

## University of Minnesota: Recommendations Regarding Spans and Layers

The University of Minnesota retained Sibson Consulting, a division of the Segal Company, to conduct a spans and layers analysis of all areas of the University of Minnesota. This document summarizes our findings.

### Introduction

The sleepy area of spans and layers recently has re-awakened in organizations. The subject is back in fashion as the needs for greater efficiencies and more streamlined operations have gained in prominence. Although the concept of a span of control is an early 20<sup>th</sup> century invention (Urwick, L.F. Scientific Principles and Organization, New York: American Management Association, 1938), trying to determine the right number of organizational layers and reporting relationships dates back at least to the formations of the Roman Legion. Unfortunately, the ensuing millennium-long debate has not produced any conclusive answers. Contemporary estimates of the ideal number of layers and spans vary widely. Indeed, some researchers claim that the number of spans and layers cannot be fixed at all due to differences in the sizes of organizations, type of industry, and the nature of the work.

We agree that there is no fixed structure that appropriately suits every organizational circumstance. There is simply too much variation in organizations and jobs to specify single “correct” values for spans-of-control and management layers. In light of the research, Sibson has developed an alternative standard in which to appraise layers and spans, namely, that spans of control should be equal to or greater than the number of layers. This rule has several virtues:

- Flexibility: It provides a standard of evaluation without rigidly insisting that a given number of layers and spans will always yield greater efficiencies
- Reality: It accommodates the real way that organizations are structured: work often becomes more specialized lower in the organization where the spans become narrower
- Hierarchical Constraint: It serves both as a managerial goal and measure of success in that the rule encourages flatter, more nimble, structures: every effort to build vertical bureaucracies confronts the built-in constraint that the design will need to be simultaneously broadened and compressed

Therefore, the ratio between spans and layers forms one index of organizational potential with regard to efficiency: the index should be equal to or greater than one.

Since this rule does not recognize that spans of control can be too wide in addition to too narrow, we also placed an upper limit on spans of control when conducting our tests. We set a range that we believed, based on our experiences, would aptly accommodate variations in the nature of work (e.g., routine or complex), structural factors (e.g., centralized or decentralized), and staff proficiencies (e.g., inexperienced or experienced) without leaving the solution open-ended. This approach may artificially curtail spans that legitimately exceed the range, however, by placing an upper bound on a span’s range we are identifying spans that may be too broad. Our goal, then, was to establish a range that would



allow for the inevitable variations in the work performed, the environment in which it is performed, and the ability of the performers, while placing a restriction on the range that could be used to flag possible spans that stretch too far.

Therefore, we incorporated a second index into our organizational assessment: the degree to which spans of control were positioned within, or were outside of, the ranges set for a given number of layers.

## Approach

Sibson developed a program that specified all reporting relationships within the University, from top down, tracing every branch of the structure until supervisory responsibilities ended with individual contributors. The program identifies the number of layers that exist (inclusive of the manager) and the spans of control for each manager within those layers. The results were tabulated and aggregated across major units within the University System:

- Crookston, Morris and Rochester Campuses
- Duluth Campus
- Twin Cities Health Sciences, e.g., School of Nursing
- Twin Cities Colleges, e.g., College of Liberal Arts
- Twin Cities Other, e.g., Budget and Finance

Viewing averages by major unit provides a more reliable and stable indicator of the University's structure than provided by sub-units and departments. The results of the latter can inform future decisions about organizational design when there are departures from normative standards, but micro examination of each University segment does not offer a blanket evaluation of how far the University has gone toward reaching a parsimonious design nor does it establish a base indicator for change initiatives.

In addition to assessing the University's spans and layers against our standard ratio of 1.0 (ratio of spans to layers), we also set limits for spans of control at each level of the organization. That is, we qualified the rule that the spans of control should equal or exceed the number of layers at each level in the organization by allowing some latitude for how far out the span could stretch: our standard suggests that a span should be equal to or greater than the number of managerial layers but certainly not continue ad infinitum. Therefore, we set an upper limit of 2½ times the number of layers. For example, a manager with four layers should have at least four direct reports, but no more than ten. In our analysis, we noted the percent of supervisors whose spans of control fell both within and outside the recommended range, and summarized the results by campus.

## Summary of Results

Overall, the results indicated that managers tended to have spans of control that are consistent with efficient operational structures. This conclusion is corroborated by both indices of efficient design: average layers, spans, and counts tended to adhere to prescribed standards as explained below.



## Layer – Span Ratios

Examination of the span to layer ratio indicates that, on average, all major units of the University have spans that surpass recommended minimums. As Table 1 shows, average spans exceed the corresponding minimums set by the number of layers of management for all University units. We suggest that this can only be achievable if the number of layers in the University are

**TABLE 1. AVERAGE SPANS OF CONTROL BY LAYERS OF MANAGEMENT<sup>1</sup>**

University Unit	Layers of Management					
	7	6	5	4	3	2
Crookston, Morris, Rochester Campuses			10.33	12.00	5.18	5.24
Duluth Campus		7.00	7.43	10.94	5.54	3.71
Twin Cities Health Sciences		18.75	11.36	8.95	4.53	2.74
Twin Cities Colleges		19.00	9.76	9.73	5.45	2.82
Twin Cities Other	11.00	7.42	6.71	6.43	6.78	4.71
<b>University -Wide</b>	<b>19.89</b>	<b>13.16</b>	<b>8.84</b>	<b>8.58</b>	<b>5.56</b>	<b>3.41</b>


<sup>1</sup>The Table contains values for major University units where three or more segments/sub-units could be combined and averaged. University-Wide averages, especially for seven layers of management, contain average spans for units that had fewer than three sub-units of data but, nevertheless, could be included in the overall average.

contained. It has been shown that institutions as large as 100,000 employees can be accommodated by 8 layers of management (Fayol, H. *General and Industrial Management*, translated by Constance Storrs, London: Pitman, 1949). Although this estimate was produced in a different era, we nonetheless believe that 5 – 9 layers of management are sufficient for most medium-sized to large enterprises. The University of Minnesota’s average number of management layers of **5.2** puts it well within a region that Sibson considers reasonable and facilitative of operational excellence. Indeed, for the size of institution of the University of Minnesota, the number of layers is remarkably low.

The abbreviated figure, below, shows the average number of layers and corresponding spans of control University-wide. It reveals an organization that is relatively flat and broad, diagnostic of an efficiently operating institution. This prototypical University design meets our guidelines for a well-structured organization with relatively few management layers and spans of control that are wide but remain within normative limits.



**FIGURE 1. PROTOTYPICAL DESIGN UNIVERSITY-WIDE<sup>1</sup>**



<sup>1</sup>The chart is incomplete: a complete chart would show reporting relationships (spans) for each manager at every layer of management.

**Span Ranges**

While the average spans and layers clearly show organizationally healthy levels, the data on the percentage of supervisors who were determined to have too few or too many direct reports qualifies the results. As depicted in Table 2, the largest percent of managers within each major unit of the University have a number of direct reports that fall within the normative ranges we set -- over 40% of managers for each University unit had spans within range. Again, these ranges were estimates based on how far Sibson believed supervisory duties could expand based on different work scenarios. These ranges, of course, are approximations; they do, however establish reasonable expectations and provide a standard to guide future inquiry. For example,

**TABLE 2. PERCENT OF SUPERVISORS (OF TOTAL SUPERVISORS) RELATIVE TO SPAN OF CONTROL RANGE**

University Unit	Position in Range		
	Under Range	Within Range	Over Range
Crookston, Morris, Rochester Campuses	20%	57%	22%
Duluth Campus	35%	43%	22%
Twin Cities Health Sciences	40%	46%	13%
Twin Cities Colleges	38%	46%	16%
Twin Cities Other	22%	54%	24%
<b>University -Wide</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>18%</b>

do plausible explanations exist for cases in which spans exceed the expected range maximums?

Similarly, Table 2 shows that about one out of every three supervisors has too few direct reports (as opposed to approximately one in six with too many). However, “too few” like “too many” are evaluative terms that ultimately must be assessed and borne out by rigorous on-the-ground study. For example, preliminary examinations of instances in which the spans of control appear too low are



largely attributable to positions providing administrative support for professors. In these cases, the technical reporting relationship is one-on-one but, in reality, these administrators often support other faculty members. If these cases are eliminated from the “under range” column, the University-wide average for supervisors below a span to layer ratio of 1.0 falls to 22%. In turn, this smaller number of cases may now be explored further and in depth.

## Discussion

Overall, The University of Minnesota appears to have an economical organizational structure. Both the number of layers and the spans of control are largely within conventional ranges that are diagnostic of efficient organizations. We hesitate to say, however, that there is nothing more that can be done since lying underneath averages and holistic renderings are smaller individual units with nuance and variability. Therefore, the favorable results of this study should not be construed as an invitation for complacency, rather, the impetus for closer examination.

Finally, one limitation of our analysis is that it obtains to the work that is currently being done in the manner it is being done. Thus, although the layers and spans within the University are of sound number, they apply to the work *as it is*. The work performed and methods by which it is accomplished might both be improved. Therefore, as good as the University looks in totality, the layers and spans might decrease and broaden, respectively, as the definition and process of work improve coincident with the University’s push toward operational excellence.

August 30, 2013



Appendix  
All Units in Alphabetical Order

Academic Affairs						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	32	32	32.00
2	32	22	10	1	18	7.20
3	72	28	44	1	14	3.66
4	161	109	52	1	13	4.13
5	215	141	74	1	25	4.81
6	356	319	37	1	19	4.43
7	164	160	4	1	3	2.00
8	8	8	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>1009</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>4.54</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>78%</b>	<b>22%</b>			

Alumni Association						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	5	5	5.00
2	5	1	4	2	7	4.50
3	18	17	1	1	1	1.00
4	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>			



Office of Internal Audit						
Level	Headcount	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Span		Average
	All			Minimum	Maximum	
1	1	0	1	4	4	4.00
2	4	1	3	2	6	4.33
3	13	13	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	18	14	4	2	6	4.25
% of Total		78%	22%			

Auxiliary Services						
Level	Headcount	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Span		Average
	All			Minimum	Maximum	
1	1	0	1	9	9	9.00
2	9	0	9	1	191	26.44
3	238	208	30	1	20	3.97
4	119	87	32	1	11	3.31
5	106	83	23	1	8	4.48
6	103	93	10	1	2	1.60
7	16	16	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	592	487	105	1	191	5.63
% of Total		82%	18%			



College of Biological Sciences						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	15	15	15.00
2	15	3	12	2	17	8.33
3	100	44	56	1	13	2.45
4	137	130	7	1	9	4.00
5	28	28	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	281	205	76	1	17	3.68
% of Total		<b>73%</b>	<b>27%</b>			

Board of Regents						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	1	1	1.00
2	1	0	1	4	4	4.00
3	4	4	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	6	4	2	1	4	2.50
% of Total		<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>			





Capital Planning and Project Management						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	3	3	3.00
2	3	0	3	7	10	9.00
3	27	27	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7.50</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>87%</b>	<b>13%</b>			

College of Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Sciences						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	36	36	36.00
2	36	4	32	1	29	10.81
3	346	174	172	1	19	3.08
4	530	475	55	1	35	2.91
5	160	154	6	1	7	3.17
6	19	19	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>1092</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>4.10</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>			



College of Continuing Education						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	12	12	12.00
2	12	3	9	1	9	4.22
3	38	20	18	1	8	3.83
4	69	55	14	1	7	2.50
5	35	33	2	1	1	1.00
6	2	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3.55</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>72%</b>	<b>28%</b>			

Crookston Campus						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	9	9	9.00
2	9	1	8	1	30	11.50
3	92	80	12	1	13	4.50
4	54	46	8	2	17	7.25
5	58	57	1	1	1	1.00
6	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>7.13</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>86%</b>	<b>14%</b>			



UMD Academic Affairs						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	20	20	20.00
2	20	9	11	2	10	4.91
3	54	25	29	1	13	5.24
4	152	130	22	1	7	3.09
5	68	61	7	1	22	6.00
6	42	41	1	1	1	1.00
7	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4.75</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>79%</b>	<b>21%</b>			

UMD Student Life						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	10	10	10.00
2	10	1	9	1	14	8.11
3	73	50	23	1	13	3.61
4	83	74	9	1	42	8.67
5	78	77	1	2	2	2.00
6	2	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5.72</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>83%</b>	<b>17%</b>			



UMD Finance and Operations						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	6	6	6.00
2	6	2	4	2	4	3.25
3	13	4	9	1	12	5.00
4	45	27	18	2	15	7.72
5	139	134	5	1	9	4.80
6	24	24	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6.14</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>84%</b>	<b>16%</b>			

UMD Chancellor's Office, Advancement, and Athletics						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	10	10	10.00
2	10	4	6	2	32	8.17
3	49	36	13	1	7	2.54
4	33	32	1	6	6	6.00
5	6	5	1	1	1	1.00
6	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>4.50</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>78%</b>	<b>22%</b>			



UMD College of Liberal Arts						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	32	32	32.00
2	32	14	18	1	3	1.44
3	26	24	2	1	4	2.50
4	5	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>3.00</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>			

UMD Swenson College of Science and Engineering						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	31	31	31.00
2	31	14	17	1	14	4.18
3	71	56	15	1	5	1.67
4	25	25	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>3.85</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>74%</b>	<b>26%</b>			



UMD College of Education and Human Services						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	19	19	19.00
2	19	5	14	1	12	3.57
3	50	45	5	1	4	2.00
4	10	9	1	5	5	5.00
5	5	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>75%</b>	<b>25%</b>			

Dentistry						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	24	24	24.00
2	24	4	20	1	14	4.70
3	94	47	47	1	18	3.11
4	146	134	12	1	17	4.25
5	51	50	1	1	1	1.00
6	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3.90</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>74%</b>	<b>26%</b>			



College of Design						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	8	8	8.00
2	8	0	8	1	8	4.50
3	36	16	20	1	8	2.35
4	47	44	3	1	4	2.33
5	7	7	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3.06</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>68%</b>	<b>32%</b>			

UMD Labovitz School of Business and Economics						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	16	16	16.00
2	16	7	9	1	10	3.00
3	27	25	2	1	4	2.50
4	5	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>			



UMD School of Fine Arts						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	17	17	17.00
2	17	6	11	1	11	3.18
3	35	32	3	1	4	2.67
4	8	8	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>75%</b>	<b>25%</b>			

UMD - Medical School						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	16	16	16.00
2	16	5	11	1	14	4.73
3	52	45	7	1	6	2.14
4	15	15	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4.37</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>77%</b>	<b>23%</b>			





College of Education and Human Development						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	19	19	19.00
2	19	2	17	1	28	8.41
3	143	73	70	1	16	4.24
4	297	262	35	1	14	3.14
5	110	104	6	1	6	3.83
6	23	23	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4.59</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>78%</b>	<b>22%</b>			

Office of Equity and Diversity						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	8	8	8.00
2	8	1	7	1	7	4.14
3	29	18	11	1	9	3.45
4	38	31	7	2	15	5.86
5	41	40	1	1	1	1.00
6	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4.33</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>77%</b>	<b>23%</b>			



Enterprise System Upgrade Program						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	13	13	13.00
2	13	7	6	2	9	5.33
3	32	29	3	3	9	5.33
4	16	16	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6.10</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>84%</b>	<b>16%</b>			

Facilities Management						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	7	7	7.00
2	7	0	7	1	11	4.43
3	31	12	19	1	40	7.11
4	135	102	33	1	63	11.45
5	378	354	24	7	30	20.75
6	498	498	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>1050</b>	<b>966</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>12.49</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>92%</b>	<b>8%</b>			



Budget and Finance						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	9	9	9.00
2	9	2	7	3	14	5.29
3	37	19	18	1	8	4.00
4	72	48	24	1	7	2.79
5	67	60	7	1	13	4.71
6	33	33	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3.82</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>74%</b>	<b>26%</b>			

Office of the General Counsel						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	3	3	3.00
2	3	1	2	12	12	12.00
3	24	20	4	1	7	3.50
4	14	14	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5.86</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>83%</b>	<b>17%</b>			



Global Programs and Strategy Alliance						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	13	13	13.00
2	13	2	11	1	11	3.91
3	43	23	20	1	11	2.75
4	55	46	9	1	4	1.56
5	14	14	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3.05</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>			

Government Relations						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	6	6	6.00
2	6	4	2	1	2	1.50
3	3	3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.00</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>70%</b>	<b>30%</b>			



Graduate School						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	9	9	9.00
2	9	4	5	1	9	4.40
3	22	17	5	2	6	4.00
4	20	20	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.64</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>79%</b>	<b>21%</b>			

Academic Health Center						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	15	15	15.00
2	15	1	14	1	19	6.29
3	88	34	54	1	16	3.80
4	205	158	47	1	14	4.15
5	195	184	11	1	12	5.82
6	64	63	1	1	1	1.00
7	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4.44</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>78%</b>	<b>22%</b>			



Humphrey School of Public Affairs						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	21	21	21.00
2	21	4	17	1	7	2.29
3	39	29	10	1	5	2.50
4	25	20	5	1	2	1.40
5	7	7	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2.79</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>65%</b>	<b>35%</b>			

Human Resources						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	9	9	9.00
2	9	2	7	1	9	5.29
3	37	19	18	1	14	5.22
4	94	88	6	1	7	3.00
5	18	18	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4.94</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>			



Institutional Compliance						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	4	4	4.00
2	4	2	2	2	2	2.00
3	4	4	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.67</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>			

Law School						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	25	25	25.00
2	25	4	21	1	7	2.48
3	52	37	15	1	8	3.00
4	45	39	6	1	3	1.50
5	9	7	2	1	4	2.50
6	5	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3.02</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>			



College of Liberal Arts						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	49	49	49.00
2	49	6	43	1	24	4.14
3	178	106	72	1	21	3.38
4	243	218	25	1	8	3.00
5	75	64	11	1	20	7.73
6	85	84	1	1	1	1.00
7	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>4.12</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>			

University Libraries						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	11	11	11.00
2	11	2	9	2	13	5.22
3	47	20	27	1	18	5.11
4	138	100	38	1	9	3.89
5	148	144	4	2	3	2.50
6	10	10	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.48</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>78%</b>	<b>22%</b>			





Carlson School fo Management						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	10	10	10.00
2	10	0	10	1	14	3.80
3	38	12	26	1	7	3.15
4	82	44	38	1	10	2.68
5	102	92	10	1	4	2.00
6	20	20	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2.96</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>66%</b>	<b>34%</b>			

Twin Cities Medical School						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	33	33	33.00
2	33	2	31	1	35	10.42
3	323	75	248	1	24	3.05
4	757	490	267	1	17	2.79
5	746	652	94	1	16	3.12
6	293	279	14	1	15	6.14
7	86	86	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>2239</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>3.42</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>71%</b>	<b>29%</b>			



Extension						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	15	15	15.00
2	15	2	13	1	15	6.08
3	79	40	39	1	20	5.23
4	204	161	43	1	8	3.53
5	152	137	15	1	10	7.47
6	112	112	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5.06</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>			

Morris Campus						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	9	9	9.00
2	9	1	8	1	19	8.38
3	67	39	28	1	23	5.39
4	151	138	13	1	35	4.77
5	62	62	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>5.78</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>83%</b>	<b>17%</b>			



School of Nursing						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	17	17	17.00
2	17	5	12	1	11	4.08
3	49	30	19	1	8	2.11
4	40	39	1	1	1	1.00
5	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3.24</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>69%</b>	<b>31%</b>			

Office of Information Technology						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	14	14	14.00
2	14	6	8	1	20	8.00
3	64	48	16	2	40	17.63
4	282	280	2	5	17	11.00
5	22	22	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>14.15</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>93%</b>	<b>7%</b>			



College of Pharmacy						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	16	16	16.00
2	16	1	15	1	21	5.27
3	79	38	41	1	8	2.59
4	106	103	3	1	1	1.00
5	3	3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3.40</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>71%</b>	<b>29%</b>			

Office of the President						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	20	20	20.00
2	20	18	2	5	6	5.50
3	11	10	1	2	2	2.00
4	2	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8.25</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>88%</b>	<b>12%</b>			



School of Public Health						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	12	12	12.00
2	12	1	11	1	34	9.09
3	100	29	71	1	13	2.90
4	206	156	50	1	16	3.54
5	177	163	14	1	7	2.79
6	39	35	4	1	18	5.25
7	21	21	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>3.68</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>73%</b>	<b>27%</b>			

Public Safety						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	5	5	5.00
2	5	1	4	3	4	3.25
3	13	4	9	2	9	5.22
4	47	35	12	1	7	3.50
5	42	42	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.12</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>			



Office of the Vice President for Research						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	12	12	12.00
2	12	1	11	2	20	6.27
3	69	28	41	1	15	4.51
4	185	157	28	1	10	2.96
5	83	76	7	1	6	2.86
6	20	18	2	4	6	5.00
7	10	10	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.21</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>			

Rochester Campus						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	5	5	5.00
2	5	1	4	3	9	5.00
3	20	10	10	1	9	3.10
4	31	28	3	1	3	2.00
5	6	6	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3.44</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>71%</b>	<b>29%</b>			



College of Science and Engineering						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	36	36	36.00
2	36	6	30	1	39	9.03
3	271	140	131	1	19	3.08
4	404	359	45	1	38	3.82
5	172	168	4	1	3	2.00
6	8	8	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>892</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4.22</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>			

Athletics						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	8	8	8.00
2	8	1	7	2	10	6.00
3	42	12	30	1	18	4.47
4	134	116	18	1	7	3.17
5	57	55	2	1	1	1.00
6	2	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.19</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>			



University Foundation						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	5	5	5.00
2	5	1	4	5	19	10.00
3	40	24	16	1	6	3.56
4	57	40	17	1	8	3.76
5	64	48	16	1	5	1.94
6	31	29	2	1	4	2.50
7	5	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3.61</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>72%</b>	<b>28%</b>			

Health and Safety						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	5	5	5.00
2	5	1	4	4	9	6.00
3	24	18	6	2	10	5.00
4	30	29	1	6	6	6.00
5	6	6	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5.42</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>82%</b>	<b>18%</b>			





University Senate Office						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	5	5	5.00
2	5	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5.00</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>83%</b>	<b>17%</b>			

University Relations						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	7	7	7.00
2	7	3	4	3	10	6.50
3	26	25	1	5	5	5.00
4	5	4	1	1	1	1.00
5	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5.57</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>83%</b>	<b>18%</b>			



University Services						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	13	13	13.00
2	13	8	5	1	6	3.00
3	15	11	4	1	4	2.75
4	11	8	3	1	8	5.00
5	15	12	3	1	2	1.33
6	4	4	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3.63</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>73%</b>	<b>27%</b>			

College of Veterinary Medicine						
Level	Headcount			Span		
	All	Non Supervisors	Supervisors	Minimum	Maximum	Average
1	1	0	1	14	14	14.00
2	14	2	12	2	44	12.67
3	152	84	68	1	13	2.75
4	187	163	24	1	17	6.75
5	162	159	3	4	10	6.00
6	18	18	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4.94</b>
<b>% of Total</b>		<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>			

