

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Mildred Johnson Shaffer for the Doctor of Education  
in Community College Education presented on December 8,  
1972.

Title: A Comparison Between Portland Community College  
and Seattle Community College for Determination of  
Organizational Efficiency. Redacted for privacy

Abstract approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Dwight C. Baird

Community colleges, along with other educational units, have increasing need to understand their administrative organizations. Both internal and external sources are now extending their influence by demanding evidence of accountability and responsibility. More specifically it means that administrators of schools are being required to state expectations and measure their accomplishments. This, in turn, makes it essential that evaluation techniques be developed, used, and results reported.

Because it was believed that the administrators of a school have lasting influence on the educational

processes, the administrative organization of two community colleges were evaluated to determine efficiency. The techniques used to examine the schools included personal observations, interviews, use of a psychological questionnaire, comparison of budgets, and a comparison of the organizational structures.

This was an exploratory study with the primary purpose of gaining familiarity with two patterns of the multi-unit districts. In attempting to meet the demands for accountability and responsibility, it was considered that experimentation with evaluation techniques would facilitate the understanding.

As this study found, the multi-branch, as established by the Portland Community College, was the least costly. There were many unusual factors that influenced the operations of the Seattle Community College District, at this time, and, therefore, it may be said that the multi-college pattern was not fairly represented. However, it may also be concluded that the differences in personalities of the administrators of the two schools were the most influential factors in establishing efficiency within the schools.

Since effectiveness of operation may be as important as efficiency, it is finally proposed that an additional study, or studies, should be made to compare the effectiveness of operations of the schools.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND  
SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR DETERMINATION  
OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY

by

Mildred Johnson Shaffer

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1973

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Professor Community College Education

Redacted for privacy

Head of Department Community College Education

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented December 8, 1972

Typed by Mildred Johnson for Mildred Johnson Shaffer

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction . . . . .	1
	Statement of the Problem . . . . .	14
	Purpose of the Study . . . . .	20
	Significance of the Study . . . . .	21
	Limitations of the Study . . . . .	23
	Definition of Terms . . . . .	24
II.	Related Literature . . . . .	37
	Theory Development . . . . .	39
	Evolution of the Art . . . . .	44
	Some Organization Theories Applied to Education . . . . .	58
	Evaluations for Education . . . . .	62
	Observation of Internal Issues . . . . .	71
	Studies of School Organizations . . . . .	79
	Summary . . . . .	86
III.	Research Methods . . . . .	87
	Limitations of the Study . . . . .	90
	The Population . . . . .	94
	Specific Techniques . . . . .	97
IV.	Background of Schools: PCC and SCCD . . . . .	114
	Portland Community College . . . . .	121
	Seattle Community College District . . . . .	148
	The Multi-Unit Colleges . . . . .	178
V.	Conclusions to Organizational Efficiency . . . . .	188
	Comparisons . . . . .	191
VI.	Summary . . . . .	215
	Bibliography . . . . .	222
	Appendix I . . . . .	233
	Appendix II . . . . .	240
	Appendix III . . . . .	242
	Appendix IV . . . . .	244
	Appendix V . . . . .	251
	Appendix VI . . . . .	253
	Appendix VII . . . . .	254

A COMPARISON BETWEEN PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND  
SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR DETERMINATION  
OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

During the last decade community colleges have experienced a phenomenal growth throughout the United States (Carnegie Commission, 1970). The number of such institutions has nearly doubled from 660 in 1960 to 1,100 in 1970. Presently some 1.9 million, full and part-time, students are being served by such schools, and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education projects that 3.5 to 4.5 million more students will be seeking the additional two-year educational services. Consequently, the Carnegie Commission estimates that an additional 230 to 280 new colleges will be required by the year 1980.

The reasons for the popularity of this educational unit can be stated as being primarily democratic ones. Not only are the college doors open to students of all age groups in the community, but they are open to students of widely varying academic ability as well as attitudes and motivations toward learning (Thornton, 1966).

Where educational planners are sensitive to the diversity of social, economic, and cultural needs of the community, a single school might have a highly differentiated educational program ascribing to all these functions:

- (1) provide terminal curricula of two years or less;
- (2) provide curricula to prepare students for transfer to four-year institutions;
- (3) provide general education for all students whether terminal or transfer;
- (4) provide assistance to students in making educational and vocational choices;
- (5) provide a wide range of general and special courses for adults; and
- (6) for all students provide remedial courses and counseling services.

Other democratic features include the general practice of charging tuitions lower than the four-year colleges or universities, or charging no tuition; maintaining open door admission policies by not closing admission to students that incurred previous academic failure; and locating so as to be geographically and socially accessible (Medsker, 1960).

Community colleges, in attempting to fulfill these functions to meet local educational demands and comply with specific state laws, have developed into an educational grouping to which few commonalities can be

applied. Not only are there variations in size, individuality in programs, objectives, philosophies, legal support, and governance, but there are variations in organizational structures and processes. It is this last variable that Kintzer (p. 1) in the Junior College Research Review, January, 1972, stated was "a most perplexing concept." Seemingly the question of how to organize and control is a growing and persistent one. This assumption is made on the basis that Cohen and Quimby in the September, 1970, issue of the Junior College Research Review recommended that the community college organizational climate should be studied.

This recent concern about organization is in sharp contrast with the complacency about the topic a decade ago. For instance, Griffiths (1959, p. 123) wrote:

The study of administration is now in its most fruitful period to date. . . this is particularly true in educational administration

Thornton (1960, p. 115), writing specifically about the community colleges, said:

No single chart of administrative organization could include appropriate officers and lines of responsibilities for all these kinds of institutions. . . .

Time, however, has a way of making adjustments, as the following quotation indicates:



The urging of the times has aroused a sense of the need for change. In this mood, a respectable segment of organizational theorists are building their positions as activists who seek to change society through effects on interpersonal behavior. . . . When one . . . considers the extraordinary number of hours managers and leaders in various organizations spend in directing and guiding work in interpersonal settings, the widespread appeal of this area of study to practitioners is readily understandable.

--Abraham Zaleznik (1965)

The community college, along with other educational units, has been caught in this need for change and understanding--particularly a need to understand administrative organization. The force of this need stems from both internal and external sources. For instance, the State Boards of Community College Education are increasingly extending their influence and governance over the colleges by setting up directives, guidelines, and dissemination of long range plans (Washington and Oregon State Board publications, 1972). The federal government is advancing its influence by awarding grants to those schools offering specific studies and activities (vocational training and work study).

Local citizens and immediate taxpayers are becoming involved in community college programs through service on advisory committees in addition to voting and/or accepting the financial burden necessary to support the school operations. Students, also, are seeking involve-

ment in administrative decisions. Faculty asks for more voice in budget decisions and other administrative detail. At the same time administrators are concerned with developing an organization to accomplish educational goals while directing effort toward maintenance of local autonomy and control.

The following abridged statements by Richardson (1970, p. 16-17), a community college president, verifies the existence of these sources and also adds some insight as to the cause of the present state of community college organization:

The past three years have been momentous ones for administrators. During this period of time, we have witnessed a revolution in attitudes concerning the role of the faculty in policy formulation. The question today is no longer one of whether faculty will be involved but rather the more serious issue of what the role of the administrator is likely to be should the current trend in the direction of separate faculty organizations for the purpose of negotiating salary and working conditions continue. . . .

. . . . .  
 In addition to the major challenges for administrators created by the joint issues of student involvement and faculty involvement, the last three years have witnessed a tremendous growth in size of institutions as well the tendency for many community colleges to become multicampus institutions. The growth in numbers has induced a corresponding complexity of administrative operations with which we are ill prepared to contend. To compound. . . these factors. . . add the now established conditions of the loss of administrative authority.

A recent survey documents the fact that students, faculty, and administrators alike recognize that administrators do not today exercise the authority that they exercised three years ago. . . .

. . . . .  
 During this period of change, there is little evidence that serious attention has been given to the question of administrative structure. . . other than relating to faculty or student involvement in policy formulation. . . . The question can legitimately be raised as to whether a science of administration. . . exists with respect to two-year colleges. . . . From personal observation . . . current practice represents a hodgepodge of ideas garnered from business, secondary schools, and four-year universities without benefit of much analysis as to how well these ideas relate to the kind of problems currently being encountered by the administrative organizations of two-year colleges.

According to Richardson (1971, p. 516), again, the rapid growth of community colleges has been detrimental psychologically and not just structurally:

Belief in and loyalty to an institutional saga are the least difficult to maintain when an institution is small and when those involved represent true believers in their own uniqueness. Increases in size and complexity reduce opportunities for interaction and hence attenuate the degree to which new faculty, students, and supporting constituencies can become imbued with the loyalty that is characteristic of the initiators of the saga. Hence it may be said that the greater the growth, the more difficult it will become to create or maintain the saga and its corresponding beliefs and loyalties.

. . . The procedure through which belief and loyalty develop, is a critical one in that an organization can operate effectively only as long as a certain core of values is held in common.

Others would undoubtedly agree with Richardson on the necessity of maintaining commonality of values and loyalty to an organization for the purpose of limiting the dispersion of effort. Litchfield (1959, p. 493-503), however, writing of the large American university, states that organizational failure can result if there is inadequacy of understanding the real nature of the administrative process per se. If administrators fail to understand the administrative process and the real responsibilities of the organization, organizational difficulties such as the following will occur:

1. There will be an inadequate central structure for decision-making.
2. Confusion regarding "control" will arise.
3. Problems of communication will be neglected.
4. No systematic provision for reappraisal will be established.
5. The concept of human-resources management will not be evident.
6. Proven management tools will be disregarded.
7. Because of the segregation of activities supported by the precedence of self-containment and self-maintenance common to universities, there will be limited coordination.
8. Confusion of roles within the institution will occur which will include not only members of the board of trustees but the faculty as well.
9. The necessity of training succeeding administrators will not be understood.

While Burns (1962, p. 31-32) theoretically might agree with Litchfield in that an understanding of the administrative process is as essential in educational units as in business, and "that organization rests on authority is almost a truism," he cautions:

The "zone of acceptance" for a faculty or administrative participant in a college or university is much narrower than that for participants in other enterprises. The faculty member views the organization from the vantage of a tradition of participation in decisions about the educational functions of the organization. He expects to make decisions in this area rather than carry out those of others. At the same time he participates as a kind of "rugged individualist" only partially oriented to the total organization. He tends to serve primarily as a member of the academic profession whose final responsibility is to a set of professional ethics which transcend commitments to one college or university. He has a responsibility for the teaching of youth, for objective truth, for scholarship and knowledge, and for his position as a specialist to which he remains strongly committed.

Because of these attitudes, Burns (p. 32) states the academic administrator has two alternatives, namely:

1. The structure of the organization can be changed to establish "a set of hierarchical relationships similar to those in a business enterprise." In this case, the administrator will assume a role similar to an executive of a business organization.
2. The administrative leader will accept the existing situation and attempt to provide leadership to improve the functioning of a loose-knit organization. In other words the academic administrator will recognize the necessity of maintaining intellectual

creativity and such would "not flourish as the result of executive direction."

While every administrative organization must develop some kind of process as well as rationality in determining and executing organizational policies, the academic leader selecting the second alternative would see his role as one to develop an organizational orientation. This would mean the leader would attempt to move the other members of the staff to recognize the necessity for an orderly arrangement for making and implementing decisions. For an academic unit this would constitute the process of administration (Burns, 1962, p. 33).

The process of administration could be explained by the POSDCORB formula broached by Luther Gulick (1937, p. 13). The formula, as stated, is actually the combination of the initials of the administrative elements of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. These elements are as essential for educational organizations as any commercial enterprise.

An example of academic administrative process would include the formulation of a budget. Specifically the processing of the budget should involve planning for operation of various academic units, student services,

and coordinating these efforts within the total entity. While budget decisions are made at several levels, the initial recommendations should come from the academic departments and thereafter should be forwarded to the dean. Final recommendations should be made by the comptroller in conference with the president, and the official approval should be made by the board of trustees.

The effectiveness of the approved budget, however, would depend upon how the provisions are communicated throughout the academic organization. As Burns (1962, p. 35-36) states, problems could arise by failing to do just that:

Poor communication can, and frequently does, lead to misunderstanding, bad morale, and ineffective implementation. Controls are exercised by deans and other administrative officers and, ultimately, by the financial officer and president. Communication (especially when changes made at the presidential level affect initial requests) may bring about difficulties, forcing immediate reappraisal and possible new decisions. To a high degree, budget making and implementing assure logical consideration of pertinent factors, although choices among alternatives undoubtedly reflect values and attitudes of participants as well as logical calculation of consequences.

Burns notes another problem in motion--the proliferation of administrators, a phenomenon seemingly common to colleges and universities since World War II. The growth in administrative organizations has become evident

by the extension of the title "dean." As Burns (p. 70-72) states:

The title "dean," . . . is now given to many administrative officers not directly concerned with the instructional program, as in research activities, admissions, records, alumni affairs, and library services.

The prospects of even still larger administrative organizations seem certain with the growing complexity of higher education and the increasing number of students. To avert the costs of operating under Parkinson's Law (1957), it seems imperative that every administrative position, new or traditional, be reviewed to determine whether contributions to the objectives of the institutions are being made by continuance of such positions (Burns, 1962, p. 70-72).

One of the costs of the proliferation of administrative personnel is the loss of effectiveness just by placing more administrative hurdles between the faculty and the president:

Any institution which alters--or, particularly, adds to--its administrative structure may face the problem of suspicion and, in some cases, almost automatic dissent. Faculty members are shy of any increase in administration, and many institutions have seen new and needed administrative posts neutralized by resistance. Other administrators look askance at new power figures, particularly if they are interposed between themselves and the top level (American College Public Relations Association, 1958).



To all of this, there must be added an understanding of what is expected of an educational unit. In this respect, an educational body is a system unique: (1) by virtue of the fact that education's major functions are delegated by other systems, and (2) that other systems depend directly on the effective functioning of the educational system. It is also an institution that is charged with the responsibility for socialization, politicization, acculturation, academic, and vocational training; and the comprehensive community college adds leisure, recreational, and survival training, and thereby adds to the unique dimensions. While an educational unit must be organized in order to coordinate actions to accomplish goals, there is the necessity to be flexible. For instance, Owens (1970, p. 60-62) states that schools, as never before, must meet the needs of these two systems to survive:

- 1) The internal system, i. e., the organization's operations must be kept functioning and a balance of needs and satisfactions of participants on the one hand, and of the organization, on the other, which Bennis calls "reciprocity," must be maintained.
- 2) The external system, i. e., the organization must conform to pressures and changes of its environment; Bennis calls this "adaptability."

Achieving equilibrium by balancing "reciprocity" with "adaptability" has become an increasingly difficult assignment because the problems already stated are added to these pressures:

- 1) pressures to innovate along with enactments stressing uniformity in operation, budgeting, curriculum development, and building structures; along with
- 2) accountability for educational achievements to support acceptance of responsibility while attempting to fulfill expectations to accommodate the increasing student population seeking satisfaction of multiple educational needs and the students' extensive range of capabilities.

With acknowledgment of these expectations, determination of rational and proven guidelines for organizational structure and process becomes essential. Continuance of operation without such direction results in operation by experimentation. Such experimentation can be exceedingly costly for both the general tax-paying public and the administrators. The cost to students, however, may be even greater. There is, then, an impelling need to search for ways of developing the effective and efficient community college administrative organization. To search implies there must be established methods of evaluation as well.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As already indicated, the organization of community colleges has become a perplexing problem. This has been increasingly so with the accumulation of impinging forces. Consequently, the study to understand the administrative organization, as never before, has become almost a necessity--that is if there is concern about obtaining adequate public support for community colleges.

This study has attempted to compare two community colleges, of similar size and development, for the purpose of determining whether there are suitable evaluative techniques to test the efficiency and effectiveness of educational administrative organizations. To carry out this mission, the two schools selected were those perceived as being representative of the most recent type of organizational structure--the multi-unit.

Multiple unit institutions have been increasing since the 1960's in response to the ". . . simple necessity of economic survival . . ." and the laudable reason to provide ". . . equal student access to better educational opportunities" (Kintzer, 1972, p. 1).

There are two common multi-unit college patterns:  
(1) the multi-branch college which expands educational

services throughout an area by establishment of branch facilities and centralized administrative controls; and (2) the multi-college arrangement which has expanded educational services within a district by adding colleges where need is indicated. Though the multi-college pattern may establish a centralized administrative staff, and so does the multi-branch entity, the centralized administrative staff for the multi-college operation is primarily for coordinating educational services rather than for controlling.

While both of these organizational patterns satisfy educational proximity, there is a question as to whether both provide equal economic advantages--particularly to the taxpayer. Consideration of the economic advantages implies concern with efficiency; therefore, this study was directed to testing the economic validity of establishing administrative organizations using a multi-branch pattern compared to a multi-college pattern. Since Portland Community College (PCC), located in Portland, Oregon, operates with a strong centralized administrative organization and multi-branches to accommodate the educational demands in a large urban area, while Seattle Community College District (SCCD), located in Seattle, Washington, operates with a decentralized administrative organization and several

multi-colleges, the opportunity to test was readily accessible.

Because this researcher was employed as a faculty member of the Seattle Community College District, there was the question of whether this researcher could carry through with this project without undue bias. It was finally determined that the bias could be overcome if objective methods of evaluating were included. Since the schools are in general similar, and within two hundred miles of each other, and there is an interest in understanding multi-unit colleges, it was determined an exploratory study could be undertaken and be of value.

The examination of the multi-unit organization is important since the quick response to the educational demands by such structuring has resulted in community college administrators making ". . . crucial operational decisions before the philosophical framework has been carefully thought out" (Kintzer, 1972, p. 1). As a consequence, the "need for a philosophical basis becomes particularly vital in institutions when multiple units replace single campuses . . . ." This is so especially when the question is whether to expand operations by development of multi-branches or multi-colleges, and these two problems arise:

- (1) With multi-units there is the need to determine whether to centralize or decentralize authority and accordingly consider the complications of the lack of communication; and
- (2) Since the multi-unit was reasoned necessary for economic survival, both patterns must have economic validity.

The first problem may be of greater importance to the school administrators that attempt to remain flexible and maintain differentiated programs. The second has become increasingly critical as the tax supporting public accelerates its demand of school administrators to demonstrate accountability and responsibility.

With respect to the question of whether to organize by centralizing or decentralizing authority, two patterns in community college organizational structure have developed. Where centralized authority has been selected, multiple units are labelled branches established within one district. Such branches are generally headed by second-level administrators, and coordination of programs is maintained through contact with a central office administrator. In general, then, the central office has a larger administrative staff than the branches because of the necessity to coordinate and centralize controls throughout the multi-branch district. In theory the total administrative costs are comparatively smaller for the multi-branch pattern than

for the multi-college pattern. The basic argument against using the multi-branch pattern would be the potential of stultifying individuality of campuses since centralized control for economic purposes may favor homogeneity of programs.

In contrast the multi-college arrangement, where there are two or more individual colleges within a district, requires coordination but not centralized controls. Each separate college is free then to reflect the individuality of the immediate area in which it is located. The potential opportunity for experimentation and innovation to fulfill the distinctive needs of that community has been considered relatively greater, depending upon individuals involved, of course.

In theory the administrative staffs of the decentralized colleges are larger than the administrative staff at the branch campuses. It seems reasonable, then, that the central administrative staff of the decentralized district will not be as large as those of centralized branch units. The autonomous colleges conceivably entail higher total expenditures for administration because of the tendency to duplicate administrators, space, equipment, and other staff by establishing a full complement of administrators at each college. The offsetting advantage is believed to occur through the

development of specific identities for each college along with the opportunity of the administrators of such colleges to make decisions appropriate to local conditions. To determine whether the differences mentioned actually do exist, it seemed essential, then, to make a comparison of the two multi-unit schools. It was also conceived that the comparative study would reveal which organizational pattern was the more effective and/or efficient.



## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The basic purpose of this study was to gain familiarity with two particular types of organizational structure used by community colleges. Since the study was formulated more to develop hypotheses and more precise research problems rather than to test a hypothesis, this was an exploratory study. It was a study concerned primarily with evaluation techniques useful in determining the efficiency of educational administrative organizations.

Encouragement to compare two schools for this purpose was obtained from this statement by Reynolds (1969, p. 148):

In seeking to discover the true self-image of a junior college, clearer results will be obtained if several junior colleges are studied. If observations are compared with abstract standards, difficulty may be experienced in drawing conclusions. Comparisons should be made of the findings on one campus with those of another; in this way, the differences become more visible. The comparisons, in the instances of observations on more than one campus, emerge from the context of the abstract into the area of the concrete.

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Cohen and Quimby in the September, 1970, issue of ERIC: Junior College Research Review, listed "Assessing Organizational Climates" as an essential research project. Two reasons were given for encouraging the research, namely: (1) to get a better perspective on the organizational Geist, and (2) to obtain clearer identities of the community colleges as educational institutions. To limit organization study to these aspects, however, suggested examination of a stable system when in fact there is a continuous and dynamic organism to be studied. Therefore, it was determined that since this is a time of constant change and increasing rapidity of change, the study of community college organization should entail experimentation of evaluation techniques. This was reasoned since it is believed that too many educational programs have been developed and implemented in the past without adequate prior experimentation, review of alternatives, or evaluation (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1967).

This study was planned to make a contribution to understanding community college organization through evaluation methodologies. It was believed that different perspectives of the community college

organizations could be obtained by using a variety of evaluation techniques.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

To accomplish the purpose of this study, the investigation was limited to the following:

1. Historical documents of the schools were reviewed to obtain an understanding of the evolution of the organizations.
2. Review of organizational charts, directories, and personal interviews facilitated understanding of the administrative organizational structures and processes of Portland Community College (PCC) and Seattle Community College District (SCCD).
3. A psychological questionnaire for evaluation of administrators above the division or department chairman level was utilized.
4. A comparison of enrollment was made to determine the drawing power of the schools.
5. Course offerings were compared for consideration of similarity.
6. Variations in costs of operations were studied by analyzing and comparing the school budgets.

## DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of clarification, the important terms for this study have been defined below:

Administration has been used synonymously with the term organization. In this respect both terms would be looked upon as a process of directing others so as to accomplish a goal. More specifically, however, organization is a unit with jurisdictional boundaries circumscribing the total scope of operation (Wilson, 1966).

An administrative unit is an arrangement of individuals or groups in a hierarchal order with each individual or group having prescribed tasks. The resulting flow of work and communication move vertically or horizontally. The control of operations, however, is designated as usually being vertical.

In summary, administration is concerned with directing the activities of others working within the organization and is responsible for the survival, maintenance, and seeing that goals are accomplished. It is, then, primarily a coordinating activity to equalize, harmonize, or synthesize (Wilson, 1966). In this respect, administration is not directly responsible for doing the work but establishing processes so that the work can be done. This means that to administer there

will be planning ahead, organizing, ordering, coordinating, and controlling.

Administrative organization defines the tasks to be performed and the system of communication. Since organization is the channel through which work will flow and administration plans, directs, orders, coordinates, and controls the processing or flow of work, administrative organization establishes the lines of authority and responsibility.

Community College is a two-year college established to provide services according to the educational needs of the community consistent or subject to the state statutes. The programs offered include: a. two years of acceptable academic work transferable to colleges and universities; b. terminal training which may include technical training for trades, industry, agriculture, and semiprofessional fields; c. community services for cultural, civic, recreational, and family development; d. general education; e. remedial education; and f. guidance.

While the comprehensive community junior college, particularly in the large urban setting, would include all of the above, a junior or community college is usually less inclusive; but this will depend upon the community it serves, the financial support (whether

private or public), and the laws to which it is subject.

A community college may be a junior college limited to offering the first two years of academic work leading to a four-year degree. While a junior college may be publicly supported as well as privately supported, the community college term is more appropriate for a school publicly financed. The community college being publicly supported by either state or the local taxpayers is sometimes labelled the "open door" college, the "people's" college, or the comprehensive college.

Effectiveness of an organization is determined by its ability to carry out its purpose (Roethlisberger, 1941). The effectiveness will depend upon appropriateness of action and conditions of its environment. If an organization cannot accomplish its purpose, it must or will disintegrate (Roethlisberger, 1941).

Effectiveness of an organization also may be termed organizational health. An organization to be considered healthy must (1) achieve its goals, (2) maintain internal equilibrium, and (3) adapt to its environment (Getzels and Guba, 1957). Miles (1969) would add these specific dimensions in describing the effectiveness of schools:

Task-centered dimensions of organization health:

1. Goal focus. Goals must be understood

and therefore clarity is essential in order to obtain acceptance of such goals. Not only must the goals be achievable but they must be appropriate or congruent with the available resources and demands of the environment.

2. Communication adequacy. As organizations are not continuous face-to-face systems but a series of individuals or groups, the movement of information is crucial to the operation of the system. Information then should move appropriately vertically, horizontally, within and without the environment. A stoppage of communication may be as disastrous as stopping blood from flowing through the arteries of a human being-- a stroke or a heart attack. If undue effort must be made to obtain the necessary information to function or to prevent or solve difficulties, there is a signal of unhealthiness.
3. Optimal power equalization. A recognition that influence may be descending and ascending but that inter-group struggles for power are not bitter or produce damaging conflict. There must be collaboration but with some coercion.

Internal state of the system and maintenance of inhabitants' needs:

4. Resource utilization. Personnel are working up to their potential and have a feeling of self-actualization and thus have a sense of learning, growing and developing as individuals and contributing to the organization. Personnel or other inputs will be utilized effectively in that there will not be overloading or idling and only minimal strain.
5. Cohesiveness. There is understanding and acceptance of goals of the organization and personnel desire to stay, be influenced, and influence in



the collaborative efforts of the system.

6. Morale. Simply an exhibition of satisfaction and well-being.

Basically adaptation and problem-solving adequacy:

7. Innovativeness. To maintain internal and external equilibrium, it is essential that organizations seek self-renewal; therefore there will be a tendency to seek new procedures, move to new goals, produce a new product, and consequently diversify rather than remain routinized and standard.
8. Autonomy. A healthy organization (one confident in its identity and capabilities) would be independent of authority or external demands; but at the same time would not be passive to demands but rather seek constructive ways of adapting to or changing because of the environment. Destructive or rebellious responses would be unacceptable just as much as responses from others would not be determinative of its behavior.
9. Adaptation. A healthy organization will conceivably make realistic adjustments when confronted with the inevitable difficulties that will occur during a period of change or adaptation. When the organizational goals are not synchronized with its environment, effort will be made to adjust resources, solve the problems, and re-structure the organization or the approach. As a result both the organization and the environment will be affected and changed.
10. Problem-solving adequacy. Though a healthy organization will not solve all its problems infallibly, and it will never be without problems, strains, difficulties, or even instances of ineffectiveness, it will solve problems with minimal energy and problem-solving

mechanisms will be maintained and strengthened because of a well-developed structure and procedure for sensing problems, inventing possible solutions, selecting solutions, implementing them, and evaluating the effectiveness.

Efficiency - an economic definition includes consideration of input at least cost in relation to maximum output. The efficiency of an organization, then, may be measured by the amount of resources used to produce the output. The efficiency of an organization is said to increase if the cost or amount of resources used is reduced and the level of output remains the same or increases. Such costs or resources include both current costs and changes in capital (Etzioni, 1964).

While efficiency and effectiveness are closely related, it is important to recognize that an efficient firm may make no profit due to external factors and an inefficient firm may have high returns because of the same external factors. Concentration on efficiency without regard to effectiveness may result in limited activity. Concentration on effectiveness without regard to efficiency may result in expansion of activities.

Measuring either effectiveness or efficiency is difficult. However where the organization goals are limited and concrete, it is comparatively easy. Where the goals are continuous, as in education, measurement

must concern not only long range returns but subjective returns which are difficult to validate.

Simon (1957) states that the concept of efficiency criterion in commercial organizations is relatively simple on the basis that money terms provide a common denominator for measurement of the inputs and output. For nonprofit organizations measurement cannot be limited to direct monetary terms; therefore, the concept must be broadened. Monetary factors are available but conclusive monetary measurement for determining the value of output must be relegated to subjective compilations. Efficiency for a public agency, from an economist's view, must be from a general standpoint rather than from partial equilibrium (Simon, 1957).

As a suggestion for determining a school's efficiency, the benefit-cost approach is receiving substantial recognition. While the method involves some quantifying of subjective values, there is provision to establish some criteria unattainable otherwise. With the growing emphasis on relating responsibility, accountability, and evaluation, perfection of this methodology seems eminent.

Evaluation is the involvement of judgment of the worth of an experience, idea, or process. Education which is primarily an experience, idea, and a process

will be evaluated and has been evaluated (Dressel, 1961). Evaluation in education has been continuous but primarily based on opinions of those external as well as internal to the institution (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1967).

Though evaluation means appraising to determine a worth or value, schools have been evaluated primarily by subjective methods; consequently, the appraisals have been inadequate and open to debate. A full evaluation program would include the following subjective evaluation goals:

1. Evaluation should be based on stated objectives.
2. Evaluation should be based on intimate and comprehensive knowledge of the community.
3. Evaluation should be a continuous activity.
4. Evaluation should be comprehensive.
5. Evaluation should be a cooperative process involving many people.
6. Evaluation should identify strengths as well as deficiencies.
7. Evaluation should involve many instruments.
8. Evaluation requires the board to look at itself.
9. Evaluation should be based on knowledge of children and youth.
10. Evaluation should appraise existing practices affecting the staff.
11. Evaluation is based on the belief that what people think makes a difference.

12. Evaluation should culminate in self-improvement (American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association, 1959, p. 1-2).

In addition, objective evaluations should be made based upon the analysis of data collected through use of tests, observation forms, and other instruments (Garvue, 1969).

By the gathering of such information, the educational system will be aided in establishing criteria and, therefore, promote measurement of direction. The availability of factual information can also be used to counter or convert destructive criticisms (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1967).

Goal is the position or condition which the organization attempts to reach. Consequently, goals can be used as guides to activities, measurements of achievements, and measurements of effectiveness and efficiency (Etzioni, 1964). Goals are the basis of classification of an organization (Hills, 1968). As Parsons (1956) states: There will be adaptive goals, implementative goals, and pattern-maintenance goals. It is the latter that is applicable to schools, for schools are primarily involved with cultural, educational, and expressive functions (Simon, 1957). In addition, the importance of achieving the goals are long run or recognition of the services as goods in themselves rather than the short-run

utility in the society (Simon, 1957). The selection of the goals, or emphasis in schools on socializing, occupational training, or academic advancement will, in turn, depend upon the values of decision-makers within the community and as interpreted by those in the schools.

Organization is a social unit (or human grouping) which is deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals. An organization is characterized by division of labor, power, communication, responsibilities, authority, random as well as planned patterns of procedures and routines (Etzioni, 1964).

Organization has a synonym often appearing as an adjective--bureaucracy. A bureaucratic organization suggests more than the definition of organization given above. With a bureaucratic organization there is the connotation of being a superior entity by the structure and processes being so well delineated and regulated that it offers precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge, continuity, discretion, unity, and subordination (Weber, 1946). There are negative implications of a bureaucratic organization by the conception that it is inflexible, redundant, and authoritative rather than service-oriented.

An organization may also be referred to as an institution. This is a rather confusing term, however,

in that GM is considered an institution and so is marriage (Etzioni, 1964).

Other variations of organization include the formal and informal structure. The formal organization exists when the procedural coordination and lines of authority are specified to denote the activities and authority of each member of the organization (Simon, 1957). The informal organization is that pattern of operations not included within the formal scheme or is not consistent with that scheme (Simon, 1957). Though the informal organization is not specified, it results from the interpersonal relationships which affect decisions of the organization personnel. While every organization has both the formal and informal structure, the formal structure must set limits as to the informal relationships. This is so in spite of the fact "no formal organization will operate effectively without an accompanying informal organization" (Simon, 1957).

Process is the mechanism of the system--the mobilizing of the resources to achieve the goal (Parsons, 1956). It concerns the utilization of the resources within the organization. Such processing can be associated with decision-making. To attain goals, policy, allocation, and integration, decisions must be made.

While policy decisions determine the nature and quality standards of the product, scale of operations, problems approach, and modes of operations, allocative decisions will determine distribution of the resources within the organization. The mechanism of internal allocation can be the delegation of authority dependent upon the competence of participants.

The coordination decisions involve the problems of "efficiency." This is because the operative decisions are concerned with the integration of the organization as a system. What is coordination of the organization is cooperation for the participants (Hills, 1968). The personality, motivations, capabilities, and expectations of the participants can have significant effect on the processes of the organization, and therefore the efficiency of the organization.

Satisfaction is one of the major functions of an organization. It can be described as ability to maintain employees and their cooperation. Assessment or valuation of satisfaction of employees can be related to the labor turnover, tenure of employment, sickness and accident rates, wages, employees' attitudes, and presently by the formation of faculty organization: strikes or threat of strikes, length of contract negotiations. The degree of satisfaction of an organization is related to the



internal equilibrium or the maintenance of the social organization in which individuals or groups can fulfill their own desires (Roethlisberger, 1941).

Structure - if goals provide a source of legitimacy justifying the activities of an organization, goals also influence the structure of an organization. As an organization is a social system, the structure of that system will be concerned with the relations and interactions of the components, or units, within that system. Since an organization involves more than one unit to accomplish a goal, the structure provides differentiation of the units by describing functions, status, and expectations of such units. As a result structure is an outline for patterning of procedures, a formalizing of the power structure, lines of authority, communication, and control.

## Chapter II

## RELATED LITERATURE

Our society is an organizational society. We are born in organizations, educated by organizations, and most of us spend much of our lives working for organizations. We spend much of our leisure time paying, playing, and praying in organizations. Most of us will die in an organization, and when the time comes for burial, the largest organization of all--the state--must grant official permission.

--Amitai Etzioni (1964, p. 1)

The prevalence of organizations according to the above is universal and pervasive. Nevertheless the study of organizations is a recent undertaking, and the study of school organizations has just barely begun (Owens, 1970).

Even though the study of organizations is of short duration, there is now a vast reservoir of literature devoted to organization theory, concepts, and issues (Sexton, 1970). The magnetism of organization study is evident by the growing core of researchers who have now emerged from such diverse disciplines as business administration, engineering, economics, mathematics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and education.

As a consequence of the diversity of backgrounds of researchers, organization theories and concepts have evolved from the relatively stark engineering perspec-

tives of Taylor and Fayol to the inclusion of social scientists concerned with motivation patterns, individual effort, and interaction systems (Sexton, 1970). While much of the effort retains a singular disciplinarian's viewpoint, other work demonstrates the possibility of reaching better conclusions by the consideration of all relevant criteria (Simon, 1957).

In the meantime there is continual radiation of complexity and diversity of views about organizations (Litterer, 1969). For instance Scott (1961) decries the present state of organization theory as ". . . an amorphous aggregation of synthesizers and restaters, . . ." He concludes, however, that the recent introduction of tools of analysis:

. . . offers the opportunity for uniting what is valuable in classical theory with the social and natural sciences into a systematic and integrated conception of human organization.

Since substantial effort has already been made to understand organizations, this chapter serves as a report on the material reviewed concerning organization theory and concepts. Some of the material covered ideas on theory development for both business and education. Subsequently, the application of organization theories to educational administration was reviewed along with some recent studies concerning community college administrative organization.

## THEORY DEVELOPMENT

Progress in development of theories and concepts and thereafter guidelines for educational organization may be advanced if work can be continued by a scientific approach. It is, however, recognized that some may "scoff" (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1967) at considering more theory for educational organization since it is assumed the field is already well defined. Evidence of the presumed accomplishment can be obtained by a review of textbooks of yesterday and today on organization or administration for education. Since 1950 there has been an accumulation of discontent with such complacency.

It is true that the current demands made of educators to be specifically accountable and responsible may not directly require understanding of administration and organization, but there are forceful implications to do so. With the promotion of educators' accountability and responsibility, there is an implied need for development of supportive statements as to how effective and efficient school operations are.

According to Koontz and O'Donnell (1964), the solution appears to be through development of theory, for they state:

When management principles can be developed, proved, and used, managerial efficiency will

inevitably improve. Then the conscientious manager can become more effective by using established guidelines to help solve his problems, without engaging in original laborious research or risky trial and error.

The development of theory, according to Griffiths (1959, p. 21), is:

. . . a movement toward a more scientific approach . . . an approach which has been helpful to the development of science.

Those interested in better understanding of organization structures and processes have observed the progress of science by theory development and have concluded those advantages could be transferred to the study of organizations. The ultimate goal of theory development by scientific means is to obtain understanding. Such understanding is necessary to discover the truth regarding events and thereby solve problems (Miner, 1971). Opportunities to review circumstances and arrive at predictions, exert influence, and establish controls are inherent in understanding. This means expectations can be established which are logically consistent and meet the test of empirical confirmation (Miner, 1971).

The process of scientific theory construction and confirmation involves the following steps:

1. The formulation of a problem or complex of problems based on observation.

2. The construction of a theory to provide answers to the problem or problems based on inductions from observation.
3. The deduction of specific hypotheses from the theory.
4. The recasting of hypotheses in terms of specific measures and the operations required to test the hypotheses (this may be referred to as the theorem--formulation step).
5. The devising of factual situations to test the theorem.
6. The actual testing in which confirmation does or does not occur (Miner, 1971, p. 113-114).

These advantages through theory building are summarized by Miner as follows:

. . . Existing knowledge, explains events or relationships, and in the end predicts what has not yet been observed. Therefore providing a state of the knowledge at a point in time with the acceptance of the fact that accepted theory of yesterday or today may become outmoded tomorrow. New facts and new formulations invariably force changes.

The necessity to build management theory, when many have concluded it has been done, is due to the belief that such theory is in the formulation stage--the "schools" phase of development (Miner, 1971). Since educational organizations have in general followed the theories of organization developed for business and industry, and still does, educational organization theory is also in the "schools" phase of development.

Attempts to build administrative organization theory for educational guidelines in the past have been inadequate (Griffiths, 1959). In most cases the facts gathered for these attempts were from practicing administrators and were basically reports of self-perception with limited reliability or verification. Other efforts included surveys of teachers which were essentially descriptions of the past. Other tries evolved from the use of deductive reasoning in making an analysis of limited situations. Finally there have been attempts to adapt models. Though the sources mentioned introduced insight, there has been little meaningful direction. To improve the direction, Griffiths suggests that observations could better replace questionnaires and short interviews currently used in the research. This is based on the concept that the scientific method which uses observation, and has many proven successes in theory development, might be appropriately used in educational research, particularly for the purpose of understanding administrative organization. To build such a theory, Homans (1950, p. 16-17) provides these rules:

1. Look first at the obvious, the familiar, the common. In a science that has not established its foundations, these are the things that best repay study.
2. State the obvious in its full generality. Science is an economy of thought only if its hypotheses add up in a simple form

a number of facts.

3. Talk about one thing at a time. That is, in choosing your words (or, more pedantically, concepts) see that they refer not to several classes of fact at the same time but to one and one only. Corollary: Once you have chosen your words, always use the same words when referring to the same thing.
4. Cut down as far as you dare the number of things you are talking about. "As few as you may; as many as you must" is the rule governing the number of classes of fact to take into account.
5. Once you have started to talk, do not stop until you have finished. That is, describe systematically the relationships between the facts designated by your words.
6. Recognize that your analysis must be abstract, because it deals with only a few elements of the concrete situation. Admit the danger of abstraction, especially when action is required, but do not be afraid of abstraction.

Simon (1957) offers this stepping-stone process of theory building: Concepts must be developed before principles can be developed, and principles are necessary before theories can be developed. Since concepts, to be meaningful, must be developed operationally, concepts ". . . must correspond to empirically observable facts or situations."



## EVOLUTION OF THE ART

The importance of administration to organization is that administration is the art of "getting things done," while organization is the arrangement of getting things done. This means the practical activity involves "deciding" and "doing" (Simon, 1957). If activities are continuous, and deciding and doing connotes there is a set of alternatives, then:

. . . the rational character of "good" administration, is that among several alternatives involving the same expenditure the one should always be selected which leads to the greatest accomplishment of administrative objectives; and among several alternatives that lead to the same accomplishment the one should be selected which involves the least expenditure (Simon, 1957, p. 39).

To increase the knowledge of administrative procedures for community colleges, it was suggested by Duryea (1960) that the work in three categories, which has already been started, be continued. These categories include: (1) theories of administration; (2) analysis of administrative processes, organizational relationships, and their institutional environment; and (3) application or operation.

Theories of Administration

Precedents as to theories have already been

established by business management and governmental bureaucracy. It has only been of recent date that educators and social scientists have become involved in developing postulates for educational administration. As of this date there are many theories of administrative organization identifiable by at least these three stages:

- 1) The era of scientific management, which gave rise to the so-called classical theory of administration, about 1910-1935.
- 2) The human relations era, about 1935-1950.
- 3) The era of the behavioral approach, about 1950 to the present (Owens, 1970, p. 46).

The dominate contributors Taylor and Fayol are often labelled the founders of the scientific management of the classical doctrine. Both developed concepts that concerned planning, organizing, and controlling of organization activities. They did so from opposite perspectives, however. Taylor's approach was through observation of the shop, especially concerned with improvement of employee's working efficiency by use of time and motion studies. Fayol's frame of reference, in contrast, was top management. His effort included development of these principles: division of work, authority and responsibility, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest, remuneration of personnel, centralization,

scalar chain, order, equity, stability, initiative, and esprit de corps.

Other contributions included Urwick's span of control and R. C. Davis' argument for telescoping the management functions to simply planning, organizing, and controlling with the assumption that commanding and coordinating are merely phases of controlling. Mooney's (1939) expansion of the scalar principle included the formation of the hierarchical structure of authority, coordination, and communication signifying the supreme level at the top (Sexton, 1970).

The human relations era is said to have originated with Elton Mayo's 1927 to 1932 study of the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne Works in Chicago. Since the report of this work by Roethlisberger and Dickson, some organization studies have focused on human interactions, personality, interplay of individuals, and the decision-making process.

Likert's (1953) research has been concerned with the human being's need to be secure, friendly, and to have a sense of worth. According to Likert, if those needs are not fulfilled within the formal organization, attempts to fulfill them may be made by development and association through informal organizations.

Argyris' (1958) research has been based on "healthy"

organizations. His findings have introduced the idea that employees have become dependent, subordinate, submissive, and psychologically immature because their work leaves them little opportunity to be challenged, creative, or even responsible. Reaction has been expressed by developing apathy, indifference, and non-involvement, except for demands for higher wages to compensate for job dissatisfaction.

Argyris' work is a particularly notable example of the human relationists evolution to the behavioral school. The behavioral school has been more interested in the way people behave in order to satisfy fundamental needs, acquire desired things, or avoid unwanted things.

Others would add that classification of organization concepts could be labelled structuralism, social systems, the decision theory school, or the mathematical school, sometimes called management science school.

Briefly the structuralists may be exemplified by advocating Max Weber's bureaucracy. The technical advantages of bureaucracy are difficult not to accept. According to Weber (1946, p. 34), the advantages include:

Precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs. . . .

In spite of the undeniable good qualities of bureaucracy, there are those that strongly oppose further

application of such guidelines. Bennis, for example, states:

. . . bureaucracy is a social invention which relies exclusively on the power to influence through rules, reason, and law. . . .

. . . . .  
Bureaucracy thrives in a highly competitive, undifferentiated and stable environment, such as the climate of its youth, the Industrial Revolution. A pyramidal structure of authority, with power concentrated in the hands of a few with the knowledge and resources to control an entire enterprise was, and is, an eminently suitable social arrangement for routinized tasks.

However, the environment has changed in just those ways which make the mechanism most problematic. Stability has vanished. As Ellis Johnson said, ". . . the once-reliable constants have now become galloping variables."

To this Bennis (1970, p. 13) adds: "The key word will be 'temporary'; . . ." Problems will be solved by groups, the executive will be a coordinator, and the organization will necessarily have to be adaptive.

For example:

People will be differentiated not vertically, according to rank and role, but flexibly and functionally according to skill and professional training.

The social system school is closely related to, confused with, or intertwined with the human behavior school. The following statement by Roethlisberger (1941, p. 94-97) exemplifies the interrelationship:

An industrial organization is more than a plurality of individuals acting only with

regard to their own economic interests. These individuals also have feelings and sentiments toward one another, and in their daily associations together they tend to build up routine patterns of interaction. Most of the individuals who live among these patterns come to accept them as obvious and necessary truths and to react as they dictate.

Decision-making is conceived as being basic to organization activity particularly when goals, purposes, objectives, policies, and programs are involved. Since these concerns are subjected to continuous alterations, and are so essential to the organization, the process of decision-making has become the focus of some students of organization or administrative theory.

The mathematical school, or management science school, visualizes management as a system to be described by using mathematical models and processes. The major belief is that management or organizations can be planned and decisions made by use of some logical process, for instance, mathematics.

While theories are concerned with hypotheses which will provide explanation as well as prediction, studies involved with theoretical considerations would stress confirmation or rejection of such hypotheses. Since it is recognized by the variations in perspectives that different theories have been developed, it is also understood there is still considerable lack of agreement or confirmation. Until there is more agreement or

confirmation of theories already developed, theory of administration or organization can only factually be stated as being in an unscientific state. As Duryea (1960) suggests, further analysis may add insight which will broaden the perceptions of those striving for conceptual schemes of administrative behavior.

Students of organization might find clarification by studying an organization as to its arrangement. The ordering of the parts and the composition of those parts, such as trustees, presidents, deans, chairmen, and faculties could be examined. If effectiveness of the administrative process is to be understood, the relationships of the parts to the entity must be understood in order to establish guidelines for development of administrative policy and decisions (Duryea, 1960).

#### Analysis of Administration

To understand the organization involves, then, an analysis of at least three elements: administrative process, structural relationships, and the institutional settings. These, in turn, suggest a number of questions for further study. For instance:

1. What is the nature of leadership?
2. Is there a difference in executive ability required for colleges compared to other organizations?

3. Which kind of organizational structure will achieve the higher degree of efficiency and yet perform with a greater degree of effectiveness--centralized or decentralized?
4. What should be the basic administrative unit?
5. How will the various departments be coordinated in terms of institutional policy?
6. May any organization use the power of bureaucracy and be effective?
7. Is it necessary to have clarification and standardization of titles and roles of administrative officers?

Others have already examined some of these questions.

For instance, as Drucker (1954, p. 3) justifies a manager's existence, he specifies the role:

The manager is the dynamic, life-giving element in every business. Without his leadership the "resources of production" remain resources and never become production. In a competitive economy, above all, the quality and performance of the managers determine the success of a business, indeed they determine its survival. For the quality and performance of its managers is the only effective advantage an enterprise in a competitive economy can have.

Bavelas (1960, p. 119) suggests how a leader may be identified:

That person who can assist or facilitate the group most in reaching a satisfactory state is most likely to be regarded as the leader. If one looks closely at what constitutes assistance or facilitation in this sense, it turns out to be the making of choices or the helping of the group to make choices--"better" choices, of course.



Choice or decision-making, according to Bavelas (1960), has changed. Since every activity within an organization requires selection from a set of alternatives, there are distinctive differences in levels of decisions and authority of personnel to make those decisions.

Organizational leadership can be equated to uncertainty reduction since all choices are not equally difficult or important. For instance, choices which are relatively clear and habitual apply to all personnel. Those decisions which involve risk, time, and values are delegated according to degrees of diversity and complexity. Organizational leadership may be determined as stated here by structure:

Precisely where a management draws this line defines its scope. The way in which a management distributes the responsibility for making the set of choices it has thus claimed to itself defines its structure (Bavelas, 1960, p. 120).

Tannenbaum's (1949) efforts record acceptance of the above by his report that managers have and use formal authority to organize, direct, and control subordinates. Tannenbaum completes his explanation by adding consideration of directive decisions (what, how, when, and where). By completing the directive decisions the purposes of action and the methods or procedures to be followed are established. The devices managers use to

eliminate unnecessary duplications of decision-making include establishment of budgets, policies, procedures, methods, rules, regulations, routines, schedules, instructions, specifications, and designs. While these devices serve as criteria for action, they also imply development of standards of performance to be attained.

#### Application or Operation

Since most of the procedures just mentioned are operational, it is implied that a complete study of the organization would entail methods of evaluating the effectiveness of an organization and the efficiency of the administrative organization.

The concept of establishing guidelines for action as listed above implies planning. Planning, which can be a formidable job, often requires assistance. How assistance is used may also serve as an evaluative point (Tannenbaum, 1949). Further planning requires a system of controls which include methods of obtaining feedback--in essence, additional planning. Controlling, an essential complement of planning, involves evaluation and can be used to relate how successful management planning has been.

Emch (1954, p. 44) states: ". . . control--perhaps more than any other major management function--reflects the personalities and attitudes of those at the top."

Reflection of the personalities may be seen in the planning and controlling implemented. One of the plans and methods of control are evident by the development of a budget. Not only do budgets serve as plans determining actions but they stimulate thinking ahead about those actions and subsequently serve as an effective basis for control and evaluation.

If it is accepted that administrators are significant factors contributing to an organization's successful operation, then, the studies of others to find dimensions of leadership by searching for that leadership quality may be important in understanding organizations. Some researchers (Gross, 1961, p. 511), in this respect, have focused attention ". . . on weight, health, intelligence, sociability, dominance, self-confidence, extroversion and introversion . . ." of those already in management. These personality characteristics have been studied with the hope that some clue to commonality of leaders might be discovered. All of these studies have been interesting, but most have only added to confusion rather than clarification. Nevertheless, there is a continuation in the belief that leadership does affect the organization, and does so by interaction; therefore, better understanding of personalities may provide the most fruitful understanding of leadership.

Tarnopol (1958, p. 56-60) conceptualized that leaders do limit or amplify interaction by being authoritarians, provide degrees of democracy, or by permitting laissez faire operations. With this hypothesis, he made a study of personalities by using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) for the purpose of differentiating between leaders and nonleaders. These are his basic findings:

- 1) good supervisors and natural leaders have like personalities;
- 2) leaders tend to accept responsibility better than non-leaders;
- 3) leaders are less defensive and less hostile and more willing to admit weaknesses and problems than non-leaders;
- 4) non-leaders exhibit more tactlessness and neurotic tendencies than leaders in relationships with people;
- 5) leaders are more capable of handling hostility through being aggressive, not necessarily being hostile; intellectual aggression by being curious is desirable while being hostile is crippling to action and thought;
- 6) the non-leader was characterized by generally possessing an authoritarian personality and, according to studies by Adorno, Frankel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford, such personality tends to be intolerant of weaknesses of others, to deny or repress anxiety or weakness in himself, and evidences conventionality, rigidity, repressive denial and moralistic punitive attitudes.

Selznick (1957), in considering a study involving a critical analysis of organizations, found that only a few studies were made from the perspective of administration. He reasoned that measuring efficiency at the upper levels of management had been considered difficult because of the increasing complexity of responsibility at the higher levels. This limitation was also due to the fact that techniques for measuring were not available. Since subordinate units were more clearly defined as to responsibilities, discretion, and precise boundaries of operation, the opportunities to develop devices for measurement of subordinates was easier and had become customary. In the meantime, measuring management's effectiveness or efficiency was neglected.

Selznick also concluded that the privileged position of higher management itself provided for a desire to thwart any threat of vested interests which might have resulted by such evaluation. Evaluation of administrators, consequently, was virtually ignored, and appraisal of subordinates, rather than upper level management, has become a sine qua non by management. This is in spite of the fact that those at the top of the organization pyramid are those most likely to ask first:

How can our organization be made more effective?

How can the organization's efforts be accomplished more efficiently?

Buchele (1962) believed he had some of the answers. One was by determining how managers cope with the future. Since managers are constantly involved in the process of planning and controlling activities, evaluation problems might be resolved by reviewing long range and short range plans. Since budgets are formalized plans and statements of expectations for both short and long range activities, such a review, or evaluation, could simply be limited to an analysis of the budgets. Such analysis might indicate an administrator's creativeness, or at least, an administrator's efficiency in allocating scarce resources.

This last proposal for analysis, examining a budget, is akin to accumulating operational data (application). While there are almost endless numbers of studies involving operating data, and such effort has been important for day-to-day operation, there has been some deficiency in accumulating data for continuous programs and comparative data. In this respect, then, something new is needed.

## SOME ORGANIZATION THEORIES APPLIED TO EDUCATION

As of 1916, Cubberley was exemplary in describing the simplicity of school organization. To him there was but one proper order. That order started with the superintendent being placed at the pinnacle of the pyramidal structure. All other positions were assigned in an orderly pattern forming the descending slopes of the pyramid. The duties and authority declining with the descent, considered traditional, defined roles.

In general, this simplistic and stable arrangement for schools remained until 1950 without question. Since 1950, controversy as to school output, input, and efficiency has been growing; perhaps this is an indication that another type of organization would be preferable for school operations. In the meantime, the confusion resulting from the controversy has virtually produced a bottleneck to funding for education--at least for expansion or experimenting for improvement.

Some within and without school organizations have advocated that schools emulate business administration practices. Others advocate schools use management by objectives, systems analysis, and the implementation of the much publicized PPBES. Others spin in circles by relating the evolution, but end with the dilemma only.

Campbell, Cunningham, McPhee, and Nystrand (1970) respond by predicting that school organizations in the future will require a proliferation of staff personnel. That seems to be their solution for the growing need for specialized knowledge and skills. The consequence they are willing to accept is an adaptation to the bureaucratic model.

If more bureaucracy occurs, the human relationists, such as Bennis and Lieberman (1956), project this argument:

Teachers . . . will lack the direct and personal responsibility of professional workers to their clients if primary responsibility for the quality of their services is lodged with educational administrators. . . . Placing the primary responsibility for the equality of professional services on the shoulders of administrators undermines the right of practitioners to make professional judgments.

This seems to follow the findings of Argyris in that employees may develop apathy, indifference, and alienation if power and responsibility are restricted. Nevertheless, there are advocates for administration with the perspective of the bureaucrat.

At the same time, there is promotion for analysis by systems. Griffiths (1964, p. 116) defines systems as follows:

A system is simply defined as a complex of elements in interaction. Systems may be open or closed. An open system is related to and exchanges matter with its environment. Further,



a closed system is characterized by an increase in entropy, while open systems tend toward the steady state. (Given a continuous input, a constant ratio among the components is maintained.) All systems except the smallest have subsystems and all but the largest have suprasystems, which are their environment.

Miller (1965) using the system's approach analyzed 165 pertinent hypotheses for organizations. As others before him found (Simon), acceptance of one principle could negate the operational usefulness of another.

Getzels and Guba (1957) clarify systems for schools by initially describing a school as a social system. Even here there are bureaucratic dimensions included within their description by recognition of the hierarchical role-structure and definition of behavioral expectations. Variations occur in the system, however, with the recognition that organizational behavior includes individuals accepting and facilitating the purposes of the organization and the organization satisfying the needs of the individuals. The interplay of this behavior is expressed by these equations:

$$B = f (R \times P)$$

where B = observed behavior

R = institutional role, and

P = personality of the role incumbent

For a full system's analysis, the organization, individuals within, and the environment must be included

in the analysis. Such complete analysis appears necessary since the organization and individuals included are both involved in attaining goals but restricted by a particular environment. In turn, the environment supports the organization for satisfaction of its wants.

As implied by the above, role status becomes important to the system's approach. Consequently some researchers believe better understanding can be achieved by studying roles in order to develop predictabilities of organizational behavior in education.

## EVALUATIONS FOR EDUCATION

Evaluation of Administrators

Considering Selznick's proposal that evaluation of the efficiency of administration should be undertaken along with Tarnopol's hypotheses that a leader's personality effects interaction within an organization, and that such analysis has been neglected, the Purdue Rating Scale for administrators was found to be a unique development and a necessary effort.

Drs. Hobson and Rupe's report of their Purdue Rating Scale suggests they have produced the missing instrument useful for such administrative evaluation. According to their report, a technique for measuring administrative effectiveness has been developed along with a comprehensive plan. In addition, they have claimed their evaluation instrument is just as useful for evaluation of educational administrators as for business administrators.

The instrument was produced by Drs. Hobson and Rupe, of Purdue University, as a result of their earlier search for determinants of a good or poor administrator. After they found no specialized devices which would measure an administrator's effectiveness, and thereafter concluded their study could not be continued without such an instrument, they prepared the Purdue Rating Scale. Their

instrument was developed on the premise that some means of evaluating educational administrators was essential because of the importance of administrators in an educational entity. An administrator in an educational organization was conceived as being in a position to substantially affect the speed and progress of education. It was, therefore, important to the researchers to know an administrator's characteristics since such an individual could influence well beyond the educational unit through the processing of students in the educational system.

To correct for the limited information on administrative effectiveness, they developed a subordinate-administrator scale designed for the purpose of investigating traits of academic administrators. Their instrument was prepared to appraise an administrator's effectiveness by determining the administrator's social qualities which, they believed, affected social interaction. After extensive pre-testing of the instrument, and finding relative success, they advocated further use of the instrument because of these determinations (Hobson and Rupe, 1948, p. 47-49):

1. The Purdue Rating Scale provided high reliability and satisfactory evidence of validity.
2. The scale could be used for further research.

3. Three common traits of administrators could be measured, and included the following:
  - (a) fairness to subordinates
  - (b) administrative achievement
  - (c) democratic orientation
4. Administrators may succeed in "administrative achievement" with only a moderate degree of fairness to subordinates. To be fair to subordinates does not guarantee achievement administratively. With an administrator, being fair to subordinates and achieving administratively does not include being democratically oriented. However, if an administrator is democratically oriented there is high probability that such administrator will be fair to subordinates.
5. Staff morale may be high though the administrator lacks democratic orientation.
6. The most important factor for staff morale was fairness to subordinates.
7. The scale could be used for any administrator above those of the teaching staff.
8. The scale appeared to be free of a general halo effect.
9. Though the scale does not provide answers to academic administration problems, it provides an opportunity for honest and an anonymous appraisal of an administrator's effectiveness.

#### Evaluation to Determine Efficiency

Determining whether an organization is effective and/or efficient involves evaluation--appraisal. While evaluation for educational activities has been inevitable, and an established process--at least for students, it has been deficient for lack of direction

and lack of quantifying (Hu, Lee, and Stromsdorfer, 1969).

Like the attempts to evaluate managers, the response in appraising the educational organization and programs has been circumvented by the statement: "It is difficult." This does not mean that appraisal of educational service has not occurred; it has, but with little scientific direction. And such appraisal has been continuous. Because such appraisal has become increasingly negative, there is a growing realization that efforts to evaluate must be developed for use within the organization as well as by external sources. Along with development of educational evaluation there is acceptance that every social system, in order to survive, to progress, or to grow, should have the benefit of being appraised. Effort to find appropriate evaluation techniques for the total organization should be equally continuous. The present state of the activity is summarized in this statement by Morphet, Johns, and Reller (1967, p. 546):

Developing adequate and valid appraisal programs for a school or school system is one of the most difficult responsibilities confronting the educational administrator. This difficulty is the result of a number of factors, such as the paucity of emphasis upon or realization of the importance of appraisal; the complexity of the aims and services requiring appraisal; the inadequacy

of the professional preparation of the staff; the tendency for many to make appraisals with little regard to validity; the inadequacy of a staff or staff members with many other demands for their time; and the difficulty of being objective when intimately involved.

In continuing the promotion for evaluation, it is argued that it is as important for the teacher to evaluate as it is for the administrator. The teacher that does not evaluate is limited as a teacher; the administrator who does not appraise is limited as an administrator. Sound teaching and administration demands adequate knowledge of results and such results may only be obtained through evaluation. The question is how to evaluate?

One means of appraising is to review methods of resource allocation--the budget. Whether reference is made to a business organization or an educational organization, budgets are important documents. A budget may be a blueprint for action for a corporation, and so it may be for an educational unit (Banghard, 1969). The budget is exemplary for a number of reasons. For instance, the budget demonstrates adequacy of decision-making, analyzing, planning, controlling, monitoring, and distribution of power.

Anshen (1965, p. 10-11) supports the concept that the budget is more than singularly directed by suggesting that the budget focuses on seven primary objectives:

1. The budget design facilitates meaningful measurements of the total money costs of accomplishing defined objectives.
2. The budget structure facilitates comparison of alternative ways to accomplish a given objective.
3. The budget presentation can clearly identify future cost implications which are inherent in interim financial commitments.
4. The design of the budget can facilitate comparison of cost inputs and achievement outputs when related segments of a single program are administered by different management units.
5. The budget design can delineate the objectives of discrete spending commitments in a way that significant cost effectiveness (cost utility) analysis can be carried through.
6. The budget presentation can make it possible to aggregate related expenditures wherever they occur in the educational administrative structure.

While a budget may serve as operational data to be observed, or as an application in education, there is a new trend in budgeting that is being widely advocated-- particularly in governmental circles (Peterson, 1971). Program-Planning-Budgeting Evaluation System (PPBES) is being heralded as that type of technique that will provide a more reliable method of collecting information.

In concept PPBES is more than an information gathering technique, or accounting system; it is a multi-purpose system which offers greater opportunity for



planning in combination with budgeting. Consequently it offers three levels of planning such as strategic planning, management control, and operational control. It encompasses these basic elements: objectives (establishment of goals), programming, program alternatives (a system for review of choices), output (program activities linked to objectives and programs), progress measurement (to determine whether output is being achieved efficiently as planned), input (consideration of all resources applied to the program), alternative ways to perform a job (using resources in various combinations), and systems analysis (use of financial and benefit-cost analytical techniques).

As Peterson (1971, p. 2) states:

The available literature is ample in describing what PPBS is; it suggests some of the ways it might be applied to higher education; but it is woefully lacking in any discussion of the implications of this management technique for higher education. In fact, the higher education discussions of PPBS fail to point out that in other settings it has been, and continues to be, a controversial management technique.

While PPBS has been acclaimed as the answer to an educational administrators' prayer for management techniques, various economic analysis techniques have been in the process of being developed for the purpose of resolving the question of whether education has economic value. For instance Welch (1966) has attempted to

measure the quality of schooling. Hanoch (1967), interested in measuring the quality of schooling, worked with estimated earnings by age, schooling, and race. Blaug (1967), among others, has investigated the private and social returns of an investment in education.

Hansen and Weisbrod (1969) prepared a very comprehensive study of the methodology for estimating the benefits and costs of higher education for the State of California. This involved estimated financial returns from higher education; median income by level of schooling, sex, and color; average costs of education borne by students, parents, and taxpayers; and distribution of family incomes and subsidies received along with state and local taxes paid.

Maureen Woodhall (1970, p. 12) in preparing a small booklet on the policy implications of benefit-cost analysis of education, provides the clearest presentation of data to be included, technique, and possible results. Even the definition of the term "benefit-cost analysis" provides understanding that many have been searching for:

The term "cost-benefit analysis" implies a systematic comparison of the magnitude of the costs and benefits of some form of investment, in order to assess its economic profitability. All forms of investment involve a sacrifice of present consumption in order to secure future benefits in the form of higher levels of output or income. Cost-benefit analysis (or rate-of-return

analysis, which is the type of cost-benefit analysis most frequently applied to education) provides a means of appraising these future benefits in the light of the costs that must be incurred in the present. The purpose of the analysis is to provide a measure of the expected yield of the investment, as a guide to rational allocation of resources.

Finally Hu, Lee, and Stromsdorfer (1969) have made a comparison of vocational and nonvocational education in secondary schools using cost-effectiveness. Though their findings were not conclusive, they did recommend that educational institutions should begin to keep adequate cost records of information relating to the production of education. Efforts should be made to determine the degree to which various educational programs are operated efficiently. This is independent of the question of optimum allocation of resources. The implication is that production and cost functions of various educational programs should be analyzed.

## OBSERVATION OF INTERNAL ISSUES

A very relevant question that must be answered before organization theory per se can be transferred to education organizations is this:

Are education organizations unique--different from other organizations?

Does the pyramidal structure of authority, communication, responsibility, unit of command, span of control, and the scalar chain apply to educational organizations?

The more recent literature on administration in education suggests there are some distinctive differences. For instance, authority in an organization cannot be exercised effectively unless the person so exercising that authority is perceived as having the right, or such right is accepted. In the school situation, according to Griffiths (1964, p. 142), the authority of the administrator is "modified by the board of education, the teachers, non-teaching staff, parents, patrons, the state school law, the customs and traditions of the community, and the authority of the profession."

Morphet, Johns, and Reller, (1967, p. 98) state that:

There are two principal competing concepts of organization and administration, . . . the traditional monocratic, bureaucratic concept and the emerging pluralistic, collegial concept.

This is not to say there is dualism in types of administration and organization, but rather that there

are extreme ends of a continuum. The traditional monocratic, bureaucratic concept of organization is that which is evidenced by a pyramidal, hierarchical structure, where power for decisions flow from superordinates. The pluralistic, collegial concept arises when all members are required to participate in decision making and ends in dividing personal responsibility. The best example of this concept, according to Morphet, Johns, and Reller, (1967, p. 104-105) is a college which:

- (1) emphasizes academic freedom, scholarship, and the dignity of the individual;
- (2) provides that the faculty, and not the administrative hierarchy, shall make major policy and program decisions; and
- (3) pays distinguished professors salaries as high as or higher than those of persons holding positions in the administrative hierarchy. . . .

. . . . .  
This concept of organization and administration is actually found in most of the leading colleges and universities of the nation.

With the pluralistic, collegial concept these assumptions emerge (morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1967, p. 111-112):

- (1) Leadership is not confined to those holding status positions in the power echelon. . . .  
. . . . .
- (2) Good human relations are essential to group production and to meet the needs of individual members of the group. . . .  
. . . . .

- (3) Responsibility, as well as power and authority, can be shared. . . . .
- (4) Those affected by a program or policy should share in decision making with respect to that program or policy. . . . .
- (5) The individual finds security in a dynamic climate in which he shares responsibility for decision making. . . . .
- (6) Unity of purpose is secured through consensus and group loyalty. . . . .
- (7) Maximum production is attained in a threat-free climate. . . . .
- (8) The line and staff organization should be used exclusively for the purpose of dividing labor and implementing policies and programs developed by the total group affected. . . . .
- (9) The situation and not the position determines the right and privilege to exercise authority. . . . .
- (10) The individual in the organization is not expendable. . . . .
- (11) Evaluation is a group responsibility. . . . .

As a consequence of the pluralistic concept and the above assumptions, structure is less important and communication occurs through many channels--being circular and horizontal. Furthermore there are committee

structures which arrange for those at the bottom of the line structure to meet face-to-face with the top administrators.

An apparent agreement with the above assumptions has been expressed by Lloyd Morey (1955, p. 178), president emeritus, University of Illinois, in his statement of basic principles for educational executive management:

1. Set up channels of communication and means of discussion, and respect and use them.
2. Listen first, decide afterwards. Do not be too quick or too positive with your answers; allow time for consideration, for discussion with others, even for the possibility of changing your judgment after further consideration.
3. Discuss with those affected and with advisers any proposed changes before they are initiated. Try to get others to agree with you as fully as possible in advance.
4. Be honest, fair, and consistent in your dealings and your decisions.
5. Praise freely, publicly as much as possible; criticize only privately.
6. Delegate responsibility as fully, wisely, and freely as possible, but give authority with it; then hold your delegates responsible for results and for errors as well.
7. Give of yourself as much as you can to your staff and your public.
8. Do not develop or hold grudges, even though you are certain the other party is wrong and is treating you unjustly.

By ranking the ten traits most desired in a college president, 400 professors indicated some agreement according to a study by Hillway (1959, p. 181-184):

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Number first place votes</u>	<u>Percentage of first votes</u>
1. Integrity in personal and professional relations	97	24
2. Intellectual ability and scholarship	89	22
3. Ability to organize and lead	81	20
4. Democratic attitude and methods	44	11
5. Warmth of personality	24	6
6. High moral and intellectual ideals	21	5
7. Objectivity and fairness	20	5
8. Interest in education (an educational philosophy)	8	2
9. Culture and good breeding	5	1
10. Self-confidence and firmness	4	1

The undesirable characteristics were these:

1. Dictatorial, undemocratic attitude	98	24
2. Dishonesty and insincerity	61	15
3. Weakness as educator and scholar	60	15
4. Vacillation in organizing and leading	60	15
5. Poor personality	36	9
6. Bias or favoritism	24	6

According to 148 trustees, the most vital competencies of a president reported by Hillway (1961, p. 185-189) were as follows:

1. Educational leader	78	52
2. Management executive	67	45
3. Public relations expert	41	27
4. Money raiser and businessman	24	16



The above perspectives of administrators and faculty are those of some in higher education but certainly not all. The congeniality described by the acceptance of the pluralistic, collegial concept was not evident in the writings of Litchfield, nor in the more recent writings in the June, 1971, issue of the Journal of Higher Education. While some accept faculty participation in administrative activities as commendable, there is continued strong resistance. With presidential perspectives of the new trends and rapid changes in education, Richardson (1970) questions whether there can be a science of administration with respect to the two-year college.

Perhaps it is time to recognize that educational organizations are unique and unlike the business organization or even most other government organizations. Educational entities at the lower levels have maintained a formal and legal allocation of authority, or a monolithic, hierarchical concentrated structure. This structure is not only questioned by Etzioni (1969) but openly challenged. Teachers at every level are vigorously pressing for recognition as professionals in spite of the fact they are serving in an occupation, are employees, and, consequently, are salaried workers subject to the authority of a public body that employs them

(Etzioni, 1969). The claim for professional status by teachers is made on the basis that teaching is an art which projects autonomy rather than control.

If teachers are professionals rather than employees, perhaps the definition of professional should be corrected, as Harries-Jenkins (1970, p. 53-54) suggests:

. . . No longer can it be assumed that the "ideal-type" professional, . . . is the independent free practitioner who practices his calling in a purely entrepreneurial role. The professional of today is often a salaried employee, performing his activities within the structural framework of a bureaucratic hierarchy, in occupations as diverse as teaching, government, social welfare, medicine and industrial management. In the majority of cases, the individual in these bureaucracies retains a distinctive frame of reference, so that, as a professional, he participates in two distinct, irreconcilable systems. He is a member of two institutions--the profession and the organization. Each of these attempts to control his occupational activities, and the manner in which the former establishes standards. . . .

Leggatt (1970) explains why teachers, in general, have failed to seek recognition as professionals at an earlier date. The reason, he states, is the stereotype that has developed about teachers. Basically this has evolved because most of the teachers, at the lower levels of education, have been women. Even as professionals the women teachers were more prone to combine teaching with their family life and often considered their profession something to "come back to" rather than an endeavor demanding complete attention. As a result, high rates

of turnover, in the interest of family, resulted in the formation of a loosely organized professional group. As a result, there has been a lack of participation by those involved in the development of professional authority and independence. This non-involvement also permitted the control of recruitment to the profession, training or certification, and conditions of service to be left to others--generally administrators (Leggatt, 1970).

The change in participation has been prompted by two factors: (1) more men are now teaching at the lower levels, and (2) the significant change in women's attitude toward achieving equality of status.

Such change in attitudes obviously effects organization theory, principles, and concepts, and this is considered so since internal compatibility is essential in achieving effective and efficient operations.

## STUDIES OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS

As stated earlier, there are numerous studies of organization, but there are relatively few studies of school organizations. There are even fewer studies of community college organizations. While accountability and responsibility is becoming a primary concern for schools, there is a noticeable paucity of study in this area as well. Some recent doctoral dissertations, however, demonstrate a growing interest in organizational development. Some considered pertinent to this study are briefly cited below:

Morin (1969) found that conflict in an organization may be functional or dysfunctional depending upon the source of conflict, the severity, and what groups were involved.

Levine (1969), concerned with environment, compared two types of community organization. The basis for the study was to analyze the difficulties that occur as a result of conflicts between the organizational posture and image and the environmental press and emphasis in programs. He concluded that the institution should be explicit in setting priorities of the various goals in order to increase internal organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Clarification was determined essential for the benefit of the student since the school's

emphasis could affect the student's selection of school or program, and it could also affect the experiencing of a transfer shock.

Several studies of organization have involved establishing theory and models. In this respect, Yuchtman (1966) attempted to provide an improved conceptual framework for the definition of organizational effectiveness. He determined that effectiveness is the ability of the organization to exploit its several environments in acquiring scarce and valued resources for its own use. Effectiveness for Yuchtman, a sociologist, was, consequently, defined as the "bargaining position." It is one that optimizes rather than maximizes its resource getting.

McEnroe (1969), using Getzels and Guba's social system theory, made a study to establish a "critical path analysis" to define scope, sequence, and dependency of the activities required to complete a complex project. This provided the structural model of the administrative system. The reason for the study was to develop a model of an administrative system which would be used to identify and quantify the system's characteristics which could induce or inhibit the achievement of the organization's goal.

Purrington (1967), in studying the supervisory behavior of school administrations and organizational effectiveness found that behavior of the administrative personnel does affect the organizational effectiveness. For instance, the administrators possessing stronger technical, administrative and conceptual skills were functioning in the more effective units. The administrators in less effective units lacked even minimum amounts of human relations capabilities as well as technical, administrative skills, and conceptual skills. Administrators strong in the technical and administrative skills were not always strong as to human relations competency; however, they usually possessed a minimum amount. It was concluded that an effective organization did have administrators who possessed at least a modicum of human relations skill, but a larger share of conceptual competency, technical skill, and administrative ability.

As a feedback for effectiveness, the teachers in the more effective units felt administrators more fully understood their viewpoints. Reasons for this include the following: (1) teachers were told in advance about changes; (2) teachers were aware of administrator's concept of teachers; and (3) communication was timely and personal. As a result there was less tension and strain

throughout the more effective organization than in the less effective ones.

In recognition of the changing patterns for organizational processing, Martineson (1969) made a study testing the hypotheses: (1) The administrators' perception of their role in decision-making in regard to the stated tasks would differ significantly from the faculty senate members' perception of the administrators' role; and (2) the faculty senate members' perception of their role in decision-making in regard to the same areas would differ significantly from the administrators' perception of the faculty senate members' role. He found that administrators disagreed with faculty as to decision-making involvement in personnel, curriculum, and student personnel policy formulation.

Bylsma (1969) studied the potential changes in the organizational structure of public community colleges in Michigan since the passage of a public employee bargaining act in 1956; found these results:

1. There was statistically significant changes in decision making primarily in areas relating to faculty welfare (salary, class size, academic calendar, continuing contract, work load, and time assignment).
2. There was significant change in decision making as to faculty and administrative appointments.

3. The organizational structure had moved in the direction of a tighter structured bureaucracy but with increased participation of the faculty and thereby achieved a representative bureaucracy.
4. Finally, it was concluded that collective negotiations in community colleges in Michigan had acted to democratize the institutions, and the changes in decision making changed the organizational structure.
5. In theory and in practice, he assumed the tightening of the structures would result in more efficient organization.

Where teachers and administrators encounter high levels of disagreement or differences in attitudes, Fiege (1970) found there would be significant levels of faculty turnover.

Areas needing attention in reference to the overall behavior of the junior college president when considering effective relationships between faculty and administrative staff include: (1) communications; (2) decision and policy making; (3) matters of salary, tenure, and professional status; (4) delegation of authority; and (5) creditability. These were the findings of Osborne (1969) who searched for the critical requirements of a public junior college president.

An analysis of the communication processing in institutions was made by Plunkett (1969) for the purpose of determining if this was a variable affecting innovation in a system. With the consideration that a



good productive system would have a better than average system of communication, Plunkett interviewed presidents of junior colleges to obtain a philosophic view, reviewed organizational charts, and sample interviewed faculty. He concluded that the school with the more effective communication system would have a wider spread of innovation among all areas of instruction. Where the communications were limited primarily to being one way, innovations were potentially limited to the availability of federal or state funds. Consequently, he concluded that the internal innovativeness depended upon the department chairman's tendency to be innovative rather than upon other administrators. There was also a finding that the rate of faculty turnover depended on the effectiveness of the communication system.

Recognizing the need for community colleges to undertake self-analysis and evaluation, Morris (1969) developed an instrument which he concluded would be useful in determining effectiveness not only of the organization but of the college's philosophies, administrative roles, and responsibilities.

Though benefit-cost analysis has been proposed for use in education by Burkhead, Becker (1964), and Garvue (1969), to name a few, none have been made for community colleges--at least for doctoral dissertations. As a

possible frame of reference, Witmer's (1971) approach may be of value, though it was applied to the Wisconsin Universities.

Witmer applied this analysis to determine the differences between major programs of study in college. This was with the belief such information would be useful for private decisions by students and their counselors, and to furnish data for social decisions by faculties, administrators, legislators and the general public. The variables included were: (1) the costs of earnings foregone; (2) the extra living costs while attending college; (3) the operating costs of college; (4) the cost of student financial aids; (5) the capital costs of physical facilities; and (6) costs of property and sales taxes foregone. These costs were incurred in expectation of the benefits which included: (a) lifetime earnings substantially higher than those of comparable people who chose not to continue formal education beyond high school, and (b) productive contributions to economic growth and social welfare.

## SUMMARY

This chapter serves as a recording of the literature reviewed concerning organization theories, application to education, evaluation techniques, and studies of community college organizations. Such a survey provided the most economical way of starting this study. An economy of effort has resulted by searching for the findings previously obtained. In this case, concepts and hypotheses developed by previous workers were evaluated for usefulness as a basis for further research or as suggestions for development of new hypotheses.

The review of literature concerning organizations has led to the acknowledgment that many other researchers, with a variety of backgrounds, have not as yet solved the problems of human organizations. While some researchers have presumed the findings of organization "truths," others called to test such "truths" found only confusion and conflict.

By this review, it became apparent that the work has not been finished. It also became apparent that there is even a greater need to search, and to find, guidelines for development of educational administrative organizations. This is particularly important for schools seeking to prove efficiency in operation--to be accountable and responsible.

## Chapter III

## RESEARCH METHODS

As the review of related literature indicated, the study of organizations has been extensive; consequently, many theories, concepts, and principles have been developed. However, the acceptance today of all such effort is not as it once was. As Litterer (1965, p. 20) states:

Not too long ago the literature of organizations consisted largely of principles of organizations; these were didactic statements or absolute and final truths which would hold in all situations. They were, in effect, the one final answer to what an organization should be. Today this is no longer the case; . . .

Litterer (1965) adds that the shift from the positive understanding of organizations to a less precise position is not a regression. It is instead an enormous step forward. Just by the knowledge developed, though varied and sometimes contradictory, there is a realization that the topic is extensive and intricate. More important, however, is the fact that the expansion of knowledge offers the possibilities of using and selecting alternative guidelines according to varying needs and circumstances.

For instance, the Taylor, Fayol, and Weber theories,

though not as readily accepted today as during an earlier period, are still useful. Though these theories may no longer set the standards for the normative approach, they can be helpful for the comparative approach.

A similar perspective may be used in response to the Koontz' thesis that a "management theory jungle" presently exists (1961, p. 3). Past developments, instead of resulting in an almost unconquerable mess or maze, provide choice and an opportunity to compare alternatives for the most efficient or most effective guidelines. This becomes possible with the acceptance that guidelines are no longer limited to but one way.

This study, which is an exploratory study for the purpose of better understanding community college organization by experimenting with evaluation techniques, includes concepts previously developed. As an exploratory study, it is a study more in search of hypotheses rather than to test hypotheses. The categories of investigation included analysis of the administrative organization with respect to characteristics of participants, activity, process, and structure. In addition, it seemed appropriate to compare some operational data as a means of analyzing administrative decision-making. Sources of information included student enrollment, distribution of limited funds by review of

budgets, and capital expenditures. The gathering of this information facilitated comparison of instructional/administrative cost ratios and costs per student.

As Reynolds suggested, the comparative approach was the primary means of studying the community college organization. Such a method was also urged by Etzioni (1961, p. xi-xii) as these statements indicate:

The comparative study of organization is a much neglected field. . . .

. . . . .  
 The comparative analysis of organizations will lead to a richer and more precise organizational theory. It will be richer because, to the statements on "universal" characteristics of organization, many new statements concerning "specific" will be added. It will be more precise because many of the propositions which make up general organizational theory are not yet validated. One aspect of validation is to test for the extent of applicability.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Hills (1968) has agreed that the study of organizations has been extensive but reasoned that a science of organization has not been achieved because there has been "little study of organizations." The clarification of this statement is based on the assumption that previous studies were centered on isolated elements such as, leadership, morale, decision-making, communication, role conflict, superintendents, board of trustees, and faculty, rather than studies of organizations in toto. Though the single element method undoubtedly has helped in reaching an understanding of the characteristics, functions, and activities of the specific elements, past studies have accomplished little in analyzing how these specific elements interacted or were affected by the organizations or how the organizations, in turn, affected the elements.

In light of the above, it would have been preferred that the total school organizations could have been studied. This would have meant an examination of the organization charts, flow of work, levels of authority, relations of line and staff, classification of functions, span of control, communication channels, coordination efforts, and the various external influences. With

concern for general systems theories, subsystems such as individuals, the informal groups, the formal organizational relationships, and the balancing and equilibrium mechanisms should have been included in the examination.

Limitations of time and energy, however, dictated placement of boundaries. The administrative organization, as a major segment of a school organization, was selected as the primary target. The operative portion (faculty) and the products (students) were virtually ignored except in summarizing the quality of education and comparison of costs. While the organization charts were important for comparison of organizational structures, subsystems such as individuals and the potential informal groups received little attention.

The administrative organizations of Portland Community College (PCC) and Seattle Community College District (SCCD) were compared by using these sources and methods:

1. Publications of the respective states, Oregon and Washington, concerning community college history, operations, guidelines, and laws were examined for the purpose of understanding the basic philosophies which influenced the development of the schools.
2. A survey of the administrative personnel was attempted to obtain a psychological appraisal of the administrators. In addition observations of activities, attitudes, and capabilities were made



during the interviews and visits to the colleges. Such effort also provided an opportunity to compare the cooperativeness and dedication of such personnel to achieve the educational goals established.

3. Operational data (enrollment, budgets, and catalogs) were collected from both schools, the state boards of education, and educational associations. In obtaining the statistical data, clues were provided as to the efficiency of the operations.
4. An in-depth study of the schools' budgets was conducted in order to compare the costs of the different organizational arrangements and allocation of funding.

While the following questions did not limit the study nor were they the only ones considered, they were those asked initially:

1. Are there educational administrative organization theories?
2. Are there differences in administrative leadership?
3. Do the attitudes of administrators affect the educational services more than organizational structure?
4. What evidence is there as to administrators' attempts to be effective and efficient?
5. What evidence exists which demonstrates attempts of the administrators of each school to be accountable and responsible?
6. Is there a basic administrative unit in educational organizations?
7. What external pressures influence internal decisions?

8. Does resource availability determine goals, values, and also structures, processes, and educational offerings?
9. How do differences in state governance influence community college operations?
10. Are there differences in community involvement and, if so, how may they influence community college operation?
11. In what ways do the citizens of the community become involved in community college decisions?
12. In what ways are educational organizations different from profit motivated organizations?
13. How are educational organizations evaluated?
14. How convincing are the results of the various evaluation techniques?

## THE POPULATION

The community college organizations selected for this study are outwardly similar. They both serve relatively large urban areas with populations approximating one million people. To serve these citizens and their various educational needs, each school has established multi-campus and comprehensive programs (vocational-technical, lower division collegiate curricula, and community services). In consideration of the range of abilities of the potential students, each school has attempted to maintain an open-door policy.

Both schools, though public institutions, charge tuition fees, though such fees are lower than those charged by their respective state's four-year colleges or universities.

Even the enrollment of the two schools is approximately the same number. Accordingly the Fall 1971-72 budgets recording the potential enrollment demonstrated the similarity--at least by the F.T.E. enrollment shown below:

<u>School</u>	<u>F.T.E.</u>	<u>Head- count</u>	<u>Operating Expenditures</u>
Portland Community College	9,262	39,960	\$ 9,238,732
Seattle Community College District	9,701	15,989	11,305,519

In computing student costs there are dissimilarities however:

Portland Community College	$\$9,238,732/9,262 = \$ 997.49$
Seattle Community College	$11,305,519/9,701 = 1,165.39$
Portland Community College	$9,238,732/39,960 = 231.19$
Seattle Community College	$11,305,519/15,989 = 707.08$

The higher per unit costs at SCCD were initially attributed to the fact that 53 percent of the students were to enroll in vocational-technical courses (such courses are generally acknowledged as being more expensive than academic courses). In contrast only 45 percent of the students at PCC were to enroll in the more expensive vocational courses.

Historically the two schools are alike as both originated as vocational-technical schools operated by local public school districts. This was so for both schools until the latter part of the 1960's when the schools were legally authorized to operate as autonomous community college districts.

Upon closer inspection of the two schools, however, noticeable dissimilarities become evident. The dissimilarities start with the state governance of the community colleges, the methods of financing, and the

community involvement. These have been clarified in Chapter V.

The SCCD is in theory a decentralized operation with three autonomous colleges forming a multi-college district. An executive committee presently serves as "an 'interim device' to administer the District." This committee is composed of the three presidents of the colleges with one of the three serving as the chairman. The former assistant to the first district president serves the committee as secretary and a non-voting member.

PCC operates multi-campus, but centralized controls are maintained by directing programs through multi-branches. While there are arguments for both types of organizations, centralized and decentralized, these issues were only important for this study with respect to effectiveness and efficiency in operating community colleges.

## SPECIFIC TECHNIQUES

Publications such as the schools' catalogs, policies and procedures manuals, miscellaneous letters, and statements of philosophies or activities were reviewed. In addition, the correspondence that developed between the schools, the state boards, and the researcher provided data otherwise not immediately available. Newspaper clippings, published statements and unpublished manuscripts were reviewed. Organization charts, organizational plans, and studies by consultants and citizens' committees provided background information concerning the philosophies, type of organizational structures, and educational offerings. Reports by the state board and educational associations were surveyed, also.

To determine whether and how administrators influence organizational achievements, a questionnaire was used, interviews and observations were made. The major effort was to have been the questionnaire. The interviews and observations were only to supplement, or confirm, the findings of the questionnaire. The questionnaire selected was specifically one concerned with determining administrators' attitudes in accordance with an hypothesis developed by Chapple and Sayles (1961). Their hypothesis proposed that designing an effective organization

structure is only the first step toward achieving efficiency and productivity. The next step involves finding ways to implement the design decisions with the supervisory skill. Explaining this further, Chapple/Sayles add that to understand such supervisory skills, the sequence of the administrator's activities and motions must be observed. Such observations should reveal the established patterns and frequency of occurrence in the organizational calendar. Subsequently, the capacities and abilities to lead, influence, handle grievances, discipline, relate information, and promote change could be discerned.

Since the observations suggested would have been time consuming and perhaps caused interference in the necessary school operations, it was decided that a questionnaire supplemented by interviews and observations limited to use of facilities and accessibility of services would be sufficient.

The importance of administrative activity is expressed in this statement by Duryea (1960, p. 1-2):

That administrative activity is increasingly a universal concern for man. He more and more works and lives as a part of larger and more complex organizations. These organizations require direction and control. Just as man by the creative use of his intelligence has achieved a greater control over his physical environment, so can he improve his ability to handle his organizational

activities. By applying intelligence and knowledge to administrative relationships and procedures, he can develop guide lines to direct decisions.

Chapple and Sayles seemingly concur by adding that each managerial job is influenced by the personality. Since such personality determines the capacity to achieve the organizational goals, the manager's private philosophies and attitudes should be of interest in studying any organization. The higher the manager in the hierarchal rise, the more influential he would be. With this rationale, a questionnaire designed to appraise the psychological attitudes of the school administrator was considered essential for this study.

The Purdue Rating Scale was selected as the device suitable for the recommended appraisal. These factors were of importance in deciding on the instrument:

1. The scale was a pioneer instrument developed to evaluate administrators in educational organizations and business organizations.
2. The originators, Drs. Hobson and Rupe, found, by their studies, there were similarities of the psychological dimensions of administrators in higher education and business executives.
3. Many psychological measurements have been prepared and used to determine the effectiveness of college teachers and even institutions of higher education as units but academic administrators have been ignored.



4. No other tests prior to this test had been developed for this specific purpose.
5. The only other means of appraising administrators was found in literature but such appraisal was essentially philosophizing based on observations concerning limited situations.

The scale was conceived as one that would provide an administrator with information about himself. By an administrator becoming aware of his deficiencies in social effectiveness, appropriate effort might be taken toward self-improvement. The intent in developing the instrument was to serve several purposes: (1) provide the information so that administrators know themselves; (2) obtain information concerning characteristics of administrators that would help determine effective administration; and (3) provide a procedure for evaluating the measuring device itself.

The total impact of the instrument was intended as a means of improving educational administration and, therefore, educational services.

The use of subordinate-administrator scaling seemed logical by the acceptance of the proposition that ". . . administrative effectiveness is largely a social quality, . . ." Since such social qualities determine social interaction, individual tests would have been as inadequate as a self administered test; therefore, those most knowledgeable about the

sociability of others seemed the most logical to rate such traits.

Since subordinates are those who know and directly experience the results of an administrator's intelligence and sociability, the immediate subordinates were conceived as those most capable of judging an administrator's characteristics. As the subordinates were conceived as professional people, it was assumed the information obtained would be a collection of data from a group of capable people exhibiting sound judgment. Since both subordinates and administrators were considered as people endeavoring to direct the best possible educational program, it was believed each group (subordinates and administrators) would comprehend the desirability of collecting such ratings.

As the originators of the rating instrument hypothesized that the ratings might be tied to certain age levels, incomes, or professional associations of the raters, so did this researcher. To determine whether there was a relationship between rater's traits and the ratings, subordinates were asked to complete a correlational data sheet.

#### Distribution of the Rating Scale

While all administrators for both schools were considered important for the study, particular emphasis

was given to those above the division or department chairman level. Those above that level were perceived as being more directly involved in making suggestions and recommending policies to the board of trustees, and thereafter implementing those policies, associating with the state board personnel in conferences, reports, and serving as public relations personnel. Further the higher level administrators were perceived as those having greater influence in hiring and firing of staff as well as determining the distribution of the funding allotted the schools.

The Purdue Rating Scale, as prepared by Drs. Hobson and Rupe, was prepared for distribution to the subordinate administrators of both schools during March, 1972. Just as Drs. Hobson and Rupe hypothesized that certain characteristics of raters might be related to the ratings, so it was hypothesized for this study. The rating scale, along with the correlational data sheet, and the instructions given are included in Appendix I.

All material was delivered personally to the presidents of each campus of SCCD. As requested the questionnaires were delivered to the Planning Administrator at PCC. The personnel of both colleges thereafter distributed the questionnaires at a time most convenient for their operations.

Though the questionnaires were delivered to each campus in Seattle separately, no coding was made to differentiate the returns by campus. It was assumed that the subordinates by designating the administrators being rated would adequately identify the campus. The number of subordinate administrators at each of the schools, the accounting of the questionnaires delivered, and the number of responses are tabulated below:

<u>Schools</u>	<u>Number of Administrators</u>	<u>Returns</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Portland Community College	<u>32</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>71.8</u>
Seattle Community College:			
District Office	17		
North Campus	23		
Central Campus	34		
South Campus	<u>9</u>		
Total	<u>83</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>26.5</u>

From the tabulation above, nine subordinates at PCC did not complete the questionnaire. Reasons for not completing were not forwarded to the researcher. It was only reported by an administrator at PCC that some had verbally expressed a preference not to participate. As the tabulation indicates, a greater percentage of administrators at SCCD preferred not to participate. While most of the SCCD administrators that did not participate refrained from stating a reason, eight did

return the blank forms and added these statements:

1. I feel that the information asked for in this rating scale is classified. We do not know to what extent the information will be used and we are not obliged to complete the form.  
  
(concerning the correlational data)  
I feel that some of my personal information should be kept within the college unless released by the president or board.
2. I do not feel that I would care to participate in this questionnaire.
3. This seems to be a very superficial approach to the subject. Sounds as if the questionnaire is directed to the 4 year institutions rather than to the complex community college, so any validity would appear to be doubtful.
4. I am sorry, but I cannot complete your questionnaire. It would be unethical for me to identify administrators as requested.
5. I resent an outsider receiving this privileged information. I believe that this invades the privacy and confidentiality of privileged personnel matters. I refuse to complete this questionnaire.
6. I cannot participate in a survey such as this one. I consider the request to identify the person being rated as a most unprofessional request.
7. No reply
8. (no comment)

The limited number of returns and the failure of raters to designate the administrators being rated, particularly by the SCCD subordinates, precluded any

statistical analysis that would be meaningful other than a compilation of raw scores. This compilation has been included as Appendix II.

If the questionnaire had been completed as desired by both schools, statistical techniques would have been used to test for reliability and validity of the items. The Pearson product-moment method was scheduled for use to determine the reliability and the validity coefficients as well as to determine item intercorrelations.

Characteristics of the subordinate administrators were to be tested by using the epsilon correlational techniques (the T. L. Kelley's unbiased correlation ratio). Since it was assumed that a curvilinear relationship rather than a straight-line relationship would result, straight-line correlation techniques were not to be used.

While this portion of the study was not completed, a review of the procedures has been included with the hope that others may become acquainted with the potential benefits and follow through for a successful completion.

Administrators were appraised at the time personal interviews were conducted. Eight administrators, primarily in the dean category and vice president level, were interviewed during February and April, 1972, at PCC.

Twelve administrators were interviewed at SCCD during March, 1972. Those interviews were open-ended and primarily undertaken to observe interaction and to learn of the philosophical views of specific administrators. All interviews were arranged by personnel of the schools involved. Each interviewee, therefore, had the opportunity of being informed about the study. More details of the interviews are included in Chapter V.

#### Budget Review

While the psychological analysis of administrators could not be completed, a comparison of the budgets was thought to be an indirect means of analyzing administrative ability. The following statements by Drucker (1954, p. 73-74) and Horngren added some support to the proposition that budget preparation could provide objective evidence of administrative capabilities:

. . . the planning for an adequate supply of physical and financial resources is primarily top management's job; . . .  
 . . . . .  
 . . . physical and financial resources are too important to be left out of consideration. . . .  
 . . . . .  
 To set objectives without planning for the money needed to make operations possible is like putting the roast in the oven without turning on the flame.

Horngren (1970, p. 187-188), as an advocate of management control, adds that the process of preparing budgets is to:

. . . put planning where it belongs-- in the forefront of the manager's mind. Successful organizations are usually characterized by both superior operating management and financial management. Business failures are frequently traceable to management's shirking of the financial aspects of its responsibilities.

While budget preparation is not the only activity that administrators become involved with, it is one of the most important duties of school administrators. According to Benson (1968, p. 4) it may be the most difficult--at least it may be more difficult to budget for schools than it is for private business. Benson states:

To prepare an ideal educational budget is difficult, more difficult than the corresponding process in a private business firm. The objectives of school systems are multiple, and there is no absolute agreement among parents, educators, and taxpayers on the importance--or relative weighting--of these different objectives.

While some of the difficulties may be decreased by an increment in funds, the reality of today is that the public is not as easily persuaded that more funding is necessary or will be spent effectively. Perhaps administrative efficiency may more readily be foretold by examining how the limited funds have been allocated. However, whether the resources are being allocated for educational services, consumer goods, or capital outlay there are five major questions that should be answered



when deciding:

1. What kinds of goods (educational) are to be produced?
2. What amounts of various (educational) goods are to be produced?
3. How are resources to be combined in efficient schemes of (educational services) production?
4. How is the total economic product (educational services) to be shared among the households (i.e., owners of resources)?
5. At what level are various kinds of improvements in the economy to be sought?

Assuming that these questions were asked, administrators' values, attitudes, and goals can be determined by reviewing the budgets. Therefore, if open-door education is a goal, then, resources should be so provided to accommodate according to demand. Organizational efficiency can be determined and may be noted by the information provided by the budgets, namely, the supply of courses in response to the demands. This last is with the presumption that educational administrators, whether they believe it or not, are businessmen running an enterprise and, therefore, are concerned about maximizing their output at least costs. Whether accepting or not accepting this responsibility, they are charged by the public to manage a part of the economy;

therefore, budgets are a vital part of the educational leader's concern. Even without these considerations, budgets are beneficial by these opportunities:

1. to plan for short term and long term goals for establishment of direction;
2. to coordinate educational goals with limited resources;
3. to establish controls to facilitate adjustments and modification for the future;
4. to provide for appraisal of plan by enabling comparisons with activity;
5. to offer means of influencing those allocating funds for support of educational services; and
6. to demonstrate which educational goals have priority and the ability to maintain.

Both schools supplied a copy of their 1971-72 budgets; however, the budgets officially provided were those used for public review. Since the PCC budget was prepared according to the Oregon Budget Law, it was well documented, detailed, and consisted of 175 pages. The SCCD budget in contrast was but 16 pages and only in summary form. To compare the budgets, it was necessary that both have similar detail. It was essential, then, to obtain such a detailed budget from SCCD. Though a copy of a detailed budget was requested from the district financial office, such a copy was not provided. This necessitated securing a copy from a budget committee

member. A monthly print-out of the budget was provided by the North Seattle College without difficulty.

The PCC budget prepared for public review is a fountain of information not only because of the method of classifying but the addition of notes explaining the number of personnel involved or inconsistencies of presentation with that of the previous year. The openness of the PCC budget may be attributed to the Oregon Budget Law. This is a law which requires that a municipal budget must be made available for review and vote by the local citizens each year before being put into effect. The openness may also be attributed to the attitude of the administrators.

In contrast, the budget detail provided citizens by SCCD, as stated before, is very brief and almost completely lacking. This, in turn, may be attributed to the lack of such public budget law in Washington and the attitudes of the administrators.

As would be expected, then, the budgets as originally received were not alike and considerable re-arrangements had to be made, as well as some re-classification.

For instance, the SCCD budget was arranged according to six basic programs with a breakdown of expenditures within the programs. The program divisions included: administration, student services, physical plant,

instructional resources, employee benefits, and instructional services. The PCC budget was organized by functions, such as administration; new and experimental instructional programs; engineering, math, science and related technology division; communications and related technology division; life science, health and related technology division; community education division; college services division; employee benefits; instructional materials, supplies and services; operations of plants; and maintenance of plants. Within each category expenditures were well defined. Administrators', along with secretarial, and instructors' salaries were clearly specified. Not only were such classifications provided, but the number of personnel with specifications as to whether they were presently employed, to be hired, part-time, hourly, and summer were added. In addition to this information, enrollment trends were included to explain why new staff was needed.

In contrast the SCCD budget intermingled administrative expenditures, secretarial help, supplies, and equipment under the instructional program. While it was clearly stated what the allocations were to be, there was no segregation as to what portion of expenditures should be chargeable to administration or instruction. The abridged SCCD budget presented to the public,

therefore, presents higher instructional costs than those actually allocated. Consequently, this mixture of expenditures leads to a false assumption about the allocation of funds for instruction. Even with the detailed budget a proration is not possible without physical surveillance.

The classification of "supporting staff" is an example of the problem encountered in re-arranging the SCCD data. Almost every budget number included an allocation of funds for "support staff," consequently, the total sum allotted to "support staff" totalled to a significant amount. The detail for such expenditure was not given and the reason for the expenditure was therefore unknown. It could actually be a "hidden reserve."

Since the PCC budget was comparatively clearer than the SCCD budget, a re-organization of the SCCD budget was made along the lines of the PCC budget. After the re-organization, comparisons were made as to administrative, instructional, supplies, and maintenance costs. Details of the budgets and the resulting comparisons are presented as Appendix III.

#### Other Analysis

Enrollment figures were related to budgetary costs in order to compare costs. This was carried out with

the realization that unit cost differentials arise from differences in institutional objectives, administrative efficiency, geographic location, age of institution, and type of curricula offered. These variations are covered more fully in Chapters IV and V.

Information as to enrollment, however, was obtained from budget detail, reports, and by correspondence with the schools and the state boards. As an indication of the differences between the schools, it must be added here that there was more difficulty in obtaining information from the SCCD registrar's offices than from the PCC personnel. Usually within a week after asking for some detail, PCC made the information available. Months sometimes passed before such information was attended to by SCCD personnel.

One of the major difficulties in obtaining information from SCCD is the fact that each campus must be contacted individually, even with a district office. This is apparently a disadvantage of the decentralized administrative organization.

## Chapter IV

## BACKGROUND OF SCHOOLS: PCC AND SCCD

Historical Development - Oregon

Oregon's community college laws have been evolving for almost an half century. With the enactment of the National Vocation Education Act, better known as the Smith Hughes Act of 1917, the opportunity of obtaining matching federal funds for local post high school vocational education encouraged state legislators to enact laws to include trade and industrial education as part of public education. Introduction of the first official bill to permit establishment of junior colleges in Oregon school districts was also attributed to the Smith Hughes Act. While this did not occur until 1925, and the bill failed, the idea persisted (Post-High School Study Committee, 1966). Another bill was presented in 1927. Again the attempt was unsuccessful.

By 1938, Oregon did establish its first area vocational school in Eugene. In addition the Regional Vocational School Act of 1941 permitted high schools to include post high school vocational training in their curricula. Since state aid was not appropriated, it was 1947 before any significant activity occurred. Portland

School District was one of the first school districts to respond to this provision.

With the passage of the Dunn Bill in 1949, school boards, with the approval of the State Board of Higher Education and the General Extension Division, were permitted to offer lower division collegiate classes in local areas interested enough to completely finance the activity. Only Baker, Bend, and Klamath Falls accepted the challenge to develop higher education extension centers. Only the Bend School District managed to survive without state aid until 1957.

Oregon legislators were particularly active with educational legislation during 1949. One of the first endeavors involved the creation of an interim committee to study post high school education. This committee obtained the services of Dr. Leonard V. Koos, and the subsequently published report in 1950 served as the basis for the first community college legislation passed during 1951. If Dr. Koos' proposals had been fully followed, Oregon's total educational system might have been remarkably different than it is today. These are some of his recommendations:

1. Tuition to be free;
2. Function as part of the local school system;
3. Reorganize the school system on a 6-4-4 plan



(community colleges would be a four-year institution rather than two); and

4. Twenty-six districts were identified as community college centers.

Senate Bill No. 143, known as the junior college bill, in contrast to the Koos' recommendation included these provisions:

1. Tuition charges were set at a maximum of \$150 per year for local residents and \$350 for nonresidents.
2. A Liaison Community College Committee was to control overhead. This committee would be composed of five members. Two would be selected from the State Board of Higher Education, two from the State Board of Education, and one by appointment of the Governor.
3. Junior colleges were placed under the State Board of Education.
4. The colleges would receive state aid on the same basis as the public elementary and secondary schools.

During the 1950's with new committee recommendations, many amendments were added to the Dunn Bill. The Dunn Bill was finally repealed and a new community college law was passed providing the following:

1. Junior colleges are an extension of the public school system.
2. The curricula was to be established according to demands of the community and would include technical and terminal work, college transfer work, and adult education.
3. School districts for junior college purposes only were to be organized.

4. A student enrolled in a junior college not the student's resident educational area would justify the junior college attended to charge the resident school district for the difference between the per capita cost of operation and the tuition received.

In spite of all the recommendations and subsequent legislation, Oregon had but one junior college at Bend, Oregon, as of 1961. It was finally reasoned that the slowness of community college development was due to the lack of state financial aid. As a result of this recognition an amendment was passed to provide two-thirds of the cost for each full-time enrolled student, or \$433, whichever was lower. In addition state contributions of \$850,000 for construction of community college facilities were provided.

By 1965 the capital funding had been increased and federal vocational funds were thereafter considered supplemental funds. By 1966 there were eleven community colleges operating in Oregon. Today there are thirteen, and legislators have set a new limit at eighteen. The Koos' study recommended the formation of twenty-six.

These are some of the requirements that must presently be met before new colleges can be formed:

1. Primary responsibility for the establishment of the district depends upon the demands of the area residents.

2. Residents can apply for establishment of a college district only if they are not adequately served by an existing college.
3. The area must have at least 1,500 pupils enrolled in grades nine to 12.
4. Adequate building space, library and suitable laboratory or shop space must be available before classes start.

During the 1965 legislation, a law was passed to prohibit local school districts from organizing community colleges. Two school districts (Portland and Salem), however, were permitted to continue community college operations or take the option of changing to an area education format.

#### Governance and Control of Community Colleges

Community colleges in Oregon are controlled and governed locally by community college boards, but they are under the general supervision of the State Board of Education. The State Board's control is significant by the fact it is in charge of the allocation of state funds to the community colleges, and application for the establishment of a community college district must be made through the State Board. In addition, if a school has not been accredited by the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, approval must be obtained from the State Board of Higher Education and the State Department of Education before lower division and

transfer courses can be offered. Approval must be received for both the courses to be offered and the instructors proposed to teach such courses. Other responsibilities of the State Board include:

1. number and location of community colleges:
2. establishment of minimum standards for curriculum, physical plants, library resources, teacher qualifications, tuition and fees, certificates and degrees;
3. conducting analysis of community college programs in order to issue an annual report with recommendations for changes if findings so suggest; and
4. at each session of legislation, the Board is to present a current plan for continuing community college development.

As community colleges have developed in Oregon these philosophies have evolved:

1. Community colleges are to be developed as comprehensive institutions offering vocational-technical, lower division collegiate, and adult education instruction.
2. Community colleges are not to be starter institutions and later evolve into four-year baccalaureate institutions.
3. Coordination of programs at community colleges are to be made with programs in high schools and baccalaureate-degree schools in order to prevent unnecessary duplication.
4. The cooperation between State Board of Higher Education and the State Board of Education prior to accreditation has been established to facilitate articulation

of courses and credits. This is especially important for an easy transition of Oregon community college students to an Oregon four-year college or university.

5. In order to provide the educational services needed by a community, surveys of employment opportunities must be made locally and elsewhere. Such effort requires cooperation with representatives of labor, business, industry, and agriculture.
6. The community college as a comprehensive educational institution must insure equal status within the institution. Special emphasis has been made to avoid the usual academic-vocational division among students or faculty. All students and faculty groups are to be accorded equal institutional privileges.
7. A staff ratio of one lower-division collegiate instructor for each 20 students and one vocation instructor for each 15 students has been set as a policy.
8. Community colleges are to be established principally as commuting colleges; therefore, only areas where the population density is so low and commuting is difficult should dormitories be considered. State funds, however, would not be made available and the institution would be responsible in finding the financing.
9. Community colleges by law in Oregon have the responsibility of providing related instruction for apprentices enrolled in the state apprenticeship programs whether employed or living in the college service area. The responsibility includes providing facilities, training and employment of instructors, coordination, supervision, and evaluation of related instruction.

## PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Portland Community College actually started to evolve in 1889 when adult classes were initiated by the local school districts. With the expansion of vocational-technical programs throughout the nation and Oregon's acceptance of the responsibility to train citizens for work opportunities, the Portland School District established post vocational-technical training. It was not until 1961, however, that Portland Community College actually came into bloom as a college by name and programs (Portland Community College Council, 1968).

Since 1961 there has been continued activity to resolve the question of whether PCC should remain under the administration of the Portland School District, become a metropolitan community college thereby provide educational services for Portland and the surrounding areas in adjacent counties, or share such educational effort with several additional community college districts. Before any final conclusions were reached, the Portland School District No. 1 Board of Education prepared to undertake construction of an up-to-date campus by purchasing 125 acres of land in southwest Multnomah County. In addition, they obtained local, state, and federal financing and proceeded with the first phase of

constructing a new campus. The location chosen, however, was not considered sufficiently close enough for the potential students from east Multnomah and Clackamas Counties; therefore, citizens of the two areas were determined to form their own community college districts. With the State Board's approval, both of these districts have since been formed and are presently operating new community colleges. In the meantime, Oregon's State Board concluded that development of one large district or a metropolitan college in the Portland area would be less costly. By establishing a single metropolitan college, courses and equipment would not be duplicated, and it would be easier to maintain control over the curriculum throughout the area.

After an extensive study of Portland's post-high school needs, it was concluded that more effective and efficient operation of the community college could be attained by a "spin-off" from the Portland School District. By such independence and extended territory for Portland Community College these advantages were conceived as possible:

1. There would be a wider tax base for operation and capital construction.
2. Facilities could be utilized more efficiently (maximum number of students at minimum cost--operating costs of PCC are currently the lowest of any community

college in Oregon--per student).

3. Rather than duplicate administrative staff by building two or more districts, administrative costs could be channeled for instruction.
4. A single governing board would have responsibility for the community college and thus could concentrate on the unique needs of the district and the college.
5. A spin-off from the school district would enable the community college to develop a separate image and allow the college to place its issues before the public with more clarity.

Some arguments presented for continued control by the school district were these:

1. There would be a loss of coordination and articulation with the high schools.
2. The college would need to establish business management procedures separate from the school district.

Considering the advantages, application for the formation of an area education district was forwarded to the State Board of Education January 8, 1967. The education district was proposed to include Portland Community College District, Washington County, and the school districts of Vernonia, St. Helens, Scappoose, Newberg, Lake Oswego, Riverdale, and Sauvies Island. With the approval by the State Board and the affirmative vote of the residents, the new college district was established. In spite of the arguments opposing a



"spin-off" from the Portland School District, a "spin-off" occurred as of July 1, 1969.

### Portland Community College Today

Portland Community College as a comprehensive community college serves all of Washington County and parts of Multnomah, Columbia, Clackamas, and Yamhill Counties. Oregon's largest city and the populous surrounding territory, which extends over 1,500 square miles, includes 35 public high schools, comprises the Portland Community College educational servicing area. Educational services extend consequently to approximately 700,000 persons (Portland Community College, Progress Report, 1971-1972).

To serve this extensive and populous area, PCC has developed six education centers. Each center functions as a part of the multi-unit operation. Students may freely move from one campus to the other to meet their personal program needs. Intra campus transportation has been scheduled by the college to facilitate student movement to the various campuses.

While none of the campuses are perceived by the administrators as being the "main campus," it is difficult not to consider the new Mt. Sylvania campus as the "main campus." Mt. Sylvania, still under construction as of 1971-72, is scheduled for completion by the Fall

term, 1972. Since it is new and constructed specifically to house a college, the "campus atmosphere" is most pronounced at Mt. Sylvania compared to the other centers. It is at the Mt. Sylvania campus that the "Educational Shopping Center" really exists. This is facilitated by the architectural design which allows anyone passing by a classroom to stop, look, see, and even listen. The "shopping" ability is enhanced by the exterior corridors, plazas, open stairways, and windows without drapes. Virtually every classroom can be viewed from the exterior and entered directly from the corridors. Plate glass, storefront classrooms face the plazas, and promenades permit the "shopping."

As of September, 1971, after extensive planning and remodeling, the Cascade Center, obtained through the Model Cities Planning Board and the City of Portland, became another campus for Portland Community College-- this time in the center of the city.

Part of the Cascade operation includes the PCC Aviation Center located in five buildings at the Portland International Airport. These facilities are used by the airframe and power plant mechanics program. In addition, the Cascade Center offers courses in diesel mechanics, auto body repair, small engine repair, and radio-TV servicing in the Cascade Transportation and Technology

Center. Failing Hall located just south of main downtown Portland provides housing for the community service administration and the MDTA coordination. Other centers such as the Multnomah Center and the Apprentice Center are also located in downtown Portland.

The PCC administration alert to the need to expand has started development of a new Rock Creek Center. This Center will be located on a 250 acre site in west Washington County. While the plan is to develop an educational center, it is also hoped that the ". . . planners can build almost a complete environment for modern man - schools, shopping center, homes, parks, roads, transportation, cultural facilities, churches, exposition centers, . . ." (A West Campus for Portland Community College--A Challenge, Portland Community College)

Even though the plans are to develop the Rock Creek Campus so that it is relatively self-sufficient as a center, it will still be considered as one part of the total college. The Rock Creek Center will only operate as an autonomous campus on a day-to-day basis. The planning, support services, budgeting, and administration will still be centrally controlled.

### Portland Community College Organization

PCC's Board of Directors is composed of seven persons elected from specific zones of the educational area. While it is often the case that boards have become involved with policies and operating procedures, this board has been careful to restrict attention to setting policies and has refrained from becoming involved with procedures.

The responsibility for policy implementation has been left to the leadership of Dr. Amo De Bernardis, the president since the opening of the school as a college. Assisting the president, in staff positions, are several people concerned with building planning, evaluation, staffing, program development, and research for development of short-range and long-range planning.

A short communication's channel exists between the major administrators and the operating levels. This is noticeable by the unique arrangement of the president's direct coordination with six administrators four of which are titled deans and two titled directors. Each dean or director has no more than four major instructional areas under his control and, therefore, no more than four division chairmen under his supervision. There are some exceptions to this, however. One is the case of the director of college services. Instead of four,

there are eight very diversified positions under his direct supervision. These positions range from clerk-of-the-works, data processing, personnel services, high school community relations, hospitality, to business manager.

Another exception is the criss-crossing authority in the community education division and other instructional divisions. While there are four major instructional divisions controlled by a dean, the director of community education, having equal status with the instructional deans, has the privilege of using the instructors of the other deans. The coordination of activity finally develops through the division chairmen of the various instructional areas. By this unique arrangement, there is a criss-cross of authority and responsibility so that an instructor may have two supervisors rather than one.

In keeping with the philosophy that academic and vocational study are of equal value, each dean has the combined responsibility for transfer courses and career programs. For instance, the four instructional divisions are as follows: (1) mathematics, physical science, and related technology; (2) social science, business, and related technology; (3) communications and related technology; and (4) life science, health, and related

technology. As the labelling of the divisions imply, all divisions include academic and vocational-technical programs. In an attempt to maintain cohesion of the total program by instructional combinations, each building at Mt. Sylvania houses both academic and vocational programs.

While the deans have the right of direct contact with the instructors, coordinators are used to assist. The activities of coordinators may include supervision of clusters of related programs. Where the programs are large, they may have further assistance by appointment of head instructors. A head instructor, in some cases, may directly assist the dean in supervision. Where only five instructors are in a department, a head instructor may assist. Where there is a very large department such as social science (45 instructors on the average), a department chairman may be selected to supervise head instructors assigned to coordinate economics, political science, and history. Because of the differences in subject matter, each instructional area may be organized differently. The differences depend upon the size of the instructional area, the diversity, and complexity involved. The duties in turn for coordinators, head instructors, or department chairmen will vary depending upon the organizational arrangement. In general, they

may all be responsible for evaluating instruction, monitoring of the programs, supervising instruction, and assisting in budget development.

Planning is an essential part of administration. In this respect PCC has established a planning department. According to some of the responsibilities, this department could as easily be labelled internal auditing or research division. The tasks that may be assigned include: (1) research of classload and space utilization; (2) writing project proposals and monitoring new projects; (3) assist in development of new programs; and (4) program monitoring in terms of employment and changing techniques.

In addition to the planning department, the president has the full time assistance of the building planning department. This department was created recently and has become increasingly important as the college has expanded. With the completion of the Mt. Sylvania Campus and the preparation for the construction of Rock Creek, there is continual and necessary direct work with the architectural personnel.

Since PCC operates with multi-units, and there is every effort to curtail administrative overhead, campus administration has been solved by using some of the deans or directors in dual roles. By maintaining each

center as a part of the total college, campus administrators are responsible for the day-to-day operations and for evaluation of instruction. They are not, however, responsible for the curricula or program development. Any curricula changes are supervised by the division program dean. This is essential if uniformity in program offering and control of standards are to be maintained.

The centralized administration means that campus administrators are second level administrators rather than presidents or even vice-presidents. By maintaining centralized control and intra campus coordination, it has been assumed that the student will be protected from instructional drift. Instead of promoting variation by autonomous campus operations, attention has been directed toward maintenance of instructional standards, provision of evaluation, uniformity of hours of credit, and centralized records. By centralized controls, there is the advantage of facilitating communication between divisions as well as centers.

For the student at PCC, help is readily available by personnel and equipment being conveniently located. This is so not only as far as instructional assistance by tutorial services and audio visual equipment, but counseling services as well. The following guiding principles expressed in several PCC publications are



substantially carried out:

1. Serve the total community and adhere strictly to the Open Door policy.
2. Each student is accepted as a unique individual and the staff member is to focus on the worth and dignity of the student.
3. Emphasis will be on learning as an individual process and an outgrowth of meaningful experience and not mere rote acquisition of a specific body of knowledge.
4. The College will be characterized by its flexibility in meeting student needs.
5. Programs will combine work experience and academic.
6. Achievement is recognized as a function of individual growth and performance.
7. Student success will be emphasized, achieved by preserving an environment where each individual will have maximum freedom of choice.
8. Students will be encouraged to look upon learning as a lifelong pattern--a continuous process and not an isolated series of incidents.
9. Every College staff member will be involved in the process of guidance and counseling.
10. Personnel, functions, and services of the College will be distinguished by specific abilities to meet the needs of students in reaching their particular goals.
11. The College is committed to continuous planning, development and evaluation.
12. The College will seek change with a purpose and encourage innovation.

13. Change is constant and will have its impact on the educational planning of the College.

In keeping with these guidelines, the teachers, and staff, including administrators, are virtually always available to any student. There are few doors to open--many of them have not been installed, nor have some of the walls been built. Faculty and counselors are not only grouped informally, they are available by being located even in student study areas. The emphasis on students means others may not be. There is a warning and an acknowledgment of this by Dr. De Bernardis:

. . . not every instructor and administrator is suited to work in an "open door" community college. This institution is committed to change, and, as such, the intellectual and physical environment is always in a state of flux. . . .

#### Enrollment Trends of PCC

The success of an organization may be identified by its profitability. The profit achieved may depend upon the number of customers or the amount of trade. A school's success may be determined by the number of students, the rate of growth, or the holding power. The following Table I provides such information on enrollment trends of PCC.

The transferability of students to Oregon institutions of higher education provides some additional

TABLE I. PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT  
ACTUAL COMPARED WITH PROJECTED 1966 to 1973

Projected	66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73
Lower Division	1,175	1,420	1,665	1,910	2,155	2,400	2,645
Other	<u>1,763</u>	<u>2,131</u>	<u>2,498</u>	<u>2,865</u>	<u>3,232</u>	<u>3,600</u>	<u>3,967</u>
Total	<u>2,938</u>	<u>3,551</u>	<u>4,163</u>	<u>4,775</u>	<u>5,387</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>6,612</u>
<u>Actual</u>							
F.T.E.	4,129	5,098	5,740	6,723	8,706	9,262	10,465 est.
Headcount	23,427	25,924	27,111	29,709	34,773	39,960	45,148

Sources: Proposal for an Area Metropolitan Community College District, 1968, p. 17.  
and Portland Community College Budget Document 1971-72, p. 4.

insight as to PCC's achievements. Table II indicates substantial growth in the number of students transferring during the last five years.

The per capita costs for the years 1966 to 1972 are presented in Table III.

### Support of PCC

Since the students of PCC do not pay the total cost of operation, public support is essential. The support of any public institution may depend upon the willingness of that public to support or supplement the student's education. While the public may be willing to accept the services of public education, their willingness decreases as the burden or share of support increases, unless, of course, the gains of the additional costs exceed those costs, and such gains are acknowledged. While such educational gains have been conceived as being basically private gains, the public may be less generous in providing educational opportunities to "others." The use of cost-benefit analysis may provide a method of demonstrating the general and universal value of education. It is important then to understand how schools are financed and who bears the burden and obtains the gains.

TABLE II. TRANSFERS TO STATE SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS  
FROM PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Class	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72
Freshmen	n.a.	n.a.	142	n.a.	188
Sophomore	n.a.	n.a.	177	n.a.	254
Juniors	n.a.	n.a.	61	n.a.	106
Seniors	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	4
OTI	<u>n.a.</u>	<u>n.a.</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>n.a.</u>	<u>16</u>
Totals	<u>201</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>388</u>	<u>494</u>	<u>568</u>

Source: OCCA Policy Maker's Guide, 1969-70, Part 1,  
January, 1970, p. 25-26.

TABLE III. PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE OPERATING COSTS OF REIMBURSABLE PROGRAMS

Programs	66-67	67-68	68-69	69-70	70-71	71-72
All Programs	\$669	\$663	\$895	\$851	\$804	n.a.
Lower Division	612	643	818	761	744	n.a.
Vocational-Technical	789	692	920	924	838	n.a.
Other Reimbursable Programs	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Oregon Department of Education Reprinted in OCCA Policy Maker's Guide, 1969-70, Part 1, January, 1970.

The Portland metropolitan area is one with a diversified economy with opportunities for expansion. It includes the largest city in the state and the area of fastest growth. In planning for the establishment of PCC, it was contemplated that the growth of property valuation and the increase in population would more than substantially provide local support for the college. Local support in the early stages of the development was essential in Oregon since such schools were considered as extensions of the public school systems. As extensions they were to be administered and financed by the local school districts which were supported by local funds. In general, only supplementary funds have been provided by the state. As community college legislation became more specific in the type of education that such colleges could offer, state support became more direct.

By earlier legislation, the financing of community colleges was to be divided in three ways. The state, the local district, and the students were each to pay one-third of the costs per student. In 1957, the state portion was set at \$150 for each full-time equivalent student. In 1958, the state legislators raised the maximum limit of payment for each F.T.E. student to \$200.

By 1963, state legislators became aware that more state support was essential if community colleges were to continue to be developed in Oregon. Beginning with July 1, 1964, a new formula for computing such support was initiated. The state thereafter prepared to pay 85 percent of the difference between the operating expenses and the tuition and fees received, or it would pay two-thirds of the unit cost for each student up to a maximum of \$433 per F.T.E., whichever was the lower. This formula was based on the assumption that \$650 per F.T.E. was an equitable operating cost even though the average state-wide cost was calculated to be \$773 for the year 1964-65. Since higher costs were usually associated with vocational-technical education, local boards were not encouraged by this fact to initiate more vocational-technical training. During 1965 the difference between the burden of lower division work and vocational-technical was somewhat alleviated by the provision that the federal vocational-technical funds could thereafter be applied as supplemental funds to the state reimbursement of \$433. In general, the state contributed 47.5 percent of the operating costs during 1964-65.

As of 1971-72, the state reimbursement was based on still another formula: \$701 was provided for the first



500 F.T.E.'s; \$579 for the next F.T.E.'s; and \$528 for all F.T.E.'s over 900 (Portland Community College Budget Document 1971-72).

In making the state biennial appropriations, projected enrollments are used. Whenever such enrollments are not realized, as projected, the funds allocated are proportionately decreased. If enrollments are understated by more than 100 students, additional funding may be obtained from a contingency fund. The state reimbursement projected for PCC for 1971-72 was set at 48.1 percent. This was based on one F.T.E. student being computed on the basis of 45 credit hours, or 680 contact hours per year.

Student tuition and fees for 1971-72 were estimated to contribute 21.7 percent of the PCC operating costs. These student charges have been increasing over the past few years as well. In 1970-71, each student was charged \$80 per quarter, or \$8 an hour for part-time students. In 1971-72 the tuition was raised to \$81, or \$9.00 per hour for part-time students. As of 1972-73, the tuition will again be raised. This time the increase is expected to be \$4.50 more for full-time students, or \$85.50, and \$9.50 per hour for the part-time students. This last increase was stated as being necessary because of increased operation costs and long range planning

needs. While the tuition increments are small, each additional dollar raise in tuition means a curtailment of the number of students that can afford the advantages of more education. The question remains: Where should the burden of education rest?

The amount of federal reimbursement expected by PCC, according to the 1971-72 budget statement, was

". . . difficult to estimate due to the lateness and uncertainty of congressional appropriations."

Consequently, income from federal sources could only be calculated for planned programs which were tentatively approved. The federal reimbursement was, therefore, estimated to be 4.3 percent of the 1971-72 general funds.

Local taxes were estimated to provide 17.3 percent of the general funds excluding capital projects. Since the continued ability of local citizens to support the community college in Oregon depends upon real property valuations, property values become an important element in community college financing. According to Table IV, PCC has experienced substantial and growing local support.

The increase in value and growth in population has provided the encouraging downward trend in tax rates as shown in Table IV. This is vital, for it indicates

TABLE IV. PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
 ALLOCATION OF TAX BASE - 1969-1976  
 (in \$1,000)

	69-70	70-71	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76
Total Tax Base	\$4,124	\$4,371	\$4,633	\$4,911	\$5,206	\$5,518	\$5,850
Allocated to Operations	1,078	1,459	1,695	2,166	2,602	3,029	3,325
Allocated to Building	2,639	2,832	2,900	2,647	2,500	2,380	2,408
Tax rate per thousand	.81	.77	.75	.73	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Portland Community College Budget Document 1971-72.

potential retention of the support of the school.

#### Local Budget Law Oregon

Oregon has a local budget law which is applicable to Oregon municipal corporations. A municipal corporation is defined to include county, city, port, and school district. This applies as well to Oregon community colleges. The purpose of the law is to establish or provide the following:

1. Standard procedures for the preparation, presentation, administration, and appraisal of budgets;
2. Outline programs and statements of the fiscal policy which the corporation intends to implement to accomplish programs;
3. Provide an estimation of revenues, expenditures and proposed tax levies;
4. Specify methods for obtaining public viewpoints in the preparation of fiscal policy;
5. Control of revenues and expenditures for the promotion of efficiency and economy in the expenditures of funds; and
6. Knowledge of the financial policies and administration so that the public, taxpayers, and investors can apprise such policies of the municipal corporation of their concern.

The law specifically states it is unlawful not to comply and only makes an exception in these cases:

1. Where the expenditure in the year of receipt of grants or gifts are transferred to the municipal corporation for specific purposes.
2. Expenditures during the current year of proceeds of bonds.

Preparation of a supplement to the budget may be acceptable only when changes have occurred and were unknown at the time the original budget was prepared. The unknown factors may include federal, state, or local government funds unknown at the time of preparation, or when an involuntary destruction of property has occurred and it is essential to replace.

Contingency funds are allowable and acceptable with the consideration that the request of funds are based on estimated enrollments. With changes in environment, including economic adjustments, actual enrollment may be substantially different than the estimated. Though such a discrepancy should be included in the plan for expenditures, a case of "over" enrollment would not be considered an appropriate reason for requesting contingency funding, unless the excess exceeds the maximum range of 100 (Budget Manual for Municipal Corporation, Revised, December, 1967).

Estimation of enrollment for community colleges has been extremely uncertain. Part of the difficulty occurs because of the fact that community colleges are relatively new and have little historical data to draw upon. In addition, the community colleges have been growing at a very rapid rate. Whether this rate will be sustained or not is another variable.

The local budget law is a demonstration of the philosophy that local citizens are responsible for providing educational services. In this respect, the public is perceived as having a right to be informed of the formal activities relative to the consideration and adoption of the budget of a municipal corporation. Consequently, in Oregon, citizens may secure a copy of the budget document (sometimes by paying a fee to cover reproduction costs) or review the document on file at the municipal office.

Further clarification of the budget, according to the law, may be obtained by attending scheduled budget hearings. After the adoption of the budget, it must be filed with the various concerned agencies of the state.

#### Construction Costs

While coverage of PCC's operating costs are important so are construction costs. PCC has had substantial growth of both costs. Table V presents the total expenditures for capital projects of Portland Community College accumulated from 1966 through 1971. Capital projects are funded by matching local funds with state and federal funds. Such funds may be used for construction of facilities and for acquisition of sites and the subsequent development. PCC has followed the practice of using local funds to finance capital projects

TABLE V. CAPITAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES  
 PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
 1966-1971

Classification	Amounts	
Purchase of Facilities		\$ 4,500,307
<u>Construction</u>		
Professional Services	\$ 507,316	
Construction	<u>8,259,121</u>	<u>8,766,437</u>
Total		\$13,266,744
Equipment		663,911
Site Purchase		483,736
<u>Site Development</u>		
Professional Services	\$ 260,061	
Construction	<u>1,361,681</u>	<u>1,621,742</u>
Total		<u>\$16,036,133</u>

Source: Portland Community College.

so that capital projects will not be delayed by bond levy failures. This "pay as you go" building resource allowable in Oregon, and used by the administration, has enabled the PCC administration to proceed with construction according to their specific time schedule.

Capital projects are reimbursed by the state at the rate of 65 percent of actual costs or \$1,560 per F.T.E., whichever is the lesser. The receipt of these funds depends upon the appropriations by the state legislature each biennium and upon the allocations made by the state Board of Education for specific building projects. As of the 1971-73 biennium, PCC was appropriated \$2,031,000.

Federal funds for buildings are dependent upon specific building project approval. Specific allocation also depends on the competition with other community colleges in Oregon. No funds from federal sources were anticipated for 1971-72.

The cash balance listed for projects in 1971-72 were the funds allocated for projects planned for 1970-71 but not completed, and, therefore, all the funds allocated for the projects were not expended. The cash balance recorded, then, were funds carried over from the previous year.



## SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Historical Development - Washington

The first permanent junior college in the State of Washington was established in 1925 in Centralia. That same year Skagit Valley Junior College in Mount Vernon was started. In 1928 the Yakima Valley Junior College came into existence. Four more junior colleges were developed during the next decade: Grays Harbor College (1930), Clark College (1933), Spokane Junior College (1933), Lower Columbia College (1934), and Wenatchee (1939). Spokane, however, was forced to close in 1941 because of a state law which prohibited the operation of a junior college in a county in which an institution of higher learning was also located (Washington State Research Council, 1968). The law has since been changed and Spokane Community College has re-opened and is presently operating.

All of the first schools were entirely independent and self-supporting institutions until 1941. In 1941 legislative enactments concerning junior colleges set forth the purpose of such schools and established a system of financing (Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1966). It was then determined that both operating and capital funds would be provided by the State of Washington (Washington State Research Council, 1968).

Legislation passed in 1945 permitted the existing junior colleges, and those that were to follow, the option of becoming autonomous institutions or to merge with the local school district and thereby come under the direction of the local school board and the respective superintendent. All the colleges in existence at that time, and those established prior to 1967, accepted the latter arrangement. By the colleges accepting supervision by local school boards, the Superintendent of Public Institutions became the designated agency charged with the state control of junior colleges. The State Board of Education thereafter defined the educational services of the junior college as "extended secondary" or vocational and general post-graduate (Washington State Research Council, 1968).

During the 1960's, the rapidly changing image and responsibilities of junior colleges throughout the nation also influenced Washington State legislators' views toward the junior colleges. For instance, public junior colleges during 1961 were renamed community colleges. One of the most important legislative acts passed in Washington occurred in 1961. This was the removal of the restriction to locate a junior college in the same county that contained a four-year college or university. The enactment also provided the legal clearance for

enabling legislation authorizing the operation of Seattle Community College in Seattle; the same county and city in which the University of Washington is located.

Legislation in 1963 authorized procedures for creation of additional community colleges within the state. Subsequently legislation in 1965 authorized the creation of an additional five community colleges. In addition, a law was passed to create a system of community college districts. Included in this law was a directive to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to prepare and submit a plan for implementing the system. The State Superintendent, in turn, obtained the services of an independent research firm to make the required study and recommendations. An invitation to bid on the study was issued July 7, 1965. The successful bidder, the Arthur D. Little, Inc., began work on the study September 8, 1965, and completed the effort in June, 1966 (Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1966).

The purpose of the study was to:

- (1) make an appraisal of the existing structure of community college education in the State to determine whether changes and improvements in the existing organizational structure were required;
- (2) propose a policy plan for the organization, administration, and financial support of community college education to facilitate development;

- (3) recommend a plan for the creation, organization, administration and financing of community college districts and specify State level responsibilities and organization with respect to community college education in the State;
- (4) suggest the major steps to be taken to implement the recommended plan; and
- (5) identify the prospective demands for community college education in the State during the next 20 years and the financial resources which would be required to support community college education in Washington (Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1966).

Many of the recommendations included in the report were eventually incorporated in the Community College Act of 1967. While the report confirmed the need to meet the expanding demand for comprehensive community college education in Washington and the state's responsibility "to prepare people to find and hold productive employment," there was, as required, significant concentration on the organizational structure for both the local administrative body and the state. As the study recommended, the Community College Act of 1967 provided for the establishment of a State Board for Community College Education. This board, as recommended, consists of seven members. Each member represents a congressional district and is appointed by the governor. Each member is selected to serve a four-year term, except those initially appointed. For the sake of continuity and to initiate staggered terms, members of

the first board were appointed to terms varying from one to four years. No salaries are paid to the members, but they are reimbursed for expenses and mileage while on board business. The responsibilities of the state board members, as stated by the law, include the following:

1. Appoint the director of the state system of community colleges to serve at its pleasure. (Such an appointment to be made upon review of acceptable educational background, practical experience in education administration, and proven management experience.)
2. Submit an annual report to the Governor which includes a summary of its proceedings during the previous fiscal year, a statement of revenue and expenditures, and other information.
3. Provide general supervision and control over the state system of community colleges
4. Review all community college district budgets. Prepare and submit to the Governor a single budget for all districts.
5. Establish guidelines for the disbursement of funds to districts; receive and disburse funds for the operation, maintenance, and capital support of the districts.
6. Ensure that the districts offer comprehensive educational training and service programs to meet student and community needs, and that each district maintains an open-door policy by admitting students regardless of residence, educational background, or ability.
7. Prepare a comprehensive master plan for the development of community college education and training.

8. Define and administer criteria and guidelines for establishment of new community colleges or campuses.
9. Establish and administer criteria and procedures for changing district boundary lines.
10. Establish minimum standards to govern the operation of the community college with respect to faculty qualifications, fiscal procedures, curricula content, standard admission policies, and degrees and diplomas awarded.
11. Permit districts to contract for construction projects and site acquisition and finance these capital costs by issuing bonds.
12. Accept grants for public or private agencies to aid in meeting capital construction and other educational costs.
13. Establish and administer criteria and procedures for district capital construction.
14. Encourage innovation in developing new educational and training programs and instructional methods.
15. Exercise other powers, duties, and responsibilities necessary to carry out the Community College Act (Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1966, p. 377).

The Arthur D. Little, Inc. recommendation to separate the community college and vocational technical institutions from the common school districts was also accepted. A provision for this action was included in the 1967 law. With the separation, each community college in the state was placed under the control and direction of a local board of trustees. While the

recommendation suggested that the local trustees should be elected, the law that followed specified appointment of the board members by the governor. One of the reasons given for recommending the election of trustees over appointment was the initial burdensome task that would have been imposed on the governor by requiring appointment of 140 trustees (Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1966, p. 74). Nevertheless, each district within the State of Washington is governed by a five member board of trustees appointed by the governor. Their responsibilities include the following:

- (1) submit annual reports to the Governor with detailed reports of revenue and expenditures;
- (2) operate all community college institutions in the district;
- (3) create a comprehensive program and maintain an open-door policy;
- (4) employ a president, a district president if there is more than one college and/or separate institutions in the district, and other administrative officers and employees;
- (5) establish new facilities when approved by the College Board;
- (6) establish or lease and operate dormitories, food service, and other self-supporting facilities of the college;
- (7) with approval of the College Board, issue and sell revenue bonds for site acquisition, construction, and capital improvement for the self-supporting facilities;

- (8) establish fees and charges for self-supporting facilities and hire the staff;
- (9) establish and maintain a night-school, if considered feasible;
- (10) prescribe, with faculty assistance, courses of study in the community college departments;
- (11) grant degrees and certificates;
- (12) receive federal funds for community college construction or other educational purposes;
- (13) perform other duties and responsibilities imposed by laws, rules, and regulations of the College Board; and
- (14) delegate to the community college president any of the Board's power and duties (Washington State Research Council, 1968, p. 379-380).

A recommendation for the continuance of the district plan of organization was also included in the report. Such a district plan reflected the following general objectives:

- (a) Local initiative and control. The responsibility for planning, policy making, administration, operations would be directly by the citizens of the area served and, therefore, more likely according to their needs and demands.
- (b) Districting the entire state. This would promote the concept of local control. Any initiation of community college development was considered preferable over the initial recognition of need by a "distant State-level agency."



- (c) Comprehensive College Systems. A minimum potential of 1,000 F.T.E. students was suggested for operation of a fully comprehensive program. No maximum size in total enrollment was considered necessary since some districts could establish multi-college operations in accordance with the needs.
- (d) Building on present achievements. Where an existing nucleus of experience existed, it was proposed that further development utilize the valuable base of experience already available within the district. By acceptance of the experience already available multi-college operation could be developed more rapidly and successfully (Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1966).

In establishment of district boundaries, it was recommended that the colleges and vocational-technical institutions already in existence were to be taken into account and establishment of a district could therefore be determined by such pre-existing unit. At the same time the report included this statement:

. . . we think it important to emphasize that the districts ought not to be regarded as immutable. They are not attendance districts in the sense that common schools are. . . . Students will be free to ignore district boundary lines and choose the college which they attend on the basis of their own convenience, and their interests.

In one sense, therefore, community college districts are creations of administrative and operational convenience and necessity. . . . district boundaries ought to be kept flexible and subject to revision.

In consideration of the Metropolitan District, namely, King County, the formation of a single community

college district embracing all of King County was stated as being preferred. It was in this particular area where a number of existing institutions were taken into account. Consequently as many separate districts were formed as institutions already in existence. For instance, within King County, Shoreline, Highline, Green River, and Renton already had community colleges or vocational-technical institutions; Bellevue and Seattle were in the process of planning community colleges, therefore, continuance of districting according to established entities was recommended as a temporary measure. In the meantime, effective patterns of cooperation were encouraged. Such cooperation was considered extremely important in order to thwart development of intense parochialism. This was considered a potential if King County remained divided into five districts. Any resistance to coordination was seen as a threat to future consolidation.

An alternative to establishing a single district within King County centered around formation of four districts. It had been suggested that corporate Seattle could be divided so that the northern portion would be included in District No. 7, known as the Shoreline District. The southern portion of Seattle would be included in District No. 9, the present Highline District.

The central portion would be combined with Bellevue to form District No. 8. This proposal was offered as the most likely solution to the racial imbalance which was predicted to accelerate if the present established districts were continued.

It was reasoned, however, that since students would be allowed freedom of choice in selecting schools, irrespective of residence, the problem of imbalance might be averted. Whatever the district boundary, or inclusion, the district plan called for the district administration to be headed by a single chief executive officer. Such an officer was scheduled to be responsible for the coordination of the various operating units and development of the district. This also meant the executive would work closely with the board of trustees and have responsibility for operation of the colleges but in a broad systematic sense. In addition it was perceived that the chief executive, as a leader in community college educational programming, would serve to interpret the district's efforts to the citizens of the district (Arthur D. Little, Inc., p. 74).

The staff of the chief executive was initially visualized as being relatively small. Until full planning had occurred, it was anticipated that the staff would consist of a systems planning officer and a

business manager. It was recommended that further staffing of the district administrative office should progress slowly and additions made only as necessary.

Each of the colleges within the district was visualized as headed by a president who would plan the programs and be responsible for hiring staff according to the needs of the educational plans. All such programming and staffing was to be done according to guidelines established by the district officers. Rather than operate the colleges within the district as multi-branches, it was decided to form the district by multi-colleges. Each college was to be an independent unit operating within the broad guidelines of a district-wide system of education. In this respect, an extremely important point was made about the developmental stage of the new colleges:

Almost immediately, for example, we can imagine that a number of districts will want to set up new attendance centers. In these centers they will want to begin to offer a variety of courses. We would expect that some of these centers should be designed so that they could develop into a comprehensive community college. In their early stages of development, however, these centers will not spring into existence as full-blown institutions with a complete range of program offerings and staff. The whole advantage of the system concept of a community college district operation. . . . is that it provides a flexible means for meeting emerging needs. Indeed, one of the great advantages of districts that are large in area terms and diverse in their population

composition, is that broad systems of education can develop in an evolutionary manner (p. 76-77).

It was therefore determined that the colleges were to operate as autonomous units with substantial degrees of administrative independence. Enforcement of equality was to be maintained by coordination through the chief executive officer and the single board of trustees. It was considered particularly important that vocational-technical institutions have equal status with community colleges. To maintain the equality, districts were to offer a comprehensive program by incorporation of both academic and vocational-technical programs. Nevertheless, some institutions, within the district, would be allowed to specialize to the extent of developing unique programs, and students were to be given the opportunity of attending any college which would satisfy their educational needs without penalty of a non resident fee.

#### Seattle Community College District

During the Fall of 1964, the Seattle School Board made formal application to the State Board of Education for approval to operate a community college. With the approval to operate a community college received, a planning staff composed of six members of the local area in association with a firm of educational consultants was formed in 1965. The long established Edison-

Technical School of Seattle became a significant element in the structural plans of the college. Since the vocational-technical training facilities and faculty were already available, the major effort in establishing the college was to secure temporary facilities and hire staff and instructors for the complement of academic offerings. This was all in keeping with the concept of building a district with multi-colleges and offering a comprehensive educational program for the Seattle area and Vashon Island.

Long range plans included construction of three campuses, each to serve an approximate enrollment of 5,000 F.T.E. students. By considering population density, accessibility by auto, public transportation, and the proximity to business and industries, the campuses were tentatively planned to be constructed in the northern, southern, and central portions of Seattle. While the college began operation in temporary facilities in the general vicinity contemplated for the central campus, there was no certainty that such an area was precisely the location most desirable for the new central campus. In the meantime it was almost immediately determined that the new north and south campuses should be developed first and simultaneously. Since the central campus had facilities that were available and operating, the

building of the new central campus was not considered immediately necessary. Since the north portion of Seattle was primarily residential and the south portion was adjacent to industry, these areas were seen as the areas in need of additional community college education services.

The long range plan was to construct and develop the north and south campuses, and, then, attend to further development of the central campus. It was, therefore, contemplated that such temporary facilities of the central campus would remain in use for several years.

In the meantime, considerable attention was given to planning and developing an administrative organization throughout the district in preparation for operation of the new campuses to be completed by Fall, 1971. In addition there was a transfer of governance to a newly organized board of trustees and the State Community College Board as of July 1, 1967. This meant it was necessary to make additional adjustments in the district organization as a result of the community college district's official separation from the Seattle School Board's supervision.

Three circumstances evolved during SCCD's formative stage which resulted in either altering the construction and programming plans or administrative directives.

The first was the faculty election of the American Federation of Teachers (A.F.T.) as the bargaining representative with the board of trustees. This was permitted by the passage of a law in the State of Washington during 1965. For the first time certificated employees in the State of Washington could legally band together for the purpose of carrying on labor negotiations. Such organization could be accomplished by forming an independent group, joining as a faculty senate, or electing an agency to serve as a representative of the employees. Accordingly an election was held on February 15, 1968, to make a choice between bargaining representatives--the A.F.T. or the Washington Education Association. The election resulted in the A.F.T. becoming the representative agency.

Since 1968, all labor negotiations have been conducted by selection of teams of negotiators. There are two teams: (1) a faculty team composed of Seattle Community College American Federation of Teachers members, and (2) the "Board" team composed of selected administrators. As a result of this association, some administrative directives have been altered:

- (1) bargaining for salaries and fringe benefits rather than an arbitrary decision by administrators and Board members;



- (2) reconsideration of decisions to involuntarily terminate faculty members and administrators;
- (3) reconsideration of denial of sabbatical leaves; and
- (4) court action taken by A.F.T. to obstruct implementation of employee policies authorized by the Board of Trustees but not negotiated.

The second major issue was one which resulted somewhat from the racial imbalance predicted by the Arthur D. Little report. This imbalance was not alleviated, as was reasoned, by students choosing their school of attendance. The difficulties increased instead as black students began to look upon the central campus as "their campus"--seemingly preferring district restrictions.

As the black students became acquainted with the long range plans, they became increasingly possessive of the central campus and concerned with its development. The plan, then, of scheduling the central campus for construction and final development after all other campuses became an issue. It started with their comparing information known about the long range plans with the chief executive's statement of March 4, 1969: "Our first priority is--as it has been--a new Central Campus facility for SCC." The long range plan, however, stated the central campus would be the last to be

developed, thus a credibility gap evolved.

In addition, the black students became incensed that the board of trustees did not include a representative of their race and community. They, consequently, demanded these revisions:

- (1) immediate re-scheduling of construction of the Central Campus even if this meant the North Campus construction already started had to be stopped;
- (2) replacement of one or more trustees with a black member of the central area; and
- (3) a revamping of educational programs offered at the Central Campus to include more training for semi-professional occupations, training for skilled occupations, and continuance of the transfer programs (a program the black students believed was scheduled to be reduced at the Central Campus).

Such changes were finally accepted by the board of trustees but not before the black students, and sympathizers, staged four days of school disturbances.

The third situation involved the resignation of the proposed provost (later the position was titled president) of the North Campus within a month of his appointment. More important, however, was the resignation of the chief executive officer within a year after officially being designated the chief executive of the district.

Though the board is currently searching for a new chief executive, there is apparent doubt as to whether

a new chief should be selected at all. This is evidenced by the long delay in making a choice. As of Fall, 1972, such a selection was not made, and a questionnaire was distributed to community college employees, October, 1972, asking for an opinion on the issue. One of the reasons given for the delay is the saving of \$50,000 that has resulted during the delay (as of November, 1972, the saving was reported as high as \$100,000). In the meantime, the single chief executive officer's position is covered by the three presidents of the respective multi-colleges serving as executive committee members. This committee, in turn, is headed by an executive committee chairman, a position that is rotated to a different member each academic year.

#### Seattle Community College Today

Seattle Community College District No. 6 is a comprehensive community college system serving the Seattle and Vashon School Districts within King County. SCCD serves Washington's most populous area. Considering that students are not restricted by residence, the potential student population may be as extensive as Seattle's population of those 18 and older, or even a larger population by including the urbanized Seattle area. This means a population of 18 and older persons drawn from the total Seattle population of

530,860 (1970 census) to the urbanized population of 1,144,075, or King County's population of 1,156,633.

SCCD is assisted in providing education services by other community colleges within King County, namely; Shoreline, Highline, Green River, and Renton, the location of a technical school. SCCD may serve some beyond the boundaries of Seattle proper, but, in general, the students reside within Seattle. These students are presently provided comprehensive educational programs located on two newly constructed campuses--north and south. In addition programming has continued and has been expanded on the central campus. Central campus operations still utilize temporary facilities scattered in the central area, but there is promise of operating in a newly constructed high-rise building beginning Winter, 1972. This is at least a year earlier than originally scheduled.

While students attending SCCD are free to take advantage of courses offered on all three campuses, an applicant must state: (1) his/her preference as to program of study, and (2) the campus the student wishes to attend. The campus selected for attendance, then, becomes known as the student's "home campus." This "home campus" is the only one that reports the student for full-time enrollment calculations, retains a file

on the student, provides for counseling, testing, and gives the student priority status for registration. Since the student can enroll in classes at a campus not designated as his/her "home campus," this necessitates additional records and compilation of a transcript at the other campuses. Since this information on the student is not centralized, it is possible that a student may be required to request three transcripts for all work completed at SCCD.

Seattle Community College District No. 6 Administrative Organization

SCCD's Board of Trustees consists of five members appointed by the governor. The original trustees were re-appointed after serving their initial terms. One, after being re-appointed, resigned in order to accommodate the demand for a vacancy and replacement by a black member.

While the long-range plan for the district is that it will be governed by a board of trustees who in turn will select a single executive officer, the district presently has the leadership of a tri-executive committee. A committee, then, rather than a single executive officer serves to coordinate the educational services throughout the district. Since the executive committee members are also presidents of the autonomous

colleges included in the district, communications between the multi-colleges are relatively easy and constant. Still such a committee of presidents does not ensure coordination through the district.

The location of the district office, just west of downtown Seattle, is somewhat isolated from the campuses in that it is at least eight miles away from both the north and south campuses and an approximate five miles from the central campus. While personal contact is still relatively easy and the telephone system serves to bridge any distance almost immediately, communication between the operating levels and the centralized services is inadequate. This is somewhat alleviated by the weekly meetings of the executive committee, and the executive committee chairman devoting one-day a week attending to district affairs. The continuity and coordination of the district, otherwise, are maintained by an executive committee secretary.

While student records are not centralized, employee records, payrolls, and applications are. These records are all processed under the supervision of the district vice president of business and finance assisted by a controller, budget officer, chief accountant, data processing director, and personnel manager.

The educational responsibilities of the district are multiple in that a substantial staff concerned with occupational education and special services is headed by a vice president. Services rendered by this division include: curriculum development and teacher education, program documentation and reporting, student information system, state/federal vocational funds, and a library technical service unit.

Each college operating as an autonomous unit is headed by a president. Both the north and central campuses have a complement of student service personnel which includes a dean, director of financial aid, registrar, director of minority affairs, director of admissions, director of counseling, and various assistants. These are in addition to deans of technical and applied studies and liberal studies assisted by division and department chairmen. Though the instructional resource center is a responsibility of the district, there are directors of the instructional resource centers at both the north and central campuses. And these directors are assisted by librarians and media specialists. As well, both the north and central campuses have the services of a business manager along with several cashiers and clerks.

The south campus, specializing in industrial education, has the smallest enrollment, and the complement of administrators is necessarily less than at the other campuses. To cover all the obligations, some administrators have multiple responsibilities. For instance, the director of the college transfer programs is responsible for instructional media production, academic instruction, and educational consultants. The director of industrial education has the assistance of those titled department and division chairmen.

#### Enrollment Trends of SCCD

The statistical detail on enrollment projected and actual has been presented in Table VI. Construction costs to house such enrollment have been presented in Table VII.

#### Support of SCCD

Before July 1, 1963, Washington community colleges were financed in the same manner as the public school system. State aid to school districts for community colleges were separated from the K-12 programs during the 1963-1965 and 1965-1967 biennia. The basis for distribution of state funds was changed at that time so that revenue for the community colleges was specifically



TABLE VI. SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT ENROLLMENT FOR  
1966-1972 ACTUAL AND PROJECTED

Year and Campus	Academic		Occupational		Community		F.T.E. Total	Headcount Total	Projected
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
1966-67 Dist.	660	19.0	2799	80.5	17	.4	3476	n.a.	n.a.
1967-68 Dist.	1417	22.3	3549	55.9	385	21.8	6352	n.a.	n.a.
1968-69 Dist.	1538	26.2	3616	61.8	700	12.0	5854	n.a.	8200
1969-70 Dist.	1822	27.9	4114	63.1	583	8.9	6519	13,617	9082
<hr/>									
1970-71 North	1249		1107		24		2381	3,735	2050
Central	2610		2698				5148	8,592	4772
South	n.a.		646		135		781	1,990	900
Total	<u>3859</u>	46.4	<u>4451</u>	53.6			<u>8310</u>	<u>14,317</u>	<u>7722</u>
1971-72 North	1591	49.1	1596	49.3	51	1.6	3238	5,180	2536
Central	2810	48.9	2919	50.8	10	.2	5739	8,031	5850
South	292	22.7	982	76.2	15	1.1	1289	2,778	1315
Total	<u>4693</u>	<u>45.7</u>	<u>5497</u>	<u>53.5</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>.8</u>	<u>10266</u>	<u>15,989</u>	<u>9701</u>

Sources: State of Washington CC-1 Summary Enrollment Reports, Seattle Community College District, 1966-1972.

1970-71 enrollments are approximate figures only.  
1971-72 enrollments are for the Fall, 1971, only.

TABLE VII. SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT CAPITAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES

Type	District	Central	North	South	Total
New Construction		\$ 584,458	\$17,183,083	\$4,828,616	\$22,596,157
Professional services		353,205	737,278	555,230	1,645,713
Relocation	\$45,197	212,483			257,680
Remodeling		1,054,135			1,054,135
Equipment		827,629	1,071,843	342,035	2,241,507
Library		68	154,706	17,764	172,538
Land Acquisition		1,786,965	2,015,350	2,297,379	6,099,694
Land Improvement		14,223		2,402	16,625
Parking		17,376	965		18,341
Miscellaneous		1,409			1,409
Total	<u>\$45,197</u>	<u>\$4,851,951</u>	<u>\$21,163,225</u>	<u>\$8,043,426</u>	<u>\$34,103,799</u>

Source: Reports on Capital Construction Costs, Seattle Community College, Controller's Office.

identified for exclusive use by the community colleges.

Today, the state still provides almost all of the financial support required to operate and maintain community colleges in Washington. In appropriating operating support, the legislature relies on enrollment reports and estimates of expected full-time equivalent weighted enrollment as supplied through the State Board for Community College Education. Computation of full-time equivalent students is made by using the following formula:

- 1) College Parallel Courses  
one F.T.E. equals 45 credit hours of enrollment
- 2) Occupational Division  
one F.T.E. equals 900 student enrollment hours
- 3) Community Service  
one F.T.E. equals 1,080 student enrollment hours

Though there has been some pressure for community colleges to operate without charging students tuition fees, the tuition fees have continued to be charged in Washington. Such fees, however, are lower than those of a four-year college or university. Initially the rate was set at \$50 a quarter for resident students and \$150 for nonresident students. Other incidental fees of \$20 were charged both resident and nonresident students. Part-time fees are set by the local board

of trustees. By statute the tuition charged full-time students is \$41.50. This amount is deposited in a system-wide capital project revenue bond retirement fund. Another \$27.00 is charged each full-time student. This sum is retained by the college for use in operations and maintenance. Students may also be charged service-activities fee not to exceed \$14.50. This amount is determined by each college. The total state maximum fee is \$83.00 for resident students and \$227.00 for non-resident students. Part-time students pay \$7.50 per credit hour if resident and \$21.90 if nonresident. For unstructured programs, fees may be \$1.10, or less, per credit hour. The total fee for residents at SCCD for 1971-72 was \$75 and \$219 for nonresident students. No increase was made for the year 1972-73.

The capital requirements of a community college may be met by issuing bonds through the State Board of Community College Education. The maximum bonded indebtedness available to the board is restricted to the potential deposits in the community college bond retirement fund. In addition, any portion of the general tuition fee, formally limited to 40 percent but now changed to a limit of 60 percent, which is not needed for the bond retirement may be deposited in the

general fund of the state treasury and used for capital projects.

As of 1971-72, SCCD received the major portion of its operating monies through the state board. The amount received was \$8,572,219. This was an increase of \$700,153 over the 1970-71 appropriation. The local revenues, the general student fees and charges, were estimated to be \$1,988,500. The amount listed as local revenues, however, included \$230,000 for federal vocational training and \$75,000 for federal work study. A cash balance of \$70,000 from the 1970-71 budget remains for use in 1971-72. The total operating budget for 1971-72 was recorded as \$12,281,719, but \$1,651,000 was listed as restricted funds. The restricted funds are not available for general institutional support since such funds are received for specific purposes. The specific purposes may include support of work on federal grants, activities of the bookstores, or associated student activities. The actual operating budget, then, was stated to be \$10,630,719. The operating expenditures for 1971-72, however, totaled \$11,305,519.

Washington, unlike Oregon, does not have a local budget law. Further, local taxes are not voted for support of schools in Washington, and, consequently,

there is little local control of the colleges, and other schools in Washington, except by the newly developed advisory boards. These boards, however, are primarily for advising of programs rather than financing.

## THE MULTI-UNIT COLLEGES

### The Development

Since the late 1960's and the 1970's, more colleges have increased their operations by developing multi-units. By 1968, one-quarter of all American students attended multi-unit colleges or universities. There were 120 four-year colleges and universities and 40 junior college districts operating two or more campuses (Erickson, 1968). As stated in Chapter I, colleges have been faced with two major conflicting philosophies as to the type of administrative organization and control that should be developed.

The first philosophy is that which has led to operating multi-college districts by retention of maximum autonomy of each individual campus. The second has subscribed to operating with a strong central administration with each campus considered a branch with only day-to-day operational control.

According to a report prepared by Dr. Erickson, former president of the Seattle Community College District, after attending a meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges during October 23-24, 1968, in Chicago, Illinois, the majority of the multi-unit colleges were operating with a multi-branch pattern of organization. One of the basic philosophies

offered at that time was the belief that participants (administrators and faculty members) developed loyalties to their branch or campus rather than to the district. Nevertheless, there was reported to be a strong preference for development of autonomously operated campuses, because some believed that conformity among the campuses would breed lack of interest and kill initiative (Erickson, 1968). Because of these beliefs, Erickson stated, the multi-college pattern was gaining in favor. Whether the multi-branch or the multi-college pattern was implemented, it was considered essential to develop a central administrative staff. With the multi-college operation, the central staff was believed to serve best if it were detached from the campuses:

. . . the chief advantage of having a central administration lies not in its superior wisdom (for it might not be superior) but in its detachment. Because it is separated and away from any of the campuses, it is outside of the area of campus or college interest. Therefore, it should be able to make more rational decisions (Erickson, 1968).

Some arguments for the autonomous campus included problems of personnel and catalog. For instance, the central office should serve only as a coordinator during the process of hiring, firing, and record keeping for employees. The administrators of each campus should be free to hire a teacher or employee that he wants. The



very fact that loyalties would develop by personnel would mean that competition might develop between campuses for educational programs, resources, and publicity. Just by planning for equity for campuses would not necessarily mean that identical amounts of money, personnel, equipment, or supplies should account for such equity. As to the catalog problem, it was reported that several administrators claimed that one catalog was not satisfactory; it had been tried. However, some larger and older districts claimed that one catalog had been their salvation.

Other issues introduced in the report included the advisability of standardizing salaries, hours, course descriptions, and the fiscal support when colleges would be spread throughout both urban and rural areas by operating as multi-units within one district. While logical and rational arguments were probably made for both centralized control or the decentralized administrative coordinating body, Erickson further stated:

Tradition continues to be a prominent factor in the organization of most multi-campus districts. The individual campuses are following the trend to an independent college, whereas the central office views this as a threat. These opposing viewpoints make improvements in mutual understanding and cooperation difficult at best.

While it seemingly was agreed at the conference in  
• Chicago ". . . that there is no best pattern or plan of

organization for a multicollge district. . . and that it is good for districts to experiment. . ." guidelines for such experimentation were offered.

A copy of the guidelines has been presented in this study as Appendix IV. In reviewing the guidelines, it is clear that there is a preference for the autonomously operated campus pattern. It is also clear that there was concern for efficiency of operation. This was notable by the recommendation that the district office be responsible for all financial reports required by the state, accounting, budget coordination, plant maintenance and development, payroll, purchasing, inter-district contracts, and data processing. Each campus would, consequently, only require an employee to supervise student funds and local college petty cash funds.

To obtain maximum efficiency and avoid unnecessary duplication of course offerings, it was recommended that the central office serve to coordinate effort between campuses by establishing a curriculum committee with personnel drawn from each campus. It was also suggested that the district office be responsible for articulation with other colleges and universities. In addition, the educational resources, educational television, audio-visual, research, and any central dial information system should be the responsibility of the district.

In an effort to maintain equality and democratization among the campuses, it was suggested that technical and vocational programs have administrators possessing qualifications and position equal to that of the academic leader. No one at the central office should have a higher position, other than the chief executive of the district, than the chief campus administrator. The title of campus administrator could be raised to vice president. Any vice president titles at the central office should be dropped, according to a St. Louis operation.

The central office should not be located on any one campus and should be moved to another location within easy access of all campuses as soon after the completion of the second campus as possible. It was reported that:

None of the administrators on whose campus the central office was located really liked it, and administrators on other campuses claimed that this gave the central office campus a favored position.

As to the campus autonomy, each campus was to have as much autonomy as the district could give, and the campus president should be a leader and translate educational ideas into reality. The final decisions must be that of the chief administrator and/or the board of trustees. Experiments should be encouraged and supported on the campus level to build morale and

encourage creativeness. Considerable emphasis was given to the type of campus chief administrator by this statement:

In administration, everything depends on the man. Almost any system will work with the right administrator, and almost no system will work if the wrong person is managing things. Furthermore, a system tends to become distorted by the person who is administering. All of this is particularly true in multicampuses where there are the added disadvantages of communication and transportation.

In the multi-unit operation, a chairman of a department becomes much more influential for the successful operation of the various programs and campuses. Such a chairman could be selected to be involved with the operations of more than one campus. In that case, the chairman must be:

- a. Fair to all campuses.
- b. Willing to travel to the other campus or campuses to hold meetings and make his administration a personal affair.
- c. Adept at bringing together periodically the entire personnel on all campuses.
- d. Able to help his departments on all campuses to be equally fruitful and energetic in their service to the students.

Whether the organization becomes a multi-branch or a multi-college district, it was recognized that mutual respect for responsibilities and competencies was essential. A major factor in the success of the

changing pattern was related to the calibre of leadership exhibited by all personnel--teachers, administrators, and the governing board.

The report suggested that "Teachers need to recognize that their primary responsibility is to teach, not to administer." It also added that:

Set up your organization very loose and flexible at first. Work with your faculties. The faculty is rightly interested and should participate in the planning for additional colleges.

A comparison of the organizational patterns of the two schools and the guidelines has been presented in Table VIII. A more complete comparison of the two schools has been left to Chapter V.

In summary, the guidelines, as stated, indicate that the more progressive and creative operation will occur when the authority and responsibilities are decentralized. Theoretically the autonomous campus, by having more freedom and encouragement to perform according to the needs of the immediate community, will be more effective. Efficiency in operation can occur by elimination of the duplication of "paper" transactions by centralizing business affairs, and, also, centralizing the articulation with other educational institutions.

TABLE VIII. THE RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATION PATTERNS EVIDENCED  
 BY PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND SEATTLE  
 COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT IN CONTRAST  
 WITH MULTICOLLEGE/MULTICAMPUS  
 GUIDELINES SUGGESTED BY AAJC

Guidelines	PCC	SCCD
<u>Central Office Functions</u>		
Chancellor (or representative of Board of Trustees)	President	Planned to be District President. Presently a committee of three.
Administrative assistants (at least 3, at lower level than chief campus administrator)	Assistants and second level administrators at main campus	Administrative assistants as staff, second level administrators lower than chief campus
Assistant chancellor or director of business	Director of College Service at main campus	Business manager equal to president (in salary) but titled vice president
Campus employee to supervise student fund and petty cash	Employees where necessary	Third level administrators titled business manager
Central office separated from all campuses	Central office on main campus	Central office separate from all campuses
Chief campus administrator ranks second to district chief administrator	In some locations--not all	Planned for such ranking

Guidelines

PCC

SCCD

Individual College Functions

Campus autonomy--leadership dependent upon campus leader

Campus programs determined by central administration primarily to avoid duplication

Campus autonomy and therefore programs duplicated

Experimentation on campus encouraged and supported

Encouragement to innovate but research before implementing

Experiment encouraged but limited by funds and little research for feasibility

Each campus hires own personnel

Hiring centralized

Each campus hires own personnel but may transfer

Each chief campus administrator agrees with organization philosophy

This is essential

Some varying viewpoints

Chairmen of departments to coordinate efforts with more than one campus

Chairmen may coordinate with more than one campus

Chairmen assigned to single campus

Source: By interviews and observations during 1972 at Portland Community College and Seattle Community College. Guidelines reported by Dr. Edward K. Erickson, 1968, Seattle Community College, Seattle, Washington.

In contrast, where there is a branch pattern conformity may be achieved, but initiative may be discouraged. Where the chief administration office is on one of the campuses, inequality of treatment or consideration of campuses may be expected to result. As it is suggested above, however, a major factor may be the leadership--not the organizational pattern.



## Chapter V

## CONCLUSIONS TO ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY

This chapter draws together the data collected, compared, and analyzed for the two community colleges, namely; Portland Community College (PCC) and Seattle Community College District (SCCD). These colleges were studied primarily to obtain understanding of multi-unit patterns used in developing community college administrative organizations. Various evaluation techniques were used to explore the administrative organizations.

In reviewing previous effort, encouragement was obtained from reports by Cohen and Quimby in ERIC: Junior College Research Review in which they urge that research be undertaken to examine community college organizations. Koontz and O'Donnell, as authorities in organization study, promoted development of organizational theory as worthwhile, since managers would be provided guidelines that would direct individuals toward more efficient procedures. Koontz, however, perceived management theory today had become a "jungle." Scott saw the many theories already developed as an opportunity to select what is valuable and

select what is valuable and suitable in order to obtain ". . . a systematic and integrated conception of human organization." Griffiths urged the continuance of the scientific approach, which Miner stated was basically by observation. This was all essential since efforts to obtain organizational understanding were inadequate. Most of the previous understanding had been derived from self-perception reports or descriptions of the past. Finally Morphet, along with others, promoted development of evaluation techniques for the total organization rather than limited evaluation of the faculty. Such total evaluation was considered essential in order ". . . to survive, to progress, or to grow, . . ."

To understand community colleges, Reynolds suggested using the comparative approach. The opportunity to make such a comparative study of multi-unit community colleges was readily available by the fact that Portland Community College and Seattle Community College District are within 200 miles of each other.

The very fact that others have worked in areas related and specifically directed toward the same goals as this study provided a base for this research at a higher level than might have been obtained otherwise. This study, then, used concepts, principles, and theories as well as evaluation techniques previously developed.

The significance of the study may be attributed to the methods of observation. Observations of the organizations were made by the use of several evaluation techniques. These techniques included examination of the organization structures, a psychological analysis of the administrative personnel, comparison of costs, a review of statistics which included enrollment and financial support.

## COMPARISONS

Portland Community College Organizational Structure

According to an organization chart, there are 36 administrators at Portland Community College. This count does not include the chairman of the faculty association and the president of the associated student body (these two positions are shown on the organization chart). Since this chart was prepared at an earlier date, it would be understandable that adjustments have occurred.

By review of the budget for 1971-72, there were 20 administrators (not including maintenance supervisors) above the division chairman level. According to the budget there were 23 division chairmen. Adding those labelled supervisors of maintenance, there were 45 officially designated in some supervisory administrative capacity. The total cost of such administration is \$754,092. A tabulation of this cost has been provided as Appendix V.

In consideration of the increment in enrollment and the subsequent growth in administration, the tendency toward acceptance of Parkinson's Law (1957) may be determined.

If 36 administrators were employed during 1968, the number represented and related to 5,740 F.T.E. students for the academic year 1968-69 is but .60 percent. In contrast the 43 administrators employed during 1971-72 related to 9,262 F.T.E. students is but .46 percent.

Administration, of course, may proliferate by other than adding to the major supervising administrators. In an educational organization, the greatest number of personnel would be expected in the instructional area; therefore, the number of division chairmen might be increased as the number of instructors advances. Out of a total 516 employees (not including the unknown number of part-time employees), 263 are classified as instructors, and there are 23 division chairmen. There are many other classifications of employees: 13.5 employees aid in counseling; 29 serve in some capacity in instructional resource; 12 are in auxiliary positions such as tutors or storeroom clerks; 63 secretaries and 31 accountants, cashiers, and data processing production workers help process the paperwork. With all the facilities involved and the numerous activities, 62 maintenance personnel help keep the plants in order. Appendix VI records the tabulation of the employees as stated above.

Seattle Community College Organizational Structure

Before the second campus was completed and operating in 1969, the number of supervisory administrative personnel totaled 47. This count was taken from an organization chart prepared during the years 1968 and/or 1969. The count does not include a pre-college division chairman, any of the counselors, or maintenance supervisors. As of 1971-72, according to a list of administrators prepared by the faculty bargaining organization, the number of administrators had increased to 81. This count was confirmed by the 1971-72 budget. By review of the administrative titles, it is evident proliferation has occurred primarily by the duplication of deans, division chairmen, registrars, and directors of instructional resources, and the addition of administrators in minority affairs.

Where the organization was formerly comprised of three instructional deans, three assistant deans, 21 coordinators and division chairmen, there were, for 1971-72, 13 instructional deans, one director, four coordinators, and 24 division chairmen.

In relating the enrollment to the number of administrators, the percentage for the year 1969-70 was .72 percent and for 1971-72 the percentage was .83 percent. These percentages are significantly higher than those

experienced by the Portland college. While the guidelines for the multi-college pattern of the multi-unit colleges predicted there would be a larger administrative organization than in the multi-branch, it would appear that a doubling of administrators could be considered excessive.

As a result of the greater number of supervisory administrators, the cost of such salaries totalled \$1,393,521 for 1971-72. The tabulation of administrative salaries has been included as Appendix VII. The amount of \$1,393,521 does not include the 3.6 percent salary increases granted administrators for the year 1971-72, but not recorded in the budget. For instance the budget indicated the president of the North College received but \$26,000 when the salary paid during 1971-72 was actually increased to \$28,000.

Out of a total personnel count of 618, 245 were recorded as full-time faculty members. A substantial increase has occurred in the numbers of counselors; there were 28 recorded for 1971-72. A substantial number of other employees are included in non-instructional classifications: 38 audio-visual personnel, 39 accountants and clerks, 123 secretaries and clerks, and 56 maintenance.

A comparison of the distribution of employee classifications for both schools has been prepared as Appendix VI.

#### Conclusions Drawn from Interviews with Administrators

The interviews with Portland Community College administrative personnel occurred on four separate dates during February and April, 1972. Those occurring in February were established directly by the researcher. The February interviews were of longer duration than those scheduled for April. The first interview provided the researcher with information about the basic organizational structure and philosophy of the school.

The appointments for interviews in April were arranged by the Planning Administrator, and each interview was scheduled for half an hour. These interviews offered the researcher an opportunity to subjectively evaluate second level administrators of each division and obtain a faculty viewpoint from an officer of the faculty organization.

Without doubt each administrator interviewed was a very well occupied individual. Though most of the administrators were located on the new campus, they were not sequestered away behind closed doors--there are few doors to close. Their locations not only placed them visually before others, but provided them a ready



view of school activities. This openness is practiced and accepted by the president as well as the faculty members.

By interviewing the various administrators, it became evident that the organization chart was a guideline and not a fact as to actual lines of authority and control. In several cases there was a criss-cross of lines of authority because of dual responsibilities or individuals with more than one supervisor.

For instance the director of personnel, according to the organization chart, is a subordinate of the director of college services. Nevertheless, the director of personnel has an equal voice at the deans' meetings, is a member of the president's cabinet, and defends his budget directly with the president.

Another criss-cross occurs by the assignment of faculty members to specific instructional divisions, but there is also the possibility of assigning them to courses supervised by the director of community services.

Most administrators at the Portland school believed there was general satisfaction among the employees. The indicator mentioned was the rate of personnel turnover. This was reported as less than one percent during five years. It was also reported that 5,000 applicants filed for 15 openings that occurred during the previous year. In addition there has been no strike by either

faculty members or students.

Since Portland has a black population about the same relative size as Seattle, it was anticipated that the school would have at least one minority affairs administrator. According to the personnel officer, there was no need for such a position. There was a question about the possibility of adding such a position if substantial federal pressure occurred, however. The need for one, according to an administrator, however, has not appeared since the Black Student Union did not function at the school.

Evaluation appeared to be a constant activity at the school and was well planned. Each dean made some comment about the methods used. Most of the deans said they took time to observe actual class activities, used checklists, and discussed recommendations for improvement with the personnel involved. Others used a self evaluation approach by asking instructors about ways of improving their efforts. A check was made as to progress of improvement at a later time. While the deans admitted they were not always prepared to teach in some specific disciplines that they were required to evaluate, they felt they were prepared to judge on a pedagogical basis. Student evaluations were not considered important, but instructors were free to use such reports for their

own purposes. Evaluation of faculty was considered essential for improvement of teaching, not to criticize.

It became very evident that the school administrative personnel was in general dedicated to providing effective education. The importance of the student was emphasized in a variety of ways. Facilities were made readily available for students in the way of conveniently located counseling services, tutorial aids, no doors to faculty, division chairmen, and almost as easy access to the deans and the president. The library, too, was open and ready for students to browse, read, or lounge. As well there were a number of dining stations of various decore and menu. To add a further touch of welcome, students with car trouble were provided with a campus mechanic when the common car maladies occurred, such as out-of-gas, dead battery, and flat tire.

As for the administrators, they almost unanimously said that the major problem was the rapid growth. Roles and functions shifted so rapidly that some found it difficult to adjust to the new decisions determined necessary because of the changing conditions. As one administrator said, the difficulty was even greater because "a small group does not listen or some are insecure and fearful of moving to the new situations."

Finally the problem common to many organizations

was mentioned--communications. While this was not considered very serious at Portland, there were occasions when some felt the communications could have been better.

Interviews at Seattle Community College occurred during March, 1972, and included half hour discussions with the three presidents and second and third level administrators at the district office and the three campuses.

While the Seattle organizational plan specifies leadership by a district chief administrator, there is the leadership by an executive tri-committee. One president, during the interview, said that by such an arrangement, the presidents were in an ambiguous position. Their loyalties are divided between their own respective campuses and the district.

By such participation, however, it was felt that communication and cooperation had been enhanced since all were involved with all campus problems. Though the top administrators considered communications had been advantaged by this arrangement, other administrators, in lesser positions, were disturbed by the lack of communication and coordination where students were concerned. This included the potential of three sets of records for students, variations in credit hours, and procedures for registration. These conditions

could easily be resolved by centralizing registration and student records.

While growth was considered a cause of some difficulties, the major complaint was the lack of funds. This last has been exacerbated by the cut in budgets in the State of Washington. As a consequence it was claimed that staff increases had to be curtailed and compensation advances limited.

The increasing demand to expand educational services in face of budget limitations has been more difficult for the North and South Colleges than for the Central College. The Central College, while affected somewhat, has not been as severely restricted by the financial crisis. The reason is that the district officers still vividly remember the chaos of 1969 when the Black Student Union imposed demands that required immediate expansion of the Central College programs. While the immediate adjustment understandably meant sacrifices by the other campuses, there are some that believe the administrators have had adequate time to develop some alternative plans which would provide more equitable allocation of funds.

The continued adherence to the 1969 demands without consideration of other alternatives has meant the North and South Colleges have been required to delay operation of some very expensive facilities. Such unproductive

capacity only adds to the higher cost of producing education at those plants. Undoubtedly the quality of education has been reduced by the present financial distribution.

Some faculty members have repeatedly urged the administrators to review their budgets for ways of distributing the funds other than by arbitrarily giving the Central College more funding. As one alternative, faculty members have urged the administrators to distribute the funds within the district on the same basis that the state uses in allocating funds. The reply has been that the state formula does not fit the district plans.

While the administrators claim they are frustrated because of limited funding which has limited expansion in instruction, administrators received an average 3.6 percent increase in salaries during 1971-72. The faculty members were offered one percent.

There was little discussion on the topic of evaluation plans other than an introduction of student evaluation of the faculty.

The seclusion of administrators is much more prevalent at Seattle than at Portland. This occurs at both the North and South Colleges by the segregated locations of the administrators within the buildings.

For the Central College, at present, such separation has developed by the delay in completing construction.

While the number of counseling personnel is greater at Seattle than at Portland, such assistance as tutorial services are more by appointment than the convenient drop-in locations provided by Portland. Though there is evidence of concern for the student at Seattle, the stress seems to be more on count than on results. There is encouragement to be creative in course offerings, but the expected investigation of costs or alternatives before implementing is virtually nil--especially if the courses are academic.

Some within the organization have become concerned that the school is operating without formulation of goals. If they have been formulated, it is wondered why they have not been enunciated.

#### The Purdue Rating Scale

The greater acceptance of the rating scale by administrators at Portland compared to the relative number of administrators willing to evaluate administrators at Seattle indicated the Portland administrators have a higher regard for improvement. It certainly is an indication of greater curiosity and a willingness to take the risk of knowing oneself. It might even be

added there is a tendency of administrators at Seattle to be more cautious and conservative. Of course, by the comments listed, there appears to be a tendency and desire to maintain privacy--in a public organization.

The total raw scores for the schools were averaged and such averaged scores are presented in Appendix II. In comparing the averages, it may be concluded there is very little psychological difference between the administrators of the two schools. There was but a little better scoring on intellectual balance for the Portland administrators, but the Seattle administrators managed a higher rating in the emotional balance category. It was only in the capacity for work that the Portland administrators were most consistently favored over the Seattle administrators.

In general the raw scores and the averaging of such scores tells very little. Without an equivalent percentage participating, the scores provide only superficial perspective of administrator characteristics. Also because of the misgivings about the purpose of the ratings such ratings may have been biased.

#### Operational Data Review

The comparison of actual enrollments for Portland and Seattle indicates the drawing power is about equal, though Seattle advanced significantly from 3,476 in 1966



to 6,352 in 1967 compared to Portland's 4,129 in 1966 and 5,098 in 1967.

<u>Year</u>	<u>SCCD</u>	<u>PCC</u>
1966	3,476	4,129
1967	6,352	5,098
1968	5,854	5,740
1969	6,519	6,723
1970	8,310	8,706
1971	10,266 *	9,262

\* Fall enrollment, budgeted 9,701

There is a substantial difference when considering the headcount. Seattle served, or planned to serve, only 15,989 and Portland budgeted for 39,960. The slightly higher F.T.E. count for Seattle may be attributed to the higher unemployment level experienced during 1971.

Seattle Community College does draw from a larger population, but at the same time, it competes against five other community colleges within a radius of 20-30 miles. Though there is a larger potential student body for Seattle, that student body has a choice of schools having relatively the same offerings.

There is, however, another factor which must be considered in comparing the enrollments of Portland and Seattle. That is the level of unemployment in the two areas. The Department of Labor provides some clue by

these statistics:

<u>Dates Reported</u>	<u>Unemployment</u>	
	<u>Portland</u>	<u>Seattle</u>
July, 1970	6.0	10.4
July, 1971	6.4	14.6
May, 1972	6.1	12.5

The very fact that the schools are readily accessible to the unemployed and that tuition fees are fairly low suggests that the unemployed made the choice of being busy rather than remain idle. In Seattle, going to school was facilitated by the continuance of unemployment compensation even if the unemployed became a student but was willing to take a job whenever offered. While this might explain the higher F.T.E. count at Seattle, it does not explain the difference in headcount.

There are several reasons why the headcount has been higher at Portland. One of the reasons includes the fact that Portland administrators encourage "shopping," part-time, evening, or moving education to the students. An educational van serves outlying areas and, in addition, instruction is extended by offering services in 35 high schools in the district. Where there is evidence of demand and interest, Portland administrators attempt to respond by providing the educational services whether academic, occupational, or hobby.

Some may criticize the extension of Portland's educational services, but it is part of the Portland philosophy that if the student cannot come to the school, the school will go to the student.

In contrast the Seattle school is less expansive, perhaps by the number of surrounding community colleges, and so offerings off the main campuses are provided in only five local high schools.

Because of the varying conditions introduced such as employment, competitive schools, and philosophies, it is difficult to conclude that Seattle is or is not more effective in drawing students to its campus than Portland.

With no answer here, it was thought ability to retain students might provide a clue. Information on returning students (holding power) was not readily available. It is obvious that such information can be found within the schools' records.

The catalogs of both schools were examined and compared. Realizing that catalogs list courses not always offered immediately, actual offerings were only noted as to types of offerings. Both schools offered similar academic courses, substantially similar occupational training, and continuing educational programs. It was only in the community service

programming that Portland appeared to be more expansive.

While all the catalogs (Seattle's three and Portland's one) provided adequate information about registration and admission policies, Portland added more clarity by explaining course content and what would be expected by other institutions in the State System of Higher Education. This information was located adjacent to course descriptions. Consequently the Portland catalog provided greater assistance to the student than all three of the Seattle catalogs.

The three separate catalogs for the Seattle District appeared to be an unnecessary duplication at a time of severely restricted funding.

#### Budget Comparison

The total resources available to Portland Community College for the year 1971-72 totaled \$13,167,463. Of this amount, \$3,595,731, plus another \$333,000, was allocated to other funds and capital outlay. This left \$9,238,957 for current operating expenses. For Seattle Community College the funds allocated to current operations totaled \$11,305,519, a figure well over \$2,000,000 of that to be used by Portland.

One of the goals set forth for Portland in developing the college was that of providing instruction

for students. The administrative organization pattern that has evolved evidences retention of this goal. By examining the allocation of funds, Portland has allocated 45.0 percent of the total operating funds for instructional salaries and only 8.1 percent has been used for administrative salaries. Seattle, however, has allocated but 35.7 percent for faculty salaries and 12.1 percent for administrative salaries. While the multi-unit guidelines suggest, whether there is expansion by branches or autonomous colleges, the resulting centralized staffing will produce economic savings, this study indicates such savings may not always occur. Where Portland has taken advantage of this type of organization and achieved savings, it is not so evident that Seattle has.

Though the number of students at Seattle have increased to a budgeted figure of 9,701 compared to Portland's enrollment of 9,262, the number of instructors is higher at Portland. Without further investigation, it appears that class sizes at Seattle are larger than at Portland. While it is indeterminate that small class sizes are better than larger class enrollments, the goals for most community colleges have included maintaining small classes.

The greater number of secretaries at Seattle compared to Portland is also an indication of higher administrative costs at Seattle. At Seattle there are 123 secretaries or clerks compared to only 63 at Portland. Secretarial costs, including the part-time assistance, at Seattle are more than double the amount allotted by Portland. Nevertheless some instructional divisions at Seattle have extremely limited secretarial help.

Currently, and ever since Dr. Erickson resigned from Seattle, the board of trustees has been searching for a replacement of the chief executive. In the interim, the executive committee has been attempting to provide district leadership. By such leadership it has been assumed a \$50,000 saving has resulted (more recently reported as a saving of \$100,000). Little investigation has been made as to whether the saving is myth or fact, however. Some within the organization accept the tri-committee leadership by rationalizing that no one leader could be any more effective anyway.

In very sharp contrast, Portland Community College has retained its president through its years of development. Even though the college has grown rapidly, and new people have been introduced, the administrative staff has been kept at a manageable level. In addition the "saga," as Richardson stated, has been continued.

The Portland operation is an institution offering instruction for the student. It is an operation viewed as a business and the product is education.

### Evaluations

According to the National School Boards Association, evaluation should be a continuous activity, and it should include many instruments for culmination of self-improvement. This study emphasized methods of appraising for just that purpose. The initial understanding of evaluation directed attention to first of all understanding what was to be evaluated--in this case, community college administrative organizations. This also necessitated researching the historical developments of the two schools along with theories of organizations for both business and educational entities. By obtaining some intimacy and comprehension of the entities being studied, then, and only then, could appropriate techniques of evaluation be suggested for the study. The determination of the organizational efficiency depended upon the evaluations.

Since this study included several different techniques and involved many people, the schools were examined from various vantage points. Since the value of making an appraisal is dependent upon the subsequent improvements, it is important to clarify the strengths

and weaknesses uncovered by such appraisals.

### Strengths and Weaknesses

Portland upon examination seems to have many strengths and few weaknesses in comparison to Seattle. Those areas in which Portland is strongest seem to be those in which Seattle is weakest. The listings for both schools are as follows:

#### PCC - Strengths

- 1) continuity of leadership--one president;
- 2) established goals that are continually reiterated--education of the student;
- 3) there is organized planning and research of the short and long range category;
- 4) openness of operation and communication--everyone knows what is expected as to role and reason;
- 5) facilities for administrators are not more elaborate or closed than for faculty members;
- 6) there are plans for democratization of instructional services--academic, technical, and community services;
- 7) cooperation is encouraged between divisions and branches;



- 8) the open-door policy is maintained;
- 9) the external and internal review of the budget has promoted clarity and inclusion of supportive data;
- 10) earnest effort is made to provide the type of education the community wants and where it is wanted.

#### Weaknesses

- 11) the burden of duty on the few administrators may be too demanding;
- 12) there is some faculty discord;
- 13) too little input from instructional staff in establishing operational and personnel policies; and
- 14) the very rapid growth and the approaching development of a new campus.

#### SCCD - Strengths

- 1) well constructed buildings on all campuses;
- 2) urgings by some administrators and instructional personnel to promote progressive short and long range planning;
- 3) an adequate operational budget, if compared with Portland's budget;
- 4) promotion of evaluation;

- 5) Central College attempts to respond to the community needs;
- 6) top level communication between colleges promotes cooperation and coordination.

#### Weaknesses

- 7) the leadership is not united in belief as to the type of leadership needed;
- 8) limited continuity of leadership;
- 9) poor communication throughout the school;
- 10) goals are unknown and reasons for changes are not revealed;
- 11) competition has developed between instructional services (academic, occupational, and community services), between campuses, and between faculty and administration; and
- 12) an inequitable division of funding has resulted by failure to plan for alternatives.

The schools compared in this study were selected because they represented the two organizational patterns of multi-unit development, the multi-branch and the autonomous colleges. The multi-units which have evolved were developed primarily for economic

reasons, maintenance of uniformity of educational standards and offerings, and extension of innovation and creativity while expanding community educational services.

By this study the branch organizational pattern was found to be the more economical. The autonomous college operation, as demonstrated by the Seattle operation, provided no proof that such an organizational structure was anymore responsive to community needs nor anymore innovative than the branch structure.

The results of this study did suggest that success or efficiency of an institution may be more attributable to the combination of personalities involved than to the organizational structure. If personalities can be so combined that cooperation will promote effective and efficient plans, and such plans can be carried through, there may be an opportunity to efficiently accomplish educational goals.

## Chapter VI

## SUMMARY

As a result of this research, some questions previously asked may now be answered. The answers, however, pending further study, are broad responses rather than specific and precise.

The questions that developed, as this study progressed, are cited on pages 92 and 93. The balance of this chapter presents the answers drawn from this investigation. The order of responses corresponds with the order of the questions.

Though the administrative theory development for educational organizations has been more recent than for business enterprises, the many adaptations and the added interests of many other researchers have produced an almost equal number of theories for educational units as for business. The range of theories expands along a continuum starting with the bureaucratic structure to the more loose knit, flexible, horizontal structure proposed by Bennis. While there are still proponents of the bureaucratic structure (Campbell, 1970), there are a growing number accepting the Bennis structure.

This last group seems to expand as the attitudes of teachers change toward achievement of professional status. As professionalism becomes more important, the bureaucratic structure would be more difficult to apply. Morphet proposes that the pluralistic, collegial concept has already been accepted at the higher levels of education by the premise that all members participate in decisions, and, therefore, all may assume responsibility, not administrators alone. In the meantime Richardson has visualized this trend in the two-year colleges, but he only asks if there is a science of administration of the two-year college. The answer may correctly be stated as yes. The current confusion may be due to the actual movement along the organizational continuum from the bureaucratic pattern to the pluralistic, collegial pattern which is occurring, but in the face of considerable opposition.

The two schools examined provide examples of the extremes on the continuum. Portland is primarily structured along the more traditional bureaucratic form. Seattle has become loose-knit, not by plan but by evolution. As a result strong personalities within the faculty group at Seattle are pressing for participation in decisions and acceptance of responsibilities.

As indicated above, attitudes do affect direction and

obviously the organizational structure. As some of the human relation theorists reason, the organization can affect the attitudes. For instance the organizational arrangement at Portland to promote equality of status for academic, occupational, and community service courses undoubtedly has influenced attitudes. In contrast Seattle's separation of academic study from the technical courses has retained division in attitudes. As a result competition between the divisions has been retained rather than promotion of cooperation.

Efficient or effective administrators, according to Litchfield's statements of problems in higher education, are those that understand the administrative processes. By such understanding, he suggests, administrators will promote centralized controls, become concerned about communication, clarify roles concerning duties and functions, and finally prepare for training of successors.

Burns, however, cautions that an administrator's authority for educational entities may be different than in business entities. Since it is possible that the "zone of acceptance" of authority in colleges is narrower than in other organizations, the educational leader must be willing to promote change and develop understanding for order by less direct means than might

be acceptable in other organizations.

Drucker is clearer in his statement of identifying an effective leader. A leader will be the one that assists or facilitates the group most in reaching a satisfactory state. The evidence would be discernible by the accomplishment of the goals in relation to the costs.

It would appear that the administrator demonstrating efficiency and effectiveness would also be one that could be identified as being accountable and responsible. Of the two schools examined, those within the Portland organization illustrated concern in being accountable and responsible. Since this study only looked at the administrative organization and excluded the faculty and the students, the quality of education for either school is still an unknown. For evidence of full accountability and responsibility, the results of the educational services should be known. A study of the faculty and students would provide a more complete understanding of the two schools.

Both Portland and Seattle colleges have similar administrative positions in their organization. By this study it could be said that there is a basic administrative set for educational organizations. This does not mean that every school will have the same positions

filled or assign identical responsibility for those positions.

As never before schools are realizing there is a need to respond to external demands. This holds true for two-year colleges as well as other educational levels. Portland, however, seems to respond more directly and constantly to the public demands than Seattle, with the exception of Seattle's Central College.

By the Oregon Budget Law, Portland administrators may have been advantaged by their early recognition that the community citizens evaluate the educational entities. Only a few administrators learned that the community does have demands in Seattle. The external pressures can and have been significant by the influence on financing, allocation of funds, and the educational services desired. By legislative tones the pressures on educational units to become accountable and responsible will undoubtedly grow in Oregon and in Washington.

The availability of resources has been of constant concern for the Portland administrators, and they have developed a philosophy concerning such resources. That is the school prepares to operate as economically as possible and extend the instructional services to accommodate all those students seeking some training. This same concern is not as evident by the Seattle administrators.



Undoubtedly there is growing concern by all school officials as to how the expansion of the state educational offices will change the way of operation. As the state offices have expanded, there has been a tendency to promote state-wide uniformity in reporting and in financing. Now it is becoming more visible that the state offices are promoting long range planning, suggesting uniform hours of operation, faculty qualifications, salary schedules, and coordination of programs.

Uniformity in budgeting procedures has been of long duration for both Oregon and Washington. The community involvement, however, has been limited in Washington in contrast with the community participation in Oregon. The Oregon Budget Law which requires that the annual budget be reviewed and voted by the community citizens supporting the school has undoubtedly promoted the clarity of budget preparation in Oregon. There were significant differences in the budgets as prepared by Portland and Seattle. The Portland budget was informative, detailed, and clear as to the programs and personnel involved. The Seattle budget presented to the general public was virtually lacking in detail.

Both schools have become involved with advisory councils, and both have found the councils helpful not

only in preparing for program development but for promotion of the schools and the students.

The most logical evaluation was the comparison of the budget. For two schools with an enrollment of approximately the same size, it could be assumed that the expenditures would be similar. The variation of \$2,000,000 was not expected.

By this study the psychological attitude questionnaire presented to administrators did not prove to be a worthy instrument. Since the purpose of the questionnaire was not explained by the researcher, the participants may have had a valid reason for not responding. If others should use the instrument, it is recommended that the researcher provide an explanation of the purpose.

According to Griffiths and Homans the most scientific technique in development of theory is through observation. In this study actual observations were made only by the researcher. While single observations are not generally acceptable for development of theory, there are other ways of obtaining acceptance. For instance observations may be verified and confirmed by using several different evaluation techniques.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association. 1959. Judging Schools with Wisdom. Washington, D. C., p. 1-2. (Cited in: Garvue, Robert J. Modern Public School Finance. London, The MacMillan Company, 1969. p. 144)
- American College Public Relations Association. 1958. The Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education. Washington, D. C., 18 p. (Cited in: Burns, Gerald P. (ed.) Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1962. p. 72.)
- Anshen, Melvin. 1965. The Federal Budget as an Instrument for Management and Analysis. In: Program Budgeting, ed. by David Norvick, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, p. 10-11.
- Argyris, Chris. 1958. The Organization: What Makes It Healthy? In: Organization Theories, ed. by William P. Sexton, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill Publishing Co., 1970. p. 191-208.
- Bavelas, Alex. 1960. Leadership: Man and Function. In: Organization Theories, ed. by William P. Sexton, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill Publishing Co., 1970. p. 115-121.
- Becker, Gary. 1964. Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education. New York, Columbia University Press, 187 p.
- Bennis, Warren. 1970. American Bureaucracy. United States of America, Aldine Publishing Company, 187 p.
- Benson, Charles S. 1968. The Economics of Public Education. New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 368 p.

- Blaug, Mark. 1967. The Private and the Social Returns on Investment in Education: Some Results for Great Britain. Journal of Human Resources 2:3. Summer, 1967, p. 330-346.
- Buchele, Robert B. 1962. How to Evaluate a Firm. In: Readings in Business Policy, ed. by Edmund R. Gray, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968. p. 468-475.
- Burns, Gerald P. (ed.) 1962. Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 236 p.
- Bylsma, Jr., Donald. 1969. Changes in Locus of Decision Making and Organizational Structure in Selected Public Community Colleges in Michigan since 1965. Doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 30:9 No. 70-4044)
- Campbell, Roald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, Roderick F. McPhee, and Raphael O. Nystrand. 1970. The Organization and Control of American Schools. 2d ed. Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 592 p.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. 1970. The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 74 p.
- Chapple, Eliot D. and Leonard R. Sayles. 1961. The Measure of Management. New York, The MacMillan Company, 218 p.
- Cohen, Arthur M. and Edgar A. Quimby. 1970. Trends in the Study of Junior Colleges. ERIC: Junior College Research Review 5:1. September, 1970.
- Dressel, Paul L. 1961. Evaluation in Higher Education. Boston, Mass., Houghton Mifflin Company, 480 p.
- Drucker, Peter F. 1954. The Practice of Management. New York, Harper & Brothers Publishers, 404 p.
- Drucker, Peter F. 1966. The Effective Executive. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 178 p.

- Duryea, E. D. 1960. Management of Learning. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 35 p.  
(New Dimensions in Higher Education No. 5, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)
- Emch, Arnold F. 1954. Control and the Administrator. In: Administrative Control and Executive Action, ed. by B. C. Lemke and James Don Edwards, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill, Inc., 1961, p. 16-26.
- Erickson, Edward K. Report of a Meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Chicago, Illinois, October 23-24, 1968. Seattle, Washington, Seattle Community College District No. 6.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1961. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organization. New York, The Free Press, 366 p.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1964. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 120 p.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1969. The Semi-Professions and Their Organization: Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers. London, Collier-MacMillan Limited, 328 p.
- Fiege, John Christopher. 1970. A Study of Attitudes, Dissidence, and Turnover in Illinois Public Junior Colleges. Doctoral dissertation. Illinois State University, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 30:12, part 1, No. 70-11,186)
- Garvue, Robert J. 1969. Modern Public School Finance. London, The MacMillan Company, 378 p.
- Getzels, Jacob W., and Egon G. Guba. 1957. Social Behavior and the Administrative Process. School Review 95:423-441.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. 1959. Administrative Theory. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 123 p.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. 1964. The Nature and Meaning of Theory. In: Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part 2, ed. by Daniel E. Griffiths. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 234 p.

- Gross, Edward. 1961. Dimensions of Leadership. In: Management in Perspective: Selected Readings, ed. by William E. Schlender, William G. Scott, and Alan C. Filley, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965. p. 510-518.
- Gulick, Luther. 1937. Notes on the Theory of Organization. In: Papers on the Science of Administration, ed. by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick, New York, Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University.
- Hanoch, Giora. 1967. An Economic Analysis of Earnings and Schooling. Journal of Human Resources 2:3. Summer, 1967, p. 310-329.
- Hansen, W. Lee and Burton A. Weisbrod. 1969. Benefits, Costs, and Finance of Public Higher Education. Chicago, Markham Publishing Company, 114 p.
- Harries-Jenkins, G. 1970. Professionals in Organizations. In: Professions and Professionalization, ed. by J. A. Jackson, Cambridge, University Press, p. 53-107.
- Hills, Richard Jean. 1968. Toward A Science of Organization. Eugene, Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 122 p.
- Hillway, Tyrus. 1959. What Professors Want in a President. In: Leaders, Teachers, and Learners in Academe: Partners in the Educational Process, ed. by Stanley Lehrer, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts Educational Division Meredith Corporation, p. 181-184.
- Hillway, Tyrus. 1961. How Trustees Judge a College President. In: Leaders, Teachers, and Learners in Academe: Partners in the Educational Process, ed. by Stanley Lehrer, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts Educational Division Meredith Corporation, p. 185-189.
- Hobson, Robert L. and Jesse C. Rupe. 1948. Some Psychological Dimensions of Academic Administrators. Studies in Higher Education 73, Further Studies in Attitudes Series 18. Lafayette, Indiana, Purdue University, A Division of Education, p. 7-93.

- Homans, George C. 1950. The Human Group. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc. (Cited in: Morphet, Edgar L., Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., p. 129-136.)
- Hornngren, Charles T. 1970. Accounting Management Control. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 589 p.
- Hu, Teh-wei, Maw Lin Lee, and Ernst W. Stromsdorfer. 1969. A Cost-Effectiveness Study of Vocational Education: A Comparison of Vocational and Nonvocational Education in Secondary Schools. University Park, Pennsylvania, Institute for Research on Human Resources, Pennsylvania State University, 302 p.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. 1972. Decision Making in the Multi-Unit College. ERIC: Junior College Research Review 6:5. January, 1972.
- Koontz, Harold J. 1961. The Management Theory Jungle. In: Readings in Management Strategy and Tactics, ed. by John G. Hutchinson, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971, p. 3-18.
- Koontz, Harold J. and Cyril O'Donnell. 1964. Principles of Organization: An Analysis of Managerial Functions. New York, McGraw-Hill Company, 637 p.
- Leggatt, T. 1970. Teaching as a Profession. In: Professions and Professionalization, ed. by J. A. Jackson, Cambridge, University Press, p. 155-177.
- Levine, Martin. 1969. A Comparative Study of Selected Characteristics of Two Types of Post-High School Organization. Doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan. (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 30:9 No. 70-4131)
- Lieberman, Myron. 1956. Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 485 p.

- Likert, Rensis. 1953. Motivation: The Core of Management. In: Readings in Management, ed. by Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnell, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., p. 255-271.
- Litchfield, Edward H. 1959. Organization in Large American Universities: The Administration. Journal of Higher Education 30:7, p. 489-504.
- Litterer, Joseph A. 1965. The Analysis of Organizations. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 471 p.
- Litterer, Joseph. 1969. Organizations: Structure and Behavior. Vol. 1. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 498 p.
- Little, Inc., Arthur D. 1966. A Policy Plan for Community College Education in the State of Washington: A Report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 193 p.
- Martineson, Wilmar Chris. 1969. An Analysis of Perceptions of Selected Faculty Senate Members and Administrators Regarding Decision-Making Powers in California Junior Colleges. Doctoral dissertation. New Mexico State University, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 30:9 No. 69-18,488)
- McEnroe, Edward Joseph. 1969. The Utility of a Critical Path Network in the Analysis of Organizational Stress. Doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 30:12 No. 69-22,433)
- Medsker, Leland L. 1960. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 367 p.
- Miles, Matthew B. 1969. Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground. In: Change Processes in the Public Schools, Richard O. Carlson, et al., Eugene, Oregon, The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, p. 11-34.



- Miller, James G. 1965. Living Systems: Cross-Level Hypotheses. Behavioral Science 10:3, p. 380-411.
- Miner, John B. 1971. Management Theory. New York, MacMillan Company, 168 p.
- Mooney, James. 1939. The Scalar Principle. In: Organization Theories, ed. by William P. Sexton, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970, p. 47-51.
- Morey, Lloyd. 1955. Leaves from a President's Notebook from School and Society. In: Leaders, Teachers, and Learners in Academe: Partners in the Educational Process, ed. by Stanley Lehrer, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts Educational Division Meredith Corporation, p. 175-180.
- Morin, Lloyd Henry. 1969. The Organization Set of a Public Community College. Doctoral dissertation. Eugene, Oregon, University of Oregon.
- Morphet, Edgar L., Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. 1967. Educational Organization and Administration Concepts, Practices, and Issues. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 569 p.
- Morris, William Robert. 1969. Identification and Development of Procedures and Criteria for Self-Analysis by Community Colleges. Doctoral dissertation. Corvallis, Oregon, Oregon State University.
- Oregon Community College Association. 1970. Policy Maker's Guide 1969-70, Part 1. Salem, Oregon, January, 1970.
- Oregon Community College Association. 1972. Policy Maker's Guide 1971-72, Part 1. Salem, Oregon, January, 1972.
- Oregon, State of. 1967. Budget Manual for Municipal Corporation. Rev. ed. Salem, Oregon.

- Osborne, John Robert. 1969. A Study of the Critical Requirements of a Public Junior College President. Doctoral dissertation. East Texas State University, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 30:12, part 1, No. 70-11,300)
- Owens, Robert G. 1970. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 247 p.
- Parkinson, C. Northcote. 1957. Parkinson's Law and Other Studies in Administration. Cambridge, Houghton Mifflin Company, 113 p.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1956. Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations--II. Administrative Science Quarterly 1:2. p. 225-239.
- Peterson, Marvin W. 1971. Decentralization: A Strategic Approach. Journal of Higher Education 62:6. January, 1971, p. 1-20.
- Plunkett, Robert Ace. 1969. A Comparison of Texas Junior College Administrations and Their Functions to Determine "Progressive" Characteristics. Doctoral dissertation. University of Texas, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 30:12 No. 70-10,846)
- Portland Community College. 1971. A West Campus for Portland Community College--A Challenge. Portland, Oregon.
- Portland Community College. 1971. Portland Community College Budget Document 1971-72. Portland, Oregon.
- Portland Community College. 1971-1972. Progress Report 1971-1972. Portland, Oregon.
- Portland Community College Council. Proposal for an Area Metropolitan Community College District. 1968. Portland, Oregon, 36 p.
- Post-High School Study Committee, A Subcommittee Appointed by the Educational Coordinating Council. 1966. Education Beyond the High School: A Projection for Oregon. Salem, Oregon, State of Oregon, 450 p.

- Purrington, Gordon Sellers. 1967. The Supervisory Behavior of School Administrators and Organizational Effectiveness. Doctoral dissertation. Cornell University, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 28:1 No. 67-8764)
- Reynolds, James W. 1969. The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum. Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 224 p.
- Richardson, Jr., Richard C. 1970. Needed: New Directions in Administration. Junior College Journal 40:6. March, 1970, p. 16-22.
- Richardson, Jr., Richard C. 1971. Comments. Journal of Higher Education 42:6. June, 1971, p. 516-520.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. 1941. The Social Structure of Industry. In: Organization Theories, ed. by William P. Sexton, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill Publishing Co., 1970. p. 94-97.
- Scott, William G. 1961. Organization Theory: An Overview and an Appraisal. In: Organizations: Structure and Behavior. Vol. 1. 2d ed. ed. by Joseph A. Litterer, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969. p. 15-28.
- Seattle Community College District. 1971. Seattle Community College Budget. Seattle, Washington.
- Selznick, Philip. 1957. Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 162 p.
- Sexton, William P. (ed.) 1970. Organization Theories. Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 433 p.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1957. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Process in Administrative Organization. New York, MacMillan Co., 259 p.
- Tannenbaum, Robert. 1949. The Manager Concept: A Rational Synthesis. In: Administrative Control and Executive Action, ed. by B. C. Lemke and James Don Edwards, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill, Inc., 1961. p. 16-26.

- Tarnopol, Lester. 1958. Personality Differences Between Leaders and Non-leaders. In: Management in Perspective: Selected Readings, ed. by William E. Schlender, William G. Scott, and Alan G. Filley, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965. p. 537-541.
- Thornton, Jr., James W. 1960. The Community Junior College. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Thornton, Jr., James W. 1966. The Community Junior College. 2d ed. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Washington State Research Council. 1968. The Research Council Handbook: State and Local Government in Washington. 3d ed., 647 p.
- Weber, Max. 1946. Essays in Sociology. In: Organization Theories, ed. by William P. Sexton, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970. p. 39-43.
- Welch, Finis. 1966. Measurement of the Quality of Schooling. American Economic Review 56:2. May, 1966, p. 379-392.
- Wilson, Robert E. 1966. Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 853 p.
- Witmer, David R. 1971. The Value of College Education: A Benefit-Cost Analysis of Major Programs of Study in the Wisconsin State Universities. Doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 32:3 No. 71-16,909)
- Woodhall, Maureen. 1970. Cost-benefit Analysis in Educational Planning. Unesco: International Institute for Educational Planning, 49 p.
- Yuchtman, Ephraim. 1966. A Study of Organizational Effectiveness. Doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan, (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 28:1 No. 67-8375)

Zalesnik, Abraham. 1965. Interpersonal Relations in Organizations. In: Handbook of Organizations, ed. by James G. March, Skokie, Illinois, Rand McNally & Co., 574 p.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix I

## INSTRUCTIONS: PURDUE RATING SCALE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Please rate your administrator on the following questionnaire by listing the number which corresponds with your perspective of the administrator. Your ratings will be anonymous--the administrator will never have an opportunity to know how you personally appraised him/her on this scale. He/she will, however if he/she desires, receive the averaged responses of those rating him/her.

Because it is essential that the administrator be identified (the one being rated), please print the name of the administrator you are rating along with the division or department he/she supervises.

Read carefully the first item on the scale. Decide which one of the five possibilities best describes your administrator. Note the answer by placing the number on the line to the right.

Proceed similarly throughout the scale.

Because such factors as age, education, income may provide some additional information will you please provide this information about yourself by completing the Correlational Data. Again this is to be held confidential and adds dimension to the study.

When you have completed the scale and the Correlational Data, please enclose in the attached envelope and mail. The stamp is already attached.

## THE PURDUE RATING SCALE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

## I. INTELLECTUAL BALANCE

1. Possesses general knowledge:  
 (5) very broad (4) fairly broad (3) limited  
 (2) very limited (1) lacking \_\_\_\_\_
2. Possesses specific knowledge in his field:  
 (5) up-to-date (4) good (3) fair  
 (2) poor (1) lacking \_\_\_\_\_

## II. EMOTIONAL BALANCE

3. Is emotionally poised and calm:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
4. Has adequate self-confidence:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
5. Is concerned with his own personal problems:  
 (5) never (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) always \_\_\_\_\_
6. Welcomes differences in viewpoints:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_

## III. ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

7. Welds staff into a unit with clearly recognized goals:  
 (5) exceptionally well (4) very well  
 (3) quite well (2) poorly (1) very poorly \_\_\_\_\_
8. Uses democratic procedures wherever possible:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
9. Inspires subordinates to independent creative work:  
 (5) always (4) sometimes (3) seldom (2) never  
 (1) makes creative work repulsive \_\_\_\_\_



## IV. ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING

10. Makes plans carefully and adequately:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
11. Is alert to recognize or devise useful innovations:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
12. Understands the objectives and interrelationships of his entire work:  
 (5) exceptionally well (4) very well  
 (3) quite well (2) poorly (1) very poorly \_\_\_\_\_
13. Does a good job of systematizing and coordinating units of work:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
14. Has knowledge of pertinent details of his subordinates work:  
 (5) very good (4) good (3) fair  
 (2) poor (1) not at all \_\_\_\_\_

## V. USE OF FUNDS

15. Employs as capable personnel as possible:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
16. Selects equipment wisely:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
17. Makes effective effort to obtain funds for self-improvement of subordinates:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_

## VI. CAPACITY FOR WORK

18. Works hard:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_

19. Welcomes additional responsibilities:  
(5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
(2) seldom (1) never
20. Meets emergencies in his work competently:  
(5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
(2) seldom (1) never

## VII. ACCOMPLISHMENT

21. Conducts his work as expeditiously as possible:  
(5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
(2) seldom (1) never
22. The essential work of his organization gets done on time:  
(5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
(2) seldom (1) never
23. The important work of his organization is completed:  
(5) all of it (4) most (3) some  
(2) little (1) none

## VIII. RELATIONS WITH SUBORDINATES

24. Compliments and thanks his subordinates appropriately and sincerely:  
(5) very frequently (4) quite frequently  
(3) sometimes (2) seldom  
(1) often criticizes negatively
25. Is available to counsel and assist subordinates:  
(5) sufficiently (4) almost sufficiently  
(3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never
26. Recognizes and rewards meritorious achievement of his subordinates:  
(5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
(2) seldom (1) never
27. Possesses insight into the problems encountered by his subordinates:  
(5) complete (4) much (3) some  
(2) little (1) none

28. Is honest and dependable in dealings with subordinates:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
29. Displays unwarranted favoritism to some subordinates:  
 (5) never (4) seldom (3) sometimes  
 (2) often (1) continuously \_\_\_\_\_
30. Appropriates ideas and work of subordinates to improve his own standing:  
 (5) never (4) seldom (3) sometimes  
 (2) often (1) continuously \_\_\_\_\_
31. Does everything possible, consistent with a subordinate's ability and achievement, to advance him:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) seldom  
 (2) never (1) curbs advancement \_\_\_\_\_
32. Is just and considerate in discharging subordinates:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) seldom  
 (2) sometimes (1) never \_\_\_\_\_
33. The general morale of his staff:  
 (5) exceptionally high (4) good  
 (3) fair (2) poor (1) very low \_\_\_\_\_

#### IX. PUBLIC RELATIONS

34. Promotes public relations:  
 (5) actively good (4) fair (3) poor  
 (2) not at all (1) actively bad \_\_\_\_\_

#### X. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

35. Attempts to orient his work to the welfare of society at large:  
 (5) exceptionally well (4) well  
 (3) fairly well (2) indifferently (1) poorly \_\_\_\_\_
36. Team work: conforms to the purposes and plans of the organization which he serves: does not seek unfair advantage for his unit:  
 (5) always (4) usually (3) sometimes  
 (2) seldom (1) never \_\_\_\_\_

## CORRELATIONAL DATA

In analyzing the data for all the administrators and from all the divisions involved, it is desirable to know if any of the following factors make consistent differences. Will you therefore supply the following information about yourself?

- A. Your age?  
 22 or below     23-29     30-44     45-59  
 60 or over
- B. Your rank?  
 Department Chairman     Division Chairman  
 Dean/Director     Administrative Assistant  
 Administrative Supervisor
- C. Your education?  
 No formal degree     Bachelor's degree  
 Master's degree     Doctor's degree
- D. Your years of college teaching experience?  
 2 years or less     3-5 years     6-9 years  
 10-19 years     20 years or more
- E. How many years have you served under your present administrator?  
 1 year or less     2-3 years     4-6 years  
 7-9 years     10 years or more
- F. Your sex?  
 Male     Female
- G. Of how many professional societies are you a member? (including associate memberships)  
 none     1     2     3     4 or more
- H. In the past five years, how many offices (including committee chairmanships) in professional societies have you held?  
 none     1     2     3     4 or more
- I. In the past five years, how many papers have your read at professional society meetings?  
 none     1     2     3     4 or more
- J. In the past two years, how many meetings of professional societies of which you are a member have you attended?  
 none     1     2     3     4 or more

K. In the past five years, how many articles of yours have been published in professional journals (including co-authorships and accepted manuscripts)?  
 \_\_\_ none \_\_\_ 1-3 \_\_\_ 4-6 \_\_\_ 7-9 \_\_\_ 10 or more

L. In the past five years, how many books of yours have been published (including co-authorships and accepted manuscripts)?  
 \_\_\_ none \_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 4 or more

M. The next four questions ask how much of your contractual time you spend in teaching, research, administration, committee. The total should be 100% of your time.

Approximately how much of your contractual time do you spend in teaching?

\_\_\_ none \_\_\_ 25% \_\_\_ 50% \_\_\_ 75% \_\_\_ 100%

In research?

\_\_\_ none \_\_\_ 25% \_\_\_ 50% \_\_\_ 75% \_\_\_ 100%

In administration?

\_\_\_ none \_\_\_ 25% \_\_\_ 50% \_\_\_ 75% \_\_\_ 100%

In committee?

\_\_\_ none \_\_\_ 25% \_\_\_ 50% \_\_\_ 75% \_\_\_ 100%

N. In which group do you fall as far as annual salary is concerned?

\_\_\_ below \$10,000 \_\_\_ \$10,000-14,999  
 \_\_\_ \$15,000-19,999 \_\_\_ \$20,000-24,999  
 \_\_\_ \$25,000 or more

## Appendix II

## RAW SCORES: PURDUE RATING SCALE

Total raw scores for items listed in the Purdue Rating Scale for Administrators have been averaged. Responses by SCCD administrators totalled 22, therefore, such total raw scores were divided by 22. Responses by PCC administrators totalled 23 and the total raw scores were divided by that number.

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>PCC Scores</u>	<u>SCCD Scores</u>
1	4.5	4.5
2	4.8	4.6
3	4.3	4.7
4	4.5	4.7
5	3.0	3.0
6	4.2	4.0
7	3.7	3.8
8	4.1	4.0
9	4.4	4.4
10	4.2	4.0
11	4.0	4.0
12	4.0	4.2
13	3.9	4.0
14	4.0	4.1
15	4.3	4.4
16	4.2	4.3
17	3.4	3.6

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>PCC Scores</u>	<u>SCGD Scores</u>
18	4.8	4.7
19	4.3	4.2
20	4.7	4.5
21	4.5	4.4
22	4.4	4.4
23	4.2	4.2
24	3.5	4.0
25	4.6	4.5
26	3.9	3.9
27	3.8	4.0
28	4.6	4.6
29	4.1	4.3
30	4.5	4.5
31	4.3	4.4
32	4.4	4.7
33	4.2	4.2
34	4.5	4.5
35	4.0	4.1
36	4.1	4.4

APPENDIX III

BUDGET DETAILS - SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND  
 PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE 1971-72  
 (In \$1,000)

Classification	District	Central	North	South	Total	Portland
<u>Salaries</u>						
Administration	\$ 51.4	\$ 84.1	\$ 58.0	\$ 45.8	\$ 239.3	\$ 109.2
College Services	130.4	19.5	18.8		168.7	146.0
Accountants, Clerks	222.8	33.4	25.4		281.6	217.3
Secretaries	119.9	438.6	225.9	81.5	865.9	391.1
Part-time	59.8	176.1	72.2	52.5	360.6	162.6
<u>Instructional</u>						
Adm. Ofc. Voc.-Tech.	89.4				89.4	
Deans and Directors		110.0	57.7	69.5	237.2	131.2
Coordinators and Division Chairmen		285.3	167.5	34.5	487.3	349.8
Tutors		6.6			6.6	19.1
Instructors		1,907.0	737.1	302.1	2,946.2	2,926.4
Part-time		526.5	331.8	237.0	1,095.3	1,235.2
Attendants and Clerks	18.6			31.9	50.5	65.6
Special Program	12.0	190.5	51.6		254.1	134.2
Work Study	14.5				14.5	
Auxiliary Services						15.2
<u>Student Services</u>						
Directors		50.2	47.3	17.0	114.5	
Counselors		214.3	49.3	27.7	291.3	167.8
Psych. and Testing						14.1

212



<u>Instructional Resources</u>						
Administration	\$ 36.5				\$ 36.5	\$ 17.8
Directors		\$ 19.1	\$ 18.5		37.6	31.4
Media			30.2		30.2	102.8
Librarians	23.2	100.3	37.7	\$ 30.0	191.2	42.8
Library Aides		53.1	36.5	5.8	95.4	15.1
Part-time			9.0		9.0	33.6
Maintenance	4.1	29.2	9.6		42.9	61.0
Administration		13.0			13.0	18.5
Security		17.0	19.3		36.3	57.0
Custodians		206.0	107.5	70.1	383.6	301.8
part-time			7.2	56.4	63.6	29.9
Increments		<u>64.0</u>			<u>64.0</u>	
Total Salaries	\$ 782.6	\$4,543.8	\$2,118.1	\$1,061.8	\$8,506.3	\$6,796.5
Contingencies						397.6
Employee Benefits	670.9				670.9	800.2
Other Expenses	<u>409.9</u>	<u>1,062.8</u>	<u>349.9</u>	<u>305.7</u>	<u>2,128.3</u>	<u>1,244.4</u>
Totals	<u>\$1,863.4</u>	<u>\$5,606.6</u>	<u>\$2,468.0</u>	<u>\$1,367.5</u>	<u>\$11,305.5</u>	<u>\$9,238.7</u>

## Appendix IV

## GUIDELINES FOR MULTI-UNIT COLLEGES

In view of the findings of the study, "Administration and Organization of Multicampus Districts," and what has happened in the multicampus districts since the study was completed, the following guidelines are summarized for your consideration in the organization and development of a multicampus district. Please keep in mind that there is no best pattern or plan of organization for a multicampus district. In fact, it is our belief that we should not all have the same plan of organization and that it is good for districts to experiment. As guidelines, we suggest the following:

## A. Central Office Functions

1. Chancellor

Representing the Board of Trustees--responsible for general administration of entire district, including development of and recommending policy, financial planning, public relation, local and state governmental relations, coordination of district's instructional offerings, and staff coordination.

2. That the central office needs at least three administrative positions besides the chief administrator, (chancellor) but the level of these positions on the personnel scale can be the same as or lower than the chief campus administrators. All do not have to be the same level. The positions needed are as follows:

- a. Assistant Chancellor-for Business: All of the hundred administrators interviewed during the investigation agreed that there must be someone at the central office in charge of business affairs for the district. This enables the district to obtain the economies of a large organization while maintaining smaller individual colleges or campuses. The district's financial office should be responsible for making all financial reports required by the

state, accounting, budget coordination, plant maintenance and development, payroll, purchasing, interdistrict contracts, data processing, etc.

We recommend that the director of business have an employee at each campus to supervise student funds and local college petty cash funds.

NOTE: Central business service provides the biggest single saving to a multi-college district.

In their recent financial study of California junior colleges, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education found that:

- (1) Multicollege districts' administration costs were approximately \$23 less per unit of ADA than the single-college districts.
- (2) Management and operation of buildings and grounds average \$9 less per unit of ADA than single-college districts.

- b. Assistant Chancellor for Instruction: The district needs someone at the central office to coordinate the instructional program to insure maximum efficiency and to avoid unnecessary duplication of offerings. The assistant chancellor of instruction would serve on each college's curriculum committee thereby aiding the colleges in coordination of their instructional programs. He would coordinate articulation with other colleges and universities. Other functions of this office should be: coordination of the district's educational resources-- educational television, audio-visual, research, central dial information system, etc. Another responsibility would be maintaining the master list of the courses offered and of their numbers.

We believe there should be a person at the central office under the assistant chancellor of instruction or co-equal who would be responsible for the

district's community services, extension centers, and coordination of evening classes.

Conventional concepts of curriculum, class size, and calendar are beginning to crack as the college population expands and the costs increase. External and internal pressures from increasing numbers force us to find ways to do more with less.

c. Director of Semiprofessional Education - Business, Technical, and Vocational:

This is a very important and necessary position in today's community colleges, especially in our large urban centers. There exists a crying need for technical and vocational education in our large urban communities, and our community colleges need to do more in this area.

The technical and vocational program must be as prestigious in the eyes of the governing board, chancellor, and the chief campus administrators as the academic or transfer program. The attitudes of these top administrators will be reflected by the faculty, students, and the community at large.

One of the best ways to give equal status to the technical and vocational program is to provide it with high quality leadership. The director should have a doctorate, practical work experience, and be at a level equal to the director of instruction for the district. On the individual campuses, the dean of technical and vocational education (or dean of applied arts) should be at the same level as the dean of academic studies.

3. That the central office be located completely away from all campuses and, if possible, centrally located within the district. This should be completed as soon as possible after the second college is completed and operating. District personnel did not appreciate having the central office on one of the campuses.

None of the administrators on whose campus the central office was located really liked it, and administrators on other campuses claimed that this gave the central office campus a favored position. All of the chief administrators considered the location of the central office to be an important decision. They all stated that it should definitely be located away from any of the campuses, and suggested some central location within the district. Oakland and San Diego have moved their central offices away from any campus. The chief administrator of the district must exercise care so that the district headquarters does not overshadow the individual campuses or lack of identification with a local campus or college by students, faculty, and residents will occur.

4. That no one at the central office, other than the chief administrator for the district, be at a level higher than that of the chief campus administrators. In districts where central office administrators, other than the chief central office administrator, outranked the chief campus administrators, there was unrest and dissatisfaction not only among the chief campus administrators, but also among other campus administrators and faculty. In higher education, chief campus administrators should and must have direct access to the chief administrator for the district.

St. Louis has dropped its central office position of vice president for instruction and raised each of the chief campus administrators to a vice president and an officer of the district.

#### B. Individual College Functions

1. That each campus should have as much autonomy as the district can give to it. We feel that each campus or college should have the right to present its ideas for development of its campus. The campus president needs to be a leader who will help to translate educational ideas into reality. However, at all times, the final decision must be in

the hands of the chief administrator of the district and/or the board of trustees. The organization of multicollge districts allows for more efficient administration, with happier and more satisfied faculty and students.

Within the district's framework, individual colleges should enjoy as much autonomy as possible. For example: Merritt College in the Peralta Junior College District plans to go on the quarter system in the fall of 1967; Laney College will not.

2. That experimentation on the campus level should be encouraged and supported. This helps staff morale and encourages creativeness.
3. That each campus should be allowed to hire its own personnel. Central office should serve only a staff relationship in the area of hiring personnel - one of coordination and not one of supervising or directing.
4. That the people hired for the positions of chief administrators on the campuses agree with the philosophy of the organization as laid down by the board of trustees. In administration, everything depends on the man. Almost any system will work with the right administrator, and almost no system will work if the wrong person is managing things. Furthermore, a system tends to become distorted by the person who is administering. All of this is particularly true in multicampuses where there are the added disadvantages of communication and transportation.
5. That the right type for chairman of a department be chosen. The responsibility of selecting a chairman is much more critical in a multicampus district and especially so if he is what San Diego calls Joint Chairman, for then he is the chairman of a department operating on more than one campus. He must be:
  - a. Fair to all campuses.

- b. Willing to travel to the other campus or campuses to make his administration a personal affair.
  - c. Adept at bringing together periodically the entire personnel on all campuses.
  - d. Able to help his departments on all campuses to be equally fruitful and energetic in their service to the student.
6. **Mutual Respect:** Teachers and administrators need to recognize the responsibilities and competencies of each other. Teachers must have "freedom to teach" and administrators, "freedom to administer." Each is specially trained and selected for his particular assignment. Teachers need to recognize that their primary responsibility is to teach, not to administer. Gross inefficiency and confusion results from failure to follow this principle.
7. **Leadership:** A major factor in the success or failure of changing patterns in junior college district organization will be determined by the calibre of leadership exhibited by teachers, administrators and governing boards. None can afford to be led by "dissidents" and "troublemakers." The "public image" of each group will be measured by the calibre of its spokesmen.

There is great need for statesmanship of the highest order as junior colleges evolve new patterns of operation. True leadership is the fine art of making disciples or followers. A great challenge faces every administrator, so that he not become just a glorified office boy or even just a mediator between the Board and the faculty. He needs to be a professional leader worthy of receiving support.

In closing, a multicollge junior college district must be:

1. United in purpose and basic principles.

2. United on such fundamental matters as standards governing the appointment of faculty and the admission of students.
3. United in academic planning to prevent unnecessary duplication.

Set up your organization very loose and flexible at first. Work with your faculties. The faculty is rightly interested and should participate in the planning for additional colleges.

Multicampus junior college districts are here to stay and, even though there are problems, the numbers will increase. Human nature being what it is, as these districts progress through their developmental cycle, the campuses will tend to become more independent and the majority of multicampus districts will eventually become multicollege districts.



## Appendix V

## PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

## ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES

1971-72

President		\$ 32,800
<u>Assistants to the President</u>		
Assistant in Administration Coordinator, Curriculum Development	\$14,144 14,300	
Coordinator, Special Projects	13,439	
Coordinator, Public Information	16,849	
Assistant in Planning and Research	17,685	<u>76,417</u>
Total President's Office		\$109,217
<u>Divisions - Instructional Administration</u>		
Dean, Math, Science and Related Technology	\$21,057	
Dean, Social Science, Business and Related Technology	23,314	
Dean, Communications and Related Technology	21,057	
Dean, Life Science, Health and Related Technology	19,500	
Director Community Education	<u>18,750</u>	103,678
<u>College Services</u>		
Director College Services	\$21,057	
Business Manager	18,570	
Director of Personnel	18,570	
Registrar	16,849	
Coordinators	59,655	
Purchasing	<u>11,374</u>	146,075

Instructional Coordination and Librarian

Division Chairmen and Coordinators	\$349,757	
Part-time Supervision	27,500	
Librarian	<u>17,865</u>	<u>395,122</u>
Total Administrative Salaries (excluding Maintenance)		<u>\$754,092</u>

## Appendix VI

## COMPARISON OF EMPLOYEE CLASSIFICATIONS

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1971-72

<u>Titles</u>	<u>PCC</u>	<u>SCCD</u>
Administrators	43	81
Instructors	263	245
Counselors	13.5	28
Audio Visual	29	38
Auxiliary	10	7
Secretarial	63	123
Accountants, Cashiers, Clerical	31	39
Tutors	2	1
Maintenance	<u>62</u>	<u>56</u>
Totals	<u>516.5</u>	<u>618</u>

## Appendix VII

## SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

## ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES

1971-72

District Administration

Executive Committee	\$ 15,600	
Administrative Assistant	20,900	
Vice President Business and Finance	27,000	
Controller	20,508	
Director Data Processing	15,840	
Internal Auditor	14,900	
Personnel Manager	15,500	
Budget Officer	14,004	
Chief Accountant	11,756	
Purchasing Agent	14,756	
Payroll Supervisor	<u>11,004</u>	\$ 181,768

District Administration Voc-Tech.

Vice President Occupations	\$ 24,000	
Director Grants	17,630	
Director Ed. Tech. Lab.	17,630	
Coordinator Programs	17,630	
Supervisor Dev. Services	<u>12,500</u>	89,390

District Administration IRC36,500

Total District Office

\$ 307,658

Administrators on Campuses

Presidents	\$ 64,400	
Business Managers	38,250	
Facilities Planning	8,000	
Administrative Assistant	4,500	
Public Relations	17,440	
Registrars	69,250	
Director Minority Affairs	<u>24,400</u>	226,240

Administration Instruction and College Service

Deans and Directors	\$237,272	
Division Chairmen and Coordinators	487,310	
Directors Financial Aid and Activities	<u>97,461</u>	\$ 822,043

Administration Instructional Media

Directors	\$ <u>37,580</u>	<u>37,580</u>
-----------	------------------	---------------

Total Administrative  
Salaries (excluding  
Maintenance)

\$1,393,521