4-1-2009

Comparing the Management in CHSS and LCVC

Linhua Wei

Recommended Citation

Wei, Linhua, "Comparing the Management in CHSS and LCVC" (2009). *Dissertations, Theses and Capstone Projects.* Paper 27.

Comparing the Management in CHSS and LCVC

Linhua Wei

A Internship Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Master of Public Administration

Kennesaw State University

March, 2009

Contents

Introduction

Administration in educational institutions and organizations is special in public administration. It shares commons with public administration issues in general but has its own characteristics. I am working as a chair in a vocational college in China and have been an administrator for eight years. How do people manage universities and colleges in America? What are the differences in the structure of governance in general, the style of leadership, the faculty's participation in management, and the differences in some specific policies? All these interest me and make my aims of study here clear. Because of this, after finishing most of my MPA courses, I applied for the intern in the Dean's Office in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, CHSS, and finally got the approval.

Overview of CHSS and Its Vision, Mission, and Goals

Humanities and Social Science College is the largest college in Kennesaw State University with nearly 5,000 students, 24 undergraduate and graduate programs, and 207 full time faculty members. Founded in 1963 first as Kennesaw Junior College, CHSS has experienced a rapid growth in size, quality and reputation around the state, the nation and the world. "Students first" orientation benefits all who comes to the college for higher education.

CHSS has its own strategic plan based on the university one. In the strategic plan, the mission, vision, and goals of the college are clearly stated, which states the whole college's direction of administration and development (http://hss.kennesaw.edu/resources/).

The vision of CHSS is

Kennesaw State University's vision is to be among the best learning-centered, comprehensive universities in the country and to expand its programs to meet state, national, and global needs. The College of Humanities and Social Sciences shares this vision by providing innovative leadership and intellectual rigor in liberal arts education through outstanding academic programs, scholarly research, and public service.

The mission of CHSS is

To provide students with a liberal arts education that empowers them to understand the human condition, meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century, and act as ethical citizens contributing to a global society. Through excellence in teaching, state-of-the-art research, and public service, we develop and promote an academic community that recognizes and embraces diversity and treats every person with dignity and respect.

Based on the SWOT analysis, CHSS set up actions to achieve the university goals. All the actions match the characteristics of the status quo of CHSS and help to solve the current problems and to enhance the competition of the college. In general, the strategic plan focus on how to solve the problems in shortage of faculty members, spaces, equipments to meet the needs of the rapid growth of the college, and how to increase the education programs, ensure the quality of teaching, enhance research, and improve the reputation of the college(HSS Strategic Planning and Implementation:2007-2012,http://hss.kennesaw.edu/resources/).

The Governance in CHSS

The governance in CHSS is a kind of two levels administration of the Dean's Office at the top and departments at the second level. At the college level, the dean's office is the administration center of the whole college; there is a College Faculty Council, (CFC), which is advisory to the dean to promote collegiality and effective shared governance of the college by increasing transparency and two-way communication between the faculty and the dean; there are also some college committees serving different areas of responsibilities. At the department level, the chair's office is responsible for the administration of the department; there is also a Department Faculty Council and several committees, which has the same function as those at college level.

The 0ffice of the Dean

The Office of the Dean is responsible for both the overall mission of CHSS and its day-to-day operations. There is a dean, an assistant dean, and two associate deans in CHSS who share different areas of responsibilities.

The Dean, Dr Richard Vengroff, who holds decision-making authority at the college level, is responsible for T&P (3rd year review, tenure, and promotion), meeting with candidates, the diversity of HSS, research, global and international issues, strategic planning,

development of HSS, and external relations.

The Assistant Dean, Hugh Hunt, is responsible for technology, students, curriculum, enrollment management and scheduling, faculty awards, faculty elections, and teaching excellence and teaching Evaluations

The Associate Dean, Lana Wachniak, is responsible for general education, graduate programs, instructional innovations and online programs, review part-time faculty files in departments of Social Sciences, and public relations.

The Associate Dean, Thierry Léger, is responsible for new social science building, interdisciplinary programs, program assessment (AOL), diversity, and CHSS intercultural competence committee, education, and review part-time faculty files in the departments of Humanities.

Associate Deans and Assistant Deans will be appointed for fixed, renewable terms of five years and the appointment of the Dean to a fixed term assignment is at the discretion of the Vice President of Academic Affairs, (VPAA). As with other academic administrators, the Dean serves at the discretion of the President of the university.

In addition to the Deans, the Office includes the Business Officer, Webmaster, Grants & Proposal Development Specialist, the Dean's Secretary, the Office Manager, and IT specialists (Office, of the Dean, http://hss.kennesaw.edu/resources/).

College Faculty Council

The purposes of the College Faculty Council, (CFC), are to promote collegiality and effective shared governance of the college by increasing transparency and two-way communication between the faculty and the dean with regard to the development of policy and to increase communication about the implementation of policy. CFC members are elected among tenured members of the department they represent. Usually, one member in each department will be elected to the CFC for a three-year term. The chair of the CFC must be selected by majority vote of the elected members of the CFC and must be the person who has served on the council the previous year,. The council shall hold meetings at least twice each fall and spring semester.

College Committees

There are four standing committees in HSS, Promotion and Tenure Committee, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Awards Committee, and Scholarship Committee. Each committee serves a certain area of responsibility. The chairs of the committees are elected. They conduct their business and make their recommendations to the appropriate Dean or University official.

There are also several Ad hoc Committees and task forces, for example, Faculty

Scholarship Awards Committee, International Committee, Environmental Studies Committee, and etc. These committees have representatives from each department. They meet as needed to address their specific concerns, draw up reports, and submit them to the appropriate Dean or University official. Should the needs any of the ad hoc committee addresses become permanent, the ad hoc committee will become a standing committee (College Faculty Council, http://hss.kennesaw.edu/resources/).

Governance of the Departments

Believing in open communication and support shared governance that is participatory, equitable, and transparent, each department in CHSS has its own governance document based on the guideline of the university and CHSS. The Department Chair serves as the chief representative of the department within the institution and provides leadership within and beyond the department and represents the department to the larger university community and to the local, national, and international communities (Governance Documents, http://hss.kennesaw.edu/resources/). In different departments, the term of the chair is different, some are five-year term and some are four-year. But all the chairs in CHSS are elected by the majority of the department faculty members among the tenure faculty and then appointed by the dean of CHSS. The assistant chair is nominated by the chair but needs the vote of the

majority of the faculty in the department. The responsibilities of the assistant chairs are various in different department based on the negotiation with the chairs. The majority of the faculty has power to recall a chair or a assistant chair by secret ballot.

The Department Faculty Council is to promote collegiality and effective shared governance in the department by enhancing communication between the Chair and faculty members and by ensuring transparency in the development and implementation of departmental policies.

Usually there are several departmental committees serving different areas of responsibilities. For example, the Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for evaluating faculty portfolios for third-year, tenure, and promotion reviews and make recommendations on tenure and promotion decisions. The Program and Curriculum Assessment Committee is responsible for continuously monitor and assess the quality and effectiveness of student learning, and make recommendations to the Department and to the Chair regarding student learning (Governance Documents, http://hss.kennesaw.edu/resources/).

Internship in the Dean's Office

The reason to intern in the Dean's Office of CHSS is because of my working

background, so my intentions are very clear, which are to find out how American people manage a college, to compare the management here with the management in my organization, and to provide an alternative to the current management in my department.

My supervisor, the dean, provides me a very flexible and loose intern environment by ensuring that I can contact everybody in the college to find out what I want to know. The internship in the Dean's Office was not a routine set of duties. Time was spent in reading documents, attending meetings, and discussing various questions about management in colleges with different people.

For reading, I began with the policy manual of the Board of Regent and all the governance documents at the university level, including the functions of different departments and committees, and the faculty handbook. Then I visited the homepage of CHSS and have learned the governance structure of the college and its strategic plan. I also read some policies in some departments to learn the detailed. All the reading helped me get an overall understanding of HSS. When I finished the intern, I have had an overview of the governance structure of the whole university system in Georgia, in KSU, and in CHSS. I also understand now the budget system, the personnel management, the management in CHSS.

Attending the chairs' meetings every two weeks is one of my favorite things. During the meeting, the chairs share their opinions and discuss the policies in the college. Sometimes, a

word of a chair can make me think a lot and bring me to new questions and new reading. I also went to the faculty senate meeting once to get a better understanding of the participation in governance of the faculty members. From these meeting, I understood things beyond the documents such as the managing atmosphere, the degree of the policy making participation of the chairs and faculty members, and daily management in the whole college.

Talking with different people at different levels is an amazing experience during my internship. I made appointments with the dean, the assistant dean, and the associate deans regularly. I also met chairs in several departments in HSS according to my study needs. Sometimes I talked with faculty members and staffs to get different opinion from different angle. Every time before I met somebody, I would make preparation and bring some questions to them. If reading make me have an objective understanding of the management in CHSS, talking with different people bring me a lot of experiences of culture shocks and make me excited and think a lot. I feel that I am approaching my goals day after day.

After getting a basic understanding of the management in CHSS, I made a comparison between the management in CHSS and my college. Then I focused on examining the annual evaluation in CHSS and also made a comparison with the evaluation system in my college, Liuzhou City Vocational College (LCVC). A probable alternative to the current evaluation system in my college become more and more clear.

Compare the management in CHSS with LCVC

When I look at the differences in management between CHSS and LCVC, I find that culture differences between the two countries play a very important role. The governance structure, the style of leadership, and the participation degree of the faculty all show a great different.

Literature Research in Culture Influence in Management

Hofstede's Five Culture Dimensions

In the past 30 years, many scholars focused on the study of the culture dimension and its influence in the value, leadership and management. The most referenced is the five culture dimensions of Geert Hofstede (1980, 2001). Geert Hofstede analyzed a large data base of employee values scores collected by IBM covering more than 70 countries and developed a model that identifies four primary Dimensions to assist in differentiating cultures: Power Distance, (PDI), Individualism (IDV), Masculinity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI). Later, he added a fifth Dimension, Long Term Orientation (LTO), after conducting an additional international study with a survey instrument developed with Chinese employees and managers. From his study, it shows that countries with different scores in different

culture dimensions have different value, leadership and management.

Power Distance Index (PDI) that is the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. This represents inequality (more versus less), but defined from below, not from above.

Individualism (IDV) on the one side versus its opposite, collectivism, that is the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups.

Masculinity (MAS) versus its opposite, femininity, refers to the distribution of roles between the genders which is another fundamental issue for any society to which a range of solutions are found. The women in feminine countries have the same modest, caring values as the men; in the masculine countries they are somewhat assertive and competitive.

Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) deals with a society's tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity; it ultimately refers to man's search for Truth. It indicates to what extent a culture programs its members to feel either uncomfortable or comfortable in unstructured situations.

Long-Term Orientation (LTO) versus short-term orientation: Values associated with Long Term Orientation are thrift and perseverance; values associated with Short Term Orientation are respect for tradition, fulfilling social obligations, and protecting one's 'face'(http://www.geert-hofstede.com/).

According to Hofstede, The scores of the five culture dimensions of the United States of

America and China are shown in table 1.

Table 1 Scores of the Five Culture Dimensions of USA & China

	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI	LTO
USA	40	91	62	46	29
China	80	20	66	30	118

The score of USA indicates a society with a more individualistic attitude and relatively

loose bonds with others, there is a greater equality between societal levels, including government, organizations, and even within families, it also has a greater level of tolerance for a variety of ideas, thoughts, and beliefs. Whereas, the scores of China indicate a societies' time perspective and an attitude of persevering, a high level of emphasis on a Collectivist society, loyalty is paramount. The high score in Power Distance dimension indicates an inequality of power and wealth within the society which has been accepted by the society as their cultural heritage.

GLOBE project

Concerning the area of culture and leadership, The GLOBE studies conceived by Robert J. House in 1991 have generated a very large number of findings on the relationship between culture and leadership. GLOBE is an ongoing program in which one hundred seventy social scientists and management scholars from 61 cultures/countries representing all major regions throughout the world are examining the inter-relationships between societal culture, organizational culture, and organizational leadership. Collecting data through different ways such as questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups, GLOBE researchers developed their own classification of nine culture dimensions: uncertainty avoidance, power distance, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, future

orientation, performance orientation, and humane orientation. They also grouped countries into 10 distinct clusters: Anglo, Latin Europe, Nordic Europe, Germanic Europe, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, Southern Asia, and Confucian Asia.

The United States of America belongs to the Anglo cluster, the countries in which were high in performance orientation and low in in-group collectivism. It indicates that countries in this cluster are competitive and result-oriented but less attached to others. The leadership profile for the Anglo countries describes leaders who are exceedingly motivating and visionary, not autocratic, and considerate of others. They should be team oriented and autonomous.

China belongs to Confucian cluster, the countries in which exhibited high scores in performance orientation, institutional collectivism, and in-group collectivism. It indicates that these countries are result-driven, and they encourage the group working together. People in these countries are devoted and loyal to their families, their organizations and countries. The leadership profile of the Confucian Asia countries describes a leader who works and cares about others but who uses status and position to make independent decisions without the input of others.

The X, Y and Z of Management Theory

Theory X and Theory Y are based on the contrasting assumptions defined by Douglas McGrego in 1960. Generally speaking, Theory X assumes that people are lazy and will avoid work whenever possible. They require a rigidly managed environment and will only respond to monetary rewards as an incentive. Theory X managers like to retain most of their authority They are highly task oriented, placing a great deal of concern towards getting the job done, with little concern for the worker's attitudes towards the manager's decision.

Theory Y, on the other hand, assumes that people are creative and enjoy work. They tend to desire more responsibility than Theory X workers, and have strong desires to participate in the decision making process. Theory Y leadership style is discussed, a participative leader shares decisions with the group. They are the "Democratic" leader who allows the members of the working group to vote on decisions, and the "Consensual" leader who encourages group discussions and decisions which reflect the "consensus" of the group (DuBrin).

William Ouchi's "Theory Z" is often referred to as the "Japanese" management style. It assumes that the workers can be trusted to do their jobs to their utmost ability, so long as management can be trusted to support them and look out for their well being. The management must have a high degree of confidence in its workers in order for this type of participative management to work (Massie & Douglas).

According to the X, Y and Z theory, the leadership of American organizations is much

like Theory Y and the leadership of Chinese organization is Theory X.

Compare the Governance and Policy Making in CHSS and LCVC

When we compare the governance structures between CHSS and Liuzhou City Vocational College in China, (LCVC), we find that the differences in structure itself are very little but the truth is that there is a basic difference in the function of some part of the governance structure.

As introduced above, the governance in HSS is a kind of two levels governance, with the college administration at the top and the departments at the second level. At each level, there is a Faculty Council serves advisory function to the dean or the chair of the department and there are several committees that have faculty members involve in the management of the department and the college. In LCVC, the governance also has two levels, with the college administration at the top and the departments at the second level. There is a Faculty Representative Conference, (FRC), at the college level in LCVC. How many representatives a department can choose is based on the number of faculty it has in the department. FRC members meet once every year to vote for some important policies to be made. There are a few academic committees in LCVC, such as Research Committee, Curriculums Committee which only deal with academic affairs but not things like promotion or evaluation.

Although the governance structures in the two college look the same, there is basic difference in its functioning. In CHSS, although the dean holds the authority to make decisions and policies, the chairs, all faculty members and the staffs' opinions are welcomed and respected through chairs' meeting, the Faculty Council and department meetings. Each part of the governance structure actually performs its own function. The faculty members have various ways to participate in management and they are willing to do so. Whereas, in LCVC, there are also various ways to gather different opinions but the unspoken rule is that if the president has a strong opinion towards a certain issue, all the chairs, the faculty and the staff will not argue and refuse to vote for it even some of them have different points of view, which results in a fact that the Faculty Representatives Conference does not perform its function at tall. FRC is actually a symbol. The faculty members in LCVC feel timid to express their opinions and some are not willing to tell. The participation in management of faculty members in LCVC is low.

Let's take a specific policy making as an example to exam the differences In CHSS. An issue raised by some faculty members to require that the results of the annual evaluation of the chairs and the deans be public to everyone in the college. And the majority faculty members agree on the issue. At the chairs meeting, the deans let the chairs to talk freely without any dean in the meeting room. When the chairs all agree that it is fair to let the

faculty know the details of their superiors' annual evaluation results, the policy is approved by the deans. It is a typical case that an issue is raised from down to the top in the managing hierarchy. If the same case happen in LCVC, the probable situation will be: the president let the chairs to discuss the opinion at the chairs' meeting but the beginning of the meeting or during the meeting, he/she will show his/her opinion, if it is against the issue, everyone will keep silent and tends to conform, if it supports the issue, everyone will talk freely to show their supports.

Issues can be put into the agenda from a suggestion of the college administration, the chairs, or even a number of faculty members in CHSS. Several discussions will be held and different opinions are gathered and discussed before a decision is made. Sometimes an ad hoc committee will be created to analyze the issue. There are several times of repeated discussion and the whole procedure takes time. It seems inefficient but for a long term, it is more effective. In LCVC, only the issues raised by the elites can be put into agenda. Usually, the chairs' meeting is the most important procedure to make the policy but follow an unspoken rule to obey the top leaders in the college. Compared to the policy making process in CHSS, the whole process in LCVC is shorter and efficient. But the long-term effectiveness can not be told.

In the appointments of the deans and chairs, there are also great differences. At CHSS,

when there is a vacancy for the dean, a search committee will be formed to help to find out the proper people for the position in national wide. The whole procedure includes review of the application documents, telephone interview, candidate giving a presentation, and face-to-face interview. After the Search Committee makes a decision, it will give its result to the president. The dean is appointed by the president. The associate deans or the assistant deans are appointed by the dean but national search is still needed and the search committee also plays a very important role in the process. In CHSS, the chairs are elected by the majority of the department faculty voting. The elected chair can nominate an associate chair but still needs the majority of faculty voting. Faculty have power to recall a chair and an associate chair with a supermajority (67 % of those present) voting, but the recall must be subject to approval by the Dean.

At LCVC, the president, the secretary of the Party, and the vice presidents are appointed by the city government according to their performance in their formal positions and in China, There is a bylaw which states the procedure of selecting and nominating leaders and the required qualification of the candidates. According to the bylaw, candidates should be recommended by people at different levels of departments. But in reality, the degree of the faculty members and even the chairs being involved in the searching and decision making process is very low. Sometimes faculty members don't know why a president or a vice

president is chosen to be their leader. The chairs and associate chairs of different departments are appointed by the college administration after succeeding in the chairs campaign. During the campaign, the candidates must make a presentation before the representatives of the faculty members and all the college leaders and then get a score. The two candidates with highest scores will be reviewed again by making a survey in faculty members. Finally, a chair or an associate chair is appointed but sometimes not based on the score he gets. There is no clear bylaw that states the recall of a chair.

In both Hofstede' and GLOBE studies, the USA got a low score in Power Distance, with a ranking of 40, compared to the world average of 55 and China's score of 80. It indicates that American organizations enjoy a greater equality in the organizations than Chinese organization. There is a cooperative interaction across power levels in CHSS which we can hardly find in LCVC. China's high score in Power Distance Dimension also verifies that the less powerful members in LCVC accept and expect that power is distributed unequally, which can explain why the unspoken rule is accepted and has existed for a long time in the college.

Compare the Leadership Between CHSS and LCVC

In CHSS, the dean believes that his main jobs include three points. The first thing is hiring right people to do the right things. Trust is very important between the dean and the

assistant and associate dean, between the dean's office and the chairs, between the leaders and the faculty members. Trust and decentralization bring more people involved in the college management and make people more productive. The second thing is setting the tone based on the mission and the goals of the college step by step. The dean believes that strategies are important when a leader wants to change people's minds and it is unwise to force the faculty members to accept something they are not ready to accept. The third thing is to represent the college to the higher level of administration and external community. Chairs in CHSS share common in leadership style. They respect the academic freedom of the faculty and presume that all the faculty members are professional.

In LCVC, we can get some hints of the leadership style from the governance in the college. The opinions of the higher level superiors are overwhelming in decision making. Quality control is ongoing through the whole academic year. Details are also checked in the job. Strict evaluations are linked to the monthly and yearly bonus of the faculty. Although there are some differences of leadership style among different leaders, the entire environment of the college is overwhelming and personal style plays little function.

According to the studies of GLOBE, the leadership of the CHSS matches the Anglo Leadership Profile. The leaders in CHSS consider the other's opinions and are visionary and motivate, whereas, the leadership in LCVC matches the Confucian Leadership Profile. The

leaders are protective of their own leadership. Although they care about others but they tend to uses status and position to make independent decisions without the input of others.

According to the X, Y and Z Theories, leadership in CHSS falls in Theory Y. The leaders are more democratic and consensual. But in LCVC, the leaders are more task-oriented and authoritative, which match them close to Theory X.

A Specific Case of Comparison, the Annual Evaluation in CHSS and LCVC

As a distinct and formal management procedure used in the evaluation of work performance, performance evaluation really dates from the time of the Second World War - not more than 60 years ago. From then on, people have been exploring ways to refine performance appraisal processes to better suit our needs. The evaluation instruments have developed from simplistic and subjective into sophisticated and objective. Many people believe that performance reviews can enhance individual performance, create a culture of high performance, foster a feedback-rich culture, increase retention, and provide objective data for compensation decisions. Performance evaluation received great attention both in CHSS and LCVC. As I was involved in the design of annual evaluation in LCVC, I have a special interest in the annual evaluation system in CHSS and try to make some comparison.

Compare the Evaluation of the Deans and Chairs

Both in CHSS and LCVC, the annual evaluation of the deans and chairs is simpler than that of the faculty members. In CHSS, different questions are provided for the evaluation of

the dean, the associate dean and the chairs. The faculty members and the staffs are welcomed to fill out the form online. The possible responses to the questions vary from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly. In addition to the objective survey questions, respondents will be given the opportunity to write in comments in essay form. The deans and the chairs receive evaluation from their subordinators, their peers and their superiors.

There is no yearly evaluation for the presidents in LCVC. Compared to the evaluation system for the deans and the chairs in CHSS however, the evaluation for the chairs in LCVC is more complicated which is made monthly by the subordinators, the peers in the department and the superiors. The heads of all the college administrative departments will also evaluate the chairs by gathering opinions in their departments and giving a score. The annual evaluation score is the average of the 12 months score during the year. The Personnel Management Department in LCVC is responsible for overseeing the record of the evaluation in each department.

Comparing the evaluation systems of the administrators in the two colleges, we can easily find out that the evaluation in LCVC is ongoing through the year. The monthly reviews help the chairs to realize their job performance timely make the annual performance review discussions more productive—rather than a surprise. But monthly evaluation is time-consuming and sometimes become a decoration if the evaluators are too busy to make it.

Compare the annual evaluation of faculty members

Unlike the evaluation of the deans and chairs, the evaluations of the faculty are more complicated both in CHSS and LCVC.

The annual evaluation of faculty in CHSS

Basically, the annual evaluation of the CHSS faculty covers the three basic categories, teaching, scholarship, and service. The result of the annual evaluation is linked to the annual increase of the salary and the promotion and the tenure of the faculty.

The evaluation of teaching is based on the students' evaluation which is made at the end of each semester. It is both quantitative and qualitative. For the quantitative evaluation, the students are asked to fill in the evaluation form which has fourteen questions. The possible responses to the questions vary from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly. The Buruss Institute at KSU will make the analysis of the survey. The mean of the scores in the department will be used as criteria to measure the effectiveness of teaching. Faculty members who get scores close to the mean will be considered to "meet expectations". Those who get much higher scores than the mean will be considered to "exceed expectations" whereas, they will be considered to "does not meet expectations". For the qualitative evaluation, the students are also welcomed to write down their answer of two questions. One is for merits of the teaching and the other is for shortcomings. The results will be considered by the chairs during the evaluation especially when there is a common consensus in the class.

The evaluation of scholarship and service is more subjective and based on the portfolio the faculty members provide to the chairs. For the scholarship, the faculty members should report their publications and presentations during the year. For the service, the faculty member should provide evidences that show their service for the department, the college, the university, and the community. Whether a faculty member is considered to meet the expectation or not, whether he/she has exceeded the expectation is decided by the chairs who usually make a judgment according to their opinions and experiences.

During the annual evaluation, the faculty members are required to submit a profile of the document to show their work during the year. The chair is the first to review all the profiles and decide the result. The dean, the associate deans, and the assistant dean will also review the profile of different department to oversee the evaluation. If a faculty member does not agree with the result of the evaluation, he/she can talk with the chair. If one thinks that the chair is unfair in evaluation, he/she can also appeal to the dean.

Effective teaching is the central priority and scholarship and service are important secondary priorities. Concerning the workload of faculty, besides teaching, they may choose service, "service-scholarship," or scholarship as their second area of accomplishment but there is an expectation that all faculty members will be active, to some extent, in all three areas in CHSS. While the teaching workload in the whole college is 18 academic hours in an academic year, each department has its own required workload of scholarship and service in each option of workload model based on different majors and programs. Selection of a workload is made in consultation with the Department Chair on a yearly basis. Let's take the Department of Political Science & International Affairs as an example. There are five workload models in the department, Undergraduate Teaching-Focused Plan, Undergraduate Teaching-Service Plan, Undergraduate Teaching-Service-Scholarship Plan (Balanced Plan), Undergraduate Teaching-Scholarship Plan, and Graduate Teaching/Scholarship Model. In each model, the workload of teaching, scholarship, and service is stated clearly. For example, in Undergraduate Teaching-Focus Plan, Twenty-four (24) to twenty-seven (27) semester hours of class instruction per academic year is the usual teaching load. To meet expectations under this model, the faculty member must demonstrate strong evidence of teaching excellence. Service efforts for faculty in the undergraduate teaching model would be oriented toward teaching as well, with the faculty member contributing to the development of teaching

among the KSU faculty and in the academic community. But in Undergraduate Teaching-Service Plan, eighteen (18) semester hours of class instruction per academic year is the usual teaching load and service efforts of the faculty will be more numerous and substantial than those under the undergraduate teaching model (http://www.kennesaw.edu/pols/).

The Annual Evaluation of Faculty in LCVC

There are both monthly and yearly evaluation for the faculty members in LCVC. The monthly evaluation is linked to the monthly teaching bonus while the yearly evaluation is linked to the bonus of each semester.

The monthly evaluation of the faculty focuses on the daily performance during the whole month of the faculty. The total point is 100. If the superiors find out some ill performance of the faculty in the month, such as late for class and meeting, delay in submitting reports, or refusal to accept working tasks, and etc, the faculty member will get a subtract in the score of the month.

The annual evaluation of faculty in LCVC is quite detailed and strict and covers five categories, regular job (10%), effective teaching (50%), scholarship (15%), service (15%), and student management (10%). All the criteria are quantified and the evaluation is ongoing through the year.

For the evaluation of regular job, the faculty members are required to have clear syllabus, detailed teaching plan for each class, enough assignments of homework, and adequate exam paper designs during the semester. They are also required to learning from and communicate with their peers by attending their peer's class for several times every semester. The directors of each teaching units will check the portfolio three times a semester and give a score each

time. The yearly score is totally 10 point which results from the average score of the year.

Effective teaching is the priority in LCVC. The evaluation involves the students' evaluation and the evaluation of the Teaching Evaluation Committee of the department. Twenty questions of five categories are asked during the evaluation covering teaching attitude, teaching content, teaching quality, teaching flexibility, and teaching effectiveness. The teaching evaluation is totally 50 points in which the students' evaluation is 50%. There is a Teaching Evaluation Committee in each teaching unit. The Teaching Evaluation Committee has at least four members, one of the chairs, director of the teaching unit, two senior professors for the unit. During the academic year, the members will go to the class of each faculty once without telling them in advance and evaluate the teaching. They check the quality of teaching and the teaching plan for the class and then give a score. The evaluation of the committee is 50% of the total value of the evaluation of teaching.

For scholarship evaluation, the faculty members should provide a portfolio to show their accomplishment during the year including publications, certificate in all kinds of competitions, certificates for mentoring students' competitions, or documents to show that the team the faculty members belong to are certificated for excellent teaching or research by the college or government. All the criteria are quantified according to the pre-agreed values of different publications and certificates.

Service refers to how a faculty member serves the teaching unit, the department and the college and the student management which refers to how a faculty member help to manage the students and enrich the students' campus lives. All the activities are listed in the evaluation system and the criteria are quantified. The evaluation of the services requires the

faculty members to prepare documents to show and the directors and chairs will work together to give a score to each faculty member.

The annual evaluation of faculty is linked to the bonuses of the month and the semester which are a big amount and more than the basic salary provided by the government budget. For example, an assistant professor may get 1100 RMB of basic salary every monthly, his/her monthly bonus can be 1400 RMB according to how many classes he/she teaches during the month and his/her bonus of the semester can be more than 3500 RMB based on the profit of the department during the semester. How much bonus will a faculty member can get every month or semester is not based on the academic rank but based on the scores in the evaluation, which makes both the evaluators and the faculty very serious and sometimes stressed.

In LCVC, a specific department was set up for quality control in the whole college. That specific department oversees the performance of the individuals as well as the department operation. Monthly report will be issued to show the results of their job which is linked to the monthly evaluation of both the chairs and the faculty members.

Compare the annual evaluation of faculty in CHSS and LCVC

Comparing the annual evaluation of faculty in CHSS and LCVC, we find that the culture impact still plays an important role. LCVC has a rigidly managed environment and will only

respond to monetary rewards as an incentive, which leads to detailed criteria of evaluation

and micro management. In CHSS faculty members are assumed to be creative and enjoy

work, which leads to a more loosed evaluation system. We can make a detailed comparison in

table 2.

Table 2 Differences in annual evaluation of faculty in CHSS and LCVC and comments

	LCVC	CHSS
evaluator	Students, evaluation committee, chairs and directors	Students, chairs
Time of evaluation	Combination of monthly and yearly evaluation	Yearly evaluation, three-year and five-year review
Means of evaluation	Quantitative, more objective	Both quantitative and qualitative, more subjective
Evaluation criteria	Detailed, pre-agreed and quantified criteria	broad
results	Linked to monthly and yearly bonus	Linked to yearly increase in salary and promotion

From the above table, we can see each system has its own merits and shortcomings and

both need to be improved. In CHSS, the only objective evaluation is the students' evaluation

of teaching. For the other two parts of evaluation, scholarship and service, the evaluation is

too subjective and relies on the opinions and experiences of the chairs, which may increase

the possibility of failure and increase the responsibility of the chairs. Actually, most of the

chairs think that the personnel management which includes evaluation costs most of their

time and energy. For the three-year or five-year review in the promotion process, the yearly

evaluation is like a periodic feedback which can help the faculty notice their merits and disadvantages and improve timely, but for the annual increase of salary, a yearly feedback sometimes is a surprise and lose the evaluation objective to improve the performance. The annual increase of salary is quite small in CHSS, at most 4% and sometimes there is no increase because of the cut in state budget. When there is an increase, everyone will get almost the same in some departments because there is not a detail policy to explain how to link to the result of the evaluation to the merit pay, and some chairs do not want to let the differences in pay to cause conflicts and constrains among faculty members. The college does not have a pool of money to apply real merit pay. All these make the current evaluation and pay system less incentives and make excellent performers upset. In LCVC, the exceedingly detailed evaluation criteria are time-consuming and decrease the academic freedom of the faculty members, which makes the faculty stressed and upset. Quantifying all the criteria by getting the pre-agreement of the faculty can not cover everything and reduce the flexibility in judgment. Linkage of the evaluation and the bonus stress the monetary incentive and sometimes may decrease the uses of other incentives like self-realization, which may make the college become more money-oriented in long term.

Elicitations and Questions from CHSS for the Future Work in LCVC

Three-hundred-hour intern in the Dean's Office in CHSS benefits me a lot. I have got a clear picture of the whole operation of the college. I compared the management between CHSS and LCVC and try to find out an improvement in LCVC. I learn some advanced managed methods by connecting the theories we have learned in classes to the real operation in CHSS. Many courses, such as Leadership, Human Resources Management, Research Methods, Policy Analysis, Budgeting, Project Evaluation, Contemporary Public Issues, and etc, help me understand the reality better during the internship. Every theory in the books comes to the real world, which helps me to understand it better and make me think and change. Because of the diversity in CHSS, intern in the Dean's Office brings me a chance to meet professional administrators from some totally different culture backgrounds. At first time, I realize that I was so used to a kind of way of thinking and dealing with business that I forgot there are many different voices in the world. Exchange of ideas and learning from different people quickly broaden my mind. I began to look back at my department and my college. What can I bring back to my college and my department? Which management methods are applicable in China? What must I pay attention to when I introduce something in my department? Because of the culture differences and the managed environment in my

college, I must be considerate and careful.

Above all the elicitations I got from my internship in the Dean's Office in CHSS, two ideas that I prefer to bring back to my college are:

1. Introduce share governance in the college and increase the participation of faculty in management. At LCVC, we have set up a way for the faculty to involve in the management, the Faculty Representative Conference, but we need to make it actually function and we need to build up more ways for the faculty to participate. Maybe because the faculty members are so used to listen to their superiors and obey policy issued from the top to down that they have become lazy or despaired to express their own opinions, we must make great effort to influence them by building up trust, step by step. Democracy can increase productivity and create a more stable managed environment-- these are the ideas I must try to convince my superiors.

2. Eliminate micro management and build trust in the whole college. Micro management increases cost of management because of the extra personnel and budget. It also makes the faculty and even the chairs upset in LCVC. The superiors seem to be supervising everything and all the jobs needs to be approved, which reduce productivity.

Meanwhile, internship in the Dean's Office in CHSS also brings me a lot of questions to think about.

1. Academic freedom in CHSS provides the faculty members a loose environment of teaching and research, but trust and freedom are not effective things ensure the quality. What is the point of balance between freedom and quality control?

2. Because the culture differences between China and USA, the style of management is very different. Can the management of CHSS be applied in LCVC which has a totally different culture background? If national culture is difficult to change and it may takes generations to change, does that mean centralized governance is more suitable in LCVC now?

3. Merit pay is an effective way in human resources management. But what the degree of implementation should be to reduce the function of the monetary-orientation and where is the point of balance between competition and harmony?

Experiences in my internship makes me excited about the changes it brings to me. I am eager to learn more and go back to China and contribute toward improvement. But I must realize that the changes can not be achieved in a short period of time. The culture impact controls the condition. The point is that I know there are some things that needs to be changed and will surely be changed, not only in LCVC and China, but also in CHSS and the USA. That is all I have learned.

Reference

http://www.usg.edu

http://www.kennesaw.edu

http://www.geert-hofstede.com

http://www.thunderbird.edu/wwwfiles/ms/globe/

Compensation & Benefits for Law Offices | 2007-09 | 7:9 | 2(3) | ISSN: 10684239 |

DuBrin, Andrew J. *Essentials of Management. Cincinnati*: South-Western, 1990. Return

Luthans, Fred. *Organisational Behaviour.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1989. Return

Northouse, Peter G,. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage, 2007. [N]

Massie, Joseph L. and John Douglas. *Managing: A Contemporary Introduction.* Englewood

Cliffs: Simon & Schuster Company, 1992. Return