

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

ELVIN THOMAS WILLIAMS for the DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
(Name) (Degree)

in EDUCATION presented on October 8, 1969
(Major) (Date)

Title: FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN POLICY FORMULATION IN
THREE SELECTED PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF
OREGON

Abstract approved: _____

Redacted for Privacy

Henry A. TenPas

Purpose of the Study

The basic purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes and opinions of community college personnel toward faculty involvement in policy formulation.

Procedures

The statistical and subjective data for this study were obtained from two major sources. (1) A statistical questionnaire was developed to identify and obtain the present faculty involvement and the "desired" faculty involvement in policy formulation in three selected public community colleges of Oregon and was distributed to community college administrators and full-time teaching faculty, and (2) A personal on-campus visitation and interview was conducted by the writer with each respondent to obtain additional subjective data

pertaining to faculty involvement.

Findings

Statistical data indicated that within the present community college organizational structure, faculty do have opportunity to be involved in and to become more involved in policy formulation.

Subjective data supported the statistical findings and also revealed that faculty are in the process of changing from their "traditional" no-involvement role to one of becoming increasingly more active in community college governance.

Recommendations

The study recommends that changes be made in the internal organizational pattern of community college operations if faculty are to be further involved and are to realize their potential in more meaningful policy formulation.

The community college is on the "cutting edge" of education and because of this, must help to modify or change the "traditional" beliefs in education that have tended to hinder and to slow down the progress of and to cloud over the creative thoughts and deeds of educational personnel. Changing the dated customary practices indicates progress and increases its effectiveness as an institution.

Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation
in Three Selected Public Community
Colleges of Oregon

by

Elvin Thomas Williams

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1970

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education
in charge of *A* major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented _____ October 8, 1969

Typed by Gwendolyn Hansen for _____ Elvin Thomas Williams

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. Henry A. TenPas, Director, Vocational, Adult and Community College Education, Oregon State University for his guidance and counsel in this study. I am also appreciative of the efforts of other members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Lester M. Beals, School of Education, Dr. Robert W. Bergstrom, Division of Physical Education, Dr. Thomas C. McClintock, Department of History, and Dr. Murray Wolfson, Department of Economics.

The cooperation and assistance of the selected public community colleges of the study, and the vocational education leadership interns of Oregon State University is gratefully acknowledged.

My sincere thanks and gratitude to my wife, Catherine, and our daughters, Cathi and Susie, for their patient understanding and help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Background of the Study	4
The Oregon Situation	7
The Study of Faculty Relations	12
Limitations of the Study	15
Definition of Terms	16
REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED STUDIES	18
Public Education	18
Higher Education	21
Junior-Community Colleges	26
METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY	36
Construction of the Rating Scale of Administrative Duties	42
Refinement of the Survey Questionnaire Instrument	44
Conducting the Field Test	45
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	46
Views of Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement	47
Views of Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement	49
Views Regarding the Administrative Areas	52
The Importance of Administrative Areas	53
The Importance of Administrative Areas for Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation	53
Major Findings	54
Views of Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation	54
Views of Desired (should be) Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation	58
Subjective Data	62
Faculty Remarks	63
Administrator Remarks	64

	Page
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	66
Conclusions	66
Recommendations	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY	72
APPENDICES	88
Appendix A	88
Appendix B	99
Appendix C	114

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Actual and Projected Annual Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment in Oregons' Community Colleges, 1965-1972	13
2. Composite Comparisons of the Mean Percentage Totals for Administrators, Total Faculty, Academic Faculty, Vocational-Technical Faculty, Female Faculty, Male Faculty, Faculty with 1-4 Years of Experience, Faculty with 5-9 Years of Experience, and Faculty with 10+ Years of Experience Regarding Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon	55
3. Composite Comparisons of the Mean Percentage Totals for Administrators, Total Faculty, Academic Faculty, Vocational-Technical Faculty, Female Faculty, Male Faculty, Faculty with 1-4 Years of Experience, Faculty with 5-9 Years of Experience, and Faculty with 10+ Years of Experience Regarding Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon	59

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN POLICY FORMULATION
IN THREE SELECTED PUBLIC COMMUNITY
COLLEGES OF OREGON

INTRODUCTION

The American Association of School Administrators has stated:

"The basic problem of our society and our schools is the translation of the ideas of our culture into the human relationships they presuppose and into effective social action" (A. A. S. A., 1947, p. 38). To be able to function successfully and harmoniously in a democratic pattern of life requires practice in democratic living in all areas of life.

The following statements quoted from recent issues of selected national and local newspapers are indicative of what the American Association of School Administrators has stated above.

"HAYAKAWA SEES CAMPUS PLOT. "

An alliance of militant students and alienated faculty, using tactics that helped the Nazis rise to power in Germany, is dedicated to destroying society, starting with San Francisco State College, Acting President S. I. Hayakawa told a House subcommittee yesterday.

Hayakawa's charges were countered by a 'truth squad' composed of officials from striking San Francisco teacher unions. The Union has been on strike since January 6, the students since last November (T. W. P., 1969).

"UC PROTEST FALTERING IN 8th DAY. "

The sociology department meanwhile, issued a statement Wednesday that defended its action not to retain Mrs. Marlene Dixon, a radical teacher in the department (C. D. N., 1969).

"EMERGENCY--REAGAN CLEARS WAY FOR CHP ON UC CAMPUS."

Governor Ronald Reagan, in an unprecedented move late yesterday, declared a 'state of extreme emergency' at the University of California in Berkeley.

He thus made the California Highway Patrol readily available to restore order to the campus.

In issuing his proclamation, Reagan invoked the State Disaster Code and said the Highway Patrol's 'assistance' would 'continue as long as necessary.'

This proposed four-point program, he said, is designed among other things to keep students and faculty convicted of participation in disorder off the campus of State universities and colleges (S. F. C., 1969).

"ACADEMIC FREEDOM FACTOR IN MONTANA CONTROVERSY" (S-R., 1969).

"STATE UNIT BACKS TEACHERS' CHARGE. IT ASKS DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST 2 I. S. 201 AIDES FOR 'HARASSMENT.'"

A state watchdog committee recommended yesterday that disciplinary action be taken against two top officials of the Intermediate School 201 complex in Harlem for allegedly harassing union-teachers.

The committee called for the suspension of David Spencer as chairman and member of the complex's governing board and for the filing of formal charges against Charles E. Wilson, the district administrator (T. N. Y. T., 1969).

"OPEN DOOR TO SHUT--COMMUNITY COLLEGES GRIM OVER FINANCES" (T. S. T., 1969).

"FOR FACULTY PAY--'POWER' TACTICS TALKED AS WAY TO GET RAISES."

Collective bargaining by the three major universities of Oregon was cited Tuesday night as a possible means of getting faculty raises.

We are going to have to coordinate our efforts and approach the chancellor and State Board of Higher Education

and say that we mean business, said panelist Floyd McFarland, professor of economics at Oregon State University.

One of the panelists, Dr. Harold Haak, professor of public administration, San Diego State College, told the 125 faculty members that they had curtailed enrollment last term as a means of stretching their budget money. One Oregon State University department has considered this alternative as a method of keeping class numbers down and professors' total numbers of students within bounds. According to David King, professor of history, 'We have a power we have not utilized' (G. -T., 1969).

Statement of the Problem

The community colleges of Oregon face immense and important opportunities and challenges in the next decade. Few, if any of the problems appear greater, more acute, or imminent than communications and a meaningful dialogue between faculty and administrators. Although democratic school administrative practices are thought to be generally in operation throughout educational circles and in community colleges in particular, there is reason to believe there may be a gap between statement and deed. Specifically, this study will attempt to identify and examine the role of the faculty involvement in policy formulation in the public community colleges of Oregon.

Purpose of the Study

The study is designed to seek answers to the following specific questions:

1. Are faculty members involved in policy formulation?

2. Do faculty members desire to be involved in policy formulation?

3. How do administrators and faculty members judge and rank numerically the importance of six administrative areas essential for functional operation of the community college?

4. How do administrators and faculty members judge and rank numerically the importance of faculty involvement in policy formulation in each of six administrative areas essential for the functional operation of the community college?

Background of the Study

Careful investigation of the literature fails to reveal studies of this particular type concerned exclusively with faculty involvement in policy formulation in the public community colleges of Oregon. It would, therefore, appear to be both timely and appropriate to engage in a study of this nature.

In the investigation of the literature pertaining specifically to faculty participation in policy formulation in public community colleges it was made quite apparent that further examination and study was needed. In the literature it was pointed out that the most important and significant issue of the two-year institutions today is the role of the faculty involvement in policy formulation. The

effectiveness of shared responsibility in policy formulation and the interchange among faculty, president and board may be the key to creative educational policy making and formulation, and consequently to a more productive and efficient educational program for students.

One eminent national junior college leader, Priest (1964), recently stated that he foresaw potential dangers in the dichotomizing of the community college operation into an organization with the faculty on one end of the institutional spectrum, the administration on the other end, and at times, the board of education in the middle.

Community college faculty, both individually and collectively, are seeking a viable stance and realistic relationship with all levels of the organizational context in which they function. As professionals in the field of education teachers feel they are ready to accept responsibility toward democratic participation in policy formulation with the administration. And, as community colleges grow in number--particularly in size--faculty militancy concerning its role in the governance of the college will develop and manifest itself unless the administration sees fit to implement methods of direct democratic faculty participation in policy formulation and implementation. It appears that the major faculty concern in the entire faculty-administrative complex is that their voice be effectively and adequately heard, particularly in matters affecting them as professionals. What the faculties want is a dialogue with the administrators rather than a

monologue from the administrators. They desire democratic practices of policy formulation rather than autocratic or dogmatic directives from the administrators.

The community college president must not ignore the fact that, to be successful administrator-faculty relations must concern more than paper programs or lip service regarding the principles of democratic faculty participation (involvement) in the operation (administration) of the community college. This principle necessarily includes the faculty as an actuality in helping to determine administrative courses of action through the implementation of the democratic process.

Bogue (1950) made this point concerning faculty-administrator decisions when he stated:

It is possible that an executive can be greatly helped by the wisdom of his staff and faculty. Even though he might reach the right decision without advice, greater confidence will be created in the administration and a sense of pride will result if it is sought.

The National Society for the Study of Education, in the 1955 Yearbook, The Public Junior College, indicated the need of an awareness of the importance of faculty involvement in the formulation of policy. "In educational institutions," the Yearbook states, "this means that improvements in the educational process are most likely to be real and enduring if they grow out of a study in which the staff of the institution has participated in response to a need in which it feels" (N. S. S. E. ,

1956).

Lombardi (1964) declared: "Faculties are asking for more participation in policy making." And, in a more recent issue of the Junior College Journal he said: "Today administrators are involved not in determining whether or not to have faculty participation in administration but in determining how to adjust to such participation" (1966).

The Oregon Situation

In Oregon as in the nation the community college institutions are now experiencing a rapid growth rate in enrollment of students and the increase of new buildings and campuses. Gleaser (1968) states: "Ten years ago, one out of five students in the nation began his work in a community college. Now the number is more than one out of three. Soon it will be one out of two." And, he goes on to say that within a decade 1,000 publicly-supported community colleges will make education beyond the high school available to youth and adults in every state. However, it was not always a condition of rapid growth and a lack of space in which to instruct students that was a major concern of educators. In 1927, when Senator Roberts of The Dalles introduced the first bill to provide for the establishment of junior colleges in Oregon, little interest was shown and the bill failed to pass. The bill was intended to divide the state into 13 junior college districts

and required a vote of the people before a junior college could be established in any of the proposed districts.

It was not until after January 1, 1949, that legislative provision for public junior colleges in Oregon became a reality. At that time Senate Bill No. 29, an enabling act known as the Dunn Bill, was passed and became law. It permitted school district boards to contract with the State Department of Higher Education and the General Extension Division for lower division collegiate courses to be held in the local school districts. The Dunn Bill did not provide state funds for the operation of the 'community centers' or 'colleges' by the local contracting school districts. Three centers were established as a result of the Dunn Bill: Baker, Bend and Klamath Falls in the fall of 1949. According to Hatton (1968) the "program at Baker closed after one term of operation. The Klamath Falls center closed after the first year of operation but the Bend center continued to operate under the provisions of the Dunn Bill for twelve years."

The 1949 Oregon Legislature also established the Interim Committee on Post-High School Educational Facilities and it was this committee that invited Dr. Leonard V. Koos, nationally-recognized figure in junior college education to conduct a study in Oregon of the post-high school educational programs.

Koos recommended that community colleges be tuition-free, be a part of the local public school system, provide a core of general

education subjects, have a minimum enrollment of 200 students, provide a plan for reimbursement for non-resident students and implement a plan for state aid similar to that followed for public secondary schools. He further believed that schools should be described as "secondary" so as to be eligible for federal funds and state basic aid.

After the Koos report, the Interim Committee presented their findings to the 1951 Legislative Assembly. "The result was passage of Senate Bill No. 143, known as the 'Junior College Bill.' Despite certain merit, the law was never used until amended in 1957" (Hatton, 1968, p. 7).

Several items were not in the 'Junior College Bill,' that Koos had earlier recommended. Pence stated:

- (1) The schools were not to be tuition free, but could charge students up to a maximum of \$150.00 tuition per year for a local resident and up to \$350.00 for a non-resident.
- (2) There was no provision in the law for consolidation of districts.
- (3) Instead of placing the overhead control in the hands of a "Liaison Community-College Committee," consisting of five members with two members selected from the State Board of Higher Education, two members from the State Board of Education, and one to be appointed by the Governor from a list of three selected by the first four named, the bill placed the junior college under the State Board of Education.
- (4) Koos' rather involved, but reasonably realistic, plan for state aid was not included in the bill. The colleges were eligible for state aid on the same basis as the public elementary and secondary schools. This provided no real inducement for districts to become interested in supporting junior colleges (1960, p. 139).

The basic provisions of the bill that a district must meet were:

- (1) the true cash value of the district must be at least \$20,000,000,
- (2) there must be at least 500 students enrolled in grades IX-XII,
- (3) all building spaces available must be modern, adequate, and well-adapted to junior college purposes,
- (4) a library with well-chosen general and reference materials must be available for use,
- (5) adequate shop and laboratory space with the necessary equipment for the courses offered must be available, and
- (6) final approval of the project by the State Board of Education must be secured.

The 1957 Legislative action which resulted in the passage of House Bill No. 594, provided state aid of \$150 for each full-time student equivalent, permissive legislation for formation of community college districts, a permissive charge-back arrangement for out-of-district students, and a change of name to "community colleges."

Senate Bill 260 of the 50th. Legislative Assembly (1959), followed closely the general provisions of House Bill No. 594 with exceptions as follows: (1) curriculum of wider scope, (2) legislative determined boundaries were replaced by area education districts, and (3) state aid was increased to \$200 per full-time equivalent student, or one-third of the operational cost, whichever was less. Buildings were still a local concern for financing.

The 1961 Legislature provided the stimulus for the establishment of four other community colleges (Clatsop, Portland, Salem, and

Southwestern), and two more colleges (Blue Mountain and Treasure Valley) in 1962. The major contributions of this session of the Legislature were: (1) the provision up to \$433 per full-time equated student for operating expenses and (2) \$850,000 for the start of construction of community college facilities.

The actions of the 1963 Legislature resulted in modification of the 1961 statute pertaining to community colleges. The most important changes stipulated that local districts must contribute at least 15 percent of the operating costs and that the state's level of participation in facility construction be reduced from 75 percent to 65 percent. Appropriations for capital construction were increased to \$1,350,000.

As a result of two major changes by the 1965 Legislature on the state level four more community colleges were established, among them Lane, Umpqua, Mt. Hood and Clackamas. These changes were (1) the distribution of federal vocational funds as a supplement to state funds, and (2) a substantial increase in capital construction funds that resulted from an appropriation of \$4,000,000.

The Legislature of 1967 passed 31 laws affecting community colleges in Oregon. The most important legislation was that of increasing the rate of reimbursement for operation and state assistance for construction of facilities. State aid was pegged at \$575 per FTE (full-time equivalent) for the first 400 FTE; \$475 per FTE for the next 300; and \$433 for all FTE over 700. State aid for construction

was increased from a net of \$1,300 for two-thirds of the FTE to a net of \$1,560 for each FTE. Local districts were allowed to start construction in advance of available state money and still qualify for subsequent state aid for the project (Hatton, 1968). Linn-Benton Community College has been formed since this bill has become law and been codified as Chapter 433, Oregon Laws 1967.

Of the twelve community colleges now operating in Oregon, 10 are governed by area education districts with sole responsibility for governing community colleges. One, Salem, is operated by a local school district and Portland has recently shifted to a special governing district of its own.

Enrollment in Oregon's public community colleges continues to climb and Table 1, shows the actual and projected annual full-time equivalent enrollment in Oregon's community colleges from 1965 to 1972 (Lawrence, 1968, p. 11).

The Study of Faculty Relations

It would appear that the conflict in faculty-administrator relations is an extension of a broader movement in modern society; the concern of the individual in maintaining his identity in ever-enlarging groups. The individual person desires generally to participate and function in an acceptable and constructive fashion. However, there has been a vast explosion of knowledge and a restructuring of many

Table 1. Actual and Projected Annual Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment in Oregon's Community Colleges 1965-1972

	First Existence	Actual F. T. E.			Estimated F. T. E.		
		'65-66	'66-67	'67-68	'68-69	'69-70	'70-71
Blue Mountain	1962	574	591	680	729	797	845
Central Oregon	1957	615	598	570	655	753	829
Clackamas	1965	117	122	475	570	1,140	1,425
Clatsop	1961	488	499	695	695	761	761
Lane	1965	1,284	2,164	2,689	3,779	4,364	4,872
Linn-Benton	1967	---	---	221	497	1,192	1,398
Mt. Hood	1965	---	407	1,320	1,959	2,865	3,605
Portland	1961	2,592	3,623	4,170	4,580	5,041	5,543
Salem Tech	1961	607	702	896	1,394	2,489	2,987
Southwestern	1961	610	761	850	957	1,064	1,149
Treasure Valley	1962	716	1,021	1,000	1,250	1,458	1,583
Umpqua	1965	262	431	640	837	1,004	1,102
Totals		7,825	10,919	14,206	17,902	22,928	26,100

Key: First existence: First time community college enrolled students as a community college.
 F. T. E.: full time equivalent student

of the formerly rigid academic disciplines and principles has caused unrest and agitation among educators. This agitation and a seeking for self-expression has necessarily rubbed-off onto various elements within a faculty and a need for personal expression has been the result.

Teacher demand for more recognition and involvement in policy formulation is increasing daily on the campuses of the colleges and universities of America. The evidence is mounting that administrative dominance of policy formulation will not go unchallenged by the faculty. Recently, in the wake of tremendous growth of junior colleges in California, both in enrollments and new schools activated and planned, the question of the instructor's role in school policy formulation has been most relevant. The teacher's role has been debated not only by school board members, administrators, faculties, and the lay publics, but also by accreditation teams and even state legislators.

Indicative data has revealed that in those institutions where the dictatorial administrator is not in control, judicious study and reflection have (by faculty members) taken place in the educational process of the community colleges. As a result, more pertinent faculty involvement in policy formulation has occurred.

Clarification of faculty rights and responsibilities toward policy formulation has prompted the Legislature to place legislation on the books that requires the establishment of an academic senate or faculty council in each junior college in California. While Oregon does not

have legislation of this nature the time may not be far off when it may become a reality either through increased faculty group pressures or through enlightened administrative understanding and leadership.

Therefore, since there is knowledge that faculty satisfaction is an outcome of the extent to which teachers are able to be involved and to participate as individuals or in groups in the educational structure of which they are a part, a descriptive study of faculty participation in policy formulation in the public community colleges of Oregon appears to be appropriate at this time.

No effort will be made to evaluate the relative effectiveness of the teaching staff. No effort will be made to judge the effectiveness of the institutions in teaching the students.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to the public community colleges of Oregon. It is further limited to three selected from those colleges.

The study is restricted to the development and validation of a list of administrative duties believed to be appropriate to community college faculty involvement in policy formulation.

Furthermore, the findings of this study are limited basically to an analysis of the judgments and opinions concerning the involvement of faculty participation in policy formulation in the public community colleges of Oregon as expressed in person and on questionnaires

received from the community college administrators and selected faculty.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, "administrative duties" are considered to be those actions necessary in or appropriate to the execution of the duties or functions of the administrative staff or the community colleges.

"Community college" means a public secondary school established by a school district or by an area education district for the purpose of providing courses of study limited to not more than two years' full-time attendance and designated to meet the needs of a geographical area by providing educational services, including but not limited to vocational or technical education programs or lower division collegiate programs.

"Area education district" means a district which includes the area of more than one common school district and is formed to operate a community college.

"Administrator" refers to an official responsible for the management or direction of some part of an educational system.

"Faculty" refers only to those members of the instructional staff who do not have any administrative duties or titles.

"President" refers to the chief executive officer of a community

college.

"Involvement in policy formulation" refers to or is defined as the process by which the faculty is involved in the determination of policies that affect the schools of which they are a part.

"Jury of authorities" or "jury" refers to the qualified individuals who agree to participate in the appraisal of administrative duties which lend themselves to faculty involvement in policy formulation.

"Validation" refers to the process of establishing a list of administrative duties which lend themselves to faculty involvement in policy formulation.

"Academic courses" refers to lower-division college transfer courses. Those courses offered by the community college for those students who will transfer credits earned to a senior college or university leading to a baccalaureate degree.

"Vocational-technical courses" refers to those courses that are designed to prepare students for employment in the technical and vocational fields after completion of either a one or two-year program.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED STUDIES

With so much emphasis recently upon the administrative problems associated with public education and higher education, in particular, one is motivated to look objectively and searchingly into the present practices of faculties in the process of policy formulation and implementation of policy. Generalized statements by various people in education have at different times given credence to the process of democratic involvement of faculty in policy formulation and implementation. But what do the people directly associated with and intimately involved in the community college structure have to say about the problem? Does the concept "democratic process" actually function in the educational matrix of policy formulation? A look at the following statements and studies by authorities in public education, junior-community colleges and higher education will provide an indication to the questions posed above.

Public Education

Moser (1938) completed a doctoral study more than thirty years ago that described the faculty involvement in school administration in one hundred public schools of California. He used a checklist of fifty representative areas of administration concerned with school affairs. In the analysis of his findings he reported that forty percent of the

respondents favored teacher-supervisor cooperation in decision-making; however, only one-third thought that it actually existed. Some seventy percent of the respondents favored and recommended liberal faculty involvement.

In another study, Williams (1942) surveyed administrative areas most commonly reported by school authorities as those in which the teaching staff are democratically involved. It was reported by Williams that most faculty involvement existed in selecting textbooks, discipline, curriculum, and extracurricular activities. The least amount of faculty participation was found in the employment of staff, assignment of staff to classes and duties, in school building construction and in the evaluation of teachers.

The Research Division of the National Education Association, in conjunction with the American Association of School Administrators, in 1952 made a national survey in which they studied the problems of teacher committees and their roles as participants in school affairs. The study was limited to cities of more than 30,000 population. It was noted that most of these cities had established permanent personnel committees with teacher members. Only ten percent of the committees studied had the power or authority to act in the formulation of personnel policies, including salaries, credit evaluation, teacher leaves, and tenure (N. E. A. , 1955).

The American Association of School Administrators expressed

concern when in 1955 they declared:

. . . staff members derive much satisfaction from participation in planning and . . . their morale is enhanced by such participation. Through sharing in the determination of purposes and in the decision of how they may best be achieved, staff members gain a sense of self-direction . . . and a feeling of being more likely to identify with the purposes of the enterprise (A. A. S. A. , 1955, p. 18).

However well intentioned the democratic process of faculty participation in the formulation of administrative policies has been, it is known that deed sometimes is slow in following pronouncement. Hall (1955), writing in the Review of Educational Research, commented that, in spite of the discussion and writing concerning decentralization in the decision-making process, it is clear that the practice is not as prevalent as the talk, either in education or industry.

Doi (1965) pointed out that a person can very simply diagram a position on a line and staff chart but that it is quite another matter altogether to know what the position incumbent is actually doing. Therefore, he cautions, we must never assume that what is described in an organizational chart is the actual pattern of the institution--too often it is not.

Goldhammer et al. (1967, p. 2), in a publication entitled Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration, describes some of the dilemmas in educational administration confronting superintendents when he stated:

As never before, the administrator is forced to take cognizance of the problems that accumulate within his community as a result of both legislated and de facto segregation; of poverty and cultural deprivation; of the diverse aspirations and expectations of different segments of the community; of the varying educational needs of the community; of changing manpower needs and allocations; of the vast explosion of knowledge and the restructuring of many of the academic disciplines; of our national imperatives and international responsibilities; of the foment in the study of education and the encouragement of experimentation and innovation within the schools; of the unrest among minority groups, students, parents and teachers who no longer submit to being passive onlookers of the decision-making processes which affect them; and of the changing characteristics of the teaching profession and its ability to deal more effectively with the complex educational problems of children.

He goes on to say that "the problems of dealing with militant teacher groups who demand a role in the decision-making structure of the schools have impressed a whole new set of concerns upon the superintendent" (1967, p. 10).

The fact that faculties do want to be and expect to be considered in the process of policy formulation is evident from the foregoing literature sources cited.

Higher Education

Also attesting to the importance of the participation of faculty in the formulation of policy in higher education is the observation made by Cross (1953) when he disclosed that there were several reasons why the faculty should have a say in the formulation of educational policies. The most important reason, of course, is that the faculty has a great

deal to contribute. He goes on to say that the collective judgment of a large number of individuals will always be more reliable than the judgment of a few.

Corson (1960) mentioned faculty senates and legislative councils as means for faculty to participate in policy formulation and had a word about committees too. He asked the question: "When should the president appoint committees, and when should committees be selected by the faculty?" (1960, p. 116). He suggested that studies be made to determine how presidents and faculties work, or do not work together.

To achieve agreement on goals and programs to fulfill them requires effective organization for communication and participation in decision-making, emphasized Derber (1960). He went on to say: "The larger the institution the more difficult it is to establish and maintain such organization" (1960, p. 132).

In his book, The Academic Community, Millett (1962) stated the goal of the academic community is to provide an environment of learning, not a product of learning. Continuing this same line of thought he suggests that, to achieve this environment, the constituent elements--the faculty, the students, the alumni, and the administrators--participate more or less equally in decision-making. Decisions, therefore, result from concensus.

The problems of college presidents are illustrated by Dodds

(1962) when he warned that today by common agreement among presidents, their most prevalent administrative weakness is inability to delegate work to others. Yet they must learn delegation or be inundated in a tidal wave of trivialities.

Writing for the Association of Higher Education in the Journal of 1963, Henderson stated:

Decision making in colleges and universities is complex and antiquated . . . because of traditions . . . and because of trends toward an increasing size of the institutions. . . . Decision making in the colleges would benefit from the findings of research relating to administration and to group behavior and processes (1963, p. 153).

From what Henderson has said it would appear that decision-making could be improved in the colleges and universities and this also could be an area for investigation and study in the community colleges of America.

Another educator concerned with the function of administration and decision-making in higher education is Blocker (1963) who recommends that we work aggressively toward the improvement of college administration.

Similar views were advanced by Hertzfeld (1963, p. 167) concerning decision making in institutions of higher education when he said: "Effective decision making requires a clear definition of responsibility within an organization. This does not mean a czar has to be created, nor does it mean that there are pat formulae which can be applied.

On the contrary, organization for decision making, to be effective, has to be custom tailored for each organization. "

Continuing (Hertzfeld, 1963) says that all administration in an educational institution has as its ultimate purpose the facilitating of the academic function, for without this concept there is no moral justification for administration. However, the administrator, while he serves the faculty and the staff in the conduct of their affairs, must not be placed in the position of a servant who takes orders from each individual for whom he performs the service.

Clark (1964) cited a traditional belief among many college faculty members when he warned that many professors feel authority ought to reside in the faculty.

Writing in the summer edition of the American Association of University Professors Bulletin Brown stated:

With the fast and increasing complexity of modern academic life, problems of administration and governance touch every aspect of teaching and learning. I will therefore argue that the role of faculty in academic government, however difficult it may be to define, is another instance where right and responsibility flow into and from each other. Faculties have a right to participate in practically every aspect of university affairs. They have a responsibility to do so, limited by considerations of efficiency and division of labor, for there are many concerns that can be discharged by other specialists, within the boundaries of educational policies which the faculty has helped to make. I do not propose to make claims for exclusive faculty rights, but I will argue that an institution of learning cannot properly ignore the counsels of the faculty in any significant operation (1966, p. 131).

Middleton touched upon very important aspects of faculty and administration relationships when he stated in the winter issue of the American Association of University Professors Bulletin:

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinions should be the rule for communications among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor (1966, p. 376).

Middleton goes on to say that other areas calling for a joint effort in internal operations of the college or university involves existing or prospective buildings and facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution; budget preparations; selection of a new president; selection of academic deans and determination of faculty status.

Reiterating the importance of communications among personnel in administration, Joughin (1966), Assistant Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, stated that it is necessary and essential that adequate channels of communications be open and functioning for the participation of faculty in college governance. He continues:

Simply, American education has reached the point where thoughtful board members, administrators, faculty members, and students believe that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage of maturity calling for shared responsibility and cooperative action among the persons of the academic institutions (1966, p. 206).

As an indication of the extreme importance of maintaining open

and effective communications with all elements of a university "family" and particularly with the faculty and students was the recent confrontation between the administration represented by Oregon State University President James H. Jensen and certain militant faculty members, the Black Student Union and the Students for Democratic Society. The confrontation was a result of an issue concerning the rights of individuals in regards to their personal liberties.

President Jensen (G. -T. , 1969) has stated:

Jensen told the Gazette-Times he was striving to maintain the university as a center of learning and would do everything within his capabilities to wipe out any racial discrimination of either whites or blacks that may be on the campus.

He urged that the people of the community and the state understand that an 'honest attempt is being made to reach a sound conclusion.'

Junior-Community Colleges

The study conducted by the American Association of Junior Colleges and reported by Gray (1948) disclosed that procedures followed in planning general faculty meetings were surveyed in the hope of finding professional democracy in action in the people's college. Instead, the autocratic procedure of having general faculty meetings planned by the administrative head was reported by 154 of 228 respondents.

Allen (1955) pointed out when he wrote in Management Record that it is quite possible in a rapidly growing junior college that a

president may become so involved with the various details of daily operation that little time is available for consultation and planning. He goes on to say: "A willingness to delegate is one of the first requisites of an effective administrator. This willingness may stem from a sound philosophical belief about democratic administration, or from the expedient demand of many tasks to be accomplished" (1955, p. 124).

In a report of his three-year survey study of junior colleges in the United States, Medsker (1960) referred briefly to an atmosphere of democratic participation in curriculum building. Some type of faculty curriculum committee existed in practically all colleges visited. Medsker went on to report that department chairmen and the appropriate administrative officer sometimes constituted the committee, but in most colleges the faculty was also represented. The committee was either a purely advisory body or made decisions regarded as recommendations to the administration or the governing board. He also stated that most administrators felt certain that curriculum committees exercised a good control over undue proliferation of courses.

In a study at the University of Southern California, Pax (1963) found that the principles of administrative organization were least applicable to the areas of leadership and delegation, staff assistance, periodic review of organizational structure, and the overall planning

of the organizational structure of the junior colleges. He also discovered that as colleges increased in physical size the sharing of responsibilities increased more than delegation.

The importance of the ability to delegate has been recognized by many colleges seeking democratic administrators and they have stated such in their criteria for selection of the top administrator. For example, the Contra Costa Junior College District of California includes the following statement among its requirement under personal characteristics and commitments:

. . . an ability to define goals and programs, to delegate responsibility, deal justly with those whom he has associated and to stand on principle while being flexible in developing a program or meeting an issue (Priest, 1965, p. 6).

Burnette (1966, p. 119) pointed out in a recent study concerned with the internal organization of selected junior colleges in Florida that: "The evidence collected during the course of this study indicates that a number of Florida's public junior colleges would find it desirable to critically appraise their systems of evaluating and revising internal organizational structures." Continuing, he says that the organizational guidelines of the Division of Community Colleges (a handbook for the operation of the public junior colleges of Florida) recommend that the total staff be involved in such activities as evaluation, review, and revision. He argues there is a strong question as to whether or not the junior colleges are living up to the spirit or the letter of these

guidelines. Another factor of concern was the apparent indication that there was not a clear delegation of authority and responsibility to subordinates within a number of junior colleges. This would hold true also for a lack of faculty participation in the formulation of policies.

In discussing the role of leadership in the two-year college, Richardson (1967) says that the most important and significant issue in two-year college education today is the total role of the faculty in policy formulation. He continues: "Increasingly, the faculty of such institutions, many of whom have never been indoctrinated in the secondary school model, are insisting upon their right to be heard on issues of importance. This movement has resulted in legislative action in a number of states and could conceivably act to enhance the status of the department at the two-year college level"(1967, p. 245).

In summary, Rislov (1966, p. 11), in his article "The Role of the Faculty in Community College Government," asserted: ". . . the position presented here is that faculty participation in college government is increasing to include not only granted freedom to think and speak, but also the power to act in matters of control."

Recognition should be frequently given to the fact that participation implements and increases faculty morale. When teachers have the opportunity to become involved in formulation of policy that affects their own well-being this in turn will influence how they "teach" in the

classroom and consequently, the end product, the student, should benefit from it.

Lahti (1966, p. 9) has a point when he observed: "In those institutions where the autocratic administrator is not in operation, there is evidence that there has been rational thought and study given to the educational process in a community college. And, as a result, we find more appropriate faculty involvement in policy formulation." Consequently, a more democratic atmosphere prevails and education is enhanced.

As a step toward a more democratic administration within the community colleges of California, Erickson (1966, p. 144) pointed out the state law that is currently on the books concerned with faculty senates.

State law can also affect internal faculty relationships. In California, by state law, faculty councils or senates must be established in community colleges. More recently, it has been required that a negotiating committee be established to handle certain prescribed matters. These laws have been passed at the request of teacher associations.

Prior to the passage of the state law in California requiring community colleges to establish a faculty senate or council, Vavoulis (1961, p. 32) reported: ". . . the role of the faculty is not conceived in terms of policy determination." Vavoulis made this statement after studying the results of a 1961 survey of fifty-one junior colleges in California.

Concurring with this statement of Vavoulis' is Priest (1964) whose study in 1964 revealed a basic lack of faith on the part of administrative officials in the competence and integrity of teaching faculty.

And Richardson (1967, p. 40), writing in a recent issue of the Junior College Journal, substantiates the recency of shared policy formulation concepts in junior colleges when he stated: "Faculty participation in policy determination is a matter of relatively recent concern to junior college educators. In fact, two-year college administrators have for the most part refused to share broad delegated powers with the teaching faculty."

It was also pointed out by Richardson (1967) that those administrators who prove to be resistant to change unknowingly contribute to the revolutionary movement among junior college teaching faculties. And Bagish (1967, p. 40) has declared that the junior college ". . . faculty has tasted the wine of freedom and found it not only sweet, but downright exhilarating." ". . . with this new found exhilaration, teachers want to have a part in the formulation of policy and intend to have a part."

As professionals in the field of education, teachers feel they are ready to accept responsibility toward participation in policy formulation with the administrators. They are seeking ways and means of accomplishing the task of opening avenues of communications with the

administrators and oftentimes the means are not above a strike or threat of strike. They especially desire to be involved in matters that relate to instruction and teacher welfare.

Garrison (1967, p. 15) commented: "The main faculty concern in the total administrative context is that their voice be effectively heard, especially in matters affecting them as professionals."

That faculty will organize, there is little doubt, and this organization will become a reality locally, statewide, and nationally--to the degree that they feel themselves inadequately represented at all significant decision-making levels. They do not feel restricted by the sanctions of unwritten laws or actions which inhibit their four-year colleagues. Garrison (1967) admonished that the means of organization--whether through faculty senates, designated 'bargaining groups', local chapters of the A. A. U. P., the A. F. T., the N. E. A., state organizations, or even local ad hoc groups--faculty militancy will grow in direct proportion to their sense of isolation (whether fancied or not) from the sources of power that control their professional destinies.

"Today, faculty-administrator relations have become a major concern in every segment of education, private or public" (Lombardi, 1966, p. 9). He goes on to relate in a recent article that all of our news media carry accounts of the increasing tensions between faculty and administrators--including collective bargaining, walk-outs, and

strikes. And, Lombardi reiterated that the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association are carrying on a verbal struggle in their publications and a political contest for the support of the public school teachers in the cities. And, it is a well known fact that the A. F. T., especially, is establishing branches in the colleges.

An example of a community college faculty on strike is the report made by Howe (1966, p. 14) as he described the developments in Michigan that led to a strike by the faculty of the Henry Ford Community College. Howe advised that: "Faculty participation in the governance of a college is an issue worthy of study in its own right. Given the opportunity I would continue to urge its introduction and its extension to the utmost degree possible."

Another incidence of a faculty strike is reported by union representatives Swenson and Novar, in the March 1967 issue of the Junior College Journal. They pointed out that the largest faculty strike in the history of American junior colleges began at eight campuses of the Chicago City College, a fifty-year-old public junior college on November 30, 1966. Among the most prominent concerns of the 684 teachers of the junior college was the lack of voice for the faculty in the determination of their working conditions.

This report by the union representatives of the American Federation of Teachers in Chicago illustrates again the concern for adequate

and necessary communications in the administrative procedures and patterns of the community colleges. Union faculties can no longer be ignored and put out-of-mind by the college president.

In California opinion is still divided sharply as the American Federation of Teachers insists that:

Two groups in higher education make policy . . . the board and the faculty. It is the function of the administration to implement policy, not to make it. A good administrator under such a system is the servant of the faculty and not its director. He executes policy as it is formulated (Schloming, 1965, p. 9).

On the other side of the coin the California Junior College Faculty Association asserted: "A true faculty senate will enhance the position of the junior college in its community and state. It will also share legislative authority with the board of trustees" (C. J. C. F. A., 1963, p. 2).

While Oregon does not have legislation of this particular nature it is possible that it may become a reality through teacher pressures, unionization of faculty, or by enlightened administrative leadership in a democratic manner sooner than expected.

As Lombardi so succinctly states:

The junior college president cannot ignore the logic that, to be successful, faculty-administrator relations must involve more than lip service to the principle of faculty participation in the governance of the college; and that this participation must include the principle that faculty should have a say in determining the means by which this participation shall take place (1966, p. 16).

Morris (1970) has just completed a study involving the identification and development of procedures and criteria for self-analysis by community colleges. He maintains there is need to assess and improve the effectiveness and pertinence of the community college philosophies, responsibilities, and the organization and administration of programs.

Also recently completed at Oregon State University is a study concerned with pre-service and in-service education for community college personnel in Oregon community colleges. The purpose of the study was to establish criteria and/or develop broad guidelines for the development of a program of pre-service and professional improvement.

The study was a project of the Division of Vocational, Adult and Community College Education of the School of Education, done in cooperation with the Oregon State Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY

The procedures of the study were threefold: The initial stage of the study involved the development and refinement of an inventory of administrative duties which lent themselves to faculty involvement in policy formulation in the public community colleges of Oregon.

The second stage, faculty involvement in policy formulation in the public community colleges of Oregon, was examined through the use of the validated survey instrument, a copy of which was mailed to each selected college and respondent. See Appendix A.

The tertiary stage involved a personal interview on campus with each respondent selected for contact by the writer.

Vitally important to the success of the research study was the validity of the questions formulated and asked. Thorndike and Hagen (1959) have indicated one method of appraising validity as "rational analysis or professional judgment." With this in mind instrument content validity was established for this particular study by the selection of items from other studies which dealt with faculty participation and involvement in decision-making and policy formulation in educational institutions (Tunnell, 1963; Carson, 1965; Rislov, 1965; Eaton, 1966; Bentley, 1966; Malik, 1968; and Morris, 1970), by the utilization of a research team of educational leaders and specialists and by the use of experiences of the investigator.

The composition of the research team included Dr. Donald K. Shelton, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association, Salem, Oregon; Dr. William G. Loomis, Assistant Superintendent of Community Colleges and Vocational Education, State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon; Mr. Carrol deBroekert, Social Science Department, Lane Community College, Eugene Oregon; Dr. Eldon Schafer, President Linn-Benton Community College, Albany, Oregon; Dr. William Aldridge, Associate Director Center of Educational Research and Services, Oregon State University; Mr. Ronald Kaiser, Coordinator Research Coordinating Unit, School of Education, Oregon State University; Mr. Robert Shaw, Vocational Education Leadership Intern, School of Education, Oregon State University; Dr. Henry A. TenPas, Director Vocational, Adult and Community College Education, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon and the writer. Also utilized in the development of the validation of the survey instrument were a group of Vocational Educational Leadership interns from Oregon State University under the supervision of Dr. Henry A. TenPas. These interns were contacted during the spring of 1969 at one of their regularly scheduled community college seminars held at various community colleges throughout the state. At the meeting held at Clatsop Community College in Astoria, Oregon the writer explained the purpose of the study and requested the help of the interns in validating the instrument. Those interns

directly involved with established community colleges in Oregon did provide beneficial and valuable contributions to the final development of the survey questionnaire as utilized in the study.

The selection of the community colleges to participate in the study was determined through a series of discussions and consultations with educational leaders within the State of Oregon. These consultants were Dr. Henry A. TenPas, Director of Vocational, Adult and Community College Education, Oregon State University; Dr. Keith Goldhammer, Dean School of Education, Oregon State University; Dr. Lester Beals, Professor of Education, Oregon State University; Dr. Alphonse Selinger, Research Associate, Division Vocational, Adult and Community College Education, Oregon State University; Mr. Ronald Kaiser, Coordinator Research Coordinating Unit, School of Education, Oregon State University; Dr. Eldon Schafer, President Linn-Benton Community College, Albany, Oregon; Dr. Robert E. Hamill, Acting President Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon; Mr. William Morris, Associate, Division of Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon; Mr. Ralph Matthews, Vocational Education Leadership Intern, Oregon State University; and other graduate students in the School of Education, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.

Final decision for the four original community colleges, Alpha, Beta, Gamma and Delta, selected to be a part of the study was the

writer's. Geographical location within the state, accessibility to the college, size of community in which the college was located, number of full-time students enrolled and longevity of the college's operation were determinate factors in the final selection of the colleges.

Each community college president confirmed the college selection by telephone to the writer. Midway through the preliminary procedures of the study, Delta Community College, one of the original four colleges requested to withdraw from the study. The request was acknowledged and granted.

Designation of full-time faculty members to participate in the study was initiated by checking the Oregon Community College Association Directory to Personnel in Oregon Community Colleges, 1968-69 to ascertain the names, positions, teaching fields and areas of placement on the college staff. It was decided by the author, after discussions and meetings with Dr. Donald K. Shelton, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association, Salem, Oregon; Dr. William G. Loomis, Assistant Superintendent of Community Colleges and Vocational Education, State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon; Dr. Keith Goldhammer, Dean of the School of Education, Oregon State University; Dr. Henry A. TenPas, Director Vocational, Adult and Community College Education, Oregon State University; and graduate students in Education at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, to attempt the selection of a faculty representative of

academic and vocational-technical education and teaching within the community colleges as respondents for the study. In verifying the OCCA Directory to Personnel, 1968-69 it was noted that approximately 78 percent of all full-time faculty were teaching in the academic (college transfer) area and the remaining 22 percent of the full-time faculty were engaged in teaching the vocational-technical aspects of education. For this reason the final selection of full-time faculty chosen as respondents for the study was predicated upon a similar ratio of approximately three academic full-time faculty members to one full-time vocational-technical faculty member.

Alpha community college and Gamma Community College were designated as "odd" number schools with Beta Community College and Delta Community College characterized as "even" number schools. Faculty of each college were assigned numbers in alphabetical order from one upward. Faculty with "odd" numbers were selected from Alpha and Gamma Community Colleges and faculty with "even" numbers were chosen from Beta and Delta Community Colleges.

The survey instruments with instructions were sent by first class mail directly to nine of twenty-one administrators of the three community colleges. Administrators designated to receive the questionnaire were the President, Dean of Instruction and Dean of Students. A stamped self-addressed envelope was enclosed for the convenience of the return of the survey instrument by the respondent

to the Research Coordinating Unit at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. (See Appendix A, page 88, for survey instrument and cover letter). Questionnaires were also sent via first class mail to sixty-five of one hundred twenty-eight full-time faculty members of Alpha, Beta and Gamma community colleges with identical instructions for completion and return of the survey instrument. The mailing of the questionnaire was all completed prior to the on-campus visitations of the selected community colleges by the investigator for the specific purpose of personally talking with each respondent.

Eight of nine administrators returned their copy of the questionnaire for a return of 89 percent, seven of which were completely usable. Fifty-six of sixty-five questionnaires mailed to the faculty were returned in usable condition for a return of 86 percent. The combined returns of the administrators and the faculty totalled 87.5 percent.

As a follow-up to the questionnaire responses, permission was sought through a letter and a telephone call by the writer to the president of each community college to visit the college for the express purpose of personally interviewing each respondent concerning his views of faculty involvement in policy formulation at the college. Examples of respondent's remarks made to the author appear in Appendix C, page 114. After permission was granted to the investigator by the president, contacts were established at each

college through the help and cooperation of a vocational-education leadership intern already on campus or by another individual familiar with the campus. These contacts were for the purpose of arranging times and locations for appointments with faculty and administrators whom the writer interviewed.

Construction of the Rating Scale of Administrative Duties

The rating scale to be submitted to the jury of selection was constructed so that each duty could be independently judged as to its importance and appropriateness to faculty involvement in policy formulation. The jurors were requested to apply one of the following ratings to each administrative duty that faculty members may become involved in for policy formulation.

1. Faculty involvement necessary
2. Faculty involvement desirable
3. Faculty involvement questionable
4. Faculty involvement unnecessary

Each selected administrative duty was prepared with a scale to the right of the duty, with directions to circle the number corresponding to the juror's appraisal of the administrative duty. An example follows:

Curriculum and Instruction

The determination and development of policies for:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. a statement of educational philosophy for
the community college | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. a method of curriculum evaluation for the
total educational program of the community
college | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. the selection of textbooks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. the content of the college catalog | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Each jury member was requested to circle the number in the scale at the right side of the statements that agreed with his appraisal of the appropriateness and importance of the duty listed.

To obtain a mean score of the jury responses, a value was arbitrarily assigned to each of the judgments. The assignments were listed as follows:

- Value 1 for Faculty involvement necessary
- Value 2 for Faculty involvement desirable
- Value 3 for Faculty involvement questionable
- Value 4 for Faculty involvement unnecessary

Each duty needed to receive a mean score less than 2.50, to be placed on the instrument for the field test. For example, item number one, under Curriculum and Instruction, would not be included on the final survey instrument to be administered to the three selected public community colleges of Oregon if the composite score received from all the jurors' scores combined would produce a mean score above 2.50. As a further example, if item number two, under Curriculum

and Instruction, received a composite score from the jurors of less than 2.50, it would be included on the final draft of the survey instrument.

The decisive survey instrument administered to the selected personnel of the three public community colleges of Oregon was the composite acceptable duties as determined by the panel of jurors.

The questionnaire was field-tested at Linn-Benton Community College, Albany, Oregon, during winter and spring terms 1969, and refined by the writer with the advice and assistance of the jurors before finally being administered to the three selected public community colleges of Oregon.

Refinement of the Survey Questionnaire Instrument

The original list of eighty-eight duties (statements appropriate to faculty involvement in policy formulation) submitted to the jury was constructed by the investigator after a diligent search of the literature that pertained to administrative duties, by discussions with various educators (professors, teachers and graduate students), and by use of the personal background and experiences of the writer in education.

The jurors were encouraged to submit statements of their own for consideration to be included on the final survey questionnaire instrument. As a result of the validation process outlined above, the

original list of 88 duties was reduced to 57 on the final draft of the questionnaire.

Conducting the Field Test

The survey instrument was submitted for a field test to the President, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Students and all full-time faculty members of Linn-Benton Community College, Albany, Oregon, during winter and spring terms 1969, for their responses. As a result of the field testing of the instrument minor changes were made in the format, arrangement of questions was modified, directions were simplified and the length of the instrument was shortened so as to be more adaptable to use.

One hundred percent of the administrators returned the questionnaire and 50 percent of the full-time faculty answered and returned the instrument. As a result of the field test, the instrument was made ready to be submitted to the three public community colleges of Oregon selected for the study.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to examine by analysis of the data, the process and extent of faculty involvement in policy formulation in three selected public community colleges of Oregon. This was accomplished by a comparison of the responses of community college faculty members' and administrators' comments as to the process and extent of faculty involvement in policy formulation in six major administrative areas: (1) Curriculum and Instruction, (2) Faculty Personnel Policies, (3) Student Personnel Policies, (4) Building and Plant, (5) Finance (budgeting), and (6) General Institutional Policies. These six administrative areas were determined by the literature related to community college government and faculty involvement in policy formulation.

The percentage totals on the tables and figures do not total 100 percent in all instances because of unusable replies and/or the implication by some of the respondents that the criteria were not applicable.

It was determined by Dr. Lyle Calvin, Chairman of the Statistics Department, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, that since the study was a descriptive type the use of percentages was appropriate and accurate for the compilation and the reporting of data gathered by the investigator.

Views of Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement

Comparison of Views of the Total Faculty and Administrators Concerning Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement

Of the 57 different policy involvement categories contained in the survey instrument faculty were involved in 51 at the reasonable or maximum levels. Teacher class load, student financial aids, the selection of an architect, financing campus growth and expansion, securing Federal funds for college programs and the annual report of college progress and growth were the six policy involvement categories where the faculty had limited or no involvement in policy formulation according to the administrators.

Only in the administrative area of General Institutional Policies did the faculty perceive of their present role as being more involved in policy formulation than did the administrators, whereas, administrators stated that they perceived faculty members to have policy formulation involvement in 5 of 6 administrative areas at the level greater than the faculty had indicated.

Comparison of Views of the Academic Faculty, The Vocational- Technical Faculty and Administrators Concerning Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement

Administrators ranked present faculty involvement as greater than what the faculty had rated themselves in every administrative area except General Institutional Policies. Here the

vocational-technical faculty stated they experienced slightly more involvement in policy formulation than did the administrators.

Vocational-technical faculty were also more involved than academic faculty in formulation of policy for Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Personnel Policies, Student Personnel Policies, and General Institutional Policies. The academic faculty had more involvement than the vocational-technical faculty in two areas: Building and Plant and Finance (budgeting).

Comparison of Views of Female Faculty, Male Faculty
and Administrators Concerning Existing Patterns of
Faculty Involvement

Administrators recognized a greater amount of faculty involvement in policy formulation than did female faculty members in all six administrative areas and in 5 of 6 administrative areas for male faculty members. The single exception for the male faculty was the area of General Institutional Policies.

When the female faculty and the male faculty were compared on the amount of faculty involvement in policy formulation conceived by each group, the male faculty were involved more in 4 of 6 areas than were the female faculty. These four areas were: Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Personnel Policies, Building and Plant, and General Institutional Policies. The female faculty members said they had more involvement than the male faculty in Student Personnel

Policies and Finance (budgeting).

Comparison of Views of the Faculty by Years of Experience
and Administrators Concerning Existing Patterns of
Faculty Involvement

The data upon examination shows that administrators recognized more faculty involvement in policy formulation in 5 of 6 administrative areas than did two categories of faculty members, those with 1 to 4 years of teaching experience and those with 5 to 9 years of teaching experience. Faculty members with 10 or more years of teaching experience felt their involvement to be greater than what the administrators recognized faculty involvement to be in two specific areas: Finance (budgeting) and General Institutional Policies.

Views of Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement

A second area of faculty involvement in policy formulation was investigated as an integral part of this study. Respondents were requested to state their views of desired (should be) patterns of faculty involvement in policy formulation on each of 57 policy involvement statements. Such a response was to be based upon a conception of an "ideal" level of faculty involvement in the policy formulation process as interpreted by each respondent. The same basic comparisons were made involving total faculty, academic faculty, vocational-technical faculty, female faculty, male faculty, and faculty by years of experience.

Comparison of Views of the Total Faculty and Administrators
Concerning Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement

Administrators considering the patterns of faculty involvement in policy formulation that faculty members feel should be in effect said one of 57 policy involvement categories should not be considered appropriate for faculty involvement on either the maximum or reasonable levels. This particular category was the selection of an architect in the Building and Plant administrative area.

Faculty, on the other hand, thought they should have representation and be involved in all 57 policy involvement categories for the most advantageous working conditions.

Comparison of Views of Academic Faculty, Vocational-Technical
Faculty and Administrators Concerning Desired Patterns of
Faculty Involvement

Administrators in every instance have shown an inclination for the academic faculty and the vocational-technical faculty to be involved in policy formulation at the maximum or reasonable levels more than 50 percent of the time in all administrative areas except Building and Plant, where the administrators have shown a propensity toward the 50 percent level of involvement by actually indicating a 44.06 mean percentage of faculty involvement.

When the academic faculty and the vocational-technical faculty were compared on their views of desired (should be) patterns of faculty involvement, it was evident that academic faculty members

felt they should be involved more often in 4 of 6 administrative areas.

These areas were: Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Personnel Policies, Finance (budgeting), and General Institutional Policies.

The vocational-technical faculty members showed a greater preference for involvement in Student Personnel Policies and Building and Plant.

Comparison of Views of Female Faculty, Male Faculty and Administrators Concerning Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement

Male and female faculty members have somewhat different preferences with regard to faculty involvement in policy formulation. Female faculty desire greater involvement than administrators in Faculty Personnel Policies, Student Personnel Policies, Building and Plant, and General Institutional Policies. The male faculty members seek more involvement in policy formulation than the administrators in Faculty Personnel Policies, Student Personnel Policies, Building and Plant, Finance (budgeting) and General Institutional Policies.

The most disagreement among female faculty, male faculty and administrators occurs in the area of Building and Plant.

Comparison of Views of Faculty by Years of Teaching Experience and Administrators Concerning Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement

Faculty with 1 to 4 years of teaching experience desire less faculty involvement in policy formulation in all six administrative areas at the maximum and reasonable levels than either faculty

members with 5 to 9 years experience or faculty with 10 or more years of teaching experience.

The administrative area of Curriculum and Instruction was the only area where administrators had a larger mean percentage (94.56) for desired faculty involvement than any of the three faculty groups, 1 to 4 years of teaching experience, 5 to 9 years of teaching experience, or 10 plus years of teaching experience in any single administrative area.

The faculty group with 10 or more years of experience envisioned the need for increased faculty involvement in Student Personnel Policies, Building and Plant, Finance (budgeting), and General Institutional Policies more than either the faculty members with 1 to 4 years of teaching experience or the faculty group with 5 to 9 years of experience.

Views Regarding the Administrative Areas

This particular part of the study was designed to determine the attitudes and opinions of administrators and faculty regarding the importance of the administrative areas and the importance of faculty involvement in policy formulation in the administrative areas.

Two auxiliary items were developed to achieve this objective; both dealt with administrative areas rather than policy involvement statements.

The first item asked the respondents to rank in numerical order from one to six, in order of importance, each of the six administrative areas. The second item asked the respondents to rank in numerical order from one to six, in order of importance of faculty involvement in policy formulation, each of the six administrative areas.

The Importance of Administrative Areas

Noteworthy is the absence of any ranking in column one by either administrators or faculty for the area of Building and Plant and the very prominent ranking in columns one and two for Curriculum and Instruction in the composite rankings of administrators and faculty regarding the importance of the six administrative areas of concern for the functional operation of the community college.

The Importance of Administrative Areas for Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation

Administrators and faculty both attach major importance to the involvement of faculty in policy formulation for Curriculum and Instruction and Faculty Personnel Policies. Much less importance is indicated for faculty involvement in Finance (budgeting) and Building and Plant.

Major Findings

Views of Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation (See Table 2)

1. Administrators tended to feel there was more faculty involvement in policy formulation than the faculty in 5 of 6 administrative areas. Only in the area of General Institutional Policies did faculty members indicate that they felt more opportunity of involvement than what the administrators believed existed.
2. The faculty felt they were least involved in policy formulation in Building and Plant policies and the administrators concurred.
3. The faculty stated they were most involved in policy formulation in the administrative area of Curriculum and Instruction and the administrators agreed.
4. The area of General Institutional Policies was the administrative area of most agreement among the administrators and the faculty.
5. The vocational-technical faculty generally discerned more faculty involvement in policy formulation than the academic faculty.
6. The vocational-technical faculty perceived more faculty involvement in policy formulation than academic faculty in four of six administrative areas: Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Personnel Policies, Student Personnel Policies, and General Institutional

Table 2. Composite Comparisons of the Mean Percentage Totals for Administrators, Total Faculty, Academic Faculty, Vocational-Technical Faculty, Female Faculty, Male Faculty, Faculty With 1-4 Years of Experience, Faculty With 5-9 Years of Experience, and Faculty With 10 Plus Years of Experience Regarding Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon

Admin. Areas	Administrators	Faculty	Academic	Voc-tech	Female	Male	1-4 years	5-9 years	10+ years
C & I	68.14	54.90	50.35	64.24	48.72	56.54	47.36	60.43	59.30
FPP	39.39	30.71	28.60	34.04	28.45	31.37	25.42	32.28	37.86
SPP	33.16	29.26	27.56	32.07	31.09	28.49	31.29	36.03	30.38
B & P	30.80	20.53	21.52	16.65	19.99	21.09	22.64	17.76	30.37
F	34.88	28.38	27.98	27.91	23.32	20.83	25.54	30.52	36.17
GIP	34.42	36.41	33.55	41.59	27.18	39.68	37.87	32.95	40.68

Key: C & I Curriculum and Instruction
 FPP Faculty Personnel Policies
 SPP Student Personnel Policies
 B & P Building and Plant
 F Finance (budgeting)
 GIP General Institutional Policies
 1-4 years Faculty with 1-4 years teaching experience
 5-9 years Faculty with 5-9 years teaching experience
 10+ years Faculty with 10 plus years teaching experience

Policies.

7. The academic faculty felt they had more policy involvement than the vocational-technical faculty members in two of six administrative areas: Building and Plant, and Finance (budgeting).

8. Administrators perceived greater faculty involvement in policy formulation than did the academic faculty in all six administrative policy areas.

9. Administrators indicated greater faculty involvement in policy formulation than did vocational-technical faculty members in 5 of 6 administrative areas. The one exception was the area of General Institutional Policies where the vocational-technical faculty indicated a greater amount of involvement in policy formulation.

10. Administrators stated they felt there was greater opportunity for faculty involvement in policy formulation in all six administrative areas than did female faculty members.

11. In 5 of 6 administrative areas administrators stated they thought there was greater opportunity for faculty involvement in policy formulation than did the male faculty members. The one exception was in the area of General Institutional Policies where the male faculty felt they were more involved.

12. Male faculty members indicated more faculty involvement than the female faculty in four of six administrative areas: Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Personnel Policies, Building and

Plant, and General Institutional Policies.

13. Female faculty members said they were involved more than the male faculty group in the areas of Student Personnel Policies and in Finance (budgeting).

14. Administrators indicated more faculty involvement in policy formulation in five of six administrative policy areas than did the faculty with 1 to 4 years of teaching experience. The one exception where the faculty with 1 to 4 years of teaching experience decided they had greater involvement was General Institutional Policies.

15. Faculty with 5 to 9 years of teaching experience decided they had less involvement in five of six administrative policy areas than administrators. The lone exception was policy involvement in the administrative area of Student Personnel Policies.

16. Faculty with 10 or more years of experience stated they had more involvement than administrators had indicated in two areas: Finance (budgeting) and General Institutional Policies.

17. Perceptions of faculty involvement in policy formulation varied by the number of years of teaching experience. Faculty members with 10 plus years of teaching experience tended to perceive the greatest amount of faculty involvement; those teachers with from 1 to 4 years of experience perceived the least faculty involvement in policy formulation.

18. Faculty members with from 5 to 9 years of teaching experience indicated more involvement in policy formulation than those teachers with 1 to 4 years of experience, but less than those teachers with 10 or more years of experience.

19. The area of most general agreement among administrators and faculty members for all years of teaching experience categories was the Student Personnel Policies area.

Views of Desired (should be) Patterns of Faculty
Involvement in Policy Formulation
(See Table 3)

1. Faculty members favored more faculty involvement in policy formulation than the administrators in five of six administrative areas: Faculty Personnel Policies, Student Personnel Policies, Building and Plant, Finance (budgeting), and General Institutional Policies.

2. Administrators advocated greater faculty involvement in policy formulation than faculty members did in the area of Curriculum and Instruction.

3. Administrators and faculty were mostly in agreement for increased faculty involvement in the areas of Finance (budgeting) and Student Personnel Policies.

4. Administrators and faculty were least in agreement for increased faculty involvement in the areas of Building and Plant and

Table 3. Composite Comparisons of the Mean Percentage Totals for Administrators, Total Faculty, Academic Faculty, Vocational-Technical Faculty, Female Faculty, Male Faculty, Faculty With 1-4 Years of Experience, Faculty With 5-9 Years of Experience, and Faculty With 10 Plus Years of Experience Regarding Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon

Admin. Areas	Administrators	Faculty	Academic	Voc-tech	Female	Male	1-4 years	5-9 years	10+ years
C & I	94.56	89.73	90.25	87.22	88.31	89.61	81.40	92.49	90.16
FPP	70.80	77.05	77.49	76.38	74.47	78.11	64.77	85.77	79.29
SPP	66.13	67.16	66.96	69.59	66.66	66.52	61.53	62.07	75.55
B & P	44.06	63.46	61.82	65.07	63.79	63.91	53.27	65.49	68.56
F	64.27	64.93	64.82	62.46	60.54	72.91	51.06	64.75	69.43
GIP	56.43	70.49	70.16	69.59	62.55	72.93	60.35	66.59	76.21

Key: C & I Curriculum and Instruction
 FPP Faculty Personnel Policies
 SPP Student Personnel Policies
 B & P Building and Plant
 F Finance (budgeting)
 GIP General Institutional Policies
 1-4 years Faculty with 1-4 years teaching experience
 5-9 years Faculty with 5-9 years teaching experience
 10+ years Faculty with 10 plus years teaching experience

General Institutional Policies.

5. Administrators advocated greater faculty involvement in policy formulation only in the administrative area of Curriculum and Instruction than did either academic faculty or vocational-technical faculty.

6. Academic faculty favored greater faculty involvement in policy formulation than did vocational-technical faculty in Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Personnel Policies, Finance (budgeting), and General Institutional Policies.

7. Vocational-technical faculty members proposed greater faculty involvement in policy formulation than academic faculty members in Student Personnel Policies and Building and Plant.

8. The administrative area of greatest disagreement among academic faculty and vocational-technical faculty was in the Building and Plant area of policy formulation.

9. On decisions related specifically to the area of Building and Plant both academic faculty and vocational-technical faculty advocated considerably more faculty involvement than did administrators.

10. Administrators perceived more faculty involvement in policy formulation than female faculty members in the administrative areas of Curriculum and Instruction, and Finance (budgeting).

11. Administrators were in favor of more faculty involvement in policy formulation than male faculty members were in the area of

Curriculum and Instruction.

12. Female faculty members proposed more faculty involvement in policy formulation than administrators did in Faculty Personnel Policies, Student Personnel Policies, Building and Plant, and General Institutional Policies.

13. Male faculty members advocated more faculty involvement in policy formulation than did the administrators in 5 of 6 areas: Faculty Personnel Policies, Student Personnel Policies, Building and Plant, Finance (budgeting), and General Institutional Policies.

14. Administrators, female faculty and male faculty advocated the closest agreement for increased faculty involvement in the Student Personnel Policies administrative area.

15. The administrative area of General Institutional Policies provided the widest margin of disagreement among administrators, female faculty, and male faculty for increased involvement in policy formulation.

16. Administrators advocated greater faculty involvement in policy formulation than faculty by years of experience did in the area of Curriculum and Instruction.

17. Faculty members with 5 to 9 years of experience proposed greater faculty involvement than either faculty with 1 to 4 years of experience or faculty with 10 or more years of teaching experience in two administrative areas: Curriculum and Instruction and Faculty

Personnel Policies.

18. Faculty members with 10 plus years of experience favored greater faculty involvement in policy formulation than either faculty with 1 to 4 years of experience or faculty with 5 to 9 years of experience in four areas: Student Personnel Policies, Building and Plant, Finance (budgeting), and General Institutional Policies.

19. Faculty members with 5 to 9 years of experience advocated the greatest mean percentage of involvement in policy formulation and faculty members with 1 to 4 years of experience favored the least mean percentage of involvement for faculty in policy formulation.

Subjective Data

As a part of this study a personal on-campus visitation and interview was made with each respondent for the purpose of gaining additional insight about the opinions and attitudes of personnel regarding faculty involvement in policy formulation.

Comments extracted from these interviews with faculty and administrators have been edited and paraphrased in order to make the statements more readable. Some of these responses follow in this chapter; other nonrepetitive responses are listed in Appendix C.

Faculty Remarks

Generally the faculty tended to feel their existing opportunities for involvement in policy formulation were not as extensive as they had anticipated or hoped they might be. Faculty voiced opinions that led one to believe they did want to be more involved in policy formulation. The following remarks are indicative of faculty statements made to the writer.

The attitude of the president seems to run counter here on campus to his public (downtown) statements about the college.

There is no faculty involvement at this college, period.

Oh, he (president) knows what's going on here because he has an "umbrella" system of communications with faculty, students, and people downtown. He runs things here pretty much on his level.

We need more faculty involvement in the operation of this college. If we (faculty) are going to function in the governing of this college then we'd better get organized to do the job.

One good way to improve faculty morale would be to open up channels of communications between faculty and administrators. If people can't relate how can they hope to understand each other?

Faculty need to be involved in the selection of administrators. I believe we could get better administrators at this college if we had a chance to grill them about their background and philosophy before they were hired.

Its my contention that administrators oftentimes overlook the fact that faculty members are citizens of the community and often parents. This should somehow be brought more directly to their attention and then perhaps they would realize that we have something to contribute.

The administration to the best of my knowledge has never told anyone how to teach or how to act outside the classroom.

Administrator Remarks

Administrators tended to give more credence to the involvement of faculty in policy formulation, both on the existing level and the desired level, as the evidence of their statements given to the investigator indicate.

The statements that follow are typical of those made by administrators regarding faculty involvement in policy formulation.

Certainly there are channels of communications open between the faculty and administration. However, the channels may not always be apparent.

We place no restrictions on the activities of the teachers in the classrooms. They are professionals and should be respected as such.

Only a very small percentage of faculty actually want to accept the responsibility of involvement in administrative policies.

Faculty are involved in many ways here, but perhaps, the most involvement is through their faculty committees.

Certainly, we make an attempt to involve more faculty in decisions--in fact, how can we avoid doing so even if we wanted not to?

Democratic administration will work well if all those concerned agree to aid and to help it function. Everyone involved must recognize that decisions must be made and when finalized they need to be implemented.

We (administrators) need the support of the faculty--after all, they (faculty) are the implementers of program and policy.

I found faculty to be responsive to new ideas and changes whenever they understood the "what" and the "why" of things.

Our basic problem is rapid "growth."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

As a result of this investigation of faculty involvement in policy formulation in three selected public community colleges of Oregon, several conclusions can be made. These include the following:

Evidence of some form of democratic administration was apparent at each of the three public community colleges visited by the writer. Personal statements, both oral and written, made by members of the administration and the faculty to the investigator tend to substantiate this. There is occasion where faculty do, however, feel unduly constrained in their own movement of purpose and this was perhaps most notably illustrated by the faculty group with 1 to 4 years of teaching experience when they stated opinions that proved to be contrary to those of administrators and other faculty members. Most conspicuous were the administrative areas of Building and Plant and Faculty Personnel Policies where faculty with 1 to 4 years of experience registered their lowest mean percentage of involvement. It is quite possible that because of their relative newness to teaching they feel less obligated to become involved; or that they have not been sought to serve on committees, study groups, planning sessions, etc.; or they may have personal hesitancy to actively engage themselves

into the involvement of policy formulation which they may see as a form of politics to be avoided or minimized.

Most community colleges--including the three on which this study is based--are "open-door" institutions. Because of this policy admitted students vary widely in their abilities to comprehend and perform in an educational setting. Courses often range the spectrum of remedial, occupational, lower division transfer and adult classes. A varied curriculum means a varied faculty. Therefore, it would appear likely that faculty members representing various subject areas, technical skills, ideas, opinions and attitudes would naturally hold different views regarding faculty involvement in policy formulation.

Realizing that the findings of this study perhaps cannot be generalized beyond the public community colleges included in the study, a number of conclusions appear warranted. There is evidence that, in most cases, faculty believe there is less faculty involvement in policy formulation than do administrators on the present existing levels of operation. On the other hand, faculty seek to be involved in policy formulation more often in all administrative areas than do administrators permit except in the area of Curriculum and Instruction. In this specific area the administrators are even more desirous of increased faculty involvement.

Further conclusions require that one make distinctions between academic and vocational-technical faculty, female and male faculty,

and faculty by years of teaching experience.

Overall there appears to be opportunity in each administrative area within the present community college organizational structure for faculty to function in the policy formulation role. Both administrators and faculty indicated the present existence of faculty involvement in policy formulation. Both also indicated their desire to see increased faculty involvement in policy formulation in all six administrative areas.

Militancy by faculty on the community college campuses was not observed by the writer; however, the possibility of it erupting from some discontent or personal grievance is always a contingency to be reckoned with by those in administrative authority. Whether "dissension among the troops" does occur is, of course, a moot point. What is known and is apparent, however, is that disparity between administrators and faculty on what the faculty involvement is at present and what it should be in the future is evident by the oral and written statements provided the writer by both parties.

A number of faculty members of one community college studied felt that committee organization is a means of providing the faculty an appearance of democratic participation. In the words of one faculty member who volunteered his information he stated: "I have the feeling that faculty committees are much the same as student governments; both groups are playing at democracy." He thought this to be

particularly true since the administrators largely controlled the faculty committees in function, procedures and memberships. Perhaps the major reason committees are perpetuated is because administrators may feel that committees perform useful functions for faculty members, particularly a place for socialization with fellow faculty members.

Faculties have a role in college government, but its continuance may be dependent upon their willingness to accept more responsibility. And, they must help to change some of the traditional beliefs and practices, otherwise they may find themselves becoming institutional employees rather than the members of a professional community.

Recommendations

This study recommends that changes need to be made in the internal organization and procedures for faculty involvement if faculty are going to be more meaningfully involved in policy formulation, committee services, and community college governance. The community college with its "open door" admissions for students needs an "open door" approach to involving faculty to help solve some of the complex operational problems of the community college. And yet, so very many of the faculty still refuse to become involved in college governance for fear of becoming lost in the machinations of complexity. Faculty, to be most effective, need to break out of the "mold" of

hindering negative thought and become positive in thought, approach and deed.

These internal changes must allow faculty to become more intimately and fully involved and to be a more viable force in the attraction of talented staff, both faculty and administrators. This is necessary because the community college, like an object moving in space, tends to persist in the direction established by its faculty as the quality of the faculty determines the character of the community college.

There is need to clarify the various areas of responsibility and authority of the board, the administrators, the faculty and the students. It should be high on the priority list of the college.

Caution must be exercised to prevent the wholesale transfer of public secondary school philosophy into being at the community colleges and at the same time copying entirely or being allied too closely with the make-up of the four-year institutions of higher education must be guarded against. To do either completely would be disastrous for the community college for it would then cease to exist as a true community college.

With community colleges being potentially the leaders in community education it is logical and necessary that faculty and administrators work very closely together in the development and extension of the community education concept.

A study in depth of why there is not a greater involvement in policy formulation and a willingness to assume responsibility by faculty members is needed as community colleges increase in complexity of governance.

A study in depth of why faculty involvement in policy formulation is less for newer staff members and greater for more experienced staff members is needed to help clarify administrative-faculty organizational patterns of governance.

As community colleges increase so rapidly in size and become more complex, it is possible that college administrators will need help with major decisions in college government. Intensive studies of community college government are needed to help determine how colleges might be organized to most effectively involve faculty, as well as the administrators, in more meaningful participation.

The community college is not sacrosanct. It is a vital, dynamic and perhaps the most crucial "cutting edge" of education today. And, because of this, faculty and administrators have not only a need to work closely together but an obligation to do so for the continued progress and improvement of education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Academic freedom factor in Montana controversy. The Spokesman-Review (Spokane, Washington) p. 1, cols. 3-4. January 29, 1969.
- Allen, Louis A. 1955. The art of delegation. Management Record 17:90-92, 122-124.
- American Association of School Administrators. 1947. Schools for a new world: 25th yearbook. 448 p.
- _____ 1955. Staff relations in school administration: 33d yearbook. Washington, D. C. 470 p.
- Bagish, Henry H. 1966. Decision making in junior community colleges: appropriate roles. Panel discussion of the Association for Higher Education Summer Conference. Miami Beach, Florida, 1966. (Cited in: Richardson, Richard C. Jr. 1967. Junior College Journal 37:40-42. March.)
- Baines, John D. 1958. The community college's newest obligation. Junior College Journal 27:247-250.
- Beals, Lester M. 1969. An institute for junior college student personnel specialists, teaching staffs and administrators. Proposed program to be offered at Oregon State University. Corvallis, 1969-70.
- Bently, Norma E. 1966. The role of faculty in community college policy making. Cazenovia, New York, Cazenovia College, 13 p.
- Besse, Ralph M. 1964. Education and the race problem. Junior College Journal 35(2):3-7.
- Blocker, Clyde E. 1964. Academic rank in two-year colleges. Junior College Journal 35(4):21-25.
- _____ 1965. Are faculties competent? Junior College Journal 36(4):12-17.

- Blocker, Clyde E. 1963. Decision making in the internal operation of an institution. In: *Critical decisions in higher education: Proceedings of the 18th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1963*; ed. by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D.C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 164.
- Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. 1965. *The two-year college: a social synthesis*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall. 298 p.
- Bogue, Jesse P. 1956. Analysis of junior college growth. *Junior College Journal* 26:354-368.
- _____ 1950. *The community college*. New York. McGraw-Hill. 390 p.
- Boozer, Howard R. 1963. North Carolina is counting on community colleges. *Junior College Journal* 34(4):8-11.
- Brown, Ralph S. Jr. 1966. Rights and responsibilities of faculty. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 52(2):131-140.
- Burnette, Horace Jimmie. 1963. An analysis of the internal organizational structures of selected public junior colleges in Florida. Ed.D. thesis. Gainesville, University of Florida. 141 numb. leaves.
- Campion, Howard A. 1961. Role of the junior college in higher education. *College and University* 35:426-434.
- Carpenter, W. W. 1962. Early interest of the University of Missouri in the junior college. *Junior College Journal* 32: 476-484.
- Carson, Robert B. 1965. Teacher preparation in decision-making in education and other local community activities in three Oregon communities. Ed.D. thesis. Eugene. University of Oregon. 246 numb. leaves.
- Chase, Francis. 1951. Factors for satisfaction in teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan* 33:128.

- Clark, Burton R. 1964. The role of the faculty in college administration. Guidelines for the aspiring professor. Burlingame, California, Southwestern Publishing Company. 263 p.
- Cocking, W. D. 1961. Community college in the '60's. Overview 2:77. May.
- Colvert, C. C. 1947. A half century of junior colleges. Junior College Journal 27:244-247.
- _____ 1956. Development of the junior college movement. In: American junior colleges, ed. by Jesse D. Bogue. 4th ed. Washington, D. C. American Council on Education. p. 10-16.
- Conant, James B. 1956. The citadel of learning. New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University, 79 p.
- Corson, John B. 1960. Governance of colleges and universities. New York, McGraw-Hill. 209 p.
- Cowley, W. H. 1963. Critical decisions in American higher education. In: Critical decisions in higher education: Proceedings of the 18th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1963; ed. by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 13-21.
- Cross, G. L. Democracy in the administration of higher education. College and University 28:472-486. 1953.
- Derber, Milton. 1960. How can a campus climate be created, for favorable development of quality programs, by involving the participation of faculty, students and administrators? In: Guidelines for the 60's: Proceedings of the 15th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1960; ed. by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 132-134.
- Diekoff, John S. 1950. Democracy's college. New York, Harper and Row, 208 p.
- Dodds, Harold W. The academic president-educator or caretaker? New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962. 294 p.
- Doi, James I. 1965. Organization and administration, finance and facilities. Review of Educational Research 35:347-361.

- Duryea, E. D. 1963. Decision making through allocation of responsibility. In: Critical decisions in higher education: Proceedings of the 18th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1963; ed. by G. Kerry Smith, Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 157-159.
- Eaton, Miles. W. 1966. The role of faculty in community college policy making. *Junior College Journal* 36(1):11.
- Ells, Walter Crosby. American junior college. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1940. 585 p.
- _____ 1962. Junior college doctoral dissertations, a supplementary list. *Junior College Journal* 33:16-19.
- _____ 1940. The junior college terminal education. *Junior College Journal* 10:244-250.
- Emergency--Reagan clears way for CHP on UC campus. *San Francisco Chronicle* p. 1, col. 3. February 6, 1969.
- Englehardt, N. L. 1961. New challenges for local school boards: grades 13 and 14. *School Management* 5(2):38-42.
- Erickson, Clifford G. 1966. Community colleges and the immediacy of community pressures. In: Higher education reflects--on itself and on the larger society: Proceedings of the 21st Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1966; ed. by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 144-145.
- _____ 1964. Multi-purpose campus operation in the big city. *Junior College Journal* 35(2):17-21.
- _____ 1965. Rebirth in Illinois. *Junior College Journal* 36(1):28-29.
- Eskow, Seymour. Barron's guide to the two-year colleges. Great Neck, New York, Barron's Educational Series, 1960. 370 p.
- Ferry, W. H. 1963. Why the college is failing. *The Educational Record* 44:312-320.

- Fields, Ralph R. The community college movement. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962. 359 p.
- Fish, Lawrence D. et al. 1964. A study of the need for a community college in Linn-Benton County area of Oregon. Eugene, University of Oregon, School of Education. 12 p.
- For faculty pay--'power' tactics talked as way to get raises. Gazette-Times (Corvallis, Oregon) p. 20, cols. 5-6. February 19, 1969.
- Ford, Thorton Morrow. 1965. An analysis of the comprehensive purposes of the junior college as appraised by personnel and directors in ten junior colleges in the State of Washington. Ed.D. thesis. Pullman. Washington State University. 89 numb. leaves.
- Fuchs, Ralph F. 1963. Decision making through allocation of responsibility. In: Critical decisions in higher education: Proceedings of the 18th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1963; ed. by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 160-167.
- Garrison, Roger H. 1962. Effective administration for superior teaching. Junior College Journal 32:517-525.
- _____ 1966. Professional and philosophical faculty attitudes. Junior College Journal 36(6):16-19.
- _____ 1967. The teachers' professional situation. Junior College Journal 37(6):15-18.
- Giles, Frederic T. 1964. Washington: new life at forty. Junior College Journal 34(8):28-30.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. (ed.). 1967. American Junior College. 7th ed. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education. 957 p.
- _____ 1960. Analysis of junior college growth. Junior College Journal 30:351-360.
- _____ 1964. A new social invention: the community college, what is it. Washington, D. C. American Association of Junior Colleges. 14 p.

Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. (ed.). 1961. National approach to junior college leadership. *Journal of Secondary Education* 36:58-64.

_____ 1968. This is the community college. Boston, Houghton Mifflin. 151 p.

Goldhammer, Keith et al. 1967. Issues and problems in contemporary educational administration. Eugene, University of Oregon, The Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration. 177 p.

Goode, Delmer M. (ed.). 1967. Administration and teaching. Improving College and University Teaching (Oregon State University) 15(4):193-268. Autumn.

_____ 1963. The professor on campus. Improving College and University Teaching (Oregon State University) 11(1):3-58. Winter.

Gordon, Mitchell. 1963. Junior college rise: two-year institutions play an expanding role in higher education. *Wall Street Journal* 162:1. December 26.

Graham, Walter A. 1964. It may happen in Alabama, too. *Junior College Journal* 35(3):28-29.

Gray, J. E. 1948. Administrative and supervisory practices for improving instruction. *Junior College Journal* 18:238-246.

Gross, S. 1963. Community college: Michigan's fastest growing whatchamacallit. *American School and University* 36(1):36-38.

Gulick, Luther and L. Urwick (eds.). 1937. Papers on the science of administration. New York, Columbia University. 195 p.

Hall, George L. 1966. Ten commandments for trustees. *Junior College Journal* 36(7):24-27.

Hall, Roy et al. 1955. Organization of schools and administrative units. *Review of Higher Educational Research* 25:334-350.

Hannelly, Robert J. 1963. Explosion in Arizona: rapid expansion of Maricopa County Junior College. *Junior College Journal* 34(1):16-18.

- Harper, William A. 1966. How community colleges are organized, started and controlled. *Nation's Schools* 77(2):53-56.
- Harris, Norman C. 1963. Changes in the junior college. *School and Society* 91:187-188.
- Hatton, Robert O. 1968. The community college development in Oregon. *Oregon Education Journal* 42(16):6-8.
- Hawk, Ray. 1960. Profile of junior college presidents. *Junior College Journal* 30:340-346.
- Hayakawa sees campus plot. *The Washington Post* (Washington, D. C.) p. A3, cols. 2-3. February 4, 1969.
- Helland, Phillip C. 1966. Minnesota turns to state junior colleges. *Junior College Journal* 36(4):40-41.
- Henderson, Algo D. 1965. Decision-making by junior college faculty. *School and Society* 93:292.
- _____ 1963. Improving decision-making through research. In: *Critical decisions in higher education: Proceedings of the 18th. Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1963*; ed. by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 153-155.
- Hendrix, V. L. 1962. A critical analysis of the relationships between administrative policies and procedures and certain faculty characteristics. Ph.D. thesis. Austin, University of Texas. 153 numb. leaves.
- Henninger, G. Ross. 1959. *The technical institute in America*. New York, McGraw-Hill. 276 p.
- Henry, Nelson B. (ed.). *The public junior college. The fifty-fifth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I*. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1956. 347 p.
- Hertzfeld, Kurt M. 1963. Decision making in the internal operation of an institution. In: *Critical decisions in higher education: Proceedings of the 18th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1963*; ed. by G. Kerry Smith, Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 167-169.

- Hill, Forest G. 1967. The faculty senate and educational policy-making. In: In search of leaders: 1967; ed. by G. Kerry Smith, Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 236-239.
- Hillway, Tyrus. 1958. The American two-year college. New York, Harper. 276 p.
- Homans, George C. 1950. The human group. New York. Harcourt, Brace. 484 p.
- Honer, Stanley M. 1966. Faculty power and participation. Junior College Journal 36(5):28-32.
- Howe, Ray A. 1966. Faculty administration relationships in extremis. Junior College Journal 36(3):14-15.
- Hutchins, Robert. 1938. Hard times and the higher learning. Yale Preview 22:714-730.
- Jensen, Arthur M. 1965. Urban community colleges go multi-campus; a survey of ten urban multi-campus districts reveals some new trend and trouble spots. Junior College Journal 36(3):8-13.
- Joughin, Louis. 1966. Faculty participation in university and college. In: Higher education reflects--on itself and on the larger society: Proceedings of the 21st Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1966; ed. by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D.C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 203-206.
- Johnson, B. Lamar. 1964. Starting a community junior college. Washington, D. C., American Association of Junior Colleges. 91 p.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. 1962. Board policy manuals in California public junior colleges. Junior College Journal 32:454-462.
- _____ 1961. California junior college faculty handbooks. Junior College Journal 32:159-160.
- _____ 1963. U. C. L. A.'s laboratory in junior college administration. Junior College Journal 34:26-27.

Knezevich, Stephen J. 1962. Administration of public education. New York. Harper. 554 p.

Knudson, Marvin. 1960. The junior college in the decade ahead. Junior College Journal 30:307-309.

Koos, Leonard V. 1944. How to democratize the junior college. School Review 52:271-284.

_____ 1925. The junior-college movement. New York. Ginn. 436 p.

Lahti, Robert E. 1966. A faculty role in policy formulation. Junior College Journal 37(1):9-12.

_____ 1962. Junior college education in Wyoming. Junior College Journal 33:92-95.

Lane Community College. 1967. Board of education policy handbook, 1967-68. Eugene, Oregon.

_____ 1967. Staff handbook of policy, 1967-68. Eugene, Oregon.

Lange, Alexis F. 1917. The junior college as an integral part of the public school system. School Review 25:465-479.

Lawrence, Ben. 1968. Community colleges enrollment: impressive projections. Oregon Education Journal 42(16):11.

Lombardi, John. 1964. Emergent issues in administration. Junior College Journal 35(3):4-8.

_____ 1966. Faculty in the administrative process. Junior College Journal 37(3):9-16.

Loomis, William George. 1964. A study of the formal preparation of academic teachers in community colleges with proposals for Oregon. Ed.D. thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University. 269 numb. leaves.

MacKay, K. C. 1964. Something new in New Jersey. Junior College Journal 34(6):4-7.

- McConnell, T. R. 1962. A general pattern for American public higher education. New York, McGraw-Hill. 198 p.
- McKenna, D. L. 1961. Planning: the key to democratic leadership. *College and University* 36:303.
- Malik, Joseph A. 1968. Faculty participation in decision-making in Oregon community colleges. Ed.D. thesis. Eugene. University of Oregon. 173 numb. leaves.
- Mathews, M. A. 1967. Perception of effectiveness of administration based on faculty participation in decision making of junior colleges. Ed.D. thesis. Los Angeles, University of Southern California. 175 numb. leaves.
- Maul, Ray C. 1965. The biggest problem: finding good teachers. *Junior College Journal* 36(4):5-8.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. 1957. Significance of general education. *Junior College Journal* 27:251-255.
- Medsker, Leland L. 1958. Let's take a new look at the junior-college picture. National Education Association, *Journal* 47:628-630.
- _____ 1960. The junior college: progress and prospect. New York, McGraw-Hill. 367 p.
- Middleton, Warren C. 1966. Statement on government of colleges and universities. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 52(4):375-379.
- Millett, John D. 1962. The academic community. New York, McGraw-Hill. 265 p.
- Moeller, Gerald H. 1964. Bureaucracy and teachers' sense of power. *The School Review* 72:137-157.
- Moley, Raymond. 1959. Vital first years. *Newsweek* 54:124. September 14.
- Morphet, Edgar L. et al. 1967. Educational organization and administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
- Morris, William R. 1970. Identification and development of procedures and criteria for self-analysis by community colleges. Ed.D. thesis, Corvallis, Oregon State University. 97 numb. leaves.

- Morrison, D. Grant. 1959. Articulation of the high school and the public community junior college in the United States. National Association of Secondary School Principals, Bulletin 42:102-107.
- _____ 1963. Two-year community college, an annotated list of unpublished studies and surveys, 1957-61. Washington, D. C. U. S. Office of Education. 70 p.
- Morrissey, Kermit C. 1966. An alternative: state control. Junior College Journal 36(8):16-19.
- Mognis, R. F. 1961. The advisory council-experiment in democratic cooperation. Junior College Journal 31:258-260.
- Moser, Wilbur. 1939. Teacher participation in school administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University, California. (Cited in: Moser, W. E. 1939. No. 58. Vol. 12. Democracy put to vote. School Executive 58:12-13. August.)
- National Education Association. 1952. Teacher personnel procedures. National Education Association, Research Bulletin 30:60. April.
- National Society for the study of education. 1956. The public junior college: Fifty-fifth yearbook. Chicago. University of Chicago. 347 p.
- Newburn, H. K. 1964. Board meets the president. Junior College Journal 35(6):12-14.
- Nelson, James H. 1966. Guidelines for articulation. Junior College Journal 36(6):24-26.
- Niland, W. P. 1961. Master plan study and trends in California junior colleges. Junior College Journal 31:427-433.
- Novak, Robert T. and Frank B. Pesci. 1963. Progress in Maryland. Junior College Journal 33(7):16-19.
- Odegard, Charles E. 1963. Community colleges: education or higher education? Junior College Journal 33(7):20-21.
- Open door to shut--community colleges grim over finances. The Seattle Times (Seattle, Washington) p. 3, col. 5. February 7, 1969.

- Oosting, Kenneth W. 1966. Equating faculty loads. *Junior College Journal* 36(8):10-11.
- Oregon. Educational Coordinating Council. 1966. Education beyond the high school: a projection for Oregon. A report. Salem. 450 p.
- Oregon. Educational Coordinating Council. 1968. Report of the ad hoc committee on community college governance. Salem. 12 p.
- Oregon. State Department of Education. Division of Education Development. 1965. Delineation of the community college's place in Oregon education. Salem. 12 p. (Report 5)
- Oregon. State Department of Education. Division of Community Colleges and Vocational Education. n.d. Oregon community colleges: annual report. 1965-66. Salem. 38 p.
- Oregon. State Department of Education. Division of Education Development. 1966. Final report of the education improvement advisory commission. Salem. 89 p.
- Oregon. State Department of Education. 1965. Oregon Community colleges: a status report. Salem. 72 p.
- Oregon. State Department of Education. 1968. Laws relating to the Oregon public school system title 30. (chapters 326-348). chapters 187-310. Salem.
- Pax, R. W. 1963. An analysis of junior college administrative organizations. Ed.D. thesis. Los Angeles, University of Southern California. 371 numb. leaves.
- Pence, Don Pollard. 1960. Criteria for a system of area education districts for the State of Oregon. Ed.D. thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State College. 299 numb. leaves.
- _____ 1963. The Oregon story. *Junior College Journal* 34(3):4-8.
- Pesci, Frank B. and Royal Hart. 1968. The question of governance in Maryland. *Junior College Journal* 38(5):7-9.
- Priest, Bill J. 1964. Faculty administrator relationships. *Junior College Journal* 34(6):7.

- Priest, Bill J. 1965. Selecting a college president. *Junior College Journal* 36(7):6.
- Putnam, Phil H. 1952. Major provisions of the state law. *Junior College Journal* 22:342-344.
- Raynalds, David Palmer. 1967. Preparation of vocational-technical teachers in selected community colleges. M. E. thesis. Corvallis. Oregon State University. 136 numb. leaves.
- Richards, James M. 1966. Description of junior colleges. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 57:207-214.
- Richardson, Richard C., Jr. 1967. Departmental leadership in the two-year college. In: *In search of leaders: 1967*; ed. by G. Kerry Smith, Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education. p. 244-248.
- _____ 1967. Policy formulation in the two-year college: renaissance or revolution? *Junior College Journal* 37(6):40-42.
- Rislov, Sigurd. 1966. The role of the faculty in community college government. Detroit, Michigan, Wayne State University. 11 p.
- Rummel, J. Francis. 1958. An introduction to research procedures in education. New York, Harper. 413 p.
- Russell, J. H. and A. R. Ayers. 1963. Patterns of administration. *Junior College Journal* 33(8):5-7.
- Sachs, Benjamin M. 1966. Educational administration: a behavioral approach. Boston, Houghton Mifflin. 412 p.
- Sack, Saul. 1959. First junior college. *Junior College Journal* 30: 13-15.
- Schloming, Ralph. 1963. Academic senates for junior colleges. Statement by the executive secretary of the California State Federation of Teachers, Los Angeles, January 1963. (Mimeographed) American Federation of Teachers Local 1521. College Guild. 1965. Let's negotiate. Hollywood, California. November (Leaflet).
- Schultz, Raymond E. 1965. Changing profile of the junior college president. *Junior College Journal* 36(2):8-13.

- Sears, Jesse B. 1950. *The nature of the administrative process*. New York, McGraw-Hill. 623 p.
- Selznick, Philip. 1961. A sociologist views junior college administration. *California Journal of Secondary Education* 36:33-38.
- Shannon, William G. 1962. *The community college president: a study of the role of the president of the public community college*. Ed.D. thesis. New York City. Columbia University. 147 numb. leaves.
- Smith, Kathleen B. 1964. Crossroads in Texas. *Junior College Journal* 35:14-16.
- Smith, Robert R. 1965. Competing internal groups in the governance of college and universities. In: *Pressures and priorities in higher education: Proceedings of the 20th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, 1965*; ed. by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D. C., National Education Association, Association for Higher Education, p. 92-96.
- Snyder, William H. 1933. The distinctive status of the junior college. *Junior College Journal* 3:235-239.
- _____ 1930. The real function of the junior college. *Junior College Journal* 1:74-80.
- Spindt, H. A. 1957. Beginnings of the junior college in California. *College and University* 33:22-28.
- Stanley, J. W. 1965. Oldest junior college? Lasell Junior College makes a case for its date of 1851. *Junior College Journal* 37(3):37-38.
- State unit backs teachers' charge. It asks disciplinary action against 2 I.S. 201 aids for 'harassment.' *The New York Times* (New York City) p. 1, col. 5-6. January 24, 1969.
- Stivers, E. R. 1961. The self-evaluation study. *Junior College Journal* 32:39.
- Stoke, Harold. 1959. *The American college president*. New York, Harper and Row. 180 p.

- Stone, James C. 1958. The preparation of academic instructors for the junior college. *Junior College Journal* 28:368-371.
- Story, M. L. 1953. Defining the administrative function. *Journal of Educational Research* 46:371-374.
- Swenson, Norman G. and Leon Novar. 1967. Chicago City College teachers strike. *Junior College Journal* 37(6):19-22.
- TenPas, Henry A., Al Selinger and Leo Marlantes. 1969. Pre-service and in-service education for community college personnel in Oregon community colleges. Corvallis, Oregon State University. Division of Vocational, Adult and Community Colleges, School of Education. 33 p.
- Thorton, James W. Jr. 1966. The community junior college. New York, Wiley. 300 p.
- Tope, Donald E. et al. 1965. The social sciences view school administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall. 249 p.
- Traylor, Dale E. 1967. The delegation of authority and responsibility as practices by junior college chief administrators. Ed.D. thesis. Greeley, Colorado State College. 198 numb. leaves.
- Travers, Robert M. W. 1958. An introduction to educational research. New York, Macmillan. 466 p.
- Tunnell, James Wesley. 1963. Faculty involvement in policy formulation in the public junior college. Ed.D. thesis. El Paso, Texas Technological College. 128 numb. leaves.
- UC protest faltering in 8th. day. *Chicago Daily News*, p. 5, col. 4. February 7, 1969.
- U.S. President. 1947. Higher education for American democracy. A report of the President's commission on higher education. New York, Harper. 6 vol.
- Vario, P. D. 1965. Faculty quality: a challenge to the community college. *Journal of Higher Education* 36:217-220.
- Vavoulis, Alexander. 1964. A faculty role in academic policy making. *Junior College Journal* 34(7):32.

- Venn, Grant. 1964. Man, education and work. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education. 184 p.
- Vroom, V. H. 1960. Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall. 91 p.
- Walker, G. H. 1960. Analysis of Negro junior college growth. Junior College Journal 30:264-267.
- Washington. State Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1963. Proceedings of the community college symposium, Seattle, 1963. [Olympia] 165 p. (Research Report 01-02)
- White athletes, BSU call talkfests. Gazette-Times (Corvallis, Oregon) p. 1, cols. 4-9. February 27, 1969.
- Whitney, Frederick Lamson. 1950. The elements of research. 3d ed. New York, Prentice-Hall. 539 p.
- Wiles, Kimball. 1967. Supervision for better schools. 3d ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall. 343 p.
- Wood, Hugh B. (ed.) 1964. Some basic issues for the community college. Curriculum Bulletin (University of Oregon) 243:10-17. April. (Mimeographed)
- Yearbook Committee. National Society of Education. 1956. The role of the public junior college. In: The public junior college: 55th yearbook. Part I. Chicago. University of Chicago. p. 64-74.
- Young, Raymond J. 1951. Junior college prospects and a guide for its legal propagation. Junior College Journal 21:444-452.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

1. Letter to Staff Members of Oregon Community Colleges Introducing the Study.
2. Survey Questionnaire used in the Study.
3. Letter to each community college president alerting him to the study.
4. Letter to the vocational education leadership interns requesting assistance in establishing on-campus contacts with college personnel involved with the study.
5. Follow-up letter to a faculty member requesting return of survey questionnaire.
6. Follow-up letter to the president of a community college requesting the return of survey questionnaire.

OSU
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
for Vocational Education
Benton Hall 102

April 28, 1969

To Staff Members of Oregon Community Colleges

This doctoral study is a part of a long range program of research studies involving the community colleges of Oregon that is being sponsored by the Oregon Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education. This particular research project concerns faculty involvement in policy formulation in selected Oregon Community Colleges.

With the apparent trend toward more decisive changes in the educational outlook and attitudes of faculty and administration it is anticipated that the information derived from this study will be of significant interest and benefit to you as a faculty member and/or administrator.

The information that you provide on the questionnaire will not be identified with you in anyway. Nor, is it the purpose of this study to evaluate any school.

Upon completion of the questionnaire please return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope to the Research Coordinating Unit.

I shall be on your campus this spring and look forward to talking with you at that time about faculty involvement in policy formulation.

May we thank you in advance for the vital information you are able to provide.

Sincerely,

Elvin T. Williams
Graduate Assistant

Henry A. Ten Pas
Project Director
Major Professor for the Study

DIRECTIONS: Part II

- A. To determine your judgment of the importance of each of the six categories please rank in numerical order from one to six the following categories. The area which in your judgment is most important should be ranked as 1. The area of second importance should be ranked as 2, etc.

Curriculum and Instruction	_____
Faculty Personnel Policies	_____
Student Personnel Policies	_____
Building and Plant	_____
Finance (Budget)	_____
General Institutional Policies	_____

- B. To determine your judgment of the importance of faculty involvement in policy formulation in each of the six categories please rank in numerical order from one to six the following categories. The area which in your judgment is most important should be ranked as 1. The area of second importance should be ranked as 2, etc.

Curriculum and Instruction	_____
Faculty Personnel Policies	_____
Student Personnel Policies	_____
Building and Plant	_____
Finance (Budget)	_____
General Institutional Policies	_____

Please return the completed questionnaire in the self addressed stamped envelope to:

Dr. Henry TenPas, Director
 Research Coordinating Unit
 School of Education
 Oregon State University
 Corvallis, Oregon 97331

APPENDIX 3

OSU
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
for Vocational Education
Benton Hall 102

May 5, 1969

Dr. David Michael, President
Alpha Community College
480 Riverton Avenue
Stanley, Oregon

Dear Dr. Michael:

Enclosed is a copy of a questionnaire designed to seek information about the extent of faculty involvement in policy formulation in the public community colleges of Oregon.

Individual copies have been mailed to Dr. Martin Donald, Dean of Instruction, to Dr. Paul Thomas, Dean of Students and to various selected faculty members for their reactions.

I shall be on your campus this spring and look forward to talking with you at that time about faculty involvement in policy formulation. I shall confirm the campus visitation date by telephone with you.

May I thank you in advance for the early return and valuable information that you are able to provide.

Sincerely,

Elvin T. Williams
Graduate Assistant
2 enc;
ETW:pcw

APPENDIX 4

OSU
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
for Vocational Education
Benton Hall 102

May 7, 1969

Mr. Michael Williams
Vocational Education Leadership Intern
Alpha Community College
480 Riverton Avenue
Stanley, Oregon

Dear Mr. Williams:

Enclosed is the list of administrators and faculty members who have had a copy of the questionnaire mailed to them. Three administrators and one-half of the teaching faculty of Alpha Community College were selected as the representative sample.

As explained by Dr. Henry A. TenPas we very much appreciate your participation in the project as an on-campus representative of the Research Coordinating Unit who is able to talk to these respondents and to remind them tactfully to return the questionnaire at an early date.

Would you also be so kind as to contact the president, the dean of instruction, the dean of students and approximately one-half of the teachers who received the questionnaire to arrange for a time next week that I may talk to each individually for a few minutes. I need to discuss with each person their opinions concerning the involvement of faculty in policy formulation at their institution.

Time is extremely critical at this stage of the study so any two-day period that you are able to arrange for me to be on campus and to meet with these people in the next two weeks (May 12 through May 28) will be appreciated. I will telephone you in a few days to confirm the arrangements.

Sincerely,

Elvin T. Williams
enc.
ETW:pcw

APPENDIX 5

OSU
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
for Vocational Education
Benton Hall 102

May 20, 1969

Mr. John Rodgers
Business Education Department
Alpha Community College
480 Riverton Avenue
Stanley, Oregon

Dear Mr. Rodgers:

You were recently mailed a copy of a survey questionnaire from the Research Coordinating Unit Office of Oregon State University. The instrument is designed to seek information about the extent of faculty involvement in policy formulation in public community colleges of Oregon.

As previously noted in the original letter to you the information that you provide on the questionnaire will not be identified with you in anyway. Nor, is it the purpose of the study to evaluate any school.

We realize that you are busy, particularly at this time of year; however, we hope that you will find a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope by the end of May.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elvin T. Williams
Graduate Assistant

Henry A. TenPas
Project Director

APPENDIX 6

OSU
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
for Vocational Education
Benton Hall 102

June 26, 1969

Dr. David Michael, President
Alpha Community College
480 Riverton Avenue
Stanley, Oregon

Dear Dr. Michael:

Since talking with you in your office May 24, 1969 I have not received your copy of the questionnaire concerning faculty involvement in policy formulation in public community colleges of Oregon that was mailed to you May 5, from the Research Coordinating Unit Office at Oregon State University.

With the possibility of the original questionnaire having been misplaced by you in the hustle and bustle of ending a school year another copy of the instrument has been enclosed for your responses.

I do need the return of the completed questionnaire from you to make the study complete. I would appreciate its return at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

Elvin T. Williams
Graduate Assistant
encl.
ETW:pcw

APPENDIX B

1. Composite comparisons of possible responses, number of responses and means of the existing totals of administrators and faculty.
2. Composite comparisons of possible responses, number of responses and means of the desired totals of administrators and faculty.
3. Composite comparisons of possible responses, number of responses and means of the existing totals of administrators, academic faculty and vocational-technical faculty.
4. Composite comparisons of possible responses, number of responses and means of the desired totals of administrators, academic faculty and vocational-technical faculty.
5. Composite comparisons of possible responses, number of responses and means of the existing totals of administrators, male and female faculty.
6. Composite comparisons of possible responses, number of responses and means of the desired totals of administrators, male and female faculty.
7. Composite comparisons of possible responses, number of responses and means of the existing totals of administrators and faculty by years of experience.
8. Composite comparisons of possible responses, number of responses and means of the desired totals of administrators and faculty by years of experience.

Table 1. Composite Comparisons of the Number of Possible Responses, the Number of Responses, and the Means for Each Involvement Category by Administrative Area for Administrators and Total Faculty of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon Regarding Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation with the Total Mean Percentages Shown

Items	Possible Responses	M-1 Res	Mean	R-2 Res	Mean	L-3 Res	Mean	N-4 Res	Mean
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>									
Administrators	72	11	15.96	36	52.18	21	26.36	4	4.88
Faculty	504	103	19.03	182	35.87	155	31.18	64	13.59
<u>FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	81	7	8.36	27	31.03	33	31.51	14	18.54
Faculty	616	54	7.81	151	22.90	221	35.69	190	33.08
<u>STUDENT PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	70	4	4.40	22	28.76	34	38.53	10	11.00
Faculty	560	19	2.70	164	26.56	195	36.06	181	34.33
<u>BUILDING AND PLANT</u>									
Administrators	35	0	0.00	14	30.80	15	34.20	6	14.33
Faculty	280	9	2.33	59	18.20	90	34.20	122	44.93
<u>FINANCE (BUDGETING)</u>									
Administrators	42	0	0.00	18	34.88	19	37.66	5	10.11
Faculty	336	22	5.88	85	22.50	119	38.77	110	32.49
<u>GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	112	6	4.12	41	30.30	50	36.47	15	11.72
Faculty	896	94	10.29	242	26.12	306	35.33	253	27.81

Key: M-1 Maximum faculty involvement in policy formulation
R-2 Reasonable faculty involvement in policy formulation
L-3 Limited faculty involvement in policy formulation
N-4 No faculty involvement in policy formulation

Res Response
8 Administrators
56 Faculty

Table 2. Composite Comparisons of the Number of Possible Responses, the Number of Responses, and the Means for Each Involvement Category by Administrative Area for Administrators and Total Faculty of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon Regarding Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation with the Total Mean Percentages Shown

Items	Possible Responses	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
		Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>									
Administrators	72	16	22.68	52	71.88	4	4.88	0	0.00
Faculty	504	176	33.22	271	56.51	54	9.09	3	0.47
<u>FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	81	10	16.90	51	53.90	18	12.81	2	2.63
Faculty	616	165	26.66	313	50.39	116	18.78	22	3.66
<u>STUDENT PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	70	4	4.40	52	61.73	14	16.53	0	0.00
Faculty	560	64	10.00	317	57.16	148	26.40	31	5.80
<u>BUILDING AND PLANT</u>									
Administrators	35	0	0.00	19	44.06	14	34.20	2	4.40
Faculty	280	44	15.46	130	48.00	74	26.06	32	10.13
<u>FINANCE (BUDGETING)</u>									
Administrators	42	0	0.00	33	64.27	8	15.61	1	2.77
Faculty	336	48	13.49	166	51.44	78	22.55	44	12.18
<u>GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	112	13	9.64	15	46.79	28	21.36	6	4.83
Faculty	896	192	22.06	426	48.43	185	19.99	93	8.74

Key: M-1 Maximum faculty involvement in policy formulation
R-2 Reasonable faculty involvement in policy formulation
L-3 Limited faculty involvement in policy formulation
N-4 No faculty involvement in policy formulation

Res Responses
8 Administrators
56 Faculty

Table 3. Composite Comparisons of the Number of Possible Responses, the Number of Responses, and the Means for Each Involvement Category by Administrative Area for Administrators, Academic Faculty, Vocational-Technical Faculty and Total Faculty of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon Regarding Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation with the Total Mean Percentages Shown

Items	Possible	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
	Responses	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>									
Administrators	72	11	15.96	36	52.18	21	26.36	4	4.88
Academic faculty	378	69	16.80	129	33.55	123	33.22	56	16.20
Vocational-technical faculty	126	33	23.29	52	40.95	33	28.76	8	6.63
Total faculty	504	102	19.03	181	35.87	156	31.18	64	13.59
<u>FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	81	7	8.36	27	31.03	33	31.51	14	18.54
Academic faculty	462	38	5.77	107	22.83	177	38.53	140	32.37
Vocational-technical faculty	154	16	9.23	44	24.81	44	28.19	50	37.34
Total faculty	616	54	7.81	151	22.90	221	35.69	190	33.08
<u>STUDENT PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	70	4	4.40	22	28.76	34	38.53	10	11.00
Academic faculty	420	9	1.47	121	26.09	152	37.45	137	34.73
Vocational-technical faculty	140	10	5.88	43	26.19	43	31.54	44	36.03
Total faculty	560	10	2.70	164	26.56	195	36.06	181	34.33
<u>BUILDING AND PLANT</u>									
Administrators	35	0	0.00	14	30.80	15	34.20	6	14.33
Academic faculty	210	6	2.00	47	19.52	69	36.42	89	42.04
Vocational-technical faculty	70	3	3.33	12	13.32	21	30.35	34	52.64
Total faculty	280	9	2.33	59	18.20	90	34.20	123	43.93

Table 3. (Continued)

Items	Possible Responses	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
		Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>FINANCE (BUDGETING)</u>									
Administrators	42	0	0.00	18	34.88	19	37.66	5	10.11
Academic faculty	252	14	4.60	66	23.38	94	40.09	78	31.83
Vocational-technical faculty	84	8	8.14	19	19.77	25	34.05	32	37.51
Total faculty	336	22	5.88	85	22.50	119	38.77	110	32.49
<u>GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	112	6	4.12	41	30.30	50	36.47	15	11.72
Academic faculty	672	79	11.21	165	22.34	221	35.66	204	30.41
Vocational-technical faculty	224	15	6.64	75	34.95	84	35.46	49	22.54
Total faculty	896	94	10.29	240	26.12	305	35.33	253	27.81

Key: M-1 Maximum faculty involvement in policy formulation
R-2 Reasonable faculty involvement in policy formulation
L-3 Limited faculty involvement in policy formulation
N-4 No faculty involvement in policy formulation

Res Responses
8 Administrators
42 Academic faculty
14 Vocational-technical faculty
56 Total faculty

Table 4. Composite Comparisons of the Number of Possible Responses, the Number of Responses, and the Means for Each Involvement Category by Administrative Area for Administrators, Academic Faculty, Vocational-Technical Faculty and Total Faculty of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon Regarding Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation with the Total Mean Percentages Shown

Items	Possible	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
	Responses	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>									
Administrators	72	16	22.68	52	71.88	4	4.88	0	0.00
Academic faculty	378	133	32.87	203	57.38	37	9.34	1	0.37
Vocational-technical faculty	126	43	33.94	67	53.28	16	12.44	0	0.00
Total faculty	504	176	33.22	270	56.51	53	9.09	3	0.47
<u>FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	81	10	16.90	51	53.93	18	12.81	2	2.63
Academic faculty	462	127	27.86	228	49.63	91	19.27	12	2.95
Vocational-technical faculty	154	36	21.93	83	54.45	26	17.67	9	5.54
Total faculty	616	163	26.66	311	50.39	117	18.78	21	3.66
<u>STUDENT PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	70	4	4.40	52	61.73	14	16.53	0	0.00
Academic faculty	420	48	10.39	230	56.57	118	27.16	24	5.85
Vocational-technical faculty	140	16	9.98	87	59.61	30	24.08	7	6.30
Total faculty	560	64	10.00	317	57.16	148	26.40	31	5.80
<u>BUILDING AND PLANT</u>									
Administrators	35	0	0.00	19	44.06	14	34.20	2	4.40
Academic faculty	210	36	16.14	94	45.68	60	29.06	20	9.09
Vocational-technical faculty	70	8	11.06	36	54.01	14	19.95	10	14.62
Total faculty	280	44	15.46	130	48.00	74	26.06	30	10.13

Table 4. (Continued)

Items	Possible	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
	Responses	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>FINANCE (BUDGETING)</u>									
Administrators	42	0	0.00	33	64.27	8	15.61	1	2.77
Academic faculty	252	39	14.69	122	50.13	60	23.86	31	11.28
Vocational-technical faculty	84	9	9.18	44	53.28	18	20.70	13	16.42
Total faculty	336	48	13.49	166	51.44	78	22.55	44	12.18
<u>GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	112	13	9.64	65	46.97	28	21.36	6	4.83
Academic faculty	672	165	25.15	295	45.01	141	20.29	60	9.37
Vocational-technical faculty	224	29	12.51	128	57.08	45	20.34	22	9.70
Total faculty	896	194	22.06	423	48.43	186	19.99	82	8.74
<hr/>									
Key:	M-1	Maximum faculty involvement in policy formulation			Res	Responses			
	R-2	Reasonable faculty involvement in policy formulation			8	Administrators			
	L-3	Limited faculty involvement in policy formulation			42	Academic faculty			
	N-4	No faculty involvement in policy formulation			14	Vocational-technical faculty			
					56	Total faculty			

Table 5. Composite Comparisons of the Number of Possible Responses, the Number of Responses, and the Means for Each Involvement Category by Administrative Area for Administrators, Male Faculty, Female Faculty and Total Faculty of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon Regarding Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation with the Total Mean Percentages Shown

Items	Possible	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
	Responses	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>									
Administrators	72	11	15.96	36	52.18	21	26.36	4	4.88
Male faculty	387	83	19.21	144	37.33	117	31.00	43	12.39
Female faculty	117	20	17.21	38	31.51	40	35.40	19	15.51
Total faculty	504	103	18.21	182	33.97	157	33.20	62	13.95
<u>FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	81	7	8.36	27	31.03	33	31.51	14	18.54
Male faculty	473	37	7.12	124	24.25	169	34.60	143	33.69
Female faculty	143	15	9.09	30	19.36	51	37.21	47	33.99
Total faculty	616	52	8.10	154	21.80	220	35.90	190	33.84
<u>STUDENT PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	70	4	4.40	22	28.76	34	38.53	10	11.00
Male faculty	430	14	2.70	121	25.79	158	37.23	137	34.21
Female faculty	130	4	2.66	42	28.43	41	32.96	43	35.60
Total faculty	560	18	2.68	163	27.11	199	35.09	180	34.90
<u>BUILDING AND PLANT</u>									
Administrators	35	0	0.00	14	30.80	15	34.20	6	14.33
Male faculty	215	7	2.66	45	18.43	68	34.20	95	44.65
Female faculty	65	2	2.66	13	17.33	24	37.20	26	42.46
Total faculty	280	9	2.66	58	17.88	92	35.70	121	43.55

Table 5. (Continued)

Items	Possible	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4		
	Responses	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	
<u>FINANCE (BUDGETING)</u>										
Administrators	42	0	0.00	18	34.88	19	37.66	5	10.11	
Male faculty	258	20	7.07	66	24.10	88	36.88	84	31.88	
Female faculty	78	2	2.22	19	21.10	31	43.10	26	33.22	
Total faculty	336	22	4.64	85	22.60	119	39.99	110	32.55	
<u>GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</u>										
Administrators	112	6	4.12	41	30.30	50	36.47	15	11.72	
Male faculty	688	83	12.25	191	27.43	223	33.28	190	26.70	
Female faculty	208	11	4.58	51	22.60	83	41.35	63	31.12	
Total faculty	896	94	8.41	242	25.01	306	37.31	253	28.91	
<hr/>										
Key:	M-1	Maximum faculty involvement in policy formulation			Res	Responses				
	R-2	Reasonable faculty involvement in policy formulation			8	Administrators				
	L-3	Limited faculty involvement in policy formulation			43	Male faculty				
	N-4	No faculty involvement in policy formulation			13	Female faculty				
					56	Total faculty				

Table 6. Composite Comparisons of the Number of Possible Responses, the Number of Responses, and the Means for Each Involvement Category by Administrative Area for Administrators, Male Faculty, Female Faculty and Total Faculty of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon Regarding Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation with the Total Mean Percentages Shown

Items	Possible Responses	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
		Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>									
Administrators	72	16	22.68	52	71.88	4	4.88	0	0.00
Male faculty	387	130	31.46	215	58.15	40	9.53	2	0.43
Female faculty	117	45	38.62	58	49.69	13	10.59	1	0.74
Total faculty	504	175	35.04	273	53.92	53	10.06	3	0.58
<u>FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	81	10	16.90	51	53.93	18	12.81	2	2.63
Male faculty	473	135	28.84	238	49.27	84	17.61	16	3.88
Female faculty	143	32	20.96	74	53.51	31	21.54	6	3.63
Total faculty	616	167	24.90	312	51.39	115	19.57	22	3.75
<u>STUDENT PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	70	4	4.40	52	61.73	14	16.53	0	0.00
Male faculty	430	50	10.52	242	56.00	120	28.38	18	4.72
Female faculty	130	13	9.10	74	57.56	30	23.03	13	9.96
Total faculty	560	63	9.81	316	56.78	150	25.70	31	7.34
<u>BUILDING AND PLANT</u>									
Administrators	35	0	0.00	19	44.06	14	34.20	2	4.40
Male faculty	215	31	14.32	104	49.59	59	26.72	21	9.27
Female faculty	65	13	19.06	29	44.73	14	23.00	9	12.86
Total faculty	280	44	16.69	133	47.16	73	24.86	30	11.06

Table 6. (Continued)

Items	Possible Responses	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
		Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>FINANCE (BUDGETING)</u>									
Administrators	42	0	0.00	33	64.27	8	15.61	1	2.77
Male faculty	258	40	14.98	126	51.51	63	23.13	29	10.32
Female faculty	78	6	6.66	42	53.88	14	19.16	16	19.94
Total faculty	336	46	10.82	168	52.69	77	21.14	45	15.14
<u>GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	112	13	9.64	65	46.97	28	21.36	6	4.83
Male faculty	688	147	21.74	341	51.19	140	19.52	59	7.35
Female faculty	208	35	15.66	95	46.89	47	23.37	31	13.72
Total faculty	896	182	18.70	436	49.04	187	21.44	90	10.53
Key: M-1 Maximum faculty involvement in policy formulation									
R-2 Reasonable faculty involvement in policy formulation									
L-3 Limited faculty involvement in policy formulation									
N-4 No faculty involvement in policy formulation									
				Res		Responses			
				8		Administrators			
				43		Male faculty			
				13		Female faculty			
				56		Total faculty			

Table 7. Composite Comparisons of the Number of Possible Responses, the Number of Responses, and the Means for Each Involvement Category by Administrative Area for Administrators and Total Faculty by Years of Experience of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon Regarding Existing Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation with the Total Mean Percentages Shown

Items	Possible Responses	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4	
		Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>									
Administrators	72	11	15.96	36	52.18	21	26.36	4	4.88
Fac 1-4	135	25	18.50	39	28.86	51	37.74	20	14.80
Fac 5-9	162	30	18.50	68	41.93	45	27.52	19	11.70
Fac 10+	207	48	23.14	75	36.16	57	27.48	27	13.02
Total faculty	504	103	20.05	182	35.65	153	30.01	66	13.17
<u>FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	81	7	8.36	27	31.03	33	31.51	14	18.54
Fac 1-4	165	9	5.44	33	19.98	64	38.74	59	35.72
Fac 5-9	198	16	8.07	48	24.21	62	31.28	72	36.32
Fac 10+	253	28	11.04	68	26.82	97	38.27	60	23.67
Total faculty	616	53	8.18	149	23.67	223	36.09	191	31.90
<u>STUDENT PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	70	4	4.40	22	28.76	34	38.53	10	11.00
Fac 1-4	150	3	1.99	44	29.30	58	38.53	45	29.97
Fac 5-9	180	10	5.50	55	30.53	49	27.20	65	36.08
Fac 10+	230	5	2.17	65	28.21	90	39.06	70	30.38
Total faculty	560	18	3.22	164	29.34	197	34.93	180	32.14
<u>BUILDING AND PLANT</u>									
Administrators	35	0	0.00	14	30.80	15	34.20	6	14.33
Fac 1-4	75	2	2.66	15	19.98	30	39.96	28	37.09
Fac 5-9	90	1	1.11	15	16.65	27	29.97	47	52.17
Fac 10+	115	6	5.20	29	25.17	33	28.64	47	40.79
Total faculty	280	9	2.99	59	20.60	90	32.85	122	43.35

Table 7. (Continued)

Items	Possible	M-1	Mean	R-2	Mean	L-3	Mean	N-4	Mean
	Responses	Res		Res		Res		Res	
<u>FINANCE (BUDGETING)</u>									
Administrators	42	0	0.00	18	34.88	19	37.66	5	10.11
Fac 1-4	90	2	2.22	21	23.32	30	33.30	37	41.07
Fac 5-9	108	2	1.85	31	28.67	40	37.00	35	32.37
Fac 10+	138	16	11.58	34	24.59	49	35.44	39	28.21
Total faculty	336	20	5.21	86	25.52	119	35.24	111	33.88
<u>GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</u>									
Administrators	112	6	4.12	41	30.30	50	36.47	15	11.72
Fac 1-4	240	20	8.32	71	29.55	69	28.72	80	32.67
Fac 5-9	288	16	5.55	79	27.40	112	38.85	81	28.09
Fac 10+	368	58	15.73	92	24.95	125	33.90	92	24.95
Total faculty	896	94	9.86	242	27.30	306	33.82	253	28.57

Key: M-1 Maximum faculty involvement in policy formulation
R-2 Reasonable faculty involvement in policy formulation
L-3 Limited faculty involvement in policy formulation
N-4 No faculty involvement in policy formulation

Res 8 Responses Administrators
15 Faculty 1-4 years
18 Faculty 5-9 years
23 Faculty 10+ years
56 Total faculty

Table 8. Composite Comparisons of the Number of Possible Responses, the Number of Responses, and the Means for Each Involvement Category by Administrative Area for Administrators and Total Faculty by Years of Experience of Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon Regarding Desired Patterns of Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation with the Total Mean Percentages Shown

Items	Possible Responses	M-1		R-2		L-3		N-4		
		Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	Res	Mean	
<u>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION</u>										
Administrators	72	16	22.68	52	71.88	4	4.88	0	0.00	
Fac 1-4	135	40	29.60	70	51.80	23	17.02	2	1.48	
Fac 5-9	162	61	37.61	89	54.88	12	7.40	0	0.00	
Fac 10+	207	75	36.16	112	54.00	19	9.16	1	0.48	
Total faculty	504	176	34.45	271	53.56	54	11.19	3	0.65	
<u>FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>										
Administrators	81	10	16.90	51	53.93	18	12.81	2	2.63	
Fac 1-4	165	34	20.58	73	44.19	49	29.66	9	5.44	
Fac 5-9	198	55	27.75	115	58.02	24	12.10	4	2.01	
Fac 10+	253	76	29.98	125	49.31	43	16.87	9	3.55	
Total faculty	616	165	26.10	313	50.50	116	19.21	22	3.66	
<u>STUDENT PERSONNEL POLICIES</u>										
Administrators	70	4	4.40	52	61.73	14	16.53	0	0.00	
Fac 1-4	150	19	12.65	74	48.88	49	32.63	8	5.23	
Fac 5-9	180	18	9.90	94	52.17	50	27.75	18	9.90	
Fac 10+	230	26	11.28	149	64.67	50	21.70	5	2.17	
Total faculty	560	63	11.27	317	55.24	149	27.36	31	5.76	
<u>BUILDING AND PLANT</u>										
Administrators	35	0	0.00	19	44.06	14	34.20	2	4.40	
Fac 1-4	75	16	21.31	24	31.96	24	31.96	11	14.65	
Fac 5-9	90	11	12.21	48	53.28	26	28.86	5	5.55	
Fac 10+	115	17	14.75	62	53.81	24	20.83	12	10.41	
Total faculty	280	44	16.09	134	46.35	74	27.21	28	10.20	

Table 8. (Continued)

Items	Possible	M-1	Mean	R-2	Mean	L-3	Mean	N-4	Mean	
	Responses	Res		Res		Res		Res		
<u>FINANCE (BUDGETING)</u>										
Administrators	42	0	0.00	33	64.27	8	15.61	1	2.77	
Fac 1-4	90	11	12.21	35	38.85	29	32.19	15	16.65	
Fac 5-9	108	8	7.40	62	57.35	19	17.57	19	17.57	
Fac 10+	138	29	20.97	67	48.46	32	23.14	10	7.23	
Total faculty	336	48	13.52	164	48.22	80	24.30	44	13.81	
<u>GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</u>										
Administrators	112	13	9.64	65	46.97	28	21.36	6	4.83	
Fac 1-4	240	45	18.73	100	41.62	46	19.14	49	20.39	
Fac 5-9	288	41	14.22	151	52.37	75	26.01	21	7.28	
Fac 10+	368	106	28.75	175	47.46	64	17.36	23	6.23	
Total faculty	896	192	20.58	426	47.15	185	20.83	93	11.30	
Key: M-1 Maximum faculty involvement in policy formulation										
R-2 Reasonable faculty involvement in policy formulation										
L-3 Limited faculty involvement in policy formulation										
N-4 No faculty involvement in policy formulation										
				Res	Responses					
				8	Administrators					
				15	Faculty 1-4 years					
				18	Faculty 5-9 years					
				23	Faculty 10+ years					
				56	Total faculty					

APPENDIX C

1. Faculty remarks
2. Administrator remarks

The following statements are the reactions and remarks of faculty and administrators made to the writer during the personal interview of each respondent.

FACULTY REMARKS

I feel comfortable working here with the president but not with the dean of instruction.

The dean of students is the real power on this campus. The president is the "front office" of the campus.

The president doesn't have a _____ thing to say about how we (faculty) run our affairs and he knows it.

Why fight "City Hall"; its better to make them (administrators) think they're right and then they leave you alone to teach.

Our biggest problem here on this campus is the extremely wide range of students' abilities. We need more staff to meet the needs of these students.

We have a weak dean of instruction and he knows it. I doubt if he'll last more than another year at this school unless the president protects him again.

I believe we could invite any controversial personalities onto this campus to speak and the administrators would not object. How could they--we control the situation here.

As the college gets larger my direct contacts with the president will probably be less frequent and direct. I suppose that's o. k. , but not as effective or desirable for me.

President _____ is really interested in the progress and growth of the colleges' departments; at least he has always shown an interest in this department.

I believe the administrators are trying to demonstrate democratic methods of operation but are not practicing it.

This campus is still split right down the middle on ideas of how it should be run. The only things that will change the fracture of faculty and administrators would be to either eliminate certain faculty members or certain administrators or both and try another approach at charming each other into a working team.

This campus is not physically arranged by buildings to enhance the cohesiveness of faculty members. The buildings are separated into departments and areas and the faculties tend to remain separated. This does not help build staff cohesiveness or morale, particularly when one department bangs away at another department with a less pretentious building or arrangement of facilities.

The dean of students is everybody's friend and Saviour.

I'm leaving at the end of this spring term and going back into high school teaching where I'll be appreciated for the amount of work that I do. I just can't get used to all the "wheel spinning" done here and it bothers me.

This is my first year of teaching and I think its the "greatest." Why shouldn't I since I'm the whole department and have had the opportunity of drawing the plans for the new building for my department.

Business certainly could not stay solvent if it was operated like they run education. I'd heard that education had troubles with financial problems but I never dreamed it was this hectic. What are the administrators doing to solve the problems? I have some ideas but I'm never asked to contribute and our faculty committee is inept.

We have the most dynamic president in Oregon. He knows what he wants and gets things done because he understands the board and the faculty.

The administrators, particularly the dean of instruction, attempts to listen to all sides of the controversy or problem and I appreciate that.

What do you really expect to learn from your questionnaire that you don't already know about this college?

Do you really think teachers will give you an honest answer to your questions?

I couldn't care less about faculty involvement with the administrative policies. All I really care about is teaching my classes. Don't bother me.

This is an exciting place to work and the general public, God bless them, does not bother you like they do in the public schools.

This is a better place to teach than in any high school or college that

I've ever taught at. You have more freedom to do the things I believe are necessary in teaching. Another thing, more of the students want to learn.

I don't think that community colleges should consider themselves as a part of higher education.

Community colleges sometimes seem like an over-grown super high school. Its like that around here except for the ages of the students.

I don't think your study will prove anything, nor will it be of any help to us here.

Our faculty represents itself well because we are organized here on campus. We do need more involvement in administration of the college, however.

Its my thinking that faculty involvement should be limited only by its competency.

We have not had any riots or revolts by faculty against the administrators and frankly I don't think we ever will, unless some lame-brained faculty member comes here just to make trouble. We did have some at one time.

The only way that we will ever get anything done here for the faculty is to organize into a stronger group than now exists. Perhaps a faculty senate is the answer.

There is a feeling of genuine friendship among the faculty here and I believe that it stems downward from the administration. I find it a good place to work.

Most of our involvement at present is advisory only. We need to have involvement in policy decisions.

My teaching keeps me so busy here that I just have no time for being a part of faculty committees seeking involvement in administrative endeavors.

If faculty senates are a good thing in colleges and universities then they should be o. k. in the community colleges because we are a part of higher education. We certainly don't belong in the secondary area of education.

Most administrators try to be fair to the faculty. The pressures they have on the job tend to separate them from faculty members.

ADMINISTRATOR REMARKS

Most faculty want to have the authority, but not the responsibility that goes with the job.

They (faculty) have their own organization by which they keep themselves informed. We are not an official part of it.

I believe that rapport between faculty and administrators is good. At least I haven't heard any loud grumblings.

Someone needs finally to say "no" or perhaps I should say someone must eventually make the decision.

We have for the most part, I believe, top-grade faculty members here. They appear interested in students and dedicated to their profession.

I would prefer more time to talk with individual faculty members, however, neither they nor I can spare the time because of the pressures of students and the ever-increasing enrollments.

We need more space to operate in and when space is limited like it is here people tend to sometimes step on others' toes.

I'm certain the general public aren't aware of how fast the college is growing. We need more exposure to the public but I'm afraid that it could lead to more demands by them that right now we couldn't handle.

Our greatest problem as I see it is the lack of time to do those things we know should be done and still find that "other" time to try new approaches to solving our problems.

Faculty oftentimes have only incidental involvement in policy making. It would probably strengthen the college if we instituted a program for more faculty participation in the internal functions of the college.

Education is big business. I hope the faculty realize that we are working for them too. It sometimes seems to me that the teachers fail to appreciate or to understand that changes in mode of operation and function takes time.

I seriously doubt if most of the faculty would actually want to form the policies and then be held responsible for them. Some that want my job would probably like to try.

We could use more help at the administrative level, but I don't think that many of the faculty members would agree.

It is tougher now to tell faculty what to do--today, you need to explain to them why its necessary to do things a certain way. This is because a majority of the faculty want to be involved whether they are qualified or not.

I believe that we operate in a democratic manner here at this college. Teachers appear to be satisfied in the classroom and complacent about the operation of the college. At least they haven't created or led any revolts.

You should remember that the board of education is the real power in the college since they have legal responsibility for its operation.

Faculty, for the most part, are sympathetic toward the tasks faced by administrators but they don't realize the complexity of the situations we oftentimes face. It would probably be of increased benefit to the college if more faculty understood the actual operation of the college. However, there is a risk involved here, since more time to learn about internal college operations could detract from their teaching time.

It seems as though your study could be of value to educators, particularly, if you care to share with us your findings. Of course, you may find absolutely nothing of value to us.

Oregon is growing, not nearly as rapidly as California, thank goodness, and needs people who can plan ahead for changes. We have some cracker-jack faculty members here and they really do help the college. They are not afraid to try innovative approaches to teaching that involves students as co-workers.

The larger the college gets the less contact administrators have with individual faculty members, and yet, we do need contacts to be aware of what is going on. I frankly don't have the ready-made answer of how to solve the dilemma of less time for more contacts.

I have an interest in every facet of education at this community college. If I didn't have this interest then I would not be president.

The dean of students is a key position, particularly now, since we have the increased amount of student unrest in the institutions of higher education. It is bound to spill over into the community colleges and we have to be prepared for it, particularly the faculty.

We welcome faculty involvement in policy formulation. It strengthens our position and helps the college, particularly in times of crises.