

**PERSONAL THOUGHTS AND RECOLLECTIONS:
HUMBOLDT STATE — Part 5**

THE ERA OF THE SIEMENS ADMINISTRATION (1)

HOMER P. BALABANIS, *Faculty Emeritus*

The five main general factors that contributed to the rapid growth of Humboldt State University during the era of the Siemens administration were: The big increase in student enrollment, which served to justify increased appropriations; the development of new undergraduate and graduate degree programs; the increase in faculty through the application of the Faculty Staffing Formula, which enabled the institution to expand its program; and the growth, in real terms, of the economy in the United States, and especially in California, which resulted in growing state revenues, which permitted budgetary increases and the successful flotation of state bonds for capital outlay purposes.

Dr. Cornelius H. Siemens assumed the presidency of Humboldt State College in the summer of 1950. He had received his Master's degree in Mathematics and his doctorate in Education from the University of California, Berkeley. He had taught at the University of California and at San Diego State College, and came to Humboldt directly from the presidency of Compton College.

The new President assumed his duties at a time when Humboldt needed a man of intelligence, dynamic personality, and resourcefulness to meet the urgent needs of an institution that had suffered serious physical deficiencies during a period of two major wars and the Great Depression. His leadership measured up to the requirements of his position.

In the summer of 1950, I was teaching at the San

Jose State summer session. The new President came down to see me, and he and I had a long conference during which I brought him up-to-date on the events that had transpired previously and on the problems then facing the College. About the same time a new administrative organization was instituted in the State Colleges. It established four official positions: that of an Executive Dean, who, at Humboldt, assisted the President largely on matters pertaining to campus planning, development and utilization; that of the Dean of Instruction charged with the responsibility of curricular development and supervision of instruction; that of Dean of Students to handle student affairs; and that of Dean of Extension and Summer Sessions, in charge of these programs.

The President asked me to serve as Dean of Instruction. I served in that capacity until January, 1964, when I was appointed Vice-President for Academic Affairs. I retired the following June. In time, the President and I worked out a *modus operandi* which proved productive and harmonious during the fourteen years I worked under him. Dr. Siemens concentrated his attention on external relations, fiscal matters, and on campus development. He took special pride in the physical condition and expansion of the campus, and I would say that the present campus stands as a physical monument to his vision and energy. In time three assistants, working as assistant Deans, were assigned to my office: Dr. John Pauley, who operated in the area of finances and day-to-

day operations; Dr. Joseph Trainor, who concentrated on curricular research, evaluation and development; and, first, Dr. Andrew Karoly, and later, Dr. Robert Dickerson, who worked on the graduate programs. Later Milton Dobkin also joined the staff in my office. Every one of these proved to be an able and dedicated man.

For a number of years after 1950, instructional policy was initiated at the meetings of the State College Deans of Instruction. Recommendations from the Deans were transmitted to the Council of the State College Presidents, and, when approved, they were referred for final approval to the Director of Education in the State Department of Education, and later to the Chancellor of the State College system. These meetings were usually attended by Dr. Aubrey Douglass, Associate Director of Education, and by Dr. Joel Burkman, Assistant Director. These two officers formed a liaison between the Deans and the Presidents as well as their superiors. Overall education policy had, of course, to conform to Title 5 of the California Administrative Code which defined the functions and responsibilities of the State Colleges. In this installment I propose to make a brief analysis of the factors used in determining the size of the teaching faculty in each institution and my role in faculty recruitment.

The Genesis of the Faculty Staffing Formula

Since 1930, the number of full-time teaching positions allotted in the budget of each State College had been based on the institution's Student-Teacher Ratio. This ratio was more or less arbitrary, and it varied from as low as one teacher for every 15 F.T.E. students in the case of Humboldt, the smallest among the State Colleges, to as high as one for every 18 or 20 at San Jose State, the largest. For this reason Humboldt was always on the defensive.

This method for apportioning teachers proved unsatisfactory, because it did not reflect a true index of the faculty teaching load in each institution. In November, 1950, the State College Presidents asked the Deans to work with Everett Chandler, Administrative Analyst of the Department of Finance (who later was appointed Dean at the California Polytechnic School at San Luis Obispo) in order to study the problem of faculty staffing and make recommendations for improvement. In

May, 1951, a report was transmitted to the Presidents and to the Departments of Education and Finance which proposed a new formula for allocating teacher positions "based upon a calculation of the total amount of college instructional work, related to the amount of work which one full-time faculty member can reasonably accomplish..." Under this formula, the number of teaching positions allotted to each college was to be determined by dividing the total teaching load by the work load assigned to an individual teacher. How this determination was arrived at is discussed in detail below. Obviously such formula, more than the student teacher ratio, could provide a more realistic and equitable method for estimating faculty needs.

After very prolonged discussions and deliberations by the Deans, the Presidents, the officers of the Departments of Education and Finance, and even the Legislative Analyst, in the course of which a number of revisions and modifications were proposed, the formula was approved by all parties concerned. The approved formula was as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{No. of Teachers} \\ \text{Needed} \end{array} = \begin{array}{l} \text{Total lecture units} + \text{total activity} \\ \text{units} + \text{total laboratory units} + \text{total} \\ \text{major units} + \text{total minor sports,} \\ \text{drama, journalism units} + \text{number of} \\ \text{student teachers} + \text{number of students} \\ \text{in field work.} \end{array}$$

Details on these deliberations will be found in the minutes of the Dean's meetings and those of the Presidents' Council. In accepting the principle of the staffing formula, the Presidents made it very clear, however, that the formula was to serve only as a budgetary instrument and faculty utilization in the hands of each college administration.

Once the formula was approved, and once the state's constituted authorities approved a certain curriculum for a college, that institution was entitled to hire a number of teachers sufficient to staff the courses appropriate and necessary for implementing the curriculum. And, since Finance had been a partner in the formulation of the criteria for teacher allocation, and had approved the formula, certification of our needs by the Department of Education was tantamount to approval by the Department of Finance, after which we could go ahead and plan our programs.

Implementation of the Faculty Staffing Formula

The change of policy was so important, especially for Humboldt, that its implementation deserves full description.

The 1953-54 Governor's Budget, introduced, for the first time, the faculty staffing formula as a guide for faculty determination. It read:

"Teaching allowances, formerly determined by a given ratio of teachers to students, are provided for the first time by a new budgetary concept of a faculty staffing work-load formula. For 1953-54, this formula calls for 142.5 additional teachers, or 31.41 more than would have been provided under the present student-teacher ratio..." Humboldt, which under the student teacher ratio would have been entitled to 3 additional teachers, was allotted 10 under the new formula.

Again we read in the Governor's budget for 1954-55:

"Recognizing the shortcomings of the ratio approach, the State Department of Finance, the State Department of Education, and the colleges developed the new staffing formula. The basic idea of the formula is that is allows staff in relation to the total work load of the college, which is the number of units of course work which the college offers. The total work load is then divided by the work load per individual instructor in order to determine the number of teaching positions necessary for a college. The work load per individual instructor is based on a work week of 45 hours which includes 36 hours of instructional work including preparation, evaluation, etc., and nine hours of advising students, work on college committees, work on student activities, etc."

The formula provided for variations in staff requirements for various types of instruction. Every course which was projected for a given academic year, was listed and classified, conformant to the projected overall enrollment in each course, and instructional methodology. At Humboldt, whenever the projected enrollment in a course, e.g., Art 25, was below the minimum agreed upon—seven for upper division, and ten for lower division courses—we combined courses at upper and lower-division level, say Art 25-125. This was acceptable to the instructor as an overload since it called for differential treatment of upper and lower division students.

Straight lecture classes, like Chemistry 1, were scheduled with unlimited enrollment except when physical facilities precluded it. Humboldt had not been geared to provide for large lecture classes.

The breaking point for lecture-discussion classes, such as Economics 1A, was 40. Enrollment in excess of that number, justified additional sections. Normally the breaking point for science laboratory sections was 25, usually the number of stations in a laboratory.

Total teaching loads had to be balanced as equitably as possible between the fall and spring semesters; and when specific work loads, as in student teaching supervision, were concentrated in the spring semester, an average of the two semesters was computed. At times, in order to keep a program going, especially in its initial stages, instructors volunteered to carry an extra load outside the formula. The initiation of every new major or graduate program entailed some overloads. Meeting the needs of students, and advancing the program of the institution, rather than serving the personal interests of the instructor was then, in the large majority of cases, the faculty ethic.

If actual enrollment in specific courses differed from our projections, adjustments were made in the overall schedule so as to insure the most efficient utilization of the entire faculty. All of this was consistent with the principle of internal autonomy in the administration of the instructional program. This flexibility allowed us to keep vacant in reserve one or two positions to apportion on registration day in order to meet unforeseen course demands.

The formula was based on an assumed 45-hour work week for all full-time teachers, converted to an equivalent of fifteen load hour assignment, of which three load hours were normally earmarked for non-teaching assignments, such as student advising and committee work, plus twelve hours of classroom teaching.

For lecture or lecture-discussion type of instruction which required one hour of class time for one unit of credit, twelve hours a week in class constituted a full teaching load. For an activity type course, such as Graphic Arts, which required two hours of class time a week for one unit of credit, eighteen hours in class for nine units of credit constituted a full teaching load. Science laboratory courses which required three hours of class time for one unit of credit, eighteen hours in class, made up a full teaching load. It was assumed, of course, that the instructor spent additional hours outside of class in course preparation, together with other services rendered.

For supervisors of student teaching, the load was based on the number of students to be supervised,

normally twenty-five. Special provision was made for coaching major and minor sports that were considered a legitimate part of the instructional program of the college.

Each year in October, the Dean of Instruction and his assistants prepared preliminary worksheets listing all the courses needed to carry out the instructional program for the fall semester, which was assumed to be duplicated during the spring semester.

During that month, Dr. James Enochs, Dean of the State Colleges, who was authorized by the Department of Education, later, by the Chancellor's Office, to examine the sheets, to propose changes and recommended approval, visited each college and conferred with the Dean of Instruction. Approval of the worksheet by Dr. Enochs was tantamount to approval by the state, and carried authorization for each institution to prepare its budget, requesting the number of teachers so approved. This procedure enabled each college to start its recruiting plans, even before the legislature approved its budget. We found Dr. Enochs sympathetic to our problems, especially in the matter of small classes, and very cooperative. Nevertheless, negotiation entailed a certain amount of bargaining.

Faculty Recruiting

Following determination of the additional number of faculty members needed to serve our instructional program for the coming year, we worked with the Division Chairmen and prepared in my office announcements of each vacancy, stipulating the area of instruction, the professional qualifications required, the rank and salary range attached to the position, a brief account of the character and overall program of the institution, its place in the educational system of California, and the type of the community in which it was located.

The announcements were mailed early in December to some thirty placement offices, and selected departments in universities, mostly in the East, Middle West and West. Applications followed. They were referred to the appropriate division, and after screening, three of the highest ranking candidates for each position were submitted to the Dean of Instruction. In a few areas we did not have much choice.

Since the College had no funds for defraying the

the travel expenses of candidates to be interviewed, I undertook to interview them at their place of residence, or study, or at certain central points. For this purpose, following consultation with the President, who authorized me to commit the institution, I would start on a three-week, arduous trip, in January, across the country. Since the "Big Ten" universities were mostly located in small towns, in stormy weather transportation by bus was the only means available. It was a tiresome, and at times dangerous job, but a challenging one; and the harvest, when good, was most gratifying. Occasionally, the President, who visited New York or Washington, would also interview local candidates. As I said before, I was authorized to make an offer to candidates who indicated acceptance, and the offer was, upon my return, confirmed by the President. We were not inhibited then by such restraints as are now being imposed by the "affirmative" action, quotas, women's movement, etc.

I had found the best harvest to be at the Universities of Chicago, Northwestern, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Indiana, and Iowa, as well as at the University of California, Stanford, Washington and Oregon. However, Harvard, Yale, Columbia and Princeton proved to be good hunting grounds over the years, and through repeated visits I established close, friendly relations with the placement officers who became familiar with the workings of this College and knew of the experience of their graduates who had joined our faculty ranks. They were, therefore, favorably disposed toward us and recommended highly qualified candidates. At times, after I had arrived at a certain campus, I would contact candidates who had not previously applied. I would interview them, and following consultation by phone with the President and the appropriate Division Chairman, I would make them an offer. As a rule, all my offers were at the assistant professor level. In this respect, the State University of Iowa was most helpful. Key men on our staff—Strahan, Pauley, Milhous, Gimbel, Day, Goodrich, Wagner, Collins, Wood and others—all came from Iowa.

Those were years during which, because of the rapidly swelling college enrollments and the reduced number of University graduates during the War, the supply of qualified teachers was far short of demand, and we were in competition with many institutions, especially the other California State Colleges. But our salary schedule, at that time, offered a differential of about five hundred dollars over the salary schedules offered to teachers in

many private colleges outside of California.

Humboldt State College and Arcata were practically unknown outside of this state; so I had to do a selling job, especially stressing our friendly environment, the growing character of our institution, our scenery and climate—I would tell them that my roses were still blooming, and it was in mid-January when the snow and ice covered everything in the Middle West—and of course, the magic name of California had its peculiar lure.

Two of the most frequent questions that candidates, especially those with young families, asked me were about the medical and hospital facilities in this area and the cultural climate of the community. So, over many years, working with others, I helped to have local hospitals accredited, organized a nursing curriculum at Humboldt, and, in more recent years, worked for the consolidation of hospital services, founded the Humboldt Arts Council which in turn sponsored the Humboldt Cultural Center, promoted the arts on this campus, and, as a member of the California Art Commission, worked to develop a cultural climate in this area. The results have been most gratifying. I have been fortunate in working in a relatively small

community where cooperation was not difficult to obtain.

All in all, between 1950 and 1964, especially during the latter period, some two-hundred new members joined the faculty of Humboldt. At times, there was some apprehension on the part of some of our resident faculty members that we should not entice candidates of a caliber that would not long remain on the staff of a small institution like ours, and, occasionally, such candidates made a few of our faculty members feel a little insecure. But it was my contention, that even if such people served on our faculty for one or two years only, we would derive the benefit of their stimulus. Actually, ninety percent of them are still on our staff. Upon my retirement Humboldt had on its faculty a greater percentage of Ph.D.'s than any other State College; and although I am not one of these who believe that the Ph.D. necessarily makes a good teacher the record of our faculty, on the whole, has been outstanding and recognized over the state, and this factor, strengthened since by the other strong men and women who joined our staff since 1964, contributed more than any other to our attaining the status of a University.