professor becomes integrated and involved in a process in a hotel, restaurant or institutional feeding or whatever, where he is part and parcel in what's going on and can observe it and study it."

The key in faculty development at F.I.U. was informality and an ad hoc approach, focused particularly among the Dean and the Associate Dean and the faculty member. Development was thus planned and executed on an individual basis and was linked to evaluation, compensation, tenure and promotion.

Similarly, new faculty orientation was informal. The University provided institutional orientation materials. The School's Dean and faculty welcomed and assisted new faculty in a personal, as needed basis consisting especially of informal visits around the faculty offices with colleagues and assistance from the Associate Dean.
Faculty Evaluation and Compensation

The Board of Regents determined funding for faculty raises. There were at least a couple of categories for raises. The first was an across the board raise negotiated by the faculty union. The second was the merit raise or incentive distribution. These were essentially made available to the Dean and were distributed based upon each faculty's annual evaluation as well as some other factors.

Each faculty's annual evaluation was done by the Associate Dean and the Dean. It was a written evaluation based on student evaluations, on peer evaluations and observed behavior on other criteria. The student evaluations were performed by state law. They were made available for Deans and the faculty member's review. The Associate Dean got input from other faculty members and from students; this all happened, however, in an informal way, as people were talking with each other, or as various topics or needs arose. The Associate Dean sometimes visited a class or two as well. In addition, the faculty were evaluated on a combination of their teaching and by some form of industry involvement as well as service to the School or community. Based upon all of this input, the Dean and Associate wrote evaluations which were given to and discussed with each faculty member annually. It was stressed by several respondents that this was a low key procedure, and generally used as another development tool. The Associate Dean noted that with a new faculty member, he would try to build his confidence the first year and stress good points, while sandwiching teaching suggestions, for example, in the middle of the good points someplace. The feeling was, if the administrator gave the person confidence, he or she would improve. The actual distribution of the merit money, besides
being linked to evaluation was a function of where it would do the most good. "... You take that money, and you put those dollars where they will talk. If you've got a young professor and he's hot, then you throw some dollars there to protect your investment and give him some encouragement." Indeed, some of the professors (who have other sources of income) had sometimes indicated they did not need a raise in some years and encouraged the Dean to use the money elsewhere.

Another faculty said of evaluation, "... We're a very small faculty. There is a very close relationship with the Deans and the faculty. So the Deans are aware of just about everything that is going on ...[T]hey hand you an evaluation sheet and ask you to read it and ask your opinion and if the faculty member is out of line in some way or not performing, the Dean would want to chat with them. It's done very quietly and on a one-to-one basis ... I figure if you do your job, me or anyone else, it's recognized. Again, we're small enough, it's recognized. The merit raise will follow."

Annual evaluations were considered in promotion and tenure; however, the system was rather more elaborate. A faculty committee was appointed, consisting of a cross section of the faculty by rank, with "leaders" from each of these categories being selected. Tenure was automatically applied for after five years. Promotion was a request from the faculty member. Chaired by the Associate Dean, the committee recommended to the Dean. The committee evaluated based upon all the criteria mentioned above in light of the University's stipulation of requirements for teaching, community service and publishing or some other creative endeavor. The University's criteria have been interpreted generally, so they can apply to the School. "For example,
in the matter of publication we have several faculty that publish and several that do not, and yet there are a number of us, probably a majority of us that work very closely with industry in many areas so that when I go off and train managers for [Name] Hotels in budgeting or whatever, that is what I use to create a course."

The Associate Dean and Dean, from the day a faculty member had arrived, reviewed requirements with him in teaching, community services and scholarship. "... we'll take these areas and we indicate basically what they will need to have accomplished to be promoted." This usually happened at the time of the annual evaluation and then more frequently as the promotion/tenure decision neared.

The following comment typifies the evaluation committee's process: "... student and faculty evaluations of their peers, they're almost identical all the time... You know clear as a bell just by communications, generally how these professors are doing, what they're doing, and we rarely have differences on this. The faculty is small enough, they know each other, they know each other's work and there is generally almost a consensus."

Thus, evaluation was by consensus and was based primarily on teaching, (current, industry related courses well presented), community services (speeches, public assistance, etc.) and scholarship or creative activity. This last category appeared as crucial and was indeed linked to teaching at the School. In terms of industry participation, "... it's almost mandatory around here to get promoted. You must be recognized by industry as having a credible approach to your topic, and it's desired by industry and they ask you for advice and counsel, you do seminars, workshops, speeches, and so on." The Associate Dean commented that, "... There are two ways to look at
consulting. One is: there is a professor out there making some money for himself and where the hell is he? Or: aren't you lucky to have a faculty member on your staff who is credible enough that industry feels he has something to offer. Now there is an interchange there. Because, while they're giving information, they're receiving information. We request that they use that in classes. Any time a faculty member has these jobs, he clears them with me, and I stress highly that to be sure and bring that case right into the classroom."

In the case of tenure, all tenured faculty vote. The committee recommended to the Dean, and the Dean recommended to the Vice President. The University appeared not to restrict the teaching and industry relations philosophy of the School, especially with specific requirements about the particular degree a faculty member needed, or not demanding that creative work take the form only of journal articles. The Dean commented that, "... I've seen a lot of Ph. D.'s who couldn't teach a chicken to walk across the street. Then I've seen one in particular who didn't even have a bachelor's degree, who was a magnificent teacher. He retired a long time ago. ... [o]ther faculty [on campus] that know my faculty don't look down their noses at them ... but they kind of marvel at this strange, motley crowd." Indeed, there was a blend of Ph. D.'s and masters degrees and professional licensures.

The Dean further noted that he had never gone against the recommendation of the School's promotion committee or the vote on tenure by the tenured faculty. "They [the committee] have recommended on two different occasions that these two people should find other havens, and I gently worked them into those havens." (He found jobs for them.)
Usually, faculty knew by the third year if they were not meeting expectations, and they left. It was noted that the most crucial personnel decision is the hiring decision to bring in the right person initially. Staff recruiting, compensation and promotion was a function of the University Personnel Office in coordination with a chief staff person in the School who is also the Dean's secretary.

University of Houston

Recruiting

Requests for increased faculty lines were based upon curricular needs or increased students. They came from the faculty, and were transmitted to the Provost by the Dean.

The actual recruiting process consisted of a two pronged approach. In past years, it had relied heavily on a network of personal contacts of the faculty and Dean with people across the country. The appropriate contacts were encouraged to apply for the position. This still occurred to a certain extent, but along with an extensive, aggressive search.

Position descriptions were written in fairly broad terms and advertised in publications such as the CHRIE job bulletin, the Cornell job bulletin, the Chronicle of Higher Education and elsewhere. Because the faculty of the Hotel College was so small, the faculty as a whole sat as a search committee with the Associate Dean as the coordinator of the committee and of the recruiting activities.

When vitas were received from respondents, they were notified that they had been received and would be reviewed. The faculty reviewed them and decided whom they wanted to invite to campus. The others
were notified and thanked for applying. The invitees were contacted by mail and phone, and arrangements made with the Associate Dean for the visit to campus.

For the position which had been advertised in 1981, twelve resumes were received. Of those, the faculty decided only two met the basic guides of the position description. The descriptions were fairly broad so that applicants could be evaluated on an individual basis as possible. It was noted that in past years, the College had sought generalists. They were subsequently turning more toward specialists (foods, organizational behavior, etc.). Part of such a decision was a function of faculty size. At the time of the research, there was only one faculty to cover each "umbrella" or academic area of the curriculum. Full-time faculty covered core courses only. Electives were offered by part-time faculty.

The position descriptions stated that candidates should have the Ph. D., but that a master's degree and experience would be acceptable. Thus, there was flexibility in making the search. The University provided guidelines to meet federal requirements to which the College adhered, particularly in documenting actions taken relative to the recruiting process.

Candidates were invited to the campus for a couple of days. During that time, they met with all of the College's faculty both in formal interview sessions and informally over meals. They were provided time to visit around the campus and city as well. Not long after the candidate left, the faculty discussed his interviews and dossier. A vote was taken, and a decision made to offer the position or not. If there were more than one candidate, the faculty would
rank them and submit the ranking to the Dean who then solicited further comments from the faculty until a consensus could be reached. The Dean then informed the Provost of the decision. There had not been a problem in having the University Administration accept the College's decisions.

If an offer were made, the Deans would make final arrangements for salary, rank, etc. with the candidate. If the decision were no, the search would continue. Part-timers were used to teach courses until a line could be filled.

During the time of this research, recruiting was being conducted for a new Dean for the College, Dr. Taylor having just retired. The Chancellor selected the search committee's chair which was the Dean of the College of Business. In addition, the committee consisted of four faculty members from the College, two or three industry representatives, an alumnus and a student. This committee made recommendations to the Provost and Chancellor.

Faculty Development

While there was not a formal program for faculty development within the College, the basic issues were addressed. The Dean had on an individual basis, set a course for development with each faculty member. This was then executed on a day to day basis by the Associate Dean. Included in such a course were items such as publishing, pursuing the doctoral degree and funding travel.

Each faculty member was encouraged to attend and funded for one national conference per year as well as one state (of Texas) meeting. Younger and newer faculty especially were encouraged to work on the doctorate. It was noted, however, that the issue of a faculty
member working on a doctorate (even at another university) must be negotiated with the University's Central Administration.

The University encouraged development primarily in the area of research and publication by providing a brochure of research grants available and notifying interested faculty about new funding as it arose. Research and publication appeared to be a primary area of concern for faculty development on the part of the University.

Sabbaticals were not automatic at the University of Houston. They must have been applied for with a written proposal by the faculty member. Hotel College faculty had not made use of them.

Orientation for new faculty was fairly informal. The Associate Dean met with them and they were basically welcomed individually, and informally by their colleagues. The University provided an orientation as well.

Faculty Evaluation and Compensation

Basic salaries for various ranks were set by the Board of Regents. Likewise, the State determined the amount of funds to be allocated, bi-annually for raises. The legislature further decreed what part, if any, was discretionary, for merit, and what part is to be an across the board raise. When a pool was given to the College for merit increases, the Dean had, for several years, decided upon the distribution. He performed a somewhat informal evaluation and often did not contact the faculty member directly, but notified him or her of the raise in the contract when each faculty member signed it annually. It was up to the individual to speak with the Dean if he had any questions.
Then, for the past two or three years, of the Dean's Administration, the Dean and Associate Dean performed the evaluations together for each faculty member. They then met with each person annually to discuss the written evaluation. The criteria used for evaluation were based upon the University's guidelines of teaching, research and service. The University's Faculty Handbook discussed these guidelines in very broad terms. The Dean had submitted his interpretation of them to the University several years ago. The faculty's perception of them was vague, however. It appeared that their course of development had been based more upon the individual development scheme they each discussed with the Dean.

It was indicated that, with the change in Deans, and change in some administrators at the University level, a re-interpretation of the guidelines would be drafted. These guidelines would be used for annual evaluations as well as for tenure and promotion decisions. Steps toward this, apparently were to involve more student input from class evaluations and would place a greater emphasis on publishing. All those interviewed indicated that the University heavily stressed research and publication as part of the tenure and promotion criteria.

The process for promotion and tenure started with the faculty sitting as a committee of the whole, including untenured faculty. The faculty, chaired by the Associate Dean, reviewed the candidate for tenure or promotion based upon the dossier assembled and the criteria discussed above. That recommendation was forwarded to the Dean. He, in turn, submitted a supportive letter (if he concurred with the recommendation) to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, chaired by the Provost. A faculty member from the College sat on that
committee. At the time of the research, only two of the faculty were tenured and one had recently been promoted to full professor. The time for tenure consideration varied depending upon what rank the candidate had been during his time on campus, ranging from five to seven years. Guidelines and procedures for promotion and tenure were explained at the University level in the Faculty Handbook. The College's interpretation of the guidelines was not included there, but was transmitted by the Dean and Associate Dean, usually verbally, to the faculty.

There seemed to be uncertainty about the necessity for the doctoral degree as the terminal degree. Respondents indicated that there was a "feeling" on campus that it would be most difficult, in the future, to be tenured without the doctorate. Also, the College was now requesting faculty to write one article per year (not necessarily based upon an empirical research project) so that they might more easily be passed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Summary and Observations

The process of faculty recruiting at all three schools was at various stages of development. While there was no conclusive evidence based upon the data presented herein, one could hypothesize that this was a function both of the variances in size at the schools, and the ages of the programs.

A strong pattern, apparent among all three programs, was that while they all adhered strictly and willingly to E.E.O.C. and other federal and state hiring guidelines, there was a clear history of and inclination to rely upon a system or network of personal contacts and professional memberships to attract faculty candidates to the program.
This must be interpreted not simply as the "old boy system" which was heavily extant in the past, but as a supplement to other methods (such as journal advertising) or building the applicant pool for positions. No doubt part of this process and attitude was related to the recruiting methods used in the hospitality professions themselves.

Cornell was attempting to open searches as widely as possible. To a certain extent, as one faculty member commented, this was a reaction to lack of broadly based searches in the past. Florida and Houston, both younger, attempted to combine both approaches to recruiting. There seemed to be an inclination toward building the pool by personal contacts at Florida, while at Houston, there was some question about which was the best approach.

A second clear pattern was an inclination toward relatively informal evaluations of faculty. There appeared to be a preference to address development issues on an ad hoc basis rather than in a formally, planned fashion. Cornell and Houston both indicated that they were changing this process. The results remained to be seen. As several respondents commented, extremely formal, structured evaluations should not be necessary among professionals; yet the argument for change was that younger faculty wanted and needed such processes in place since, the perception was that tenure and promotion were becoming increasingly more difficult to obtain. This was especially so for a professional school such as hotel schools who have not always, precisely fit the research and publication mold or the terminal degree requirements in the same way as have the more traditional, non-professional disciplines.

There was concern at both Cornell and especially at Houston that tenure and promotion would increasingly require both the doctoral degree and
publications. The School at Cornell however, was to have each faculty member embark on a path of heavy development in one of the areas of teaching, research or service rather than a completely even spread among all three for faculty development. Florida appeared to continue to view consulting and professional experiences as most crucial. There were several at Cornell who did as well, and a few at Houston who did.

There was also a clear pattern among all three schools emergent as a concern over the issue of what combinations of academic degree and experience should be sought in faculty applicants. On the one hand, the universities placed pressure on the schools (subtle or not) for the doctoral degree as the terminal degree for faculty. Yet, the perception among industry and some respondents at the schools, especially Florida, was that the combination of a degree such as a masters and industry experience was the more important quality than the doctoral degree with very limited experience. There was a mixture of both types of faculty at all three schools. Cornell appeared to seek both types of faculty and wanted to make individual evaluations.

Florida sought experience especially with the masters or equivalent while Houston appeared to want the doctorate, but would settle for the masters.
Physical Facilities

Cornell

The focus for management of the physical facilities was with the Assistant Dean for Business and Administration. Reporting to him was the Manager of Statler Inn who in turn had a plant engineer reporting to her. The plant engineer was in charge of maintenance for all the physical facilities.

The physical plant consisted of Statler Hall on the main campus and "Statler West" on the other side of Lake Cayuga, (about ten miles away). Statler Hall was a thirty year old building consisting of two, five story wings and a library/auditorium wing. One wing contained five floors of the Statler Inn with fifty-two guest rooms, public areas, ballroom, cocktail lounge, a formal dining room, and two self-service restaurants. The University’s faculty club was housed in these facilities. The second five story wing housed the School with its offices, classrooms and laboratories. The third wing housed the School's own library, a large auditorium with full stage facilities and some offices and student spaces. Statler West Annex was formerly the residential facility of an international fraternal order set on 165 acres overlooking Cayuga Lake. It contained offices, guest rooms and dining facilities.

The Space Utilization Committee, formed in 1980, was responsible for planning the use of space for offices, labs, etc.. It consisted of the Assistant Dean for Business and Administration (ADBA) and two faculty members including one from the Property Management academic area in the School. The Committee, according to one interviewee made
recommendations, but the Dean could change their recommendations if he saw fit. Classroom assignment was performed by the School Registrar. Any request for classroom use in Statler from elsewhere in the University came directly to the School Registrar who, in turn would make the space commitment, if it was available. Faculty offices were grouped by academic area as much as possible.

Planning for rehabilitation or new construction generally originated with the School's administrators, especially insofar as funding was concerned. The University "trades' union" people (carpenters, electricians, etc.) were reimbursed by the School for work done. Major jobs would be contracted to outside suppliers through the University's Department of Design and Project Management. A committee in the School would be empaneled to ascertain requirements. Because the Property Management area had some professionals on the faculty, some of the design work would even be done in-house. They would then turn this over to Design and Project Management. The University, however, imposed no control on management or physical plant except for safety. The School needed only present both a plan and evidence of funding ability.

Building maintenance and cleaning was performed by the Statler Inn's maintenance and housekeeping staff. The School reimbursed the Inn's accounts. Technically, communication with the plant engineer should come through the Inn manager even in matters concerning the School wing, since the plant engineer reported to the Inn manager. In fact, the relationships were much less formal than that. The ADBA usually dealt directly with the plant engineer. Students cleaned
work stations in laboratories as they were used, with major cleaning (such as floors) performed by the Inn's staff.

The Faculty Club had a committee which dealt with the School and Inn to determine and execute physical plant changes for the Club, as well as to conduct other business with the Inn and School.

Equipment was completely inventoried by the plant engineer. Records of scheduled maintenance procedures were also kept, thus aiding in evaluation and planning. The School and Inn have been operating on a five year plan of renovating one floor per year of the complex.

Plans for Statler West called for using it for non-academic functions (The Cornell Quarterly for example) and for expanded conference and executive education activity from the hospitality professions and industry.

**Florida International University**

The office of the Associate Dean was the focus for most physical plant concerns.

The School occupied space on parts of three floors in one of the campus academic buildings (Deuxième Maison) and lab space including kitchen and dining labs in another building (Owa Ehan). With the opening of the University and the School in 1972, the School had been assigned original space on one floor and the laboratories. As growth took place, offices had been assigned where they were available by the Vice President. Basically, requests for space were made by the Associate Dean or the Dean to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
It was noted that getting space was not just a function of growth but of "making a case for usage" as well.

Classrooms were assigned in classroom buildings by the University Registrar. (See Curriculum and Instruction, F.I.U.)

Maintenance was performed by the University under the auspices of the Director of Physical Plant. Cleaning was contracted out by the University. Students cleaned their own lab stations. The (daily) contract cleaners did more cleaning at night, and once each semester, the Associate Dean allocated funds to the food faculty to oversee a major, general cleaning, of the food preparation and service spaces. The School maintained a strong, informal relationship with the Physical Plant Director, thus insuring that needs were cared for without great difficulty.

University of Houston

The Associate Dean and Dean were the focus for most decisions concerning the College's portion of the physical plant. The entire complex, called the Continuing Education Center, consisted of the University of Houston Hotel and the Division of Continuing Education in one wing and the College in the other wing. The Continuing Education and Hotel wing contained several large classrooms, meeting rooms, banquet rooms, restaurant, kitchen, office, reproduction center, guest rooms, front office, lobby and a parking garage.

A synopsis of development and current status of the administrative structure governing the complex was more appropriately given under – Administrative Structure – of this chapter.
There is a manager of the entire physical facility. He was responsible for maintaining the College's portion of the facility as well, but in coordination with the College's Deans. Part of his custodial staff was separately funded in order to accomplish this.

At the time of the research, the Associate Dean and the Acting Dean of the Hotel College were meeting periodically with the facility manager and the Director of Continuing Education to plan and coordinate needs. For example, Continuing Education used classrooms occasionally in the College wing, while the College used some meeting rooms, banquet rooms and kitchen space in the Hotel and Continuing Education wing. There were no room charges in either of these cases.

The Associate Dean's Office assigned classroom and office space for the College and forwarded the information to the facility manager who maintained a record of space use.

Because the College operated from appropriations, it used the University's physical plant department to do heavy maintenance or light construction. This was coordinated with the facility manager, however. The entire plant was ten years old, and the facility manager was developing five, seven and ten year renovation and maintenance schedules.

The dining room and kitchen were used very infrequently for teaching (only two or three times per year). At those times, the food service director assumed responsibility for maintenance and cleaning.

The College had discussed empaneling a building planning committee. There was a strong possibility of constructing a kitchen laboratory/dining addition to the College. The addition would also house more offices and classrooms. Because there was no permanent
Dean at the time of the research, both the Committee and the plans were quite unclear. Funding for this was discussed under Finance and Resource Allocation.

Summary and Observations

In terms of degree, Cornell had the most extensive facilities. Discussion was needed for an understanding of Florida and Houston. Florida, while it had limited facilities, somewhat spread out on the campus, used their food labs intensively. Houston was housed in a comprehensive guest lodging facility, yet included very little use of those facilities in their curricular program, for a variety of reasons, many of which were temporary and were discussed in the following two sections.

Perhaps true of many educational institutions, all three programs found themselves in need of more space or a renovation or of both. A pattern emerged in that all three saw food lab facilities especially, as an important component of the pedagogical process. (Even though the College at Houston did not extensively use them, it saw the labs as quite important.)

Identifiable physical plant represented a means for identification for all three programs. Perhaps for this reason, another pattern was apparent— all considered the appearance, the cleanliness and the atmosphere of the physical facilities to be important in conveying the message of teaching hospitality administration to those who enter the facilities. To be sure, the curriculum, faculty and students were paramount, but, in a sense, the medium was the message concerning physical facilities.
Finance and Resource Allocation

The Assistant Dean for Business and Finance had total responsibility for budgeting and financial management. On an annual basis, he prepared the budget for the School. Budgeting guidelines and forms were provided by the University. They were divided into broad areas; the School further delineated these areas into more accounts. As part of the budget process, he solicited from faculty lists of major items which they anticipated they might need. There were no departmental or curricular budgets or budget input. There were very strong feelings on the part of all who discussed the subject that items such as food expenses for courses should not be separately budgeted. The ADBA himself stated concerning dining room curricular food costs . . . "I don't care . . . the students make up the menu. We want them to be management oriented. But, we also want them to be exposed to working with different types of foods . . . I don't think that those types of decisions should be made on a financial basis, as long as we're able to pay for it. If we can't pay for them, I think then, we'll have to start looking at expenses. There are a lot of other things we can cut out before we get to those types of controls . . . I guess I wouldn't want to see us have that tight of control over an academic program."

Budgeting for the School was done partially on an historical and partially on a zero basis, depending upon the particular area of the budget. The actual budget system fit the University accounting system and was developed by the University Budget Office.
The Statler Inn budget was prepared separately by the Inn manager and his or her staff. It was then submitted for review to the ADBA.

Other units in the School such as the Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly and the library were either consulted on their budget or submitted budget items to the ADBA.

The budget package was submitted to the Dean for review and approval. It was then submitted to the University Budget Office for approval, but that approval was more a matter of form.

The School was completely autonomous in terms of financing. The major part of financing was generated by tuition. Students paid tuition to the University, the University took a percentage of that tuition which they called retainage, and the Hotel School got the remainder. The tuition income paid 100% of expenses ten years ago. In 1981, it paid 83%. The other 17% had to be made up from other sources. The School must pay all its own expenses including salaries, some financial aid, a subsidy to the Statler Inn, research expenses, operating expenses and capital expenditures. The physical plant was a gift from the Statler Foundation. There was also an endowment which at one time covered all building operating expenses, but at the time of the research, covered only about one-third of the expenses.

Other financial resources were provided by endowed chairs, Statler Teaching Intern grants, accessory instruction, Bundy funds, The Cornell Quarterly and external programs. Accessory instruction consisted of payments made out to other academic units at Cornell for Hotel students who took courses at those units as well as payments made to the School by other academic units at Cornell for their students who took a course at the Hotel School. The School has usually realized a
net inflow from accessory instruction. Bundy funds were paid to the School by New York State for certain graduates of the School. The Inn and the Faculty Club were seen as pedagogical tools and so the School's administration saw some subsidy for them as a worthwhile cost of education. Students used the facilities by taking food courses in the faculty cafeteria, the student cafeteria, banquet facility and the main dining room. These food facilities were operated by students preparing, serving and managing from 2 P.M. until closing, Monday through Friday during the academic year as part of their classes. But there must also be regular full-time staff. January, June and August were slow because the campus was inactive, and the Inn could not advertise off the campus because as a tax exempt organization, it could not go into direct competition with other hotels and restaurants in Ithaca.

Less than 10% of the tuition was provided by endowed grants and scholarships awarded to students. Many of the existing funds were established in years past when the "spin off" was a much greater percent of tuition than it was in 1982. Inflation has eroded them to a certain extent.

The Dean indicated that financial resources would be an area of major attention from him. He hoped that increased external programs would, in addition to fulfilling industry needs, provide increased revenue. He was going to commit time to seeking foundation grants and proprietary grants in kind for equipment and other capital items. He was encouraging faculty to become more involved in seeking outside grants.

Endowment investments were managed by the University, and there was some concern that their investments were more conservative than
need be and thus were not producing the yield which they might safely have done.

The Dean observed that while, compared to other academic units at, and other than at Cornell, the School was quite fiscally sound, "I never met anyone who is capable of making advances in programs who spends zero dollars. So, I think my needs for cash will increase as a result of a more quality program."

Purchasing for the School flowed through and was approved by the ADBA. Major capital items were supposed to be purchased on a bid basis in conjunction with the University purchasing department. All other items, including food, could be purchased either from University General stores (paper, supplies, etc.) of from private vendors, including food. Many of these direct purchases were executed through the Statler Inn's office. Purchases were vouched, and the University drew the check to the vendor. The School had almost complete discretion and autonomy in purchasing (with audit from the University), except as noted. Much of the food was, in practice, purchased from the Inn by the School for use in lab courses.

Financial statements were prepared by the ADBA monthly, and were reconciled with the budget and University generated statement. The ADBA sent pertinent sections to various places such as The Quarterly office as he saw necessary.

Some accounts were being divided into narrower segments in order to better analyze the School's expenditures and income by area or program. This was a priority of the Dean's.
The financial function at F.I.U's Hospitality School resided primarily with the Associate Dean.

He prepared a budget annually. The University provided documentation and instructions which they had developed to use in preparing the budget. The format changed somewhat from year to year. The Associate Dean noted that, "They give us a packet and if the packet truly reflects the needs of the School, we'll use it; and if it doesn't, we'll amend it." The procedure used is a combination of historical and zero based. Supporting schedules were not required for every item. It was noted that there were differences from year to year. Some years, the University would ask for block budgets while in other years more line items would be requested. In either case, justification was given for budget items in broad terms.

A classified (non-professional) fiscal assistant prepared a summary of the previous year's financial activities along with recommendations for the following year for the Associate Dean. He used this in conjunction with program plans and any requests from faculty in preparing the proposed budget.

The budget was submitted to the Dean for review and approval and then to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Financial resources for the School were almost totally appropriated. The state legislature approved a bi-annual budget for state agencies. The Regents were involved at that point in order to secure sufficient appropriations for the University. F.I.U. then received its cut through the President's Office. At that level, the Vice
Presidents divided the budget between administration and academe. The Deans' budgets were then considered based upon programmatical needs and enrollments, but were based upon whatever the Vice President for Academic Affairs was able to secure in negotiations with the other Vice Presidents and the President. "The real nuts and bolts happen when the Deans meet with the Academic Affairs slice of the budget. The real negotiation occurs between the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Dean. That's where the real nitty gritty happens, everything else is garbage!"

Some limited funding accrued to the School through an endowed Statler Professorship and, of course, scholarships discussed under - Students, F.I.U., Financial Aid. The School was attempting to secure some outside funding from industry. These efforts were focused within the actions of the Dean as he met with industry representatives.

The responsibility for purchasing and all financial management was with the Associate Dean. The actual execution, again, was in the hands of the "fiscal assistant". She actually wrote the purchase orders, and maintained the ledger of accounts. That ledger was reconciled monthly with reports from the University Comptroller's Office. The Associate Dean then reviewed the accounts with the fiscal assistant, and any necessary adjustments were made.

Requests for supplies and other items to be purchased were directed by the faculty to the fiscal assistant. If she had any questions about authorization to purchase the item, she discussed it with the Associate Dean.

Food was purchased by the food purchasing clerk. Blanket purchase orders (for up to an estimated, budgeted amount) were opened with
purveyors and stores where the School did purchasing. If an item were needed from a new supplier, then an emergency purchase order number would be secured from the University purchasing department and an account (blanket purchase order) eventually opened, based upon the previous year's activity.

Orders for supplies not stocked on campus, such as uniforms, dry goods, etc., were made on a purchase order through the purchasing office. They procured the items from companies with whom the state had a contract, unless the School specified otherwise for some reason. The fiscal assistant noted that emergency purchases were easily made. The University purchasing department asked only that no purchase be made without first securing a purchase order number.

University of Houston

The budgeting and finance function at the College was managed in the Dean's Office. The Dean was responsible for this function but the actual execution of the operational details was performed by the Assistant to the Dean (a non-faculty person).

The budget was prepared on an annual basis. Legislative funding was on a bi-annual basis for the University itself, however, There had been some input from the Associate Dean in some years for the entire budget, and almost always on faculty compensation lines. There had been no input from other faculty.

The Dean approved the final version and it was forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs. The Dean then negotiated with the Vice Chancellor and the Provost to obtain the funding he deemed necessary and for long-range planning. The budget was then returned.
In legislative funding years, it could be cut substantially from the requested amounts or just not increased over the previous year. The budgeting process was performed on University developed documents, usually by line item, and on an historical basis.

Financing for the College was approximately 80 to 90% state appropriated and 10 to 20% gifted through what are termed "local funds". Local funds were used at the discretion of the Dean, were either restricted or unrestricted, and were vouched through the University accounting system. In addition, there were scholarship funds as discussed in the section - Students. Raising funds had primarily been the function of the Dean. The Associate Dean commented that while this was a fitting function for the Dean, the Associate Dean believed that the faculty could get involved as well, especially because they come in contact with many potential donors. "... If you have a plan and program for raising money, I think you're more successful and I think to do that, you have to do it internally and explain everything to the faculty because if they can get leads on people who want to give money, then they in turn should get that back to the administration. I also think you need to work with the other development organizations on campus."

The College, through the Associate Dean, was at the time of the research, engaged in active fund raising for their French course program from local companies and for another program from NASA. The Hilton Foundation donated some of the funds for the original building. They recently discussed with the Dean the possibility of further funding in order to, in their terms, make it the number one program in the country. To that end, the Dean, with an outside advisor, solicited
input, especially from the Associate Dean and the faculty and wrote a proposal to the Foundation. The proposal outlined funding requests as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Endowed Professorships</td>
<td>$  1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Endowed Chairs</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Positions: Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Industry and Alumni Affairs;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff for Hospitality Library</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Fund</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Furnishings, Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad N. Hilton HRM College Building</td>
<td>12,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Library Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Construction from State Funds)</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books for Hospitality Library</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Hospitality Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To be Funded Later)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$18,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Foundation had assured the College that funding would be forthcoming upon the resolution of some legal questions related to funding of the Foundation.

The Assistant to the Dean conducted all purchasing activities for the College and managed the financial accounting. All purchasing was done through the University and the state. Large items went out
for bid. It appeared that the process was relatively slow. The Associate Dean ordered a lighted, enclosed bulletin board through the system. It took five months to arrive.

All interviewees noted that whatever materials they needed to teach, and run the College were never denied. If there were no appropriated funding available, other sources of revenue would be found.

The University records were reconciled with the College financial records by the Assistant to the Dean on a monthly basis. The appropriated funds could not be carried forward to a new fiscal year, and so must have been expended or lost prior to the end of the fiscal year.

Summary and Observations

The first thing which was strikingly clear in this section was the difference in the financial function at Cornell, a private School and at Florida and Houston, both public institutions. Cornell received funding as a lump sum function of enrollment times tuition and its gifts and endowments. Florida and Houston were highly dependent upon state legislatures, Boards of Regents and University administrations for a large portion of their budgets. These might be linked to enrollments but not directly. Their programmatical and distinctive needs had to be negotiated with the University's administrators. Houston was attempting to work itself into this position. Florida had been designated a program of distinction by the university system and did receive additional budget consideration.

Secondly, a clear pattern emerged. All three schools placed a great deal of emphasis on not asking faculty to budget themselves. Without exception, all interviewed stated that faculty should and would
get what they needed to accomplish their tasks. The administrators clearly saw this as their function.

The budget and finance activity at all three schools, while under the Dean, was performed by someone else. At Cornell, it was the Assistant Dean for Business and Administration (and his assistant), at Florida, it was the Associate Dean (and his assistant) and at Houston, an administrative assistant in the Dean's Office. One interviewee commented of the financial function that the Dean should, "... always have (his) assistant in charge of the budget, then the assistant can get it in the ass and the Dean is clean. It's a good system."
Administrative Structure

Cornell

Development and Functioning

As explained in the beginning of this chapter, H.B. Meek was the founding faculty member and eventually the first Dean of what became the autonomous School of Hotel Administration. He saw the program through from its inception within Agriculture and Home Economics in the New York State College to its eventual standing within the endowed section of the University. Even in the private sector, the School has aided Cornell in fulfilling its mission as a partial land grant institution.

As the School had grown from around 20 students in 1922, to somewhere around 350 in 1961, the administration of the School had remained largely a function of the Dean. Professionals had been hired to teach. The Dean had taught and cared for the operations of the School. One interviewee who knew Meek observed that, "... He strictly ran it as a one-man show; there were no Assistant Deans, no departments, no department heads. There were no directives, it was virtually dictated, a benevolent dictatorship ... The teachers taught and the administrators administrated, and that is the way the School was set up."

Another respondent who knew him personally commented, "H. B. Meek ran the School completely, did all the administration, and one famous line that might be a little humorous to throw in [was from] Professor Tom Silk, a very loved accounting professor, but who had a sharp tongue, once said, 'Well one of the interesting things about H. B. Meek is
when I saw him going down the hall, I didn't know whether he was going
to the men's room or to London, England to give a speech'; and that
sets the stage for what the faculty knew about the administration of
the School.'

Robert A. Beck had assumed the Deanship upon Dean Meek's retirement
in 1961. Beck noted that, "Professor Meek did most of the interviewing
for Admissions and set up courses as he pleased and really was a one-man
show. So when I came aboard in '61, I inherited this faculty who were
relatively complacent [administratively], so I guess I have the same
kind of style, and continued the dictatorship or autocracy, or whatever
you want to call it." Faculty and student admissions' requests and
enrollment grew. Jerry Lattin had been appointed as Assistant Dean.
He performed some of the tasks which the Dean alone had been doing, but
especially academic/administrative functions.

In 1967, Beck had appointed Paul Guarnier to the post of Assistant
Dean, thus having given the School two Assistant Deans. Many of the
operational functions of the School, for which the Dean had not re­served
decision power, had been left to individual faculty or groups
of faculty to do as they pleased. Basically, Guarnier was then to care
for many of these details, especially the operational and financial
aspects as well as the management of a planned growth phase for the
School and oversee the Statler Inn. Guarnier commented that, "... we
centralized little administrative functions. We tried to take the ad­
ministrative responsibilities off the faculty people and wind up by
saying to the faculty person, in effect, if we could succeed, all you
will have to do is teach. We want you to read, we want you to study,
we want you to consult. When you show up, the blackboards will be
clean, the chalk will be there, we'll buy the view graph, we'll have
the Xerox [sic] machine. So we went through quite a period. We
established forms; some liked it and some didn't. We consolidated re-
production facilities. We consolidated purchasing, we started budgeting;
for example, we made formal the fact that faculty could go on a trip,
if it was broadening, if it was intellectually stimulating, the School
would pay for it. We got a lot of those things down in writing and so
we started having regular meetings every other week. The faculty had
been gathering for coffee occasionally, but the School [formally] had
not been [meeting]."

The growth took place. Enrollment had increased from 490 in 1967,
to 750 in 1972. Guarnier emphasized that the administrative and service
consolidations, the growth, and the addition of the Master of Profes-
sional Studies Program (M.P.S.) had all been done primarily in an in-
formal manner and especially used the informal group structure and
contacts, with formal meetings and committees limited. The faculty
had numbered between 20 and 30 in those years. Guarnier further
observed that, "... We did have informal coordination of activities
that allowed the administration to do things; but the [School's] ad-
ministration did it from a central direction of control. Our informing
of the faculty was just that, we generally informed them subsequent to
the decision or stated that, 'We are about to offer a job to Professor
X, we hope you'll support us.' So it was an information type of noti-
fication, not a vote, not a true group. Interestingly enough, though,
I have had quite a few people say to me, 'You know we really did have
a group process, didn't we?' I said, 'Yes we did.' You see, you don't
have to have the formal meetings to have a group process if someone
is honestly sounding out the constituents."
Another respondent observed that neither of the Assistant Deans had had well defined responsibilities. The distinctions in their duties had not been documented, nor were they communicated to the faculty. Faculty had been unsure of whom to approach on various issues. During this period, as administrative tasks had grown more complex and numbers increased, the Dean appointed various Directors of Admissions, Placement, and Research and Development. Some of these had also been faculty members, some had not.

In 1972, Lattin left to assume the Deanship at the newly formed Hotel and Restaurant Program at Florida International University. Guarnier then had assumed his duties and, in effect, filled both positions. He had been promoted to Associate Dean. Beck and he had agreed that the Dean would approve strategic policy and work primarily with industry and alumni relations, all of the "outside" tasks. The Associate Dean would care primarily for the internal operations of the School.

This arrangement had continued until about 1976, when the Associate Dean had asked to be relieved of his post. The Dean had asked him to stay another year, after which he reverted to a professorial faculty member and director of the summer programs (center for professional development). This had been precipitated by some disagreement on direction between the two administrators, and because in one respondent's opinion, the Associate Dean had become spread too thinly in terms of administrative duties.

There had still been no formal departments at this time, although the engineering and foods teaching areas had each fairly well coalesced because of the numbers of faculty involved in each and the nature
of the teaching, especially the coordination necessary in the foods area.

The Dean had not replaced the Associate Dean. He had thought that since the Directors had been in place, including now a Director of Alumni Affairs, he would have been able to run the School on his own again.

During the period of the late 60's and the 70's, many of the long-standing cadre of professors had retired. Several of them had been replaced with younger people who had been quite academically oriented and often working on their Ph. D.'s at Cornell or elsewhere while they had been teaching as instructors in the Hotel School. Several others had been hired who were scholars with degrees from specialized fields other than hospitality administration and who had primarily been educators rather than practitioners. They had come in from teaching in other places (not hotel programs). Thus, the composition of the faculty had been changing, not only in the actual identities of the incumbents, but in the type of person who had been hired.

In order to ease the burden somewhat, the Dean had appointed the former Inn manager to be Associate Administrator for the School and to oversee the new manager of the Inn. His had been strictly and administrative and not an academic appointment. His task had been primarily to oversee the financial and classified staff functions of the School.

When the Associate Dean had stepped down, "there was a period of time when the role was not being filled by anyone . . . [The School was] left only with central direction and control [from the Dean] without
the informal coordination that made it work . . . so frankly, sides and viewpoints hardened." Dean Beck observed that, "... during the time that Lattin and Guarnier were here, the faculty was used to going to them for big or small or intermediate problems. . . . There was a reticence to go to the Dean because, 'I don't want to bother the Dean;', and there was a breach developed, a gap between the administration, me, and the faculty. There was a void there, when I was away, who would run the ship?" He further observed about the Associate (non academic) Administrator that, "faculty tended to go to him for things that really, they shouldn't have; but they didn't want to go to me for whatever reason." When the Dean had realized this was happening, he had appointed an Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, and had elevated the Associate Administrator to Assistant Dean for Business and Administration (but still as a non-academic appointment).

Concurrently, many of the instructors mentioned above had earned their Ph. D. degrees and the new "non-hotel" experienced educators had begun to get acclimated to the School. Beck noted that, "When all these people came aboard with their Ph. D.'s and appointments to the professorial staff, they began to look around and they began to have more input in the School and the way it works. And there was a definite clash to my style of operation and their kind of, I called it, rule by committee, although I don't think they intended that; as it went on what they wanted was to have a voice."

In addition to then having appointed a new, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, the Dean had made other efforts to give greater input by faculty to the School's operational administration, even though this was uncomfortable for him and inconsistent with his
style. A standing curriculum committee had been formed and had become heavily involved in making some recommendations. (See the Curriculum and Instruction section, supra). An Advisory Council had been formed and the School had been formally divided into seven administrative "disciplinary" areas as shown in Figure 3. An area coordinator had been elected for each of the seven areas. A Coordinators' Council had then replaced the Advisory Council. The distinction had been made that these were area coordinators and not department chairpersons. They had no budgets, nor any real control over faculty or faulty salaries. Their function had been to coordinate courses, schedules and students within the areas as well as act as a conduit between faculty and administration and convene the faculty within their area.

The growing differences in approaches between the Dean and some of the faculty had come to a head in 1980. During the winter break, it had been brought to the Dean's attention that what eventually became Statler West Annex had been put up for sale by the fraternal organization, the Odd Fellows. The Dean had known the School needed more room, especially for a conference center to expand those types of programs. He had consulted with the Assistant Dean and with the University's Vice President in charge of buildings and properties. Many of the faculty had been away, thus he had not convened them or consulted them and made an offer for the facility. (Another party had also made an offer.) The Dean felt time was of the essence. Some faculty had read about the purchase in the newspapers, and had brought the matter of why they were not consulted before the entire faculty.

---

9 This is located across the lake. (See the Faculty and Staff Section)
Figure 3. Organization of Academic Disciplines - Administrative Areas

(51, 1981, p. 20)
The Dean had felt, rather than change his style of management any further, based upon his philosophy that faculty should teach and administrators administrate, he would resign. He had been thinking of doing so in any event. This was a catalyst. He had been serving as Dean for 20 years and felt that it was time. Indeed, he commented in the interview that 10-15 years would be the optimal number of years for one Dean's administration. Parenthetically, the new Dean also agreed, and was serving on renewable five year terms with the intent, on the part of all, that he revert to a professorial faculty member at the end of ten years.

Approximately a one year search had been conducted for a new Dean. The Search Committee had representatives from faculty, alumni and the University on it and had recommended three or four candidates to the President. Jack Clark, a professor on the School's faculty with a degree in Engineering from Cornell and who had taught Properties Management courses had been selected. Dean Beck, before returning to professorial faculty status, had thought he should take a year's sabbatic. The Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs then retired.

Clark then called for organizational suggestions from the faculty. These were then made and several standing committees have been maintained or instituted. A new Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs had been appointed from among the professorial faculty, and after it had been decided, early on in the new administration to have an Assistant Dean for External Affairs, one had been appointed from the professorial faculty.  

---

10The new ADAA was on sabbatical, thus his position was filled, in an acting capacity, by the person who was to become the Assistant Dean for External Affairs.
The latest organizational chart appeared below as Figure 4. The chart did not show a place for the Area Coordinators, but they were convened by the ADAA. The ADAA also chaired faculty meetings. The faculty were divided by University policy, into professorial and non-professorial faculty. Professorial faculty consisted of those who were on the tenure track or were tenured. Non-professorial were others who taught, including lecturers and teaching support specialists. The professorial faculty met sometimes separately from the non-professorial faculty and staff and sometimes with them. The administrative/academic areas also met. The frequency of meeting has changed with changing demands, but increased as the new administrative structure was taking shape. Only professorial faculty had voting rights.

The new administration, especially the Dean, has indicated that they want input from faculty on the administration of the School, even though the Dean would still make the ultimate decision in many cases. This input from the faculty could come through committees, area coordinators, Assistant Deans, faculty meetings, or direct communication with the Dean if necessary. The ADAA chaired the faculty meetings.

The Dean has stated, however, that the professorial faculty were to have full control and final say over academic and curricular matters, with input from him. He has attended some faculty meetings.

The role of the Area Coordinators was still in the fine tuning stage at the time of this research. During the period of transition, the Coordinators' Council had been making a substantial number of day-to-day decisions. There has been a swing of the pendulum, as one respondent phrased it, from little input to almost weekly detail
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Figure 4. Administrative Organizational Chart, School of Hotel Administration, Cornell University
management by this group. The pendulum, during this study, was seeking a middle ground. It appeared that there would still be no department chairs. But the Dean would like the coordinators to act as a liaison between their faculty colleagues and the administration. They will focus on long-range planning and policy making. They were also to have input on faculty personnel matters such as merit, but would not make decisions and would not have budgets. The School's faculty was seen by many as too small to warrant full-fledged department chairs.

Virtually the only dictate the University made concerning organizational structure itself concerned the faculty and staff ranks as discussed earlier. The questions of departments, administrators and most internal committees as well as, of course, budgets to fund any of these, was completely within the discretion of the School. The University did dictate that each School or College was responsible for certain functions such as course registration and student records. The School could fulfill these functions in any way it saw fit, but happened to use a School Registrar, for example.

Indeed, many faculty had part-time administrative responsibility such as financial aid or placement. The School has been moving away from this (using more staff positions) and was to continue to do so under the new administration. There was concern that one who was acting both as teaching faculty and administration could devote sufficient time or energy to either task.
The following standing School Committees were listed in a proposed faculty handbook outline:

Academic Integrity Board
Admissions Committee - Undergraduate
Admissions Committee - Graduate
Coordinators Council
Curriculum Committee
Financial Aid Committee
Grievance Committee
Hotel Ezra Cornell Advisory Committee
Interview Team - Undergraduate
Interview Team - Graduate
Library Committee
Management Intern Committee
Petitions Committee - Undergraduate
Petitions Committee - Graduate
Practice Credit Committee
Space Utilization Committee
Student-Faculty Committee

Again, many of the faculty saw this growth in committees as a necessary result of the School's growth and of the faculty assuming more control. Other, especially long tenured, faculty saw it as unnecessary, but was cooperating to a degree.

The Assistant Dean for Business and Administration had remained in place throughout the entire transition process. In addition to those functions already discussed, that position hired, trained and managed the non-professional (non-exempt/classified) staff. Each
(academic) area had one or more secretaries. They were responsible primarily to their professors who also had input to hiring them. The ADBA prepared their evaluations and generally administered personnel decisions such as intra-mural transfers and problems that might arise with work inequities or dissatisfaction on the part of professors or secretaries.

**Leadership Style**

Dean Beck characterized himself as autocratic or paternalistic. One professor, however, characterized his style as, "Laissez Faire . . . pure-- very rare to run across a pure laissez faire management style. He doesn't know that. He describes himself as paternalistic." A Vice Provost (from the University) commented that, "Beck was a very friendly independent person and he presented that image. . . . Beck always took the occasion whenever he saw me to say, 'Oh my god, here comes someone from the Central Administration.' . . . and it was almost a big joke. I told him when he retired that I was going to become an honorary 'hotelie' and he'd never get rid of me! . . . I think Meek and Beck were of very similar philosophy, very similar style, a very unique kind of Deanship, which I don't think we'll see again [for awhile] . . . [t]heir style was much more-- they would think of themselves as strong leaders; I would characterize them as administrators of a group of individual faculty members. I think the deans of the future are going to have to build effective groups and get faculty making group goals-- and that's what's going on this year at the Hotel School."

Dean Clark characterized his style as an open one. His desire was to make decisions carefully and only after receiving input from
appropriate faculty, administrators and others. He desired to make as few "quick" decisions as possible. He and the whole School were in the process of decentralization with various offices and areas handling their own operations. He viewed his role as a strong force in policy creation and as an insurer of having right persons in key jobs so that this system would work. In terms of tactical decisions, he wanted to handle only exception cases. All matters would first funnel through Area Coordinators or one of the three Deans (or both). The Dean had indicated that, in that sense, he did not want an open-door policy unless the business at hand had first been discussed at another level. He wanted to narrow his span of control as much as possible.

As a point of comparison, one respondent commented, "I think he's less visible than Beck. He's not at coffee every morning from 9:45 until 10:15 -- Beck was. [Sometimes Clark is.] But, . . . instead what he's doing is communicating with the faculty about what he's doing, which Beck didn't do. He'll do it through a memo . . . or faculty meeting." The interviewee continued that Clark related the current state of his business on behalf of the School to the faculty and staff constantly.

Yet, other faculty liked Beck's style better, "I think we are doing too much communication back and forth. Too much information. I think we are doing more smoke than fire, more fluff than substance. In other words, we are paying more attention to the system than to the accomplishment. I want them to do their job; I want them to run the School and I want to teach." This same respondent lamented the growth of the number and use of committees indicating that he/she was
on five committees, "and I don't like committees. Now think of the people who love to spend time blowing smoke up each others' noses on committees. Think if I had volunteered!"

Clearly, style was a matter of preference. From the interviews, it was quite apparent that many of the faculty were ready for the structural and style changes for the reasons indicated earlier.

**Informal Relationships**

For many years, the faculty "... was inbred; they were 'hotelies'. If not graduates of this School, long-term practitioners of this School."

In the late '60's, the School began to hire some non-hotel type faculty. They had their degrees in other academic areas and had no hotel background whatsoever. "I think for a while there, it was the 'hotelie' vs. the 'non-hotelie'. I think a lot of 'non-hotelies' felt like second rate citizens... I think we've come to realize these people have an awful lot to offer, they have different perspectives, they're intelligent people, they can learn the industry, and the needs of the industry and adopt their teaching and their syllabus to meet the needs of our students. They (have) different ideas, and are outsiders looking in; I think, in the long run, it's been good for us. But, I think that the first few people that were hired that way felt to a certain extent, like outcasts."

For the past five years, the "two factions" have blended together until there was, according to respondents, close cohesion among all of the faculty. Many of the faculty have formed a close knit group, "They meet together quite a bit socially outside the building. Too
much so as far as I'm concerned. You go to a party and there are all Hotel faculty there and there are no arts faculty or engineers or merchants from downtown. But they're very close knit." Informal professional relationships within the School, among colleagues, were strong as well-- especially fostered by the coffee hour.

The Graduate Program

The M.S. and Ph. D. portions of the graduate program in the School have existed for years. The Broten Committee suggested a Master of Professional Studies Degree. The purpose had been twofold. First, industry was calling for people with a hotel equivalent of an MBA degree. Secondly, people could not pursue the M.S. at the School without first having had the School's B.S.. Also, the M.S. was an "academic" degree while the M.P.S. was a professional degree.

In 1972, the program had been initiated with a new faculty member who took the position of Graduate Field Representative to coordinate between the graduate school and the Hotel School. This faculty member had administered the program both academically and mechanically throughout the 70's. In 1981, his title had been changed to Graduate Faculty Representative. He was then to be about one-sixth time working on the graduate program, and a new full-time position was created, called MPS Director, who was to administer primarily the mechanics (admissions, records, information, etc.) of the program. The Director was a professional, non-faculty position.

Autonomy

Both Deans Beck and Clark commented on the tremendous amount of autonomy afforded the Hotel School by the University Administration.
Indeed, in discussing admissions, Dean Clark observed that, "The new [University] Dean of Admissions would like to see admissions totally centralized, and I don't think any of the Deans at Cornell would like to see that or would allow that to happen."

The Vice Provost corroborated this autonomous relationship. "My job is to challenge them . . . I see that role as presenting issues to them . . . We have no ability to direct or control . . . I can't threaten Jack Clark or anything. I'm sent over to talk to him, and for an academic, that's an enjoyable way of doing business. And if you can't convince people to do something, maybe it's not as good an idea as you think it is."

The School saw this relationship as enabling them to react to problems, such as curriculum changes for example, quickly, without "red tape". " . . . That's one of the strengths of this School."

One comment was that the School's autonomy was, "almost to the point-- where the joke is we have got to fill in the most around this building . . . that's one of the things we want to do, is have more interaction with the rest of the University."

Florida International
University

Development and Functioning

As outlined in the first part of this chapter, the School of Hospitality Management and the University had begun concurrently in 1972. Dean Lattin had then been Assistant Dean at Cornell. Upon accepting the position of Dean at Florida, the first thing he had done was to hire an Assistant Dean (later to become Associate Dean) Tony Marshall, before ever arriving in Florida.
Lattin had based a good part of the administrative structure upon his experience from Cornell. This, and size had been basic reasons for deciding against a departmental structure.

The two Deans began to staff the program with a particular emphasis on heavily practitioner, professionally oriented faculty. Most of these people had also favored the type of administrative style and structure which developed. They favored (and still did) more of a business model of administration than a traditional academic model.

The underlying philosophy of such a structure according to the Associate Dean was as follows: "... We tried to remove all structures which would inhibit the process of the School growing [which included] red tape and so forth. We decided there are two administrators of the School-- the Dean and the Associate Dean. We will handle all administrative activities and not bother the faculty with it. In return, we will give them a lot of freedom and our job is to facilitate them, and we see it that way-- keep them happy and keep them here; because we've hired good people and we want them to stay." A faculty member commented that, "They give you a job to do, and they let you alone to do it .... Yes, sure I'll tell them what I'm doing, but as far as checking first to see if this is what they want, that's never been necessary."

Departmentalization was seen by all interviewed as completely unnecessary given the size of the faculty. Further, it was viewed as a potential impediment to what the faculty and students saw as a predominately "informal" organizational structure which works well. There was concern that the addition of an administrative layer would abrogate the network of one-to-one and small group relationships which now existed.
The Associate Dean commented that, "We have always felt that departments inhibit growth, and inhibit progress because it's just another layer . . . to go through for decision-making . . . --fast-- . . . There are two administrators; if you need a decision, you come in and we'll give it to you, and we'll give it to you fast." The Dean commented, " . . . What is a department chairman going to do except be on more echelon between the Dean and the faculty. We aren't big enough, in my humble opinion, that we need any more administrators. Basically, we're a teaching organization. So, the most manpower we can put to teaching, the better off we are." Lattin quotes former Dean Meek (Cornell's first Dean) as saying, "If I had committees or department chairmen, we would have been delayed thirty years."

A faculty member commented, "I'm free to do my job in the best possible way I know how. I think if there were layers of authority, somebody would always be questioning the things I'm doing, [e.g.] 'Why wasn't powdered gunk good enough for coffee; why did you order half and half at 19c a pint?' I didn't want that kind of bullshit. I'm used to being given a job to do, and people going away and leaving me alone to do it. If I had department heads, I don't think I'd be here."

Several respondents indicated that, in certain academic areas, there was a need for coordination of faculty teaching schedules, course scheduling, students, etc.. For these reasons, where there were enough faculty teaching in one area, there was a coordinator. The position was quite informal. In the foods area, it was an appointed position but with the accession of the faculty in that area. In the accounting and finance area, it appeared to be an "emerged" position
Figure 5. Florida International University Organization Chart
one that naturally developed with the administrators' approval. In other areas, coordination was done on an ad hoc basis. Coordinators were not compensated extra and usually did not receive release time (but could receive it). Their service was considered in merit recommendations.

Concerning the foods area, the Associate Dean stated that, 
"... We'll [appoint] a coordinator because we would like the three [faculty] to see themselves as co-equal. So, one person will accept the responsibility of the overall unit in terms of, if something's wrong, we'll call them, but we expect the three to work as a team. In other words, we prefer the team approach rather than a boss approach ... [i]t's considered a little bit of an honor to be a coordinator."

The faculty receive broad curricular powers within each academic area. "In other words, they receive a lot of freedom in exchange for us being the administrator."

Likewise, committees and faculty meetings did not play a significant role in the administrative structure of the School. They were viewed by many, both faculty and administration, as unnecessary administrative encumbrances, again, which slowed down decision-making at the expense of the educational mission of the School. The School had one or two faculty meetings per year, with only major [not detailed] agenda items as proposed by the faculty. "... We have generally found ... that the informal structure is so strong here that faculty meetings really produce very little. The real change comes from the informal process of two or three professors who are from one discipline or another wishing to make a change. ..."
Dean Lattin observed that one statement which Cornell's Dean Meek made which had remained with him was that: the success of an organization is in inverse proportion to the number of meetings which they have. Lattin continued, "So, consequently, it's a great occasion when we have a faculty meeting." The only standing committee at the time of the research was the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (whose membership rotated). There had been an ad hoc curriculum committee (supra, the section on - Curriculum and Instruction). Any other time a group was needed, it had informally formed ad hoc, such as for scholarship evaluations.

The Dean conjectured that, "I can see right now that within the next few years, we're going to have more faculty committees doing things. There are a lot of things that I could do up until now that I'm not going to be able to do . . . Right at the moment, I think I'm in the position of being more willing to have a Faculty Admission Committee, and a Faculty Steering Committee, if they want it. I am more willing to let that happen than the faculty is to let it happen. Now that may sound strange coming from the autocrat, but . . . One guy just flat out said, ' . . . don't let the Dean form too many of these damned committees, [or] you've got my resignation. I'm not going to have any part of that.' This is not me resisting this, it's the faculty resisting it."

The Associate Dean is the administrator in charge of non-exempt/classified/non-professional staff. The actual supervision and administration of these personnel was primarily the responsibility of the "staff assistant". She was the ranking classified staff person in the School. She hired, trained, and evaluated the employees. Secretaries
operated in a pool with no area or departmental secretaries. Work was completed on a priority basis, again, with a view to accommodating the faculty as much as possible. Both faculty and secretaries indicated that the system worked fairly well. There was some concern that the pool concept might not prove to be as efficient as the number of faculty and secretaries continued to grow.

Classified staff personnel were guided completely by personnel policies of the University Personnel Department.

**Leadership Style**

The observations made above, concerning organizational structure, departments, area coordinators, committees and faculty/staff authority and responsibility were intricately intertwined with the leadership style of the Dean and Associate Dean. The Dean commented that, "The first day I [ever] had the faculty together, it was around my pool, over on 64th place. I said, 'I want you to understand that you are probably working for the most autocratic/democratic individual in the world!'" This was a difficult statement to understand, yet was collaborated by all those interviewed. Both Deans were highly visible with open-door policies and open receptions of those who go in to see them. A faculty member commented about the Dean, "... he spends a tremendous amount of time just talking to students. He's very visible both to students and to faculty... I think it's one of the things that makes the University great." He went on further to say about the curriculum changes proposal for example, "If you wanted to make any changes, you went in and talked to him about it... As far as democratic [vs. autocratic] goes, everybody gets his chance on
important decisions, to give the Dean some input. He makes the final decision."

Day to day operating decisions were made at the most local level possible, by faculty, staff or even students, if someone else was not available to make an operating decision which would not wait.

The Associate Dean characterized both the Dean and himself as, "benevolent autocrats-- who listen to our people-- but it's an informal structure, and we rarely make decisions without lots of private, informal consultation. On the surface autocratic . . . we will get involved with the budget . . . and so forth. But look, your job is to teach . . . now in exchange we will give you the ultimate freedom, support you in every way possible-- we are facilitators . . . If you become a totally democratic School, then you cannot hold a Dean or Associate Dean responsible for the total outcome of the School, because, after all, you all are involved in this democratic process, which is slow, cumbersome, and oftentimes conducive to no change . . . " He further commented however, that the check on all of this was first that the leaders should be fired if there is dissatisfaction. "Now this faculty could overturn us in a second if they wish to . . . the faculty gives us the grace to be autocrats so long as they think we are making the right decisions. And the minute they don't, they can get together and go to the President and get our asses fired."

In discussing the process by which input was made as it related to leadership style, it was observed by the Associate Dean that, " . . . the [Dean's] door is always open, my door is always open, there's a coffee pot always brewing-- you can come in any time." When big decisions are being made, "Some of the senior faculty members
and the affected folks . . . would be called in and we would have a discussion-- it would not be a formal meeting-- it would be a discussion-- in his office with coffee."

A faculty member collaborated this style by observing that, "We're such a small faculty and there is such a personal relationship with all of us that the Dean, in addition to the committee, talks to individuals and also many of us feel free to walk in at any time to discuss anything with him or the Associate Dean."

The Associate Dean summarized the structure well: "If you're talking about how many paper clips you're going to buy this year, it would be totally centralized. If you're talking about change within the various segments of the program, there's a lot of freedom down there -- so they would see it as decentralized, I think." And, the faculty did view it this way. He commented further, however, that, " . . . even though they may be centralized in terms of getting paper clips, you're never going to question why they need those paper clips either."

**Informal Relationships**

"The informal relationships are the true governing body of this School . . . We encourage this to the nth degree-- the more informal change, the better." The informal relationships occur primarily within the professional milieu. "There is great harmony within the School, based on the respect that their [faculty] profession and their skills and the credibility have within it." As discussed above on departments and committees, this informal network of one-on-one and small group relationships appeared to accomplish the same ends,
especially communications, which committees, departments and votes might have done in other, more formally structured organizations.

Social aspects of the informal organization were limited and low key. Many of the faculty were heavily involved in outside activities and had full schedules. Outside social contact was quite spontaneous, and would take place primarily at occasional student events.

**Graduate Program**

The graduate program centered primarily around those (graduate) courses in the curriculum. Graduate students were advised by the Dean and by the faculty internship coordinator discussed earlier. Administration of the program was not highly structured and was performed in great measure by the Dean's Office.

**Autonomy**

Very little of the organizational structure of the School was dictated by the University. The School has had to coordinate with University Administration on budget and finance, admissions, and promotion and tenure. Internally, the School could organize as it pleased.

The Dean made an acute observation, "... This Hotel School had one advantage that no other School ever had. That is we started the same day the University started... Hell, any time you start even with them, you know you got them beat before you even start. But, that's one advantage Jerry [Vallen] didn't have at [Las] Vegas, Meek didn't have it [at Cornell]. Nobody had it." He was referring to the fact that while Cornell and Las Vegas have autonomous Schools,
they both began as sub-units. Recall that Cornell had been founded in Home Economics and Las Vegas had been founded in the College of Business and Economics. Houston had begun as an autonomous unit, but the University itself was already over sixty years old. The Dean's remark here was meant to convey the notion that, in his opinion, because hotel schools (especially theirs) were composed of so many professional faculty and so many spirited students and were very purposive, they can easily occupy a position of predominance on the campus. Indeed, when the University needed an Acting President, they had asked him. There was only one other University administrator who had been on the campus as long as he.

He further noted that, "I honestly believe that we are treated differently from other divisions of the University. We've probably got more autonomy and are almost an entity unto ourselves . . . I guarantee you that we have more freedom, more autonomy to do what we want to do . . . I think the University has decided that since we create so damned few problems for them . . . and with Tony [Associate Dean Marshall] in there, our budget comes right in on the button. Why should they interfere? So we're really way toward the decentralized [relative to the University]."

In this same respect, the Dean believed that he dealt with University offices at the lowest administrative levels possible. He dealt with the Vice President only when necessary. "But so many Deans (on campus) run over to the administration . . . , 'What do you think of this, how about this?' We've stayed away from that; so the political climate per se . . . petty policies . . . I stay away from it. I don't need that. We've had beautiful support from the President."
In discussing an item such as curriculum change, however, he noted (politically shrewdly) that the trend for change has been right and, "We'll switch things around. Nobody's going to give me any argument on it now. I didn't even ask for permission. I probably violated sixteen rules of the bureaucratic University. But there's one thing . . . as far as style or whatever, you never go ask, 'May I?'." Thus, as the executive of an autonomous body, he noted, "I still think my role is to protect them (faculty and students) from a whole bunch of bureaucratic crap that takes place on the campus and comes flowing here. The less they have to be concerned about, I think the better off they are. They can concentrate on doing the things they should be doing. Teaching the students, upgrading their courses, out into industry and back again. So, I'm almost an insulation between them and top administration." Both he and the Associate Dean added that a major role for them was to see to it that the School's support services from the University were adequately maintained and helpful rather than hindering to the School. This was especially so with the University Admissions Office, seen as so critical to the School. The Dean worked closely with them and exerted influence to be sure they understood and executed the School's policy toward transfer students and the desire to accept as many of their previous credits as possible.

Finally, he concluded that being autonomous had meant, "almost everything. There's no way we could have the curriculum that we have. We probably would not have the faculty members we have now, if we were in that traditional mold where I had to report to a Dean of business or any of those. Strangely enough, I think those are our
two greatest strengths (faculty and curriculum) . . . look at my faculty. I know you all live under the Ph. D. blanket very much out there [in Las Vegas]."

University of Houston

Development and Functioning

As the physical facilities for the College neared completion in 1975, the Dean had begun to expand the administrative staff. He had been Dean of the Downtown College for several years. He was named Dean of Continuing Education and the Hilton School of Hotel and Restaurant Management. (Later re-named "College"). He had had an Assistant Dean for Continuing Education who had been primarily responsible for operations and an Associate Dean of Continuing Education who had been responsible for programming. In addition, the hotel manager and food service manager had reported to the Dean. Just prior to moving into the new facility in 1975, the Assistant Dean of Continuing Education had also been named Assistant Dean of the Hotel School, in addition to the then standing Assistant Dean of the School. Apparently this had been primarily in order to partially fund him out of the Hotel College.

In 1979, an unfortunate incident had occurred. The Assistant Dean of Continuing Education had been accused of embezzling funds. He then committed suicide. Within a few months, by September of 1979, the University had made organizational changes. The College had been administratively separated from Continuing Education, so that the Dean had had administrative control over only the College at that point. Continuing Education had been split into two administrative areas. A
The manager of the Continuing Education Center had been appointed, in charge of all the physical facilities. (See Faculty and Staff -- University of Houston -- supra) He had reported to the Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs. Also, a Director of Continuing Education had been appointed in charge of Program Development and Management. He reported to the Provost. Of course, the College Dean reported to the Provost as well.

It appeared that the incident with the Assistant Dean of Continuing Education had precipitated these changes. One interviewee observed that, "... the administration of the University decided that was too much power for one person [to be Dean of both C.E. and H.R.M.]."

Previous to the split, the C.E. Center and Hotel had served as a practice laboratory for the College's scholarship students (other students were and are hired for pay as well). Both C.E. and H.R.M. had fed off each other in terms of facilities and operations. Indeed, Dean Taylor commented that, "We felt that in time, some faculty person would take it over (the Hotel) and be totally responsible for it. ... including the food service ... a special person specifically hired for that job."

Subsequent to the split, the students have not worked in the Hotel facility as part of the College's program (although they did individually). One respondent commented that, "When it split, we couldn't ask them to work ... because we couldn't supervise them."

Scholarship students had been working in the Hotel 10 hours per week.
Several respondents from both the C.E. Center and the College, commented that after a new Dean was hired, it would be hoped that some new relationship could be established between the two entities. Indeed, the University planned on studying the entire situation and how to resolve it.

After the split, the administrative structure in the College had consisted of the Dean with an Administrative Assistant, the Associate Dean, an Admissions' Analyst, the faculty, a full-time secretary, two part-time secretaries and teaching assistants. The Dean reported to the Provost.

In 1981, Dean Taylor had retired. Dr. Doug Keister had been appointed Acting Dean. The Dean search was in progress at the time of this study.

Faculty meetings fell into two categories. The faculty met with the Associate Dean once or twice a month at a scheduled meeting. The Dean had been advised of, but never attended one of these meetings. Additionally, there had usually been one meeting per semester with the Dean, the Associate Dean and the faculty. Meetings sometimes had formal agendas, and sometimes not.

As discussed earlier concerning the curriculum (Supra,-- Curriculum and Instruction-- University of Houston), work that might be discussed or performed by internal, College committees in a larger school, was done by the entire faculty-- a committee of the whole, because the faculty was so small. In some instances, such work was performed by individual faculty members such as the placement report

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\text{It was established that the Acting Dean would not be a candidate for the Deanship.}\]
by one faculty member, or the six year plan written by the Associate Dean, and approved by the Dean. While each faculty member had one or more areas of specialty, there certainly was no departmental organization: the faculty was far too small.

The non-exempt/classified staff reported to the Associate Dean.

Faculty gave work to the full-time secretary who in turn attempted to distribute it equitably among the two part-timers and herself. These secretaries and the Admissions' Analyst met with the Associate Dean at a monthly scheduled meeting.

The Assistant to the Dean was a professional/non-faculty position who reported directly to the Dean, and was responsible for the details of budget and finance in addition to screening people and items coming to the Dean.

Leadership Style

In this case, the interview data were quite ambiguous in this area. Several interviewees either found it difficult to adequately express themselves (get a handle on their observations, experiences and feelings) or were reluctant to do so. Of course the Dean was already gone during the time of this research. The Acting Dean appeared to be titular and short term.

The former Dean commented that, "I think I would like to think that I have created an atmosphere of strong expectations, and a realization on the part of the faculty and even students, that we have things to do and places to go. At the same time, I gave a

\[13\] It was noted that the six year plan should have had input from all faculty, but there had not been enough time to do so.

\[14\] N.B., the Acting Dean was hospitalized during the research visit. A telephone interview was conducted with the former Dean.
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loose reign to give everyone an opportunity to develop their own capabilities and any expertise that we hoped to take advantage of."

There seemed to be a consensus that the Dean had taken responsibility for public relations, fund raising, and student financial aid, while the daily, operational aspects of the other functions had been left to the Associate Dean. The Dean's office was in another wing of the building, removed from the College. One faculty member observed that the former Dean had been more visible to the students than to the faculty. "Again, part of that was too-- our offices are in this wing-- he was in the other wing. So, therefore, if the faculty needed to talk with him, he was available, but he wouldn't come around soliciting." When asked if faculty went to see him very often, he answered, "I can only speak for myself; when I needed to see him, I'd call and make an appointment."

In discussing the externship program, one faculty member commented that, "... it was something the Dean held very close... with his own little staff-- you know it used to be them against us; with real bifurcation from the second and first floors."

Another respondent characterized the Dean's style as paternalistic and autocratic. "You sensed this paternalistic attitude... even though it was very autocratic. But he was the father figure, he knew best, and 'Let Dad take care of it.' and everything will be allright."

Apparently, on some daily operational items, the Dean had liked to make decisions himself; curriculum was one area that, according to one faculty, he had been reticent to change. If an operational decision didn't interfere with what he considered
important, he would let the faculty do as they pleased, or not act at all. The same respondent who made these comments, however, noted that on long-range, strategic decisions, the Dean had made a point of getting written and verbal input from all the faculty. Others collaborated that he had polled the faculty on strategic issues. Indeed, one commented that in preparing the Hilton proposal, "Now that was the best I saw him operate. He got input from everybody via memo, and tried to incorporate everything that everybody had into that proposal."

**Informal Relationships**

There was a weekly coffee hour where students and faculty gathered to converse.

Since the faculty was so small, people saw each other often, but there was not a great deal of time to carry on the informal, professional relationship that some would like to have because of demanding and conflicting class schedules. Some of the informal, professional relationships were developed on consulting trips.

Socially, there was not a great deal of informal activity. Again, the faculty attended alumni and student functions and did carry on some relationships there.

**Graduate Program**

There was no graduate program at the time of this research. One has been discussed in conjunction with long-range planning.

**Autonomy**

At the College's inception, there had been a great deal of decentralization at the University. The Deans had been rather long tenured, and had built many of the programs with the former President
apparently this "network" of Deans and President had been fairly informal. Deans had great autonomy during that period of growth (60's and 70's). Administrators, including the President, had changed and the pendulum swung to a considerably more centralized orientation of the University administration toward the Schools and Colleges. After the Assistant Dean's incident and subsequent split in 1979, the University administration apparently had attempted to exert even more control over the College. The Dean and some others had been irritated by this, while others thought it gave "more definition to the organizational structure".

The Associate Dean commented that staff services from the University were good, but that there had been problems with Admissions, as discussed earlier. (Supra, **Students-- University of Houston**)

There has been some discussion of doing some of that function in the College if more funds (from Hilton) became available.

Dean Taylor commented that, "... to talk to Dean Meek [founding, Cornell], I spent many hours with him discussing what brought the Cornell program into being and how he felt about it. I cherish those discussions greatly. He had a tremendous influence on my wanting to go on and do it. He was one of those that I would say resulted in my feeling that we had to be independent, and have our own program. But he felt very strongly about that, and to give our own degree; ... in talking with Dean Meek, he felt like that if we were going to truly serve the hospitality industry, we had to have the freedom to be able to devise our own curriculum and put the emphasis where we felt it was significant to the specialty of the hospitality industry. And, not be dictated to and controlled by the American Collegiate School of
Business standards or desires. If we didn't do that, we'd never have the kinds of programs that would truly fulfill what he felt was the goal of the hospitality industry, which is unique within itself. The educators that chose this route chose this as their dictum." He concluded that, "... we ... have great respect for them because Cornell led the way. It would have been tough without them ... very difficult."

The Provost observed that, "I always think, having been a Dean myself, that the opportunity to grow, the opportunity to develop, the opportunity to become imaginative and creative is always going to be somewhat, if not stifled, inhibited by being within a host organization. I mean, business has certain foci and for a Director, say of a school within a college of business, if that's the way it works -- there would have to be some built in inhibitions. So, I think autonomy is essential in this operation."

Summary and Observations

The most striking observation which could be made concerning administrative structure was that all of the three institutions appeared to be profoundly affected by the philosophy of Dean Meek, and to a degree, Dean Beck of Cornell.

To be sure, one would expect many of the reactions concerning autonomy, since autonomy was the independent variable used to select the program for study. Yet, the unequivocal reaction on the part of all, including the University administrators on the importance of autonomy for the programs was clear and certain.
Cornell had begun as a department in another academic unit. It had grown slowly and eventually had become autonomous. The faculty had evolved from a small group of people with Dean Meek as the chief executive, to a larger group with Dean Beck fulfilling much the same role. This same pattern existed strongly at Florida; the faculty, largely professional (versus academic) and practitioner oriented, gave the Deans the power to care for administrative detail, while, they, the faculty taught and consulted. The policy-making and decision-making process, especially at Cornell and Florida, involved and were greatly dependent upon the informal organization and the network of one-to-one and small group relationships among the faculty and between the faculty and the Deans or their assistants. The Deans received input in order to make final decisions. Formal faculty meetings generally involved curricular policy and not the day-to-day operations of the schools.

When the Deans had not been in constant touch with the faculty, such as in the case of Beck, the Assistant was. Thus, while there was no formal democratic or committee process, there was a very open conduit and link between faculty and administration directly, without department heads.

In the case of Dean Beck, the link, in the form of the Associate Dean had been removed when that person stepped down. This, in combination with a cadre of new, traditionally more academically oriented faculty members, and a growing size appeared to have caused dissatisfaction with the informal input type arrangement. The style subsequent to Dean Beck's departure was in a significant state of change.
Committees have been established and administrative, academic areas more clearly defined.

Florida still thrived on the former style. Houston was arranged this way to an extent, but there appeared not to have been as strong an informal input link between the Dean and the faculty as was needed to function. He retired. The follow-up since then was commented upon later in this study.

While every one of these administrators characterized themselves (or were characterized) as autocrats or paternalistic autocrats, such descriptions were modified (by themselves, faculty and students) to indicate that input could be given on decisions which affected the others. Such input would appear to be crucial for this "autocratic" style to function. Indeed, a pattern emerged which suggested that a more appropriate term for the style might be "collegial autocracy". It was not as purely democratic as a clearly traditional academic department might be, nor was it as laissez faire as a pure professional research organization might be, nor was it as autocratic or even as paternalistic as a business (for profit) organization such as a hotel might be. There was further discussion of collegial autocracy in the section-- Finance and Resource Allocation.

At all three hotel schools, there seemed to be an administrative concern for the admissions function. This was seen as a primary area both insofar as the overall relationship with students was concerned and insofar as the organizational and administrative cares of the Deans were concerned. At Cornell, much of the function was housed within the School (except for initial and final processing). At Florida, the School had worked closely with the University to coordinate the
admissions function, especially the criteria between the two. At Houston, there was a desire to more closely coordinate with the University Admission’s Office.

With University staff in general, a progressive pattern could be observed among the three programs. Cornell used the University staff the least, Florida more, and Houston the most. This also happened to be the order of size (in faculty) of the three programs respectively. It could be possible that size may be related to the number of services which are contained within the program versus those which come from the University staff.

None of the three programs were able to find (nor did they rely upon) self-appraisal reports prepared in conjunction with University accrediting processes, even though all three had been through the process. All of the programs had, however, prepared self-appraisal reports on items such as curriculum, placement, and future plans, and were using these reports as guides.
CHAPTER 5
ANCILLARY DATA

Introduction

While on each campus, the researcher collected data additional to that described on the questionnaire.

At the end of the second (in some cases, third) session with the Associate or Assistant Dean, upon completion of the entire questionnaire with him, the questions were posed: "Do you have anything more that you would like to add which might not have been covered in the questionnaire?" "Is there some area which has not been addressed?" "Is there something else you would like to say?"

Usually at or near the end of the research visit at each campus, a session was held with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, or his equivalent. The following questions were asked of each of these persons: "What role do you see the Hotel School occupying at this University?" "What role or relationship do you see for yourself with the Hotel School?" The responses to these questions were broad. Beyond posing these questions, the interviewer was relatively non-directive with the respondents, asking only an occasional probe question.
Cornell University

Dr. Rainsford at Cornell suggested that more information could have been elicited concerning research and its function within the Hotel School. He suggested that research has not had a high priority in hotel schools because the faculty have been more practitioner-oriented rather than academically oriented. Further, faculty have been rewarded primarily for teaching and sharing in administrative tasks rather than for research. The criterion used in evaluating faculty activity has been an evaluation of the return which would accrue to the School (especially monetarily). Research may not yield such returns and would often not be measurable in that way.

These attitudes were further reinforced by various hospitality industry companies. Very few of them conduct long-range research and development. "Hoteliers are practitioners, and there is no place in the balance sheet that says, 'Net result from research and development'. I think it's going to take time. We need to reward faculty for doing the research. And I think we have here (at this School) a mentality that will reward research." He observed that this would be increasingly so because of the greater mix of "academically" oriented faculty among the "practitioner"-oriented faculty.

A second area which the Assistant Dean suggested be questioned was the relationship of a Hotel program to other Hotel programs. "... I think we have a lot to offer; the other hospitality education programs have a lot to offer us. I think there needs to be more
cooperation among the programs. . . . I think there is no reason why
the four-year institutions can't get some exchange programs going with
faculty." And finally, he commented that "... the four-year schools
that are separate colleges have an edge over the ones that are
departments."

Florida International University (F.I.U.)

The Associate Dean, Marshall, here amplified on the process
element of appraisal and evaluation. His observation was that in
the normal course of affairs, a hotel school does not (and should not)
have formal evaluation procedures on a scheduled basis. His con­
tention was that evaluation is an ongoing process and is linked to
what the ideal situation would be concerning whatever is being
evaluated.

I think the most important thing for any hotel school
to do is ask two questions. They are the two most
important questions of all even though they seem simplistic.
The questions are basically this. If you had an ideal
hotel school, 1. How would you know it? and 2. What
would be happening? You can ask these questions relating
to any particular part of any particular hotel school.
. . . You don't go by management by objective, because
then you just set the objectives low enough so that you
can meet them. . . . As long as you're heading toward
the ideal, you know you're heading in the right direction
--the hell with time frames, the hell with what you're
doing to get there--all you have to know is that if
that's the ideal and you're not getting closer to it
then change the method. It's a non-fault finding con­
cept. . . . It's free, it's easy, it's not costly in
terms of people because you're never blaming anybody
for anything; you're blaming the system and you change
that frequently.
He suggested that measures of evaluation should include things such as: from how wide an area are students attracted; do faculty want to teach there; is there a high rate of job placement, etc.?

He also commented on autonomous schools in his summation.

I must tell you that I think the only good ones are the autonomous ones. I'll tell you why. You develop an arrogance. In other words, if you are a school separated, distinct with your own individual funding, then you have the right to become arrogant about the program in the sense that you want it to be damned good and you're responsible for it. If you are a school, then you can have a school identity—a student identity within the school which you can never get with a program within a business school. When you are a program within a business school, you are now competing with accounting, you are now competing with every damned thing in the world. And it's very difficult, I think, to get students to identify and develop spirit when we're talking about simply a department. Nor do you have the power and the authority under the University structure to get the appropriate funding, because generally, there are so many bureaucratic steps to go through for that funding that you are literally worn out going through the process or that you just can't achieve your ends. Now, when you're in a school and you've got a Dean and that Dean sits with the other Deans, you're at the top of the pile, where the allocations come down.

He concluded by stating that hotel schools which are departments or programs in a large academic unit "are stymied and stifled by the bureaucratic process directly related to funding and partially related to spirit and enthusiasm within the departmental level. I just don't think it happens."

University of Houston

Associate Dean Rappole at Houston suggested that the questionnaire should focus more keenly on gathering data to compare full-time equivalent teaching hours and student numbers in order to compare these statistics among the programs.
He further made observations on faculty recruiting and retention. In his opinion, there were problems in this area for some hotel schools. Getting the proper mix of faculty with academic credentials and experience with the resources available was difficult. While he commented that Cornell might need a better mixture of "outside" people on the faculty (which they were doing at the time of the research), he stated:

I'll tell you why Cornell is going to stay successful, because they develop their own. They may be myopic in some ways, but they still have an excellent fundamental education, and they can develop their own; they've got the system established. They're still hurting, they're still crying for people. But, at least, they've got a nucleus from which to work that they can pretty well self-perpetuate.

Additional Comments by University Administrators

Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education Palmer prefaced his remarks by stating that Cornell had as its unique mission to offer general as well as professional educational opportunities at the undergraduate level; thus the School of Hotel Administration was

... an important part of the professional undergraduate education on campus [and] ... it also provides for the University a world-wide reputation—there's no question about that, it's one of our most renowned Schools, along with our Agriculture School, around the world. It allows for us to fulfill our land-grant mission. ... We're the only Ivy League School which is a land-grant University. We're the only private land-grant University in the country.

Palmer saw the School's role increasingly to be a leader among the academic community of hotel schools, departments and programs around the country and the world. "It is becoming the trainer at the graduate level for educators in this field. ... I think we are
going to be a School of the tradition of the major research institution, of helping to shape and revamp hospitality education; I think we're going to be very instrumental in that."

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the Deans at Cornell were afforded a great deal of autonomy. The University administration coordinated, recommended, urged and coaxed, but did not dictate to the Deans, especially those in the professional schools. They listened to the problems which the Schools wanted to discuss. Their role was thus, at times, reactive but also "a proactive role of presenting issues to them . . . my job is to challenge them."

The Vice-Provost saw the thrust for the Hotel School developing in two ways. First, more emphasis might be placed on doing research. "The consulting contracts are nice for the individual faculty member, but they don't add to the institution what a research contract brings."

An interesting note here is that, as indicated in earlier in this chapter, Assistant Dean Rainsford also felt there was a need to do more traditional research in addition to teaching, consulting and offering seminars. The Assistant Dean, however, questioned the efficacy of securing research funds from hospitality companies, while the Vice-Provost did not address that issue.

**Florida International University**

Vice-President for Academic Affairs Altman saw a role for the School to

. . . provide education and training for people to assume positions of leadership in the industry--it would be the industry nationally and internationally rather than just
looking over to Miami Beach. We expect our graduates to carry our good name... and be able to apply professional characteristics to their work to advance the state of management in the industries. ...[t]he program has been designated as one of our programs of emphasis... and is receiving quality improvement, funding, and has, as a result of that, a very central place in the University's plan, the University's mission. We speak often about our urban professions and this is probably one of them.

The Vice-President saw his role involving planning, control and coordination with the Deans of the Schools. He also saw a facilitating role for himself, especially concerning outside community forces and the School. In some cases, he might buffer the School from outside forces, while in others he might present the School with good ideas or demands which came forth from the community. He saw himself for all intents and purposes as the University's check on faculty personnel decisions concerning promotion and tenure.

Concerning research, Altman commented that

... there is the regular debate that you get at any University. Should there be more research, hard research, publications and the like? It continues here as well. But it's hard to ignore, really, the dramatic impact that the faculty makes on the industry. They're contributing in every way that I can imagine. As long as it continues, then I'm going to be satisfied with their performance... somebody who is teaching only, is not doing enough. It's a University, it's not a trade school. There have to be other professional contributions. The forms which those take can be varied. I don't have difficulty with that. I do expect some form of external, objective evaluation. I expect some public rendering of whatever it is. But it doesn't have to be in the "Journal of Zippidy Doo," it doesn't have to be a text book. It doesn't have to be a variety of the more traditional scholarly measures that are used in other professional schools.

Finally, the Vice-President characterized his daily function as being involved with the Dean on an exception basis only concerning problems or dilemmas which might arise.
Vice-Provost Makar characterized the College as one of the less well developed or accepted professional schools on the campus. First of all, many members of the faculty and the administration would not perceive Hotel and Restaurant Management as a fully developed profession. It is an industry in the process of evolution and rather rapid change; an industry more viewed as an industry than as a professional body.

When probed further, he responded that a professional school such as Pharmacy has a more active research component. He compared Hotel Administration to the School of Social Work where it is not evolved to the degree or the level or terms of stature or prestige or a theoretical base or research base that, say, other professions have, like law, and medicine, and pharmacy. So that puts the Hotel and Restaurant Management College, in some ways, in a fairly difficult position on the campus because it is not one of the prestige units on the campus.

Yet, he indicated that he saw the industry developing and that the College had access to resources, especially financial and especially from Hilton, to develop itself and all the things such as research and a theoretical base and the faculty to do it. He saw the role of the College in the community as part of an urban institution. Further, he stated: "From the University's perspective, our objective is to see to it that the College moves beyond a local, state orientation to more of a national orientation."

With increased funding and a new Dean on board, the Vice-Provost saw the College developing an increasingly academically oriented program while maintaining ties with the industry. "You have to reconcile the profession with the values and expectations of the academy." For example, he suggested:
I would continue pushing the Dean. And I will do this with the new Dean, toward increasing the number of . . . terminal (doctoral) degree appointments, people who have the academic background and the tools that enable them to carry out what is considered the scholarship role as well as the teaching role. There's a loss in that—and that's a service relationship loss. These are not going to be people who have had a lot of immersion in the industry . . . I think that is something we have to reconcile, but that's a choice I think you have to make.

He proposed looking for some faculty "who already bring to the institution a national reputation and stature." He summarized the future role for the College as follows: "The goal is to make this College into one of the finest in the country. And I think we can do than, between private support and state support in that combination, we could do it."

The Vice-Provost saw his role as the direct-line officer responsible for the Hotel College and all other academic units on campus. He was to insure quality performance and efficiency relative to faculty appointments, promotions and tenure, to budget use and set academic policies. "It's a fairly formal direct role . . . but [t]here is a facilitating, supporting, encouraging . . . positive, constructive role. It is my responsibility to do what I can to insure that the College meets its own goals and objectives."

In order to fulfill the roles he saw in the College's future, the Vice-Provost intended to exercise

. . . increasingly careful and vigorous scrutiny of their academic program . . . of their major appointments, of their policies in relation to promotion and tenure, of their expectations of their faculty members in terms of a scholarly thrust as well as a teaching and service thrust. . . . You have to somehow reconcile the profession where it is . . . with the values and expectations of the academy.
Summary and Observations

Each of the Assistant or Associate Deans was interviewed through the entire questionnaire. All of them indicated that the questionnaire covered completely the functions and processes which were part of the administration and operation of a School or College of Hotel and Restaurant Administration; however, there were some exceptions to this.

One respondent felt a need to add further questions concerning faculty research and the role it plays in the program.

A second respondent suggested that more information should be elicited concerning faculty teaching and student ratio statistics in order to provide a more complete mise en scène for understanding the particular program itself and compared with others.

A third respondent suggested that to ask about the planning and evaluation processes in each of the seven functional areas was rather specious. The processes of evaluation and planning were ongoing rather than isolated in the actual operation of the program. Instead, he suggested that the question, especially for evaluation, should revolve around two basic questions concerning the ideal: If you had the ideal, what would be happening and how would you know it?

All three of the university administrators interviewed saw a role for themselves in the hotel schools, but from rather differing views. The Vice-Provost at Cornell conceived his role primarily as a listening, facilitating, suggesting relationship with the School, rather than a controlling relationship. The Vice-President at Florida viewed his role as the university link with the School,
especially as an academic leader in relation to planning and control with all of the academic units on campus. He summed up his daily involvement by indicating that it was on an exception basis only, with the Dean being the primary daily operating officer.

The Vice-Provost at Houston viewed his role as a very direct one with the College which had an acting Dean at the time of the research. He was the direct-line officer ultimately responsible for the College.

All three administrators saw the hotel schools on their respective campuses as important to the overall educational mission of the campus, especially in educating professionals in a national or international rather than purely a local setting. Both Cornell and Florida viewed this as a fait accompli, although they both saw a need for further development. Houston saw it as a desired goal.

There was a distinctly similar pattern of philosophy in one area among all three administrators. To one degree or another, they deemed a movement by the School's faculties toward more research and "traditional scholarly behavior" as necessary. They viewed the Schools from an academic rather than from a professional point of view.

Their interpretations of the manner in which this philosophy would manifest itself were, however, quite different. Two of the administrators viewed almost any type of creative expression as significant, including articles, books, lectures, seminars, and certain consulting. The third administrator indicated that he would like to see traditional research and (journal article) publication constitute a major portion of faculty scholarly activity.
CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose
The purpose of this study was to identify and select a model for the analysis of autonomous schools of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional (HRI) Administration.

Problem
The problem of the study was to ascertain what patterns of structure and characteristics emerge from an analysis of programs at three selected institutions.

Results from investigation of these questions should be helpful to the designers of new programs, to all those involved in continuing programs and to all of those engaged in HRI education research. This study has developed a framework and guide with which to examine the programs in the university setting. The centerpiece of rationale for a study such as this one is that planners will increasingly want to search out different approaches to common problems.

Literature Review
The literature of HRI education, related organizational theory and related higher education administration was reviewed. While in-depth, comparative organizational studies have been performed in other areas of education, none existed, nor did a framework exist,
for such a study for HRI administration education. Studies of programs in other professional areas of higher education such as nursing, engineering and pharmacy provided background and guidance for the study undertaken herein.

Methodology

Both positivist and direct (descriptive, exploratory) approaches to research were examined. Positivist approaches to research were most useful in some circumstances where the research paradigm was highly structured and a variable or two were to be isolated, quantified and statistically tested within the framework of some hypothesis.

Alternately, direct, descriptive research lent itself well to understanding organizations more holistically. This was especially useful in attempting to build organizational paradigms where they were emerging or non-existent. This type of research could be systematic and structured and lent itself to understanding complex relationships, to building models and to generating hypotheses.

This study used the direct approach, expressed specifically in a matrix of functional areas and process elements of HRI administration education. The matrix was based upon the taxonomy developed by Campbell (8, 1976) for public school administration and upon his interpretation of classical management theory to identify the process elements needed, by which the functional or operational areas were administered. The resulting matrix appeared as Exhibit I (Supra, p. 47). An interview questionnaire was then developed based upon the matrix and was administered to administrators, faculty and
students at three of the four autonomous HRI programs in the United States. Descriptions were made of the findings based upon the interviews, upon document search and upon observation. Each program was described and analyzed by functional area. The three programs were then compared by functional area for organizational and operational patterns or lack thereof. Additionally, certain interviewees were asked to assess the adequacy of the matrix and the interview guide for describing and analyzing HRI university programs.

Major Findings

A comparative study of the history and development of all three schools revealed that all three in some way were heavily influenced by the philosophy of Dean Meek (founding Dean at Cornell) and that the other two programs were indirectly influenced by Cornell. In the case of Florida, Dean Lattin came there from Cornell where he had been Assistant Dean. In the case of Houston, conversations with Cornell's Dean Beck and with Cornell alumni influenced the design of the program, and the Associate Dean was a Cornellian. Indeed, some at Cornell spoke of it as having as one of its major roles to train the HRI educators.

Conclusions

* Interviewees at all three schools saw autonomy within the host institution as crucial to the operation of their programs. This view could be expected, however, since autonomy was the independent variable used to select the programs for study.
The following paragraphs were arranged by operation area of administration, as was Chapter 4 of this study. First, a summary of findings and then conclusions were given for each area. This was followed by a section on general observations and recommendations.

**Alumni - Industry Relations**

1. This area was seen as critical to the goals, objectives and operation of all three schools.

2. Included in this functional area were the sub-areas of corporate recruiting, alumni relations and industry relations. A pattern emerged among these sub-areas. The administration of corporate recruiting was the most structured, alumni relations less structured, and industry relations the least structured. This pattern might be due to the decreasing tangibility of corporate recruiting, alumni relations and industry relations, in that order. In addition, the objectives of corporate recruiting were clear and immediate, while with industry relations, at the other end of the scale, the objectives were more long-term and hazy.

3. Cornell was the most well-developed of the three in terms of a strong alumni network and public image. Undoubtedly, this was due to its age, as well as the prominent position it has occupied.

4. Houston was the only program which did not house corporate recruiting entirely within the College. There was great attention being paid, however, to strengthening the communications with the University's corporate recruitment office and perhaps move some of the functions to the College.
Conclusion

* Alumni relations and an alumni network appeared to be crucial to these and perhaps all HRI programs because of the professional nature of the education.

* Corporate recruiting was critical inasmuch as placement of students was a major goal of these professional schools. Indeed, some have suggested that student placement was an excellent measure of effectiveness or success of an HRI program; thus, risks should not be taken which would impair the mechanics of the recruitment process.

Curriculum and Instruction

1. Faculty involvement with curriculum development was high at all three schools.

2. In each case, the initial curriculum was formulated, primarily by the founding program head with some inputs from industry and the host institution.

3. Cornell's and other curricula served as a guideline for the initial curricula at Houston and F.I.U. (It might be noted that some curricular design decisions may have been as a reaction to certain courses in the Cornell curriculum.)

4. The process of curricular change and development has been informal within all three programs. Ad hoc groups would be formed when a specific evaluation or change needed to be done—and this after considerable informal discussions. Only recently, Cornell has empaneled an ongoing, formal curriculum committee.

5. Both Houston and Florida have made significant curriculum revisions, even though they are relatively young programs.
6. A tremendous difference existed in the process of host institution approval. Houston and F.I.U. were public institutions with an administrative structure and philosophy consistent with public (especially state) universities. Curricular decisions originated in the academic unit, but must have been approved and sometimes negotiated within a university curriculum committee. Cornell, on the other hand, was private, "ivy league," and rather unique in its attitude toward the academic units, especially those which were professional, and privately endowed. Rather than getting approval from a university curriculum committee, the School's Dean simply notified the University administration that a change was being made.

7. A distinct difference also existed in the proportion of the total curriculum taught within each program. At Cornell, almost the entire curriculum, including general courses such as psychology, communications, and economics, was taught within the School. At F.I.U. and Houston, most of the general education and many of the business courses were taught to HRI students by other academic units on campus.

8. All three schools perceived it as important to provide faculty with material resources in an unhesitating fashion within their means.

9. All three programs conducted some sort of internship programs. Florida's program was the most expansive. Cornell is in an awkward geographic location for an encompassing program, while Houston has had administrative difficulty and was in administrative transition relative to the program.
10. All three schools have an 800-hour, non-credit work requirement of all students.

Conclusions

* Cornell was 35 to 40 years older than the other two programs. Its curriculum heavily influenced new programs. It was also considerably larger in terms of faculty and number of course offerings. That program has, only in the past couple of years, put in place a rather formal curriculum review and change process and committee. It would be reasonable to expect that the others may find themselves doing likewise as they develop similar conditions.

* Over the years, Cornell taught more courses within the hotel school as the faculty deemed that HRI students' needs were not met in other parts of the University. Houston, conversely, with such a small faculty, was barely able to cover the required HRI courses with its current complement of full-time faculty. Florida struck a balance in between. Their attitude was that they would teach a course in the School if it were not being adequately done by other units.

It appeared difficult to determine what was adequate and, for example, just how far a foreign language department should go in designing a course for and catering specifically to HRI students. At Houston, precisely such a course was designed for HRI students in German.

It appeared that there was a desire on the part of university administrators to not have duplication of courses and a desire, especially among younger faculty, to work more closely with colleagues in other parts of the campus. By and large, though, it
appeared that a fairly parochial attitude still existed toward HRI curriculum by the HRI programs.

Students

1. The procedures for admissions were distinctly dissimilar between Cornell on the one hand and F.I.U. and Houston on the other. The admissions decision function was almost entirely self-contained at Cornell, while it was largely housed at the university administrative level at Houston and F.I.U. The hotel schools at the latter two universities made decisions on individual admission cases (usually) only in appeals by denials. All did, however, have control over admissions criteria.

2. A pattern was evident whereby all three schools made significant efforts to be most cordial to the students who applied. This appeared to be a very high priority, even with Cornell, which has seven applicants per available seat.

3. The methods for coping with growth and determining criteria for admissions seemed somewhat uncertain at all three. A pattern emerged (with strong evidence at Cornell and F.I.U.) that applicant work experience, exposure to the profession and attitude were crucial for determining a successful student and alumnus, in the judgement of the schools. This appeared to be based upon experience rather than research.

4. There was dissimilarity between Cornell and the two programs at F.I.U. and Houston concerning student registration. The process was almost completely self-contained at Cornell, while at the other
two, it is administered (except for advising) almost totally by the host institution.

5. Student advisors were assigned by all three institutions. At F.I.U. and Houston, the process was quite informal, and students did not necessarily go to the assigned advisor at all times. Rather, there were a few faculty and staff who were "recognized" as the curricular knowledge resources. Students would go to them for curricular advice, but might go to other faculty for advice in other areas. The process was somewhat more formal at Cornell, where there were advisor-advisee contacts built into the system and where students had to formally request a change of advisor.

6. Financial aid at F.I.U. and Houston has been controlled directly by the Dean's Office; at Cornell the process was more complex and was under a separate director in the school.¹

7. Clearly, one of the strongest patterns to emerge from among the three schools concerned students. Students occupied a central role and were the focal point at all three. The schools prized themselves on the students' attitudes and involved them to a substantial degree in their operation, especially with community, professional, industry and student activities and relationships.

**Conclusions**

* As the schools have continued to grow, especially in the number of applicants, it

¹Subsequent to the research visit to Cornell, the financial aid function was moved to the School's Director of Admissions Office.
appeared that student selection techniques and student success predictor variables might need more development. Choices of weighting past school grades, test scores, work experience, attitude and interviews will become more critical.¹

* The focus on students as an integral factor in almost every area of HRI school seemed to be crucial. It is possible that such an attitude was important for the motivation of both students and faculty as well as the public appearance of the vitality of the program.

**Faculty and Staff**

1. The process of faculty recruiting at all three schools was at various stages of development. While there was no conclusive evidence based upon the data presented herein, one could hypothesize that this was a function both of the variance in size at the school and the varying ages of the program.

2. While all the programs willingly adhered to the intent and requirements of the various hiring laws and guidelines, there was a clear history and inclination to rely upon a system or network of personal contacts and professional memberships to attract faculty candidates to the programs. This could be interpreted, not simply as the "old boy system," which was heavily extant in the past, but as a supplement to other methods of building the applicant pool for positions.

¹For example, Ley and Sandler (33, 1982) recently completed a study to determine the choices weight of various student factors in determining corporate recruiters.
3. Cornell was attempting to open searches as widely as possible. This may have been due to the clear lack of broadly based searches in the past. Florida and Houston attempted to combine both approaches to recruiting to build an applicant pool based on personal contacts and broadly based public searches.

4. There was a clear pattern for relatively informal faculty evaluations. Many commented that extremely formal, structured evaluations should not be necessary among professionals; yet, the argument for change was that younger faculty wanted and needed such processes in place, since the perception was that tenure and promotion were becoming increasingly more difficult to obtain. The interpretation and place of the elements of the traditional trinity of teaching, research, and service for faculty development, promotion and tenure, was emerging as the "issue of the day" for hotel schools relative to their host universities.

5. There was also a clear pattern among all three schools, emergent as a concern over the issue of what combination of academic degree and professional experience should be sought in faculty applicants.

Conclusions

* The need to address the emerging questions relating to faculty qualifications, role and relationships in the schools has become chronic and could soon be acute. The host institutions seem to have recently been in a "cycle" of pulling in reins—of demanding more standardized performance by all faculty, professional and academic. Yet,
it would seem that the very difference in nature between professional and academic units in the university calls for a difference in their goals, the type of faculty which staff them, and the criteria to be used for both the schools' and faculties' evaluations.

Perhaps positions of moderation should be examined in HRI programs, particularly in light of the goals of each program. Should a balance be struck between Ph.D. faculty and highly experienced faculty? Should a balance be struck between encouraging "traditional" research by some faculty and speaking and consulting by others, with teaching important to all?

The conclusion from the section is profound: These issues must be addressed if the nation's HRI programs are to maintain their identity and meet the needs of both the host institutions in which they are housed and the professions which they serve.

Physical Facilities

1. Cornell had the oldest and most extensive physical facilities, including dining areas, faculty club and guest rooms in addition to classrooms, laboratories and offices. The food facilities were used intensively for student courses and training, while the guest rooms and associated departments of the Inn were not used for training as extensively except for the internship program involving only one or two students per semester.

The facilities at Florida were limited and somewhat spread out on the campus, but were used intensively, especially the food laboratory.
Houston was housed in a comprehensive guest lodging facility, yet included very little use of those facilities in their curricular program for a variety of reasons, many of which were temporary until a new Dean would be selected.

2. All three programs found themselves in need of more space, of renovation, or both. A pattern emerged in that all three saw food lab facilities, especially, as an important component of the pedagogical process.

3. Each of the programs had a distinctly different way of using the labs of the physical plant. Cornell ran a hotel, did catering, ran a restaurant, a faculty club and a student cafeteria. Hotel students were involved in all of this through laboratory courses. Florida used its dining room as a laboratory food outlet and a public relations device on a carefully controlled and restricted basis. Many faculty in that program did not want to venture into the business of feeding the campus or the community. Houston had the facilities, but because of serious administrative difficulties, for all intents and purposes, did not use them pedagogically, but strictly for conference servicing and (tablecloth) campus feeding under the aegis of ARA contract feeding company and the conference center.

Conclusions

* An identifiable physical plant represented a means of identification for all three programs. Such facilities enabled the teaching process, especially in the food courses, to be accomplished with greater ease. Moreover, it appeared that the facilities provided a focal point for students and
Faculty as well as a tangible public relations (and perhaps fund-raising) device. Potential donors may like to "see," concretely, the HRI program!

* The appearance, the cleanliness and the atmosphere of the physical facilities seemed to be important in conveying the message of teaching hospitality administration to those who entered the facilities. To be sure, curriculum, faculty and students were paramount, but in a sense, the medium was the message concerning physical facilities.

* Spatial relationships and placement within the physical plant seemed to affect interpersonal relationships and organizational structure itself to some extent. If some faculty are physically removed (by floor or building, etc.) from their (HRI) colleagues, they may feel separated from the organization or may tend to foster relationships primarily with the group where they find themselves.

In one case in this study, a Dean was in a separate wing of the physical complex. Only he and his Administrative Assistant were there, separated from the faculty and students to a certain extent. Interviewees used phrases like "up there" and "over there" in referring to his office. The implication was that he was not as accessible as he might have been. One must question to what extent physical location affected such perceptions.

Finance and Resource Allocation

1. There was a striking difference in the process of the financial function at Cornell, on the one hand, and Florida and Houston on the other. The Cornell Hotel School received funding as a
lump-sum function of enrollment times tuition, as well as its annual gifts and endowments. Florida and Houston were highly dependent upon state legislatures, boards of regents and university administrators for a large portion of the budget; these may be linked to enrollments, but not directly. Their programmatic and distinctive needs had to be negotiated with the universities' administrators.

2. A clear pattern emerged in that all three schools placed a great deal of emphasis on not asking faculty to budget themselves. Administrators all indicated that faculty should and could get what resources they needed to accomplish their tasks; the administrators clearly saw this as their function.

3. The management and mechanics of budget and finance activity at all three schools, while under the Dean, was performed by someone else--Assistant Dean or Administrative Assistant.

Conclusions

* Efficient financial and budget management was seen as a necessary tool to the operation of the schools and the education of students. It did not occupy a central role, however, in any of the institutions studied. It was a means to an end.

* While fund-raising has not been a major activity at either the private or public institutions cited herein, it appears that as needs increase and financial resources remain constant or attenuate, active fund-raising is going to become more necessary.
Administrative Structure

1. As discussed above, the unequivocal reaction on the part of all interviewed, including the University administrators, on the importance of autonomy for the programs was clear and certain. They viewed autonomy of their programs within the University administration, structure as essential to their character, operation and success, or lack of thereof, in the instances when their autonomy would be impinged.

2. Cornell began as a department in another academic unit; it grew slowly and eventually became autonomous. The Dean functioned as the chief executive of what, in other parts of the University, would look more like a department in terms of size and structure (except the Dean functioned more like a Dean than a department chair).

This same pattern existed strongly at Florida; the faculty, largely professionally (versus academically) and practitioner-oriented, gave the Dean and Assistant Dean the power to care for administrative detail, while they taught and consulted. The policy-making process, especially at Cornell and Florida, greatly depended upon the informal organization and the network of one-to-one, small-group relationships among the faculty and between the faculty and the Deans or their Assistants. The Deans received input to make final decisions. Formal faculty meetings generally involved curricular policy and not day-to-day operations of the schools.

3. When the Deans had not been in constant touch with the faculty, such as Beck, the Assistant Dean was. Thus, while there was no formal democratic or committee process, there was a very open
conduit and link between faculty and administration, directly, without department heads.

In the case of Dean Beck, the link, in the form of the Assistant Dean, was removed when the Assistant Dean stepped down. This, in combination with a cadre of new, more academically oriented faculty members and a growing size, appeared to have caused dissatisfaction with the "informal input" type of arrangement. A similar process seemed to have been partially at work at Houston with Dean Taylor's retirement.

4. These younger, more academically (versus professionally) oriented faculty wanted change. The style at Cornell, for example, after Dean Beck, was in a significant state of change. More committees have been established to administer the School and administrative/academic areas were more clearly defined.

5. None of the schools were organized into departments, which obviously was a function of size at Houston; at Cornell and Florida, it seemed to have been resisted by the majority of faculty and administration. Both of these schools did, however, have a well-defined "foods faculty group" to coordinate faculty, students and laboratories. The heads of these groups, however, did not have the same role as a department chair would in another college. Their function was more as convener and coordinator; they did not, for example, make any faculty personnel decisions.

At Cornell, there were administrative/academic areas each with an elected coordinator. This coordinating role has been emerging over the last couple of years and remained rather unclear. Faculty and administration, at the time of the research, were in the process
of further defining the role.

6. A progressive pattern was evident among the three schools concerning University staff (advisory/resource) people. Cornell used the University staff the least, Florida more and Houston the most; this also happened to be the order of faculty size of the three programs, respectively (from largest to smallest).

Conclusions

* It is possible that size may have been related to the number of services which were contained in programs versus that provided by the University staff.

* For a variety of reasons, departments were not likely in the younger, smaller programs, and even at Cornell, a larger, very mature program, were resisted in the traditional form which they took in other academic areas. The relationships among the faculty and administration were more direct; this was consistent with findings concerning some other professional schools such as nursing (21, 1980, p. 57) and pharmacy (29, 1980, p. 118). The question which may have to be asked as faculties and student bodies increase is whether or not it is more productive toward ultimate goals to departmentalize, or would the increased administration (including meetings, memos, etc.) consume more resources of time, energy and funds than they would generate.

* Linked to the administrative structure of: (a) no departments, (b) many working, informal relationships, and (c) a dean and assistant with final administrative power and responsibility is the question of leadership and administrative style. Based upon the discussion in item 3 (above), a
pattern was identified wherein the Dean or an intermediary had to be in touch with all faculty or their informal leaders where there were no formal department heads. The faculty thus had input, and the Dean made his decisions based upon that input, upon student input and upon his own experience, knowledge and information he possessed from University administration and other sources. Thus, while nearly all of these administrators characterized themselves (or were characterized) as autocratic or paternalistic-autocratic, such descriptions were modified by the Deans themselves as well as by faculty and students to indicate that input could be and was given on decisions which would affect any of them. Such input seemed to be crucial to the "autocratic style" of functioning. Indeed, a pattern emerged which suggested that a more appropriate term for this style might be "Collegial Autocracy"—not as democratic concerning all matters as a traditional department might be, not as autocratic as a "Theory X" business for profit management might be, and not as laissez faire as a research organization might be. This style combined the notion and informal processes of collegiality on major decisions, yet accords autocratic decision-making power on mechanical and intermediate decisions to the Deans and their Assistants. It allows faculty professionals and student latitude of action, but they must place trust in and believe in fairness of the leader. There must be a direct contact of dean to faculty or a conduit (such as assistant dean) through which the contact is made. There appeared to be a reticence on the part of collegial autocrats to document procedures, policies, rules and regulations (the opposite of a bureaucrat).

Indeed, this style resembled accounting and law firm organizations to a certain extent, as far as faculty professionals are concerned, and developed from the original
small faculties, such as Cornell's, who were professionally and practitioner-oriented rather than traditionally academically oriented. The faculty primarily taught and consulted; the administrators administered.

As noted, however, use of this style may have been changing as faculty composition included more academically (Ph.D.) oriented persons. A question which should be asked at any hotel school is: Which style is the correct one for its time, place and state of development?

* One of the reasons autonomy was perceived as so important was that it eliminated levels between the faculty/students and the University administration. The dean of an autonomous HRI school sat, on an equal level, with the other deans at the university. He was the one and only direct link between the faculty/students and the university. The needs of the program were not in competition with nor subordinated to a host college (such as business), division or other departments.

* In the cases reviewed herein, the dean has functioned primarily as the "outside man" and the assistant dean as the "inside man." Again, if the communications flowed easily back and forth, this arrangement seemed efficacious, especially since outsiders often want "the dean"--he was available because the assistant dean would be minding the shop.

General Observations and Recommendations

1. Evaluation appeared to be an ongoing, unstructured process at the institutions researched. Occasionally, it occurred because of the time of the year, such as after the job-recruiting season; at other times, it occurred because of a change in a faculty member or a new
Highlight of Operational Areas by Schools

**Cornell University**
- Highly developed, powerful alumni network (1922), administered in-house
- Private, more well-funded, with progressively more staff for number of people served
- Highly structured corporate recruiting done in-house, administered by same professional staff
- Separate Dean added for entire area of external affairs
- Faculty had considerable autonomy in spending
- Faculty recruiting heavily based on personal contact network
- Promotion and tenure rely upon fulfilling track emphasizing either teaching or research or service, periodically evaluated
- Concept of experience and education was suitable credential for faculty
- Extensive facilities including classrooms, offices and lab wing as well as housing and dining facilities, an auditorium and large, self-contained library
- Physical plant crucial to program, both for teaching and for public relations
- Funding consisted of enrollment support - University keeps, plus endowments and gifts: School paid all costs and expenses, including faculty salary and all operating costs out of this budget
- Had considerable autonomy in spending decisions
- Finances administered by Asst. Dean for Business & Finance
- Individual faculty and departments not budgeted, but agent as necessary
- Administrative units, such as CHRA, submitted budget to ORBA

**Florida International University**
- Founded 1971, was just developing alumni activities; no staff person dedicated to handling alumni
- Recruiting function housed in the School, administered by faculty member who does internships
- Industry relations vaguely developed; primary focus with Dean
- Curriculum developed based on survey of industry needs and on Cornell curriculum
- One major of business had been completed, eliminating majors
- Faculty had not met as a whole to review curriculum; a major change has been proposed
- University approval was required
- College admissions core, being contact only; all other courses taught elsewhere on campus
- Curricula largely self-structured
- Student organizations almost an arm of University; student organization almost an arm of School's administration
- Facilities included offices on three floors and limited laboratories in another building; laboratories used intensively both for teaching and limited public relations
- New lab facility was in planning stages
- Funding appropriated by State through University administration based upon University approval proposed by Asst. Dean and negotiated by Dean with University
- Dean was primary responsibility for budget administration
- Funding was provided; additional funds were needed to meet requirements
- Substantial grants and endowments under negotiation with foundation

**University of Houston**
- Program began with University by a Cornell Associate Dean, helping buoyantly on experience gained at Cornell
- Structure could be characterized as a collegiate structure
- Administration in Dean of Dean and Associate Dean, with teams distributed administratively based on divisional emphasis
- Wide span of control, flat structure
- "Feeder" areas expanded and informal division into academic areas
- Funding appropriated by State through University administration based upon budget prepared by Asst. Dean and negotiated by Dean with University
- Dean had primary responsibility for budget administration
- Funding was provided; additional funds were needed to meet requirements
industry requirement or because some outside event happened. It would seem propitious for HRI schools to perform periodic, scheduled "self-audits." The framework used herein or a similar one could provide the guide for such an audit. It seems likely that increasing pressure will be brought to bear for professional accreditation which no doubt would include such an audit. CHRIE, at its August, 1982, meeting, formed a committee to investigate just such a possibility.

2. The author has observed from this research and from the preliminary research at community colleges that the following hypothesis could be made: The early leaders of new programs (especially the founding heads) tend to be collegial autocrats. This has been the case, without exception, in each of the HRI programs researched and the two community colleges. This might be so because such a style lends itself to a small size, informal relationships and operating in a dynamic environment, in an uncertain climate and without a clearly defined program.

3. It is clear from this study that the style, structure, and to a degree, the success of the organization in HRI programs was very much a function of the leader—the dean. Thus, it is that individual, with his style, tone and abilities, who set the tone throughout the school.

It further seems that the person selected and the leadership style should be matched, as far as possible, with the goals and needs of the particular program. In turn, this implies that the goals and needs of the program should periodically be re-evaluated, as suggested in item 1 (above).
4. There was a good deal of difference at all levels, but especially in degree of autonomy and financing, between the public universities and the private university in this study. To the author, it seems that this exigency should be further discussed by all concerned in the HRI educational process, especially as it might relate to accreditation considerations in the future.

5. Also in need of discussion, and possibly study as well, is the role of research in HRI programs. If the programs are truly professional schools, then what type of research, if any, is appropriate? How much weight should be placed upon research in faculty evaluation? How would research benefit the students and practitioners? How should research be disseminated? (Are journals the only or even a good way for practitioners?) How should research be funded? The question of research appears to be looming ahead, certainly on two of the three campuses documented herein.

6. As leadership, management style and philosophies in HRI education change, the role of faculty also needs to be constantly evaluated, in broad terms and for each program. Of salient interest to many interviewed herein were the pros and cons of assigning administrative responsibility to some faculty. Should faculty do some administration (such as corporate recruiting coordination or financial aid or alumni directing) or should they teach and research or consult only? Conversely, should administrators do some teaching? The argument on the one hand is that people cannot spread themselves too thinly. On the other hand, the argument is that there is greater understanding when some individuals are doing some of both. What role should research play for those who do both?
Conclusions and Recommendations Concerning This Study

1. All interviewed indicated that the analytical framework used herein was useful and covered almost all functions and processes.

2. The most important outcome was to identify patterns, trends, questions and common problems within a framework which could be used repeatedly and thus lend stability and continuity to these considerations.

3. A respondent suggestion was to include a section on research in the questionnaire (probably in the faculty section).

4. Another respondent suggested that teaching load (F.T.E.) comparisons be made.

5. Student financial aid seemed more appropriately included in the finance and budget section than under the student section, both for research purposes and for analysis flow.

6. Questions on graduation procedures and ceremonies should be developed for the student section.

7. A section on graduate programs within the HRI schools should be developed.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Develop a definition for HRI education. It is not a discipline—but is it an applied professional educational area drawing on many disciplines? What does it subsume?

2. Perform comparative analyses among HRI programs, for example, those housed in business colleges. What patterns and differences are found there? Then compare program by type, e.g., autonomous to
business-housed. What distinguishable similarities and differences emerge?

3. Study the autonomous College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, as well (in light of the findings herein).

4. Document the complete history of the program at Cornell, using faculty minutes and other resources available there.

5. Develop criteria for HRI program effectiveness. For example, some have suggested that corporate opinions would be one criterion, etc.

6. Research the hypothesis that schools with strong industry relations meet their goals more effectively and are more successful than those who do not have such relations.

7. Research the "cycles" of HRI program administrative structure and style as they evolve. Do they fit, for example, the model suggested by King and Dietrich (28, 1980) for Schools of Allied Health in terms of the evolution of cycles for schools? If so, then prediction could be made concerning the best course of administrative structural changes, depending upon at what stage or cycle of development a school is in terms of structural development.

8. Research the question of size. Is there an optimal-size school for varying circumstances? Should there be a ceiling or is there a floor, a critical mass, below which a program cannot function (especially in terms of number of faculty)?

9. Research the hypothesis that the greater the autonomy a program has, the greater will be its success.
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APPENDICES
HOTEL SCHOOLS INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

1. SCHOOL--ALUMNI--INDUSTRY RELATIONSHIPS
   
   A. Recruiting
      
      I. Decision Making and Planning
      
      a. Who plans approach to industry--both public
         relations and job recruiting?
      
      b. Who gathers information concerning the
         "job recruiting market" from industry?
      
      *  c. What is the composition of the industry support
         group for this school?
         (i.e., names of companies; people/position in
         the companies).
      
      d. Do many of the industry supporters seem to be
         alumni (estimate %)?
      
      *  e. Are there any policies guiding relations with
         company job recruiting and industry on campus?

      II. Programming
      
      a. Who schedules recruiters?
      
      b. What office arranges recruiting interviews?
      
      c. What procedure is used for public relations,
         especially with industry?
      
      d. Who is responsible for this?
      
      e. What budget pays for expenses associated both with
         industry relations and recruiting?
      
      f. Who deals with the local industry community?
      
      g. What procedures are used for them to recruit
         students? Through what person or office does
         this take place? Are there policies governing
         student employment?

      {transition statement}

      III. Stimulating (directing)
      
      a. What efforts are made and incentives placed to
         secure company recruiters of the quantity and
         quality desired?
      
      b. Who has final decision making power relative to
         recruiting?
      
      c. Are faculty encouraged to foster relations with
         industry? (Conferences, consulting, travel,
         entertainment, work, etc.) What resources are
         provided for this if any? Does the informal
         organization play any role with industry relations -
         faculty entertaining at home, etc. In what ways?

      IV. Coordinating
a. Is recruiting coordinated with or through the host institution?
b. Who coordinates schedules, the recruiters themselves, interviewing rooms, etc. while they are on campus. If this is done by the host institution is there any coordination with the HRI unit?
c. Are the recruiters entertained and hosted? By whom? Are any financial resources used for this? From where?
d. Who coordinates industry relations efforts? If PR is handled through host institution, how is this coordinated?
e. Is information exchanged among faculty and staff concerning industry visitors, publicity, speakers, etc?

V. Appraisal
a. How is company job recruiting evaluated? who takes part in the evaluation? Are there reports?
c. How is the HRI unit's industry relations program or circumstances evaluated or appraised? Who participates? When? How frequently?

B. Alumni Relations
I. Decision Making and Planning
a. Is there any planning, formal or informal, for relations with Alumni? For HRI the alumni organization if any? When did it start? Who participates? What format does the planning take? How frequently? For what period of the future time? What are the goals of the alumni organization?

II. Programming
*  a. What form does the alumni organization take? (Get constitution, newsletter, etc.)
  b. Is the organization housed in any way, at the school?
  c. What facilities and resources of the university are used? Is the school reimbursed? Are any personnel of the school used?
*  d. How is a current roster of alumni maintained?

III. Stimulating (Directing)
  a. How are faculty encouraged to maintain relations with alumni? To participate in alumni activities?
  b. How are alumni encouraged to be active in the organization?
  c. What kind of person (geographically, professionally, demographically) is usually selected as the formal alumni leader?
  d. Is there an executive director? How is such a person selected? What role does he play?

IV. Coordinating
  a. How are alumni programs coordinated with the school's programs? Are there any alumni programs conducted at the school?
and of graduating seniors for jobs coordinated with alumni in any way?
c. Is there a (formal) liaison person from the faculty/staff who deals with the alumni? If not, does this happen informally?
d. Is there any coordination with the university"s general alumni organization?
* e. Are there chapters in the HRI alumni organization? How are they operated? What relationship do they have to the school; to the parent chapter or main organization?
f. Is any continuing education performed through the alumni organization? In what way?

V. Appraisal
a. How are the goals and operation of the alumni organization evaluated? How frequently? By whom?
b. How is the relationship of the school with the alumni evaluated? How frequently? By whom?
c. How are changes decided upon and implemented?

2. Curriculum and Instruction
I. Decision Making and Planning
a. How was information analyzed for the original establishment of the curriculum.
* b. What are the learning goals and objectives of the program?
c. How are curricular decisions made within the program?
d. Is there a curriculum committee?
e. What part does the host institution play in curriculum planning?
f. Is any one area emphasized in curriculum planning? (foods, mgt., finance, tourism, etc?)
g. Is consideration made of transfer students in planning curriculum?
h. How is the registration process coordinated between the program and the host institution?

II. Programming
a. How is determination made of which courses are to be offered in a given semester?
b. How are faculty and student assignments to specific courses made?
c. Who makes the actual schedule of sections, times and places?
   1. What elements are considered in devising the schedule?
   2. Who controls assignment of rooms?
   3. Who controls special laboratories or other special classrooms?
* d. Are instructional outlines and/or syllabi required of instructors?
e. Are instructors free to devise any syllabus they desire?
f. How are texts chosen?
* 1. Get lists of texts.
g. Are any special instructional materials used such as workbooks, guided exercises etc.?
h. Where is reproduction of course materials performed?
1. by whom (secretary, typing pool, etc.)
i. How are requisitions made for laboratory materials (food, beverages, equipment, etc.)
l. Who administers these materials?
j. How is equipment chosen?
1. By whom?
k. How is disposed of from laboratory courses?
l. What part does the HRI program play in the (pre)registration process?

* m. Obtain curriculum.

III. Stimulating

a. Does (do) the formal leader(s) take the initiative in curriculum development? (Department chairs, area coordinators, etc.).
b. Are alumni and faculty stimulated in any special way to communicate concerning curriculum development?
c. Are resources and/or incentives provided for curriculum development?

IV. Coordinating

a. Is the program's curriculum coordinated with the host institution's general curricular requirements?
b. Is the program's curriculum coordinated with other programs in the institution, such as business, food science, social science, etc.? 1. What form do these relationships take?
c. Is the curriculum coordinated with the library? In what ways?
d. Is the program coordinated with continuing education? In what ways?
1. Is there a professional development component separately or as part of continuing education.
   2. Who is responsible for such a program?
e. Is the development and/or execution coordinated (Both curriculum and professional development) with industry in any ways?

* f. Is there an internship segment in the curriculum? 1. How is this organized (Participation)?
   2. What policies govern it?
   3. Who has responsibility for it?

* g. Is there an externship as part of the curriculum (a work requirement)?
   1. How is it organized? (Participation)
   2. What policies govern it?
   3. Who has responsibility for it?

h. How are provisions made for coordination within the curriculum? Particularly for:
   1. Sequence of courses.
   2. Continuity of course material and experiences.
      a) especially theory to laboratory.
   3. Integration of material (such as a "capstone" course or courses?

i. How are food lab courses coordinated with each
other, especially for meal production and patron consumption?

V. Appraisal
a. Are curriculum and instructional objectives expressed in behavioral terms?
b. Is faculty instruction evaluated?
   1. If not, why not?
   2. Who performs the evaluation?
c. Is the curriculum evaluated in terms of goals and objectives?
   1. Are any behavioral measurements made in such an evaluation?

3. Students
   I. Decision Making and Planning
   * a. Are the goals and objectives of the program expressed specifically in terms of:
      1. The target markets sought?
      2. By type of student (transfer, "hands on" mgt, etc.)
      3. By geographic location of program?
      4. By the background of students?
      5. By the goals of the host institution?
   * b. Are there admission requirements for incoming students?
      1. How are these determined?
      2. Who participates in this planning?
   c. What formal planning takes place for the processing of incoming students?
      1. Who participates?
      2. When it is done?

II. Programming
   * a. Gather demographics on students.
   * b. What is the procedure for admission?
      1. Who administers the admission process?
      2. Who makes admission decisions?
      3. What are the admissions' requirements (if not discussed previously?)
   c. Who is responsible for recruiting?
      1. Where is the organization housed for recruiting?
      2. What are the procedures?
      3. With what frequency are these efforts made?
      4. What follow-up takes place to recruitment activities?
   d. What process is there for incoming student orientation?
      1. Is the differentiation between freshmen and transfer students?

III. Stimulating (directing
   a. Is there one person designated to lead recruiting efforts?

IV. Coordinating
   a. How is the admissions' function coordinatated between the HRI program and thy host institution? (meetings, copies of applications, reports, etc.)
   b. How is the incoming student orientation process coordinated between the HRI program and the host
V. Appraising
a. How are the student recruiting and admission processes evaluated?
   1. How frequently
   2. By whom?
   3. Are reports made; to whom; from whom?
   4. How is possible change evaluated?
b. How is the incoming student orientation process evaluated, particularly as it bears upon the HRI program?
   1. Who participates in such evaluation?

A. Student Financial Aid, Counseling and residence

I. Decision Making and Planning
a. What planning takes place for processing student financial aid?
b. What planning takes place for student counseling and advising (both academic and personal)
c. How is planning and decision making done relative to student residence?

II. Programming
a. How is financial aid administered?
   1. Who is responsible?
   2. Who decides upon the actual awards?
g. Who performs student academic advising?
   1. Is this structured or unstructured?
   2. Is there a formal procedure and guidelines?
h. Who performs counseling and advising other than academic?
i. Is the campus residential?
   1. Under what arrangements do students live?
   2. Is there a housing office?

III. Stimulating
a. Who directs counseling and advising for the HRI program?
   1. Are faculty encouraged to commit to these activities?

IV. Coordinating
a. How are faculty decisions and information gathering for financial awards physically coordinated?
b. How is host institution—granted financial aid coordinated with the HRI program's organization?
c. What procedures are used to refer students between academic and personal advising and counseling?
d. How do counseling services of the host institution coordinate with the HRI program?
e. How are residential needs coordinated through the admissions procedure and/or the HRI program, if at all?

V. Appraising
a. How is the financial aid process evaluated, particularly as it pertains to the HRI program?
   1. Who makes the evaluation; how frequently?
b. How is the advising and counseling process evaluated? (Both the program's and the host host institution's as it relates to the program?)
1. Who makes the evaluation?
2. How do recommendations flow into the planning process, particularly for curriculum changes, financial changes, etc.?

C. Student Organizations
I. Decision Making and Planning
   a. Is there planning for HRI student organizations?
      1. Who participates; when?
      2. What are the goals and objectives of the organization?

II. Programming
   a. How are the student organizations arranged within the HRI program?
      1. Are there several? Which? (HSMA; FSEA; etc.)
      2. Do they coexist or is one of them a 'master' organization?
      3. Get constitution, etc.

III. Stimulating (directing)
   a. What incentive and direction are provided? Students to join a student HRI organization?
   b. What incentives are provided faculty to advise and interact with student HRI organizations (benefits, rewards, sanctions, contracts, recognition, etc.)

IV. Coordinating
   a. Does the student HRI organization take part and/or have a role in campus-wide student activities (formal or informal role)?

V. Appraising
   a. How is the role of student organization(s) in the HRI program evaluated?
      1. How are the organizations themselves evaluated (e.g., by their membership, officers, student government, etc.)?
   c. How is the role of student organization(s) in the HRI program evaluated?
      1. How are the organizations themselves evaluated (e.g., by their membership, officers, student government, etc.)?
   d. How is the financial aid process evaluated, particularly as it pertains to the HRI program?
      1. Who makes the evaluation?
      2. How frequently?
   e. How is the advising and counseling process evaluated? (Both the program's and the host institution's as it relates to the program)?
      1. Who makes the evaluation?
      2. How do recommendations flow into the planning process, particularly for curriculum changes, financial changes, etc.?
   f. How is the student employment process evaluated, if at all?
4. Faculty and Staff
  A. Recruitment
     I. Decision Making and Planning
        a. How are faculty and staff hiring decisions made. (Or what office, or committee makes them)? Who participates?
        b. How and by whom are recruiting and staffing problems solved?
        c. Are recruiting policies formed?
           1. How?
           2. By whom?
           3. What are the policies?
     II. Programming
        a. How do systems operate to initiate the recruiting process?
        b. How are committees, if any, selected?
     III. Stimulating
        a. Does a committee head (or someone else) make daily decisions in the faculty recruiting process? arrange meetings, interviews, edit outgoing job descriptions, read & resumes, etc.)?
        b. How are faculty members (program, dept.) encouraged to get involved, if at all?
     IV. Coordinating
        a. What influence does the host institution and other superordinate offices (Division head, department chair, etc.) have upon the recruiting and staffing process in terms of involvement with others in the process?
        b. How do departments coordinate with each other?
        c. Is there coordination or even cooperation with other colleges, schools, or disciplines on campus (law, nutrition, business, etc.)? How has this worked out, both mechanically and philosophically?
        d. How does coordination with other agencies in the program operate such as alumni, students, classified staff, etc.?
        e. Is there coordination with faculty and/or other affected members on hiring of classified staff?
     V. Appraising
        a. Is there a mechanism for evaluating the recruitment process? How does it operate? How are decisions made, followed up and implemented?
  B. Faculty Development/Staff Training
     I. Decision Making and Planning
        x. Is there a faculty development program?
           a. Who plans for faculty development?
              1. Who makes final decisions?
           b. What process is used for such planning?
           c. Upon what data is the planning and
decision making based?

II. Programming
b. Is it administered by the host institution, the HRI program or both?
c. What are the program components (get documentation)
   1. e.g.: travel, research, seminars, publishing, new faculty development, course development, exchanges, etc.
d. How is the program administered?
   1. forms, applications, printed procedures?
e. Is there a staff training program?
   1. What are its components?
   2. Where is it housed?

III. Stimulating (directing)
a. Is there a leader designated to head faculty development?
b. How are faculty encouraged to develop themselves?
   1. Are there links with the reward system?
   2. Is faculty travel encouraged?
c. What are the contents of orientation to new faculty?
   1. Is the development process explained to them at this time?
   2. In what form?
   3. Are staff encouraged to aid faculty during faculty orientation periods?
d. How are faculty and staff encouraged to contribute to staff training? (formal and informal)
   1. are staff encouraged to go to campus wide seminars.

IV. Coordinating
a. Is faculty development (and orientation) coordinated among the departments?
b. Are there campus wide publications discussing faculty development?
c. Is faculty development coordinated with curricular assignments.
d. Is faculty development coordinated among chairs or leaders within the HRI program?
e. How is staff training coordinated with work supervisors?

V. Appraising
a. How is faculty development evaluated?
   1. at the host institutional level
   2. at the program level?
b. How are evaluation data fed into the planning/decision process?
c. How is staff training evaluated?
   1. by whom?
2. against what criteria?

C. Faculty Evaluation and Compensation

I. Decision Making and Planning

a. Is there a faculty evaluation program?
   1. How does it work?
   2. Is there any part of it done by students?
   3. What instrument is used? (obtain)
   4. Is there any colleague or supervisor evaluation in the classroom?
   5. If there is no program, are there established criteria for evaluation?

b. Is there a host institution faculty evaluation process?
   1. How does it work?

c. How is faculty compensation organized?
   1. What are host institution directives concerning compensation policies and changes? e.g., funding, outside compensation, etc.
   2. What are program directives concerning compensation policies and changes?
   4. Are individual faculty compensation changes (changes in pay) linked to evaluation procedures and results?

d. Do faculty work on a contract?
   1. Get copy.

e. How is staff evaluation and compensation organized?
   1. Is it more directed by the host institution or by the program?

   2. What process is in place for promotion and tenure?

III. Stimulating (directing)

a. Who makes final decisions concerning evaluation?

b. How are students encouraged or discouraged (or left alone) concerning involvement in faculty evaluation?

c. Are faculty encouraged to become involved in the process?
   1. how or how not?

d. Who makes final decisions concerning faculty compensation?
   1. Are faculty or others encouraged to participate in this process?
      1. how?

e. Who makes final decisions concerning promotion and tenure?

IV. Coordinating

a. Is faculty evaluation coordinated with any type of institution-wide evaluation program?
   1. How?

b. Is compensation input coordinated with the institution at large?
   1. How? (e.g., committee)

c. Is any direct link made between evaluation and compensation?
   1. Which facets?
i. i.e., teaching, research, community
or institutional service linked
to merit pay, special bonuses,
tenure, promotion, etc.

b. Is staff evaluation and compensation and
coordinated with:
1. faculty
2. institution at large

V. Appraisal
a. How are evaluation techniques and policies
appraised?
1. Are reports made of results?
b. How are compensation policies and
techniques appraised?
1. Are reports made of compensation schedules?

5. Physical Facilities

I. Decision Making and Planning
a. Who plans for the physical facilities
of the program?
c. If facilities have been (or will be)
built or remodeled, what planning
process is used in such a project?
d. How is planning done for the
program's space allocation?
e. What role does the program play
in planning for operations and maintain-
ance of physical facilities which it
uses?

II. Programming
a. What office makes faculty assignments
to spaces for the HRI program? (except
classrooms)
b. Where is the administrative structure and
work force for operations and
maintenance of HRI facilities located?
c. Is the HRI program housed in its own
facility (by itself).
d. If the facility is cared for by campus
personnel are they organized horizontally
or vertically (are there maintenance people assigned
only to THOSE HRI facilities or to special tasks
(such as windows, floors, etc.) campus wide.
e. Who cleans laboratories?
1. dining rooms
2. kitchens
3. shops
4. food science laboratories
5. demonstration theatres.
f. Who maintains laboratories?

III. Stimulating
a. What relationship does the program director
have to the senior person in charge of
HRI physical facilities (formally)
b. Is there one office or person who has
responsibility for direction of the
HRI physical facilities?
c. Are faculty, staff and students encouraged in any way to make suggestions about, and care for the physical facilities?
   1. e.g., new equipment for labs; changes in traffic flow, self cleaning of areas, etc.

IV. Coordinating
   a. Is facilities' usage coordinated with any other units on campus? (other depts., programs, etc.)
      1. What process is in place for this?
   b. How is facility usage coordinated?
   c. How is maintenance of the facilities and their usage coordinated?
      1. general cleaning of labs
      2. periodic major maintenance

V. Appraising
   a. Is there a process of reporting on the condition of physical facilities?
   b. If construction is being planned or in progress is it reported upon?
      i. in what form and to whom?
   c. Are there inspections of cleanliness and appearance?
   d. Are there documented procedures for both operations and maintenance?

6. Finance and Resource Allocation
I. Decision Making and Planning
   a. Does the program director prepare a budget?
   b. Do department heads prepare budgets?
   c. Is there faculty input to budgets?
   d. Is there staff (classified and professional) input to budgets?
   e. Who gives final budget approval (operationally as well as legally).
   f. Is planning done to secure further donated, granted, or endowed funds?
      1. Who participates in such planning?

II. Programming
   a. To whom is the budget submitted and by what final office or position in the program?
      1. What role does the board of governors and/or legislature have on approval?
   b. Is there a formal procedure (and form) for preparing the budget?
      1. Is any of this documented?
      2. Is chronology important to the process. If so how is it maintained?
      3. If there is a particular budget procedure used (such as PPBS), has it been modified?
      4. Is budgeting for the program primarily historical or zero based?
      5. Is budgeting for the program primarily
line item or by block.

c. Does the program director or someone from the institution provide materials needed (forms, historical data, etc.) for budget building to the program person in charge of budgeting and others responsible for budget input?

d. Is financing of the program appropriated, endowed, or both?
   1. What is the percentage break down?
   2. What other sources of revenue are there?

e. What devices are used to obtain non-appropriated funds?
   1. Who is primarily instrumental in this.
   2. Is responsibility for obtaining non-appropriated funds divided among the faculty and staff in any way?
   3. Are there periodic, scheduled fund raising activities?

f. Is purchasing for the program done centrally or directly?
   1. Is there a documented purchasing procedure?

g. Do lab courses operate on a self paying basis?
   1. If so, which courses and how?
   2. How are the other lab courses financed?

h. How is the student HRI organization financed?

III. Stimulating

a. How is the program director approached by the host institution in terms of attitude toward budget? (build in fat, be meticulous or realistic, etc.) What is the director's attitude in response?

b. How does the program director approach faculty and staff about their input (if any) to the budget process?

c. Is financial and budget awareness often discussed within the program and by the director, or is it cyclical, or is it perfunctory to all except the person actually submitting the budget?

d. Are faculty, staff and students encouraged to be concerned with raising finances, both appropriated and non appropriated?

e. Who actually administers the mechanics of budgeting and finance for the program?

f. Who is in charge of the mechanics for purchasing?
IV. Coordinating
   a. How are budgeting needs within the program coordinatet with each other?
   c. How is the program's final budget coordinated with other units' budgets at the institutional (and/or divisional) levels?
      1. How is competition for scarce resources resolved (e.g. additional faculty positions)?
   d. How is purchasing coordinated within the program, if at all?
   e. Is purchasing coordinated with other units in the division or at the institutional level?
   f. What procedures are in place to process the coordination and management of donated or endowed funds to the program with the host institution. Who controls investment of the funds? Who or what controls release of the funds (both principle and interest)?
   g. If the program operates a commercial outlet is it coordinated with the rest of the program's finances?
   h. How is financial planning coordinated with curriculum, faculty, facility and student planning, if at all?

V. Appraising
   a. Are final budgets distributed?
      1. Available to directors only?
   b. Are financial reports made?
      1. Frequency?
      2. Detail?
      3. Example—if possible.
   c. Are adjustments made to financial management based upon periodic budget and financial reports?
      1. How are the adjustments made?
      2. Is deficit funding ever necessary?
   e. Are fund raising activities evaluated in any formal way?
   e. Is the overall financial area of the program evaluated?
      1. Frequency?
      2. By whom?
      3. How are the results fed into the decision making and planning process?

7. Administrative Structure
   I. Decision Making and Planning
   a. What was the evolution of the program to its current organizational structure?
      1. Get documentation, if it exists.
   b. Who participates in planning the organizational
c. In planning administrative structure of the program, how much of the planning must depend upon host institution requirements? (e.g., it is required that there be an elected program director, or not.)

d. Is any rational, formalized process used for problem solving? (e.g., O.D. techniques, Kepner-Tregoe method, flow charting, etc.)

e. Is there a formal set of organizational guidelines in the form of mission or purpose statements for the program?

1. Is there a statement of goals and objectives based upon the mission or purpose statement?

2. Are any of these used in the planning process in any or all of the seven areas defined herein?

II. Programming

a. Is the program departmentalized?

1. how?


3. Structurally, how do they relate to each other?

   i. faculty meetings in departments?

4. To whom do the heads report?

b. What is the relationship of the program to the host institution?

1. title of the program director and of the program

2. To whom does he report in the university?

3. On what organizational level is he in the university?

c. Is there an organizational chart?

1. Faculty?

2. Staff?

   i. Do any of the staff who work primarily for HRI program report to some other unit in the university?

   ii. Is there one person in charge of secretaries or are secretaries arranged in a pool, or curricular area, or departments, or some other way.

   iii. At what level are reproduction services performed?

   iv. What equipment is in custody of the program? If not, then whose custody?

   v. At what level are audio-visual services performed? If by the program, then to whom does
the audio visual director report?

3. Is there technical laboratory staff?
   i. To whom do they report?
   ii. What are their functions?

4. Are there job descriptions for both staff and faculty?
   i. Obtain

5. If the program has an ongoing guest service component which it operates (e.g., hotel, restaurant, etc.,) what relationship does it have with the rest of the program?
   1. with the host institution?
   2. Who directs it?
      i. To whom does he report?

6. Does the program have any relationships, formal or informal with the governing board of the host institution?
   1. For what purposes?
   2. Who conducts them?

7. Is there an industry advisory board for the program?
   1. How is it enpaneled?
   2. Is it active?
   3. What are its functions?
   4. Through whom does it primarily relate to the program?
   5. How often does it meet?
   6. Is it a part of the informal organization and relationships as well as the formal?

8. Do there appear to be many informal relationships within the program?
   1. among staff
   2. among faculty
   3. what form do these take?
   4. Are they fairly supportive of the goals of the organization, disruptive to them or neither?  

III. Stimulating
   a. Is the program director visible in a motivating, stimulating capacity?
      1. If so, in what ways?
   b. Does he make many of the final (strategic) decisions concerning the program?
      1. How does he arrive at them?
         i. input?
         ii. research?
   c. Does he make intermediate (tactical) decisions concerning the program?
      1. only under time pressure or as part of the normal operational pattern?
   e. How would the director's leadership style be characterized according to this chart?
organization stimulated by the leader(s)?
1. How? (supportive conversation, financial support, other incentives, etc.)

IV. Coordinating
a. Are there faculty meetings?
   1. frequency
   2. agendas
   3. length
   4. accomplishments
b. How many different kinds of faculty meetings are there?
   (departmental, school or college, committee, institutional)
c. Are there staff meetings to coordinate work being done?
   1. How frequently?
   2. what are the agendas?
d. Is there a communication device within the program such as a newsletter?
   1. Bulletin boards?
   2. "Coffee hour"—formal or informal.
      i. with students?
   e. How are functions coordinated with each other within the program?
      (special dinners, seminars, etc.)
f. How are functions coordinated with the host institution?
g. How is work generated by faculty coordinated to be completed if the faculty do not have individual secretaries?

V. Appraising
a. How are the mission statement and general goals and objectives of the program evaluated?
   1. Is there an accreditation visit?
      i. describe the visit.
      ii. how do the reports influence future planning and operations?
      iii. get copies of reports.
b. Is there a self evaluation document?
   1. obtain.
c. Is the administrative structure of the host institution more centralized or decentralized?
   1. i.e., control by host institution over the program; adherence to standard procedures; amount of autonomy of decision making by the program itself.
   2. Where would you place the institution's position on the following scale?
c. Is the administrative structure of the program more centralized or decentralized?
1. Where would you rate the program on the scale?
   decentralized centralized
   1  2  3  4  5

d. Are there many "staff" v. line positions in the host institutions?
1. i.e., are there many or few advisory and helping specialists such as A.V., graphics, purchasing, personnel, testing, printing, etc.? (get host institution organizational chart.
2. Are the staff personnel helpful to the line—both faculty and classified.
3. Is there ever conflict with or an overstepping of bounds or lack of service by the staff personne?
4. How useful is the host institution staff personnel to the program?
   least useful most useful
   1  2  3  4  5

e. How many levels are there between a secretary and the board of governors (including the professors).

f. How many people does the head of the program have reporting to him?
1. What is the span of control for the secretarial supervisor?
2. What is the span of control for the superior of the head of the program?

g. Is the administrative structure of the host institution more vertical or more horizontal?
1. i.e., do the programs and units have basic authority and responsibility for their overall operation (including personnel recruiting, physical facility, use decisions, equipment purchasing, etc.) or is most of this work done at the institutional level with program and unit heads exercising a limited sphere of control?

h. Obtain job descriptions for all positions.

*