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ABSTRACT

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE TO UNSATISFACTORY FACULTY PERFORMANCE AT SELECTED WESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Adele Cereghino Koot, Doctor of Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 1983

Major Professor: Dr. Anthony Saville
Department: Educational Administration and Higher Education

This research analyzed administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance at 158 Western public community colleges. Participating administrators completed a questionnaire which described nine personnel situations involving unsatisfactory faculty performance. The situations differed as to the length of employment, tenure status, racial background, and political influence of the faculty member.

Chi square analysis was used to analyze responses to the nine personnel situations based upon seven institutional variables determined from the questionnaire. Participants were also asked to enclose a copy of their current personnel policy manual. Seventy-six documents were received.

Results were as follows:
1. A very narrow range of strategies was used by administrators when confronted with unsatisfactory faculty. Dismissal and counseling were the most frequently employed methods.

2. Dismissal was the strategy of choice in situations describing clearly documented incompetence. Respondents were somewhat less likely to choose this strategy if a minority faculty member or a politically influential faculty member were involved.

3. Counseling was preferred for recently tenured faculty who had become unresponsive, or for unsatisfactory faculty who had been with the institution for many years and had a history of satisfactory performance.

4. No statistically significant differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance were found based upon institutional size or history of dismissals within the last five years.

5. Administrators from campuses with tenure were more likely to choose the dismissal response for untenured, unsatisfactory faculty who had been at the college two to three years than were administrators from institutions which did not grant tenure. When the unsatisfactory faculty member was tenured in the same situation, the administrators from institutions with tenure were more likely to select the counseling approach than
administrators from non-tenure granting institutions.

6. Nearly 89 percent of the colleges reported that they had written personnel policies. Only 13 colleges reported a lack of written personnel policies.

7. Nearly 72 percent of the surveyed colleges reported faculty dismissals within the last five years.

8. Only two respondents reported unsuccessful dismissal attempts.

9. Sixteen documents addressed the unsatisfactory performer. Thirteen of these documents described professional improvement plans.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Economic and societal conditions in the 1980's have had an adverse effect upon higher education. It has been "widely recognized and generally accepted that a quarter of a century of unparalleled growth in American higher education has come to an end" (25, 1981, p. 16). Kaplin has noted that because of the pressures of inflation, rise in the retirement age to 70 years, and decreased enrollments, few new faculty positions are available (33, 1980, p. 53). During this period of retrenchment there has been an increased demand for accountability and concern for what to do with "academic deadwood." Governing boards in at least two Western states, Nevada and Colorado, have made recent attempts to alter faculty evaluation and tenure policies in response to demands for accountability (66, 1982, p. 1, 24).

An increasing concern has been shown for the topic of the unsatisfactory performer as evidenced by the additional number of pages spent addressing the problem in personnel texts (11, 1976; 12, 1981). The negative institutional effects associated with ineffective personnel performance
have been listed by Castetter as including tardiness, absenteeism, retraining costs, reduced productivity and morale, increased burden upon coworkers, legal costs, increased supervisory responsibility, errors, and inefficiency (12, 1981, p. 282). Institutions have been particularly disadvantaged by these problems related to unsatisfactory performance during a negative economic climate.

A recent statement by Kavina summarized the confusing situation in which many administrators feel currently involved with regard to personnel issues:

Society has imposed a dilemma upon executives. On the one hand the executive is expected to lead the organization towards maximum productivity. On the other hand interpretations of the Constitution, due process decisions by the courts, and promulgation of job security through legislation have restricted personnel options available to the executive (34, 1981, p. 4).

Was this restriction of personnel options detectable in Western community colleges? Strategies used by community college administrators to deal with unsatisfactory faculty performance had not previously been determined.

Adding to the executive's dilemma has been the current popularity of Japanese management techniques which call for the administrator to adopt a more subtle approach to personnel problems or "develop extraordinary qualities in ordinary men" (54, 1981, p. 68). During periods of decline few institutional resources have been available for faculty
development programs. Additionally, the concept of nonpromotability may be of concern to community college administrators. Once a job has been mastered it "loses its freshness . . . and the duties become routine" (62, 1977, p. 61). Declining enrollments and decreased funding usually mean less opportunity for faculty advancement. It is a possibility that many more faculty members will enter the category of "nonpromotables" and become unsatisfactory employees in the future. According to Watson and Nelson, administrators can expect increasing personnel problems during periods of decline since "people are likely to lower their expectations and performance when opportunities are severely limited" (77, 1982, p. 415).

The National Commission on Excellence in Education believed

our nation is at risk . . . . While we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity (30, 1983, p. 1).

It is clear that administrators have been under public pressure to raise the standards of their institutions including faculty performance standards. Faculty, however, have perceived themselves as "stuck" with few growth opportunities available to them which can manifest itself in lowered performance. Faculty positions have been scarce
which contributes to the increased probability of litigation resulting from faculty dismissal since "termination may well mean removal from a profession, not just a position" (61, 1977, p. 123).

Administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance has not been extensively researched. A previous study of public and private school systems, governmental agencies, and private noneducational organizations has been reported and served as the impetus for the present research (34, 1981). Several personnel textbooks and journals addressed the general management of the unsatisfactory performer, but much of the information was based upon the authors' prior experience rather than research data (7, 1975; 12, 1981; 23, 1981; 62, 1977; 72, 1968). A computer search revealed no publications specifically investigating this topic at the community college level. Although there has been no research to substantiate what the answers are to the difficult personnel problems surrounding ineffective performance, a logical first step was to gain information on current personnel practices in an effort to better define the problem.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this research was to analyze administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty
performance at selected Western public community colleges. The 158 institutions studied were listed in the 1982 Community, Junior and Technical College Directory (CJTCD), and were located in the following states: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming (81, 1982).

With this purpose in mind the following question served as the basis for the evaluation and analysis of the data:

1. What were the strategies used by community college administrators to cope with unsatisfactory faculty?

The following sub-questions were also addressed:

2. Were there differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty based upon size of institution?

3. Were there differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty between single campus and multi-campus institutions?

4. Did the institutions studied have written personnel policies addressing the unsatisfactory performer and such related personnel issues as termination, transfer, promotion and tenure?

5. Were there noted differences between written personnel policies and reported personnel strategies?

6. Were there differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty between campuses which provided
tenure and campuses which did not grant tenure?

7. Were there differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty based upon history of successful dismissal of faculty?

8. Did administrators who preferred to delegate faculty disciplinary tasks respond differently to unsatisfactory faculty than did administrators who personally disciplined faculty?

Hypotheses

The null hypotheses tested were:

1. There are no statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level among administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at very large, large, medium-sized, or small institutions.

2. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at single campus or multi-campus institutions.

3. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at campuses with written personnel policies and campuses without written personnel policies.

4. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at campuses which grant tenure and
5. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who have dismissed faculty within the last five years and administrators who have not dismissed faculty within the last five years.

6. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who have successfully dismissed faculty and administrators who have not successfully dismissed faculty.

7. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who prefer to delegate disciplinary tasks and administrators who do not delegate disciplinary tasks.

Research Hypotheses

Based on the statement of the problem, null hypotheses, and previous research the anticipated results of this study were:

1. There are statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level among administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at very large, large, medium-sized, or small institutions.

2. There is a statistically significant difference at
the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at single campus or multi-campus institutions.

3. There is a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at single campus or multi-campus institutions.

4. There is a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at campuses with written personnel policies and campuses without written personnel policies.

5. There is a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at campuses which grant tenure and campuses which do not provide tenure.

6. There is a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who have dismissed faculty within the last five years and administrators who have not dismissed faculty within the last five years.

7. There is a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who prefer to delegate disciplinary tasks and administrators who do not delegate disciplinary
tasks.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:

1. The organizations surveyed had procedures for evaluating faculty and have had unsatisfactory faculty. The previous research by Kavina and numerous studies of faculty evaluation systems supported this assumption (34, 1981, p. 2; 13, 1979; 46, 1979; 74, 1981). Menzie reported that in 1973 three-fourths of all community colleges had a formal evaluation system (40, 1973, p. 1651).

2. All college chief executive officers received printed directions for completing the questionnaire (see Appendix A), and it was assumed that the questionnaire contained in Appendix B was an appropriate instrument for measuring administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance. The instrument had no established reliability or validity, but similar questions had been asked previously of administrators (34, 1981, p. 1-5). Content validity was established through evaluation of the questionnaire by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas educational administration faculty and the Vice-President for Personnel of the California Community College System.

Limitations

The investigation was limited by the following
factors:

1. A one-group, post-test only research design was used. The nature of the research was descriptive using a survey approach.

2. Validity of the study might have been influenced by role selection. No explanation of the instrument other than directions for completion and a general statement of purpose was given to the subjects. Anonymous responses were requested to control for the effect (5, 1972, p. 170).

3. Random sampling techniques were not used. All chief executive officers at 237 Western public community colleges were asked to respond to a mailed questionnaire. Volunteer bias might have been a factor in this investigation since a 69.6 percent response rate was obtained representing a convenience sample of the accessible population. Follow-up reminders (see Appendix C) and a second mailing (see Appendix D) were used in an attempt to increase the response rate (20, 1980, p. 84).

4. The questionnaire was distributed to 237 selected Western community college chief executive officers. One hundred and fifty-eight usable questionnaires were returned, and 76 personnel documents from 70 colleges were received. Data analysis was limited to these responses. No inferences can be made beyond this population or geographic region, because of the relatively moderate
response rate.

5. Thirty-four of the 76 personnel documents were partial excerpts, making conclusions about the presence or absence of specific personnel guidelines at the participating colleges difficult to determine.

**Method of Research**

Chief executive officers at 237 Western public community colleges were eligible for inclusion in this investigation. Each participant was asked to complete a questionnaire which described nine personnel situations requiring administrative response. Seven institutional variables were determined: (1) institutional size; (2) institutional type (single or multi-campus); (3) presence of written personnel policies; (4) presence of guidelines for termination, transfer, promotion and tenure; (5) prevalence of faculty dismissals; (6) prevalence of dismissal case appeals; and (7) preference of administrators for delegation or non-delegation of personnel tasks. Sixty-three two-way crosstabulation tables were analyzed using the chi square test of independence to determine significant administrative response differences to the nine situations based upon the seven variables. The personnel documents were studied using content analysis, and the frequency with which varying personnel guidelines were described was determined.
Definition of Terms

Definitions of terms used in this study were:

Western community college  A public community, junior, or technical college listed in the 1982 CJTCD located in one of the following states: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington or Wyoming.

Chief executive officer  The presiding officer at a Western community college. Chief executive officers included persons with the following titles: president, campus president, executive dean, superintendent-president, vice-president, provost, or director.

Small institution  A community college having a headcount, full and part-time enrollment for credit courses of 4,999 or under.

Medium-sized institution  A community college having a headcount, full and part-time enrollment for credit courses of between 5,000-9,999.

Large institution  A community college having a headcount, full and part-time enrollment for credit courses of between 10,000-19,999.

Very large institution  A community college having a headcount, full and part-time enrollment for credit courses of 20,000 or over.

Type of institution  A phrase used in this
dissertation to mean a single campus college or a college that was part of a multi-campus district.

Unsatisfactory faculty performance Performance which did "not [meet] organizational requirements, specifications, or standards" (12, 1981, p. 283).

Dismissal A "separation from the payroll or cessation of employment for whatever reason" (7, 1975, p. 363).


Demotion A "reassignment of an employee to a job of lower status and pay" (7, 1975, p. 362).

Position modification An increase or decrease in the responsibilities of an employee. Position modification could have involved the reassignment of work to others, job enlargement, or job enrichment (12, 1981, p. 296).

Dehiring The indirect firing of an employee. The subtle encouragement of an employee to resign (72, 1968, p. 46).

Early retirement A "reasonable and socially acceptable way of severing people from the system when they are no longer able or willing to perform effectively" (12, 1981, p. 302). Early retirement assumed that the employee would receive the benefits of retirement upon leaving the institution.
Counseling  Any number of interpersonal techniques used to bring the employee's performance up to standard.

Organization of the Study

A brief description of information presented in this dissertation follows. Chapter one included a statement of the problem, hypotheses, assumptions, limitations, methodology, definition of terms and other related introductory matter. Chapter two presented a review of the literature concerning administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty. Research procedures were described in Chapter three. Chapter four presented the results of the survey and hypotheses testing, a description of the personnel documents, and an analysis of the findings. Chapter five included a summary of the research, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature pertaining to unsatisfactory faculty performance. Three basic phases of personnel management have been described: hiring, employment, and withdrawal (65, 1980). The hiring phase has encompassed recruitment, selection and appointment of staff. The employment phase has been concerned with all conditions of the work environment and has included placement, career development, promotion, and transfer. The withdrawal phase of personnel administration has included all aspects of separation, dismissal or termination from the institution. The focus of this dissertation was on the employment and withdrawal phases of personnel management. The specific purpose of this review was to relate personnel decisions regarding unsatisfactory faculty to larger educational issues and to describe primary research studies of unsatisfactory faculty. Since very little research in the area of unsatisfactory community college faculty could be found, the literature cited included cases from elementary, secondary and higher education. The scope of the review
was confined to the following sequence of topics:

1. Personnel Decisions Regarding Unsatisfactory Faculty and:
   a. The Law
   b. Personnel Documents
   c. Professional Evaluation
   d. Tenure
   e. Disciplinary Procedures
   f. The Profession

2. Primary Research Studies of Unsatisfactory Faculty

These topics were by no means discrete, and there was considerable interrelationship among these categories in the literature.

Personnel Decisions Regarding Unsatisfactory Faculty and the Law

The administrator faced with a difficult personnel decision must be familiar with the laws regarding dismissal of faculty. An increase in involuntary dismissals within higher education has been predicted by Kaplin, due to such societal issues as the rise in the mandatory retirement age, inflation, and declining enrollments (33, 1980, p. 53-54). Incompetency, insubordination, immorality and disability have been the most common reasons for termination of tenured higher education faculty for adequate cause (33, 1980, p. 54). Kaplin recommended that
institutions carefully define "adequate cause" and the terms used as examples of cause in order to avoid legal problems. Options offered by Kaplin instead of termination of tenured faculty for cause included: early retirement plans, plans for reduced teaching assignments, retraining of faculty, and non-tenure contracts. Kaplin and Baird and McArthur reminded administrators that they must follow all published guidelines when making personnel decisions, and that termination of tenured faculty always deprives them of property rights making due process procedures mandatory (32, 1978, p. 132; 6, 1976, p. 212).

Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth and Perry v. Sindermann were landmark decisions regarding faculty employment rights (8, 1972; 56, 1972). An early definition of due process was "the exercise of the powers of government in such a way as to protect individual rights" (58, 1968, p. 58). The later Roth case clarified the definition of due process by ruling that procedural safeguards such as giving notice and providing an opportunity for a hearing were necessary whenever an individual had been deprived of a property or liberty interest. Plaintiff Roth was employed on a one-year contract for the 1968-69 school year at Wisconsin State University on a non-tenured basis. In January of 1969 Roth was notified that he would not be rehired for the next
academic year. No reason for nonrenewal was given to Roth, and a hearing was not allowed. Roth contended that he should have been allowed due process. In the second case, Sindermann had been employed on a series of one-year contracts at Odessa Junior College from 1965 to 1969. Odessa Junior College had no formal tenure system, although the faculty handbook stated that:

The administration of the College wishes the faculty member to feel that he has permanent tenure as long as his teaching services are satisfactory and as long as he displays a cooperative attitude toward his co-workers and his superiors, and as long as he is happy in his work (56, 1972, p. 2699).

Sindermann also argued that his rights to due process had been violated.

The Supreme Court stated that the requirements for due process applied only to situations involving the deprivations of liberty and property interests provided for under the Fourteenth Amendment (8, 1972, p. 573-74; 6, 1976, p. 211). An example of a liberty interest is a charge made against a faculty member that could seriously damage his or her community reputation. Property interests have been created by rules which entitle individuals to specific benefits (8, 1972, p. 578). A property interest has been established, for example, with the attainment of tenure. The Court ruled against Roth, explaining that:

It stretches the concept too far to suggest that a person is deprived of 'liberty' when he is simply not rehired in one job but remains as free as before to
seek another (8, 1972, p. 575).
The Court ruled that Roth had no property interest or liberty interest under the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court ruled in favor of Sindermann, however, since the statement in the faculty handbook established Sindermann's property interest and entitlement to due process. In addition to the guidelines provided by the familiar Roth and Perry cases, the recent McClendon case (McClendon v. Morton 249 S.E. 2d 919 (W.Va. 1978)) provided due process protection for probationary faculty who have been required to attain a certain rank before application for tenure (33, 1980, p. 58).

Baird and McArthur listed seven due process procedures required for public employees:

1. advance notice of any charges against the employee;
2. a hearing prior to taking any action against the employee;
3. an impartial decision-maker to hear the matter and render a decision;
4. the right at the hearing to representation by counsel;
5. the further right at the hearing of the employee to confront his accusers;
6. the right at the hearing to cross-examine witnesses; and
7. the right to a written decision (6, 1976, p. 215).

In Munnelly's opinion four additional requirements were necessary:

1. right to introduce evidence
2. right to protection against arbitrary rulings
3. right to proof of damage
4. right to review by an appeal tribunal (45, 1979, p. 222).

In addition to these due process requirements, the administrator must also remember that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prevents discrimination in dismissal because of "race, color, religion, sex or national origin" (64, 1980, p. 1008).

Obvious sources of legal information and guidelines regarding faculty dismissal can be found in state statutes. College administrators must be familiar with their state education laws. The education statutes from the thirteen Western states pertinent to this research have been reviewed below. California, Colorado, Nevada, and Washington state statutes specifically listed causes for dismissal of unsatisfactory faculty. The state laws of Alaska, Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming did not directly address community college faculty dismissal and were, therefore, not discussed. The local governing boards of the two Idaho community colleges and the University of Alaska Board of Regents have been given the responsibility for establishing dismissal regulations as well as all other personnel policies (27, 1983; 31, 1981; 70, 1982-83). There was no mention of personnel guidelines relating to community college faculty in the state laws of Utah or Wyoming (75, 1981; 80, 1981). Arizona, Hawaii, Montana, New Mexico, and

The California education laws were very detailed with respect to community college faculty. Twenty-one pages were devoted to personnel matters (10, 1983, p. 152-73). The grounds for dismissal of faculty were listed as:

(a) Immoral or unprofessional conduct
(b) Commission, aiding, or advocating the commission of acts of criminal syndicalism, . . .
(c) Dishonesty
(d) Incompetency
(e) Evident unfitness for service
(f) Physical or mental condition unfitting him to instruct or associate with children
(g) Persistent violation of or refusal to obey the school laws of the state or reasonable regulations prescribed for the government of the public schools by the board of governors or by the governing board of the community district employing him
(h) Conviction of a felony or of any crime involving moral turpitude . . .
(k) Knowing membership by the employee in the Communist Party (10, 1983, p. 153-54).

Colorado Revised Statutes listed "mental disability, neglect of duty, conviction of a felony, insubordination, moral turpitude, and incompetency" as grounds for dismissal or nonrenewal (15, 1975). In addition, the "failure to meet reasonable written and published standards" was also listed as grounds for dismissal (15, 1975). The statutes required notice of dismissal or nonrenewal by February 15 of the first contract year or December 15 for
subsequent years. A hearing procedure was also outlined.

The Nevada Education Code stated that the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada System must establish regulations for dismissal of tenured faculty members or nonrenewal of contracts for good cause. "The regulations must specify what constitutes good cause" (48, 1982, p. 15053). The wording of the statute seemed to extend due process rights to the non-tenured employee. The only causes for dismissal specifically mentioned in the Nevada state laws related to failure to fulfill the requirements of the law and participation in activities or organizations which advocated overthrow of the United States government. The Board of Regents Code, however, is considered law in Nevada as the King case (King v. Board of Regents, 65 Nev 533 (1948)) established the dual powers of the legislature and the Regents over higher education (16, n.d., p. 1027).

Washington education laws specify that "sufficient cause" was the only grounds for dismissal. The laws stated that

sufficient cause shall also include aiding and abetting or participating in: (1) any unlawful act of violence; (2) Any unlawful act resulting in destruction of community college property; or (3) Any unlawful interference with the orderly conduct of the educational process (9, 1981, p. 49).

Federal guidelines with respect to due process and civil rights, and state statutes have been reviewed. A
summary of what case law has determined to be adequate cause for dismissal follows.

Both Tigges and Rosenberger and Plimpton presented excellent reviews of cases of public school teacher dismissal on grounds of incompetency (73, n.d.; 63, 1975). Successful public school teacher dismissal cases have been made for the following causes:

1. errors of fact in history and geometry
2. lack of knowledge of English grammar, spelling and punctuation
3. lack of proper organization of school work
4. failure to maintain classroom control
5. failure to maintain proper discipline and decorum in the classroom
6. lack of material presented to class
7. academic level maintained at level of weakest student
8. same teaching methods for 25 years
9. harsh treatment of pupils
10. lack of rapport with students
11. punitive grading practices
12. creation of fear in pupils
13. students did not progress as required
14. pupils did not learn much
15. lateness
16. refusal to accept supervision (63, 1975, p. 473-77; 73, n.d., p. 1102-18). Munnely has summarized these successful dismissal causes as being related to teaching methods, effects on pupils, teacher's personal attitude, and knowledge of subject matter (45, 1979, p. 223). Primary research studies related to legal guidelines for teacher dismissal have been discussed later in this review. In conclusion, readers have been advised that the quality of supporting testimony and written documentation are just as important as the cause for dismissal. Rosenberger and Plimpton have written that while incompetency is difficult to define,

[t]he basis for upholding dismissal was failure to meet standards which are based upon "common sense." The teacher did not do those things which "everyone knows" a competent teacher would do. Conversely, the teacher did those things which "everyone knows" a competent teacher would not do. A kind of "conventional wisdom" rather than any precise predetermined and announced standard was used to make the incompetence decision (63, 1975, p. 486).

Personnel Decisions Regarding Unsatisfactory Faculty and Personnel Documents

In addition to a working familiarity with state and federal education laws, administrators must have written guidelines, policies, and procedures to serve as a basis for personnel decision making. Faculty should have access to and knowledge of personnel policies. These policies and guidelines, however, have often been inadequate as two
research studies described below indicate.

An early study by Kintzer analyzed faculty handbooks from 51 California community colleges and found that 35 percent mentioned evaluation criteria, 11 percent described resignation procedures, 28 percent described retirement options, 25 percent mentioned tenure practices, and 64 percent described disciplinary procedures such as probation and expulsion (36, 1961, p. 20-23).

Holderfield did a content analysis of 105 community college personnel documents in six states to determine if faculty dismissal criteria were different for colleges administered by three different types of boards (28, 1975, p. 1). Forty-one colleges indicated that no written dismissal criteria were available. Holderfield also reviewed 111 court cases concerned with defining dismissal criteria from 1956 to 1974 and identified 14 general dismissal categories: for cause (seven cases), neglect of duty (12 cases), incompetency (seven cases), misconduct (15 cases), immoral conduct (32 cases), insubordination (8 cases), physical or mental incompetency (two cases), financial emergency (two cases), loss of enrollment (no case law), change of curriculum (no case law), conviction of crime (no case law), creating a disturbance (three cases), perjury (no case law), and vague dismissal criteria (23 cases) (28, 1975, p. 37-44). The study of court cases
appeared to have been national in scope, but it was unclear if only post-secondary cases were reviewed or if elementary and secondary cases were also included. In comparing case law definitions of dismissal criteria to those found in personnel documents from Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Mississippi community colleges Holderfield concluded that:

1. Inadequate statutory provisions for the dismissal of faculty were found in all six state community college systems, representing governing, governing-coordinating, and coordinating structures.

2. The governing systems had the largest percentage of adequate agency dismissal criteria . . .

3. More of the institutional dismissal criteria from the governing systems were adequate than were the institutional criteria from the other systems . . .

4. Each state system should review and modify its existing agency and institutional dismissal criteria, utilizing the most frequently reoccurring case law definitions for dismissal criteria (28, 1975, p. 79-81).

Collective bargaining agreements have become more common on two-year campuses, and many have replaced other documents as a source of personnel guidelines. Kemerer, Mensel and Baldridge reported that 98 percent of two year college collective bargaining agreements contained a grievance policy, 84 percent had a nonreappointment section, 86 percent described dismissal procedures, 83 percent described personnel evaluation procedures, 65
percent had a tenure section, 54 percent outlined retirement policies, 53 percent had a promotion policy, 40 percent described disciplinary actions, and 11 percent had merit pay guidelines (35, 1981, p. 23). Collective bargaining agreements appeared to contain more complete and detailed personnel guidelines than did other documents.

**Personnel Decisions Regarding Unsatisfactory Faculty and Professional Evaluation**

The three responsibilities of faculty in higher education have been listed as research, teaching and community service. Community colleges have placed little or no emphasis upon research activities, but additional community college faculty functions have included counseling and guidance, continuing or community education, and developmental education. Evaluation has taken two forms: formative, for faculty development purposes, and summative, for the purpose of making personnel decisions. Summative evaluation practices were of concern in this review. Miller summarized the areas in which faculty can be evaluated as: classroom teaching, advising, college committee work, management activities, performing and visual arts, professional services and consulting activities, publications, public service, and research (41, 1974, p. 16). Faculty have been evaluated by administrators, colleagues, self, students, or a
combination of the above methods. Multiple approaches to evaluation have been encouraged.

Centra surveyed 326 two-year colleges in 1976 and found that in 67 percent of the colleges at least half of the faculty were evaluated by means of student ratings (13, 1979, p. 12). Only 48 percent of the colleges used systematic administrative evaluations of at least half of the faculty. Peer and self evaluations were used to a lesser extent. These figures agreed closely with those of Menzie which indicated that 75 percent of community colleges had formal teacher evaluation programs (40, 1973, p. 1651). Newton noted that "higher education has been more resistant to performance-based personnel evaluation than any other area"(50, 1982, p. 39).

After reviewing court cases related to faculty evaluation, Holley and Feild listed 15 recommendations for developing performance evaluation systems which are in compliance with the law:

1. evaluation must be job-related
2. evaluation systems should evolve from job analysis
3. employees should be frequently observed
4. observable job behaviors should be evaluated
5. standardized scoring methods should be used
6. evaluation must not discriminate against
minorities

7. evaluation language should be precise and uniform
8. trained evaluators should be used
9. several independent evaluators should be used
10. evaluation should be supported by evidence of performance results
11. evaluation instruments should be designed with input from all campus groups
12. performance evaluation must precede personnel decisions
13. employees should know evaluation criteria
14. employees should be informed of the results of performance evaluations
15. policies for the use of performance evaluations should be developed (29, 1977, p. 447).

The demand for increased accountability in education by the public has made more sophisticated faculty evaluation mechanisms necessary. Personnel decisions have not been legally supportable unless formal written summative evaluation systems were in effect.

Personnel Decisions Regarding Unsatisfactory Faculty and Tenure

Tenure in higher education has been defined as the "right to continued or permanent employment subject to dismissal for cause" (16, n.d., p. 1023). Tenure may be
provided for in an employment contract (contractual tenure), described in state statute (statutory tenure), or implied by institutional practice (de facto tenure) (16, n.d., p. 1022-26). An example of de facto tenure has been cited earlier in the Perry case where the Odessa Junior College faculty handbook described tenure. Tenure has been further described as a mechanism "which generally provides guaranties against arbitrary dismissal . . . or disciplinary action" (16, n.d., p. 1022). Tenure has been justified as a crucial protection of academic freedom discouraging dismissal on ideological or political grounds. Tenure originated in medieval times as a means of protecting independent thinking scholars, and Harvard University had endowed chairs as early as 1721 (43, 1980, p. 2-3). By 1979, 88 percent of the unionized campuses and 55 percent of the nonunionized campuses had written tenure policies (35, 1981, p. 18). Approximately 59 percent of all full time faculty in higher education had tenure in 1982 (14, 1982, p. 44).

The arguments in favor of tenure have been summarized as follows:

1. tenure is essential for academic freedom
2. tenure creates a faculty with institutional loyalty
3. tenure provisions attract high ability faculty
4. tenure is necessary for institutions to compete for academic talent


The arguments against tenure have been listed as:

1. tenure is an inflexible financial burden to an institution

2. the tenure system makes it hard to recruit young faculty in periods of little growth

3. tenure emphasizes research productivity and not teaching

4. tenure makes institutional change difficult


At least one study disagreed with the faculty deadwood argument. Orpen found that the research productivity of 36 tenured and 36 non-tenured faculty at four large universities who had been matched as to age, seniority and professional degree was the same (53, 1982, p. 61). In addition, there had been a slight increase in research productivity among the tenured professors after tenure (53, 1982, p. 62).

In 1979 the College and University Personnel
Association conducted a survey of 371 public and private community colleges' tenure practices. Sixty percent of the institutions granted tenure (43, 1980, p. 110). Most institutions awarding tenure provided for dismissal for financial considerations and program termination in addition to "termination for cause" (43, 1980, p. 110). Only 12 institutions could dismiss tenured faculty for cause only. Eighty-nine percent of the public institutions granting tenure had formal written tenure policies (43, 1980, p. 112). The survey also determined that most institutions allowed a three month notice for termination of faculty who had served one year, a six months notice for second year faculty, and 12 months notice for faculty having served three or more years (43, 1980, p. 127-28). In the five year period between December 1972 and December 1977, 135 tenured faculty dismissals were reported (43, 1980, p. 133). Incompetency and discontinuation of program were the more frequently listed causes for termination. Fifty-seven percent of the surveyed institutions had established termination criteria with incompetency, financial considerations, moral turpitude, discontinuation of program, neglect of established obligations, and falsified credentials being the most commonly specified criteria (43, 1980, p. 129-30).

Kemerer, Mensel and Baldridge reported an increase in
formal faculty personnel procedures, a trend which they attributed to the fact that "negative employment decisions involving faculty members, such as nonrenewal and denial of tenure, are more likely to be challenged in a declining job market" (35, 1981, p. 20). White had noted that contested teacher dismissals are on the rise, and McNamara reported a 347 percent increase in teacher dismissal litigation from 1967 to 1977 (78, 1978, p. 1; 39, 1979, p. 12). Hellweg and Churchman found that the "annual turnover in tenure track positions in the United States has declined from around 8 percent per year in the 1960's to less than 2 percent per year in the 1970's" (25, 1981, p. 16).

Traditional tenure policies have already been challenged in five states including the two Western states of Nevada and Colorado (66, 1982, p. 1, 24). In Nevada, major University System Code changes were proposed calling for the review of tenured faculty and increasing the difficulty of receiving tenure (60, 1983, p. 30). Colorado regents were considering increasing the probationary period from six to seven years and defining new mechanisms for faculty lay-offs due to financial exigency or program termination (66, 1982, p. 24).

Amid the turmoil over tenure the following suggestions for alternatives to tenure have been proposed:

1. voluntary early retirement plans . . .
2. flexible retirement/tenure plans . . .
3. limited term tenure . . .
4. longer probationary periods . . .

In addition, Chait and Ford suggested non-tenure track appointments, tenure quotas, and term contract employment (14, 1982, p. 44). Although not the primary focus of the present research, some indication of the extent to which these tenure options were used among Western community colleges has been discussed in Chapter Four.

Personnel Decisions Regarding Unsatisfactory Faculty and Disciplinary Procedures

In a recent research study very closely related to the present investigation, Singh mailed a disciplinary policy questionnaire to a department chairman, a dean, and an academic vice-president or comparable campus administrator at 50 randomly selected colleges and 50 randomly selected universities (69, 1978, p. 213). Of the 300 questionnaires mailed, 177 were returned for a 59 percent response rate. Participants were asked to indicate whether or not their institution had a written set of disciplinary procedures and a written policy for termination of faculty. Respondents were also asked the extent of their involvement in disciplining or terminating tenured and non-tenured faculty and how they would rate their institution's disciplinary procedures. The final section of the questionnaire described increasingly severe disciplinary
actions ranging from "does not require disciplinary action" to "warning of recommended termination" and asked administrators to select the disciplinary action they believed was appropriate for each of 21 offenses (69, 1978, p. 268-71). The offenses described included such behaviors as lateness for class, absence from faculty meetings, insufficient class preparation, abuse of consulting privileges, arrest for a felony, and "undesirable social relationships with students" (69, 1978, p. 271).

Respondents were also asked to list reasons for termination on their campuses. Four null hypotheses were tested:

[1.] administrators have no preference for written or unwritten procedures for disciplining faculty members.

[2.] ... administrators do not believe their disciplinary policies require improvement.

[3.] ... there are no differences among administrators relative to their choice of disciplinary methods.

[4.] ... administrators have no preference for stern as opposed to less stern methods of discipline (69, 1978, p. 213).

Results showed that administrators had a strong preference for written disciplinary procedures and believed that their procedures could be improved. Only two faculty offenses elicited a statistically significant disciplinary preference among chairmen, deans, and academic vice-presidents. Vice-presidents did not believe the assignment of grades in an arbitrary manner and the lack of
cooperation with colleagues warranted disciplinary action to the degree that the chairmen or deans selected (69, 1978, p. 221-22). Perhaps this result simply reflected the relative remoteness of the vice-presidents from the classroom and day to day interaction with faculty. All administrators preferred the less stern disciplinary methods, and vice-presidents were slightly more lenient than the deans or chairmen. Singh also analyzed the responses from the three groups of administrators controlling for age and length of service. No differences in the results were noted based on age of administrator, but length of service did result in statistically significant response differences (69, 1978, p. 230). The offenses "late for office hours," "abuses sick leave," "poor rapport with colleagues," and "poor course planning" warranted decreasingly stern disciplinary actions as length of service increased. Singh noted that "the tendency to become lenient with time in office is unanimous across the board" (69, 1978, p. 231). The most frequently listed reason for termination was poor teaching with 69 percent of the responses. Financial exigencies comprised 29 percent of the responses and lack of scholarship, 26 percent (69, 1978, p. 234). Singh concluded with the presentation of a five step disciplinary model for higher education which has been summarized as:
1. informal procedures
   a. private conference
   b. group conference among involved faculty members, senior faculty members, and administrators
2. formal procedures
   a. structured meeting between faculty member and administrator where notes are kept and tape recordings made
   b. official letter becomes part of personnel file
   c. referral to higher administrative level for further action (69, 1978, p. 241-43).

Counseling or some form of oral reprimand has been frequently mentioned as the first step in the disciplinary process (44, 1982, p. 66-67; 19, 1980, p. 1). Pellicer and Hendrix listed the three basic disciplinary options as remediation, dismissal or ignore situation (55, 1980, p. 57). The use of a wider range of disciplinary actions such as suspension with or without pay, transfer and demotion is advocated by others (21, 1978, P. 2).

The most complete theoretical discussion of disciplinary procedures for faculty has been written by Castetter (12, 1981). Two basic options for the disciplinary decision prompted by unsatisfactory performance have been described. The unsatisfactory employee may be retained or separated from the organization (12, 1981, p. 296). Several approaches were described for
retaining employees which included: retraining or remediation, transferring of work to others, enlarging position responsibility, modifying position responsibilities, enriching position difficulty, lateral transfer, promotion, temporary reassignment, and demotion (12, 1981, p. 296-300). No research was cited to substantiate the effectiveness of the described retention options or to verify their current use in educational settings. The approaches for separation of an employee from the organization were listed as: early retirement (voluntary or involuntary), encouraged resignation or dehiring, and firing (12, 1981, p. 301). The options listed by Castetter appeared complete, and were helpful in constructing the questionnaire used in the present study. The text by Beach contained many of the same options (7, 1975, p. 355-63).

Halloran and Steinmetz pursued the retain or dismiss decision in greater psychological depth in terms of questions which must be resolved by the administrator (23, 1981; 72, 1968). Halloran outlined three questions, for example, which must be answered before a decision to fire an employee can be made:

1. Was honest criticism given to the employee concerning previous unsatisfactory work?

2. Is a qualified replacement available?

Steinmetz discussed the personnel option of dehiring or subtly encouraging an employee to resign. Advantages to dehiring were: no interpersonal confrontation, no questions asked about hiring practices which allowed employee access to organization, no morale problems with other employees regarding lack of job security, and the employees work record is not marred by a dismissal (72, 1968, p. 46-47). Disadvantages to dehiring were: the manager is not in control of the situation and the employee may not respond as desired, the most problematic employees often don't resign since no one else would hire them, and questionable tactics in terms of ethics are often used to encourage resignation (72, 1968, p. 47). No research was cited in support of the disciplinary procedures described, although the reader is left with the impression that dehiring is a commonly used personnel option. Henderson has concluded, however, "that often incompetent instructors are permitted to resign rather than to be dismissed" (26, 1960, p. 172). His study of the bases for teacher dismissal is discussed more fully later in this review.

Personnel Decisions Regarding Unsatisfactory Faculty and The Profession

The teaching profession has developed several
guidelines related to the termination of employees. The 1967 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment called for three months notice before termination during the first year of employment, six months notice during the second year, and at least 12 months notice thereafter (3, 1967, p. 407). The 1971 AAUP document concerning nonrenewal of faculty appointments has expanded the guidelines to recommend that faculty be periodically reviewed, be advised of review criteria, and have the opportunity to submit material during the probationary period. The AAUP further recommended that faculty be given written notice of the reasons for nonrenewal of appointment and be allowed to petition for review alleging violation of academic freedom or inadequate consideration (2, 1971, p. 206-10). Seven faculty dismissal guidelines have been presented in another AAUP document which recommended that faculty be advised of their shortcomings during a personal conference and be allowed time for remediation; initiation of formal proceedings be done in writing; suspension of the faculty member, if necessary, be with pay; a hearing committee be selected; the hearing committee follow due process guidelines and allow the faculty member counsel and the right to question witnesses; the committee transmit its decision to the governing body; and publicity during the
proceedings be avoided (1, 1958, p. 270-74).

In addition to the widely recognized AAUP guidelines, the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges made the following contract termination recommendations in 1970:

1. a Professional Practices Committee of three faculty be appointed by the Faculty Senate to review evaluations of alleged unsatisfactory faculty to determine if dismissal is justified

2. due process requirements be met

3. written reports be filed and a copy given to the faculty member

4. full pay during suspension be provided

5. the Governing Board should not terminate the faculty member unless recommended to do so by the Professional Practices Committee (47, 1970, p. 3-4).

Community colleges have traditionally been more dominated by administrators than have four year colleges and universities, and it is doubtful that many community colleges use the Professional Practices Committee mechanism when making personnel decisions. Rood has noted that even though the AAUP statements have "great moral sway within the academic community, . . . [they] receive no recognition in court, unless a school has made [the] statements part of its handbook or contract" (61, 1977, p. 146).
Factors which effect personnel decision making including legal guidelines, personnel documents, professional evaluation criteria, presence of tenure regulations, disciplinary procedures, and professional standards regarding personnel decision making have been discussed. Primary research studies related to personnel decisions such as dismissal of faculty have been reviewed in the concluding section of this chapter.

Primary Research Studies of Unsatisfactory Faculty

Executive responses to unsatisfactory employee performance have been sparsely investigated. A search of the educational literature found few primary research studies of educational personnel practices concerning the ineffective or unsatisfactory faculty member. Most of the research was confined to the dismissal option. Ten graduate studies were located in addition to the paper concerning unresponsive personnel in school systems, private business, and governmental agencies which initiated the present investigation.

Kavina mailed questionnaires to 160 public and private educational and noneducational organizations in eleven Western states (34, 1981, p. 1). Participants were asked to respond to three personnel situations. Situation one involved a new employee whose job expectations had been outlined and understood. The new employee's performance
was inadequate. Seventy-five percent of the respondents favored dismissal as the solution to situation one. Twenty percent indicated that some form of counseling would be the appropriate personnel option. In situation two the employee had been in the position for two to three years and had recently become unresponsive to new leadership. Thirty-nine percent of the respondents chose dismissal, 38 percent selected transfer, and 10 percent preferred a counseling method as appropriate for situation two. Only one percent of the school district administrators, however, selected the dismissal option. Whether this finding was due to the lack of opportunity to exercise the dismissal option or personal dislike for the option was not determined. Situation three specified that the employee had been in the position and the organization for many years and had a satisfactory performance record in the past. The current performance of the employee was unresponsive to new leadership. The transfer option received 57 percent of the responses, and dismissal was the choice of 20 percent of the respondents to situation three. Kavina concluded that:

Public agencies are severely restricted in their personnel policies much more so than organizations in the private sector (34, 1981, p. 4).

Cottingham studied the reasons why instructors left their positions in Florida community colleges between
February 1962 and February 1964 (17, 1964, p. 1). Among other questions, Cottingham investigated the differences between voluntary departers and involuntary departers. Using a structured interview questionnaire for the college administrators and a mailed questionnaire for departers, Cottingham identified 143 departers out of 572 faculty members employed as of February 1962. Of the 143 departers, 28 left involuntarily (17, 1964, p. 44). The involuntary departers were older and less involved with the college, community and students than faculty who stayed or left voluntarily. Involuntary departers had more graduate credits and 21 percent went back to graduate school after being dismissed (17, 1964, p. 57-59). Cottingham also noted that "as would be expected, dismissals (or the equivalent thereof) were least frequent in the most critical [teacher shortage] areas" (17, 1964, p. 78). The final question on the survey asked the departers to list a philosophical or policy change at the college that would most likely have persuaded them to stay in their teaching position. Not surprisingly, Cottingham discovered that the involuntary departers had the most critical things to say about their former institutions and wondered if their dissatisfactions curbed the effectiveness of their work, or if a realization that they were not measuring up to institutional standards and demands brought about a souring of attitudes and seeking of defenses by looking for aspects of their junior college to regard as inferior (17, 1964, p. 107).
Henderson developed an open-ended questionnaire and distributed it to 12 rural and urban school districts in California during the 1958-59 school year (26, 1960, p. 35). Seventy-one responses from building principals were analyzed. The survey asked each principal to list the steps followed in reaching the dismissal decision, list the most frequently occurring reasons for dismissal, relate a successful and an unsuccessful dismissal attempt, and describe the dismissal reasons that have "consistently stood up as being valid" (26, 1960, p. 34). Tabulation of the questionnaire responses showed that the principals used classroom visitation, conferences, reports of remediation, formal evaluation, and written data to reach the dismissal decision (26, 1960, p. 45). Conferences and evaluation by the principal were the most frequently listed steps in the dismissal decision process with 100 percent of the principals using those strategies. Only 30 percent of the principals used written records of the time, date, place and description of conferences; remediation attempts; and improvement recommendations to make the dismissal decision. The six most frequently cited reasons for teacher dismissal were lack of classroom control; lack of cooperation with colleagues, superiors, parents, or children; personality problems; poor teaching performance; health problems; and inadequate preparation for teaching (26, 1960, p. 58).
Eighty-eight percent of the principals mentioned classroom control difficulties as a reason for dismissal. Thirteen bases for dismissal had consistently proven to be valid in the California courts:

1. Detailed description of incompetent behavior  
2. Detailed description of insubordination  
3. Immorality when supported by evidence  
4. Poor physical or mental health verified  
5. Drunk driving with conviction  
6. Criminal offense with conviction  
7. Detailed description of unprofessional conduct  
8. Verification of lack of control  
9. Verification of lack of ability to get along with colleagues  
10. Verification of lack of ability to get along with parents  
11. Verification of poor teaching techniques  
12. Use of physical punishment  

The written documentation implied in these responses appeared to contrast with the finding that at the time of the dismissal decision only 30 percent of the principals used detailed written data to arrive at the decision. Perhaps more accurate records were relied upon once the dismissal decision was made. Henderson concluded that principals need to fully document the "persistent nature of difficulties . . . repeated warnings . . . frequent assistance [and] . . . close supervision" in order to successfully dismiss a teacher (26, 1960, p. 165).

In a recent dissertation Van Horn addressed the following questions relating to public school teacher
dismissal cases:

(1) What state codes define or include incompetency as a cause for dismissal? (2) What categories of incompetent conduct have emerged from the decisions of state and federal courts? (3) What standard of evidence must school officials meet to sustain a charge of incompetency? (4) What legal guidelines for the dismissal of incompetent teachers can be generalized from case law? (76, 1982, p. 8).

A national survey of state education codes was conducted, and it was found that 31 states listed incompetency as grounds for dismissal. Only two states, Alaska and Tennessee, defined incompetency within the state code (76, 1982, p. 17). Six major categories of incompetent conduct were identified through a review of 146 public school teacher dismissal cases from 1950-1980: inadequate teaching, classroom discipline problems, personality factors, disability, insubordination, and neglect of duty (76, 1982, p. 141).

Van Horn's findings were very similar to earlier studies by Coyle, Erickson, Lakey, McNamara, Riddle, White, and Williams (18, 1975, p. 69-102; 22, 1965, p. 45; 37, 1976, p. 134-35; 39, 1979, p. 18-20; 59, 1974, p. 143-44; 78, 1978, p. 46; 79, 1967, p. 46). The most prevalent charges were for inadequate teaching and classroom discipline problems. The frequency with which a specific category was used as grounds for dismissal can be summarized as follows:

Inadequate teaching

| Mastery of subject matter | 6 |
Teaching skills/methods 44
Student progress 8
Motivation/rapport 18
Classroom discipline 60
Personality
  Lack of self control 7
  Poor judgment 6
  Poor relations with others 22
Disability 14
Insubordination 12

As Henderson found 22 years earlier, classroom discipline difficulties were the leading cause of teacher dismissals. Successful legal causes for teacher dismissal were so varied that McNamara concluded

that any behavior or condition of a teacher which can be demonstrated or logically reasoned to have some "adverse effect" upon the school system can result in legal teacher dismissal (39, 1979, p. 275).

In Van Horn's study 13 cases were appealed at the federal level, but only two were overturned on constitutional issues. Van Horn concluded that a "teaching certificate is prima facie evidence of a teacher's competence and the school board has the burden of proving incompetence" (76, 1982, p. 85). Coyle's conclusion agreed with that of Van Horn (18, 1975, p. 22). The validity of
this statement with regard to higher education faculty must be questioned, however, since not all states have required community college instructors to possess a teaching or vocational education certificate. White disagreed with Van Horn and Coyle, believing that the "teacher has the burden of proving that the board's [dismissal] actions are an abuse of discretion, arbitrary, capricious, or malicious, or not based on substantial evidence" (78, 1978, p. 9). All sources reviewed agreed that to successfully dismiss incompetent teachers the pattern of inadequate behaviors must be documented and evidence must be presented that superiors provided the teacher with remediation opportunities and a sufficient time to improve.

Summary

Many complex legal and educational issues have had an effect upon personnel decision making. Since teacher dismissal litigation has been increasing, the administrator confronted with unsatisfactory performance must be aware of tenure regulations, civil rights legislation, state education statutes, and case law. Statutory grounds for dismissal of college faculty have most commonly included incompetency, conviction of a felony, moral turpitude, and mental incapacity. The states of California, Colorado, Nevada, and Washington described grounds for dismissal of faculty in state laws. (Some state education codes,
however, deferred all personnel issues to the college governing board). Fifty-nine percent of all full-time faculty in higher education have been tenured. Tenured faculty property rights as discussed in the Roth and Perry cases have entitled faculty to due process procedures. Due process protection for faculty with established liberty or property interests has included requirements for advance notice of the dismissal charges and the right to a fair hearing.

An institution's established evaluation plan and disciplinary procedures as outlined in personnel documents were additional sources of information for administrators. Seventy-five percent of community colleges had formal teacher evaluation programs. Personnel documents should be in compliance with all superseding regulations and laws. Research has shown, however, that this was not always the case. The campus evaluation plan should be a formal, written system involving multiple sources of information, and campus disciplinary procedures should provide for a sequence of increasingly stern measures beginning with an informal conference. Disciplinary alternatives such as transfer, demotion, position modification, and early retirement have apparently been little used in higher education. The dismissal option has been well researched, however.
Little was known about administrative responses to
unsatisfactory faculty performance based on research. Lack
of personnel options for educational administrators had
been noted in one study, and dehiring was presumably a
quite common practice. Methods for coping with the
unsatisfactory employee appeared logical in theory, but
their effectiveness or prevalence in educational circles
had not been established. It was intended that the present
investigation would add to the body of knowledge
accumulating on the subject.
CHAPTER THREE

Methods and Materials

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the research methodology, data collection techniques, and statistical treatment of the data used to determine administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty. Two hundred and thirty-seven community college chief executive officers in 13 Western states were asked to complete a survey of administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty performance. College size and type (single campus or multi-campus) were determined from the questionnaire shown in Appendix B as was presence of written personnel policies; presence of guidelines for termination, transfer, promotion and tenure; prevalence of faculty dismissals, prevalence of dismissal case appeals; and preference of administrators for delegation or non-delegation of personnel tasks. Responses were analyzed to determine which strategies were most frequently used to handle poorly performing faculty. Responses to nine personnel situations were compared among community colleges stratified by the seven variables listed above. The chi square test of independence was used to determine if administrative
responses to the nine personnel situations differed on these variables. Written personnel documents from seventy colleges were studied by means of content analysis, and the frequency with which specific personnel guidelines were contained in the documents was reported.

Sample Description

The accessible population of this investigation included 237 chief executive officers of public community colleges listed in the 1982 CJTCD located in the states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. One hundred and sixty-five subjects responded to the mailed questionnaire and seventy colleges sent personnel documents representing a convenience sample of the accessible population. Seven respondents refused to participate in the study or returned incomplete questionnaires, leaving 158 usable responses. Seventy-three questionnaires were received from small colleges, 34 from medium-sized institutions, 32 from large colleges, and 19 from very large schools. Seventy-five single campus institutions responded and 83 multi-campus schools returned questionnaires. All 13 Western states were represented. Data analysis was limited to the responses received, and no inferences beyond this population and the Western geographic region can be made.
Research Design

The nature of this research was quasi-experimental; therefore, a survey approach utilizing a 69.6 percent convenience sample of the accessible population was appropriate. The data produced in this research were nominal or categorical and much of the analysis involved the appropriate descriptive statistical procedures. Sixty-three two-way crosstabulation tables were generated comparing responses to the nine personnel situations based upon the seven institutional variables. A one-group, post-test only research design was used.

Methodology

Names and addresses of the chief executive officers at the selected community colleges were obtained from the 1982 CJTCD (CJTCD, 1982, p. 24-70). Subjects received a packet mailed April 5, 1983 containing a cover letter (see Appendix A) briefly explaining the purpose of the study and requesting prompt participation. The questionnaire in Appendix B and a coded, stamped return envelope were also included in the mailing. A post card which could be returned to the investigator requesting the results of the study was added to the packet. Subjects were asked to enclose a copy of their current personnel policy manual if one were available.
Subject participation was on a volunteer basis. Code numbers on the envelopes were used to determine the necessity of follow-up procedures. Coded envelopes were destroyed once the respondent had been identified as having returned the questionnaire. Non-respondents were sent a follow-up post card one month later on May 3, 1983 and encouraged to reply (see Appendix C). A second packet consisting of a new cover letter (see Appendix D), questionnaire, and a coded, stamped return envelope was mailed on May 16, 1983. Only personnel documents and accurately and correctly completed questionnaires received within the ten week time schedule for the study were included in data analysis. Materials received after June 15, 1983 were not included in the study.

Data Collection

Data were collected from respondents as previously described. The instrument used to measure administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance was closely modeled after that used by Kavina (34, 1981, p. 2). The instrument used a multiple choice or closed-ended response format. This questionnaire had no established reliability or validity, but face and content validity were determined by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas educational administration faculty. The questionnaire was also sent to the Vice-President for Personnel of the California.
Community College System for comment. Permission to use questions from Kavina's instrument was obtained from the author. The questionnaire has been included in Appendix B.

Questions one and two in section one were developed to establish the size and type of the responding institutions. Questions three through seven were designed to assess whether the institutions had written personnel guidelines; provided for termination, transfer, promotion, or tenure; had dismissed faculty recently, and had successfully dismissed faculty. The wording of question five resulted in unintended multiple responses, so in recording responses only the most recent faculty dismissal was tabulated. For example, if a respondent marked both "1 year" and "3 years" as having dismissed faculty only "1 year" was recorded as the response. Question eight in section one was used to determine the respondent's preference for delegation or non-delegation of personnel tasks. Nine personnel situations involving unsatisfactory faculty were described in section two with respondents given the choice of dismissal, transfer, demotion, position modification, dehiring, early retirement, counseling, or other as a response. The questions varied as to the unsatisfactory faculty member's length of service and tenure status. Two sensitive questions regarding a minority faculty member and a politically influential faculty member were placed at the
end of the brief questionnaire. The questionnaire was professionally printed on bright colored paper and assembled as an 8 1/2" x 11" two-page, folded booklet to increase the response rate.

Content analysis of the 76 personnel documents from 70 colleges was used to determine the frequency and extent to which the following categories of personnel information were found:

- Disciplinary Procedures
- Dismissal/Termination/Nonrenewal
- Early Retirement Options
- Evaluation Procedures
- Faculty Responsibilities
- Grievance Procedures
- Merit
- Promotion
- Resignation
- Retirement
- Retrenchment/Reduction in Force (RIF)
- Tenure/Probationary Period
- Transfer

Personnel policies extraneous to this research such as sabbatical leave were not tabulated. The categories listed above were mutually exclusive, and analysis of the detail in which the topics were described was possible by labeling
the coverage of a topic as complete, incomplete, or none. This method of categorization had been used earlier by Kintzer in his analysis of faculty handbooks (36, 1961, p. 7). Complete coverage was used to mean that the description of the topic was detailed, sequential, and included a time line if appropriate. A topic was tabulated as incomplete if coverage was lacking in detail or the appropriate time line. Topics not discussed in the personnel documents were tabulated as "none." Content analysis has been a commonly used data collection technique in the social sciences, and the guidelines of Selltitz, Wrightsman, and Cook were followed (67, 1976, p. 391-97).

Statistical Treatment

Each questionnaire item was arranged in a frequency distribution table, with resulting modal and percentage responses designated for all response choices. Appropriate tables and summary statistics have been presented in Chapter Four for each of the nine personnel situations described in the questionnaire stratified by the seven institutional variables using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and the Edu-Ware Statistics 3.0 program (51, 1975, p. 218-48; 71, 1983). The subprogram crosstabs chi-square statistic available with SPSS was used to determine differences in administrative response due to the seven institutional variables. Initial data analysis
with the SPSS chi square program resulted in greater than 20 percent of the cells in some crosstabulation tables having expected frequencies of less than five. Siegel has noted that when this occurs the chi square test requirements have been violated and the results are not interpretable (68, 1956, p. 178). It was necessary to combine adjacent categories in some crosstabulation tables and recompute the chi square statistic using the Edu-Ware Statistics 3.0 program and an Apple IIe computer in order to accurately analyze the data for hypothesis testing.

**Summary**

This chapter has presented a description of the research methodology, data collection techniques, and statistical treatment of the data used to determine administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty. The results of data analysis and discussion of the pertinent findings have been presented in Chapter four. Chapter five concluded the investigation with summary remarks and recommendations for future study.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

The purpose of Chapter four was to describe the results of data analysis relative to the survey instrument, hypotheses testing, and content analysis of the personnel documents. Following the results a discussion has been presented of the pertinent findings and their relationship to the questions listed in the statement of the problem.

Two hundred and thirty-seven Administrative Response to Unsatisfactory Faculty Questionnaires were mailed to chief executive officers at public community colleges in 13 Western states. Respondents were asked to enclose a copy of their personnel policy manual when returning the questionnaire. A total of 165 questionnaires were received for a 69.6 percent response rate. Seven respondents declined participation in the survey leaving 158 usable questionnaires. Response by state is shown in Table 1, page 61. Response rates varied from 42.8 to 100 percent. Both community colleges in Idaho participated in the study for a 100 percent response rate. The lowest response of 42.8 percent was received from Wyoming. All 13 states were represented. Seventy-four of the 165 questionnaires were
Table 1
Response by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Total Possible Respondents</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
received from California community colleges representing 45 percent of the total. In addition, 76 personnel documents from 70 colleges in ten states were received for a 30 percent response rate (see Table 2, page 63). No documents were received from Idaho, Utah, or Wyoming colleges. Personnel manuals, negotiated agreements, board policy manuals, and faculty handbooks were submitted. Respondents sent complete documents as well as excerpts. Negotiated agreements and documents from California community colleges were the most frequently received type of document and state represented.

The following seven variables were determined from responses to the questionnaire:

(1) college size,
(2) college type (single campus or multi-campus),
(3) presence of written personnel policies,
(4) presence of tenure,
(5) faculty dismissals within last five years,
(6) success of faculty dismissals, and
(7) preference of administrators for delegation or non-delegation of personnel tasks.

In addition, respondents answered nine questions concerning unsatisfactory faculty. Raw data were coded and 63 two-way crosstabulation tables and chi square statistics were generated using SPSS and the facilities at the University
### Table 2

Types of Personnel Documents from Seventy Western Community Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Personnel Manual</th>
<th>Negotiated Agreement</th>
<th>Board Policy Manual</th>
<th>Faculty Handbook</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- C Complete document
- P Partial document

*Does not equal 70 because several colleges sent more than one document*
of Nevada, Las Vegas Computing Center to determine if there were differences in administrative response to the nine questions concerning unsatisfactory faculty based upon the seven variables (51, 1975, p. 218-48). Further analysis using the Edu-Ware Statistics 3.0 chi square program and an Apple IIe computer was necessary because expected cell frequencies in many of the crosstabulation tables were less than five (71, 1983; 68, 1956, p. 178). Adjacent categories were combined to increase the expected cell frequencies and the chi square statistic was meaningfully applied to 42 of the crosstabulation tables.

Content analysis of the 76 personnel documents determined the frequency and extent to which the following 13 categories of personnel information were found:

1) disciplinary procedures,
2) dismissal/termination/nonrenewal,
3) early retirement options,
4) evaluation procedures,
5) faculty responsibilities,
6) grievance procedures,
7) merit,
8) promotion,
9) resignation,
10) retirement
11) retrenchment/RIF,
(12) tenure/probationary period, and
(13) transfer.

Results

The following summary of the findings has been presented in relation to the specific questions found on the survey instrument. Pertinent written comments from participants have been noted where appropriate. Following the survey results, the results of testing the seven hypotheses and content analysis of the personnel documents have been presented.

Item I.1. The enrollment of this institution is (headcount of full and part-time enrollment for credit courses only). Small institutions were most frequently represented in this study with 46.2 percent of the total response. Only 19 very large institutions participated (see Table 3, page 66).

Item I.2. This institution is . . . . This question was designed to determine institutional type (single campus or multi-campus). An approximately equal number of institutions were represented from the two categories (see Table 4, page 67).

Item I.3. Does this district or institution have written policies or guidelines? A positive response to this item was received from 88.6 percent of the participants (see Table 5, page 68). Comments from 21
Table 3
Response to Item I.1. The enrollment of this institution is (headcount of full and part-time enrollment for credit courses only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-9999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Response to Item I.2. This institution is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a single campus</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of a multi-campus college district</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Response to Item I.3. Does this district or institution have written policies or guidelines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents indicated that their personnel policies were too voluminous to mail, and nine respondents wrote that their policy manuals were being revised or out of print. Only 13 institutions did not have written personnel policies, and comments from three such respondents indicated that written policies were being developed.

**Item I.4.** This district or institution has definite personnel policies regarding the following (for this question only, please check all those that apply) . . . . Termination and tenure policies were more frequently noted by respondents than were transfer and promotion policies. Definite termination policies were claimed by 82.9 percent of those responding (see Table 6, page 70). Seven respondents from California wrote that tenure policies for community colleges were contained in the state's Education Code. One respondent noted that there was no tenure in Arizona.

**Item I.5.** Have you dismissed faculty in the last . . . . The wording of this item resulted in multiple answers from many respondents, therefore, only the most recent year of dismissal indicated was tabulated. Nearly one-third of the respondents had not dismissed faculty in the last five years. Fifty-nine respondents or 37.3 percent had dismissed faculty in the last year (see Table 7, page 71).
Table 6
Response to Item I.4. This district or institution has definite personnel policies regarding the following (for this question only, please check all those that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percent** Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>termination</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>429*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total does not equal 158 because multiple responses allowed

** Percent of 158 responses
Table 7

Response to Item I.5. Have you dismissed faculty in the last

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no faculty dismissed in last 5 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item I.6. If faculty have been dismissed in last 5 years, was case(s) appealed? Of the 113 respondents for whom this question was applicable, 48 had experienced faculty dismissal appeals (see Table 8, page 73). This figure represents 30.4 percent of the 158 respondents, but 42.4 percent of the subgroup of 113 participants.

Item I.7. If case(s) appealed, what was result? Only two respondents of the 48 for whom this question was applicable responded that the college had lost a faculty dismissal appeal (see Table 9, page 74). One respondent checked both the college won and college lost response categories and wrote, "won then lost and settled out of court--terrible process." Another respondent chose the not applicable category and noted that "we were going to dismiss a tenured faculty--but were advised by the Attorney General's office not to proceed."

Item I.8. When it comes to transferring, dismissing, or confronting faculty, I most often . . . . A total of 94 or 59.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they preferred not to delegate personnel tasks (see Table 10, page 75). The next most frequently selected response choice was the other category. Thirty-one of the 38 participants selecting this category referred in their comments to some combination of delegation and non-delegation involving several administrative levels.
Table 8
Response to Item I.6. If faculty have been dismissed in last 5 years, was case(s) appealed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Response to Item I.7. If case(s) appealed, what was result?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>college won</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college lost</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision pending</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Response to Item I.8. When it comes to transferring, dismissing, or confronting faculty, I most often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>delegate the task to a subordinate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do the task myself by written or oral communication</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item II.1. A new faculty member is hired, expectations clearly outlined, and orientation provided and completed. After one semester it is evident that the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory or inadequate. Administrative response would be . . . . As seen in Table 11, pages 77-78 the dismissal option was selected by 31.6 of the respondents. Some form of interpersonal counseling was chosen by 29.1 percent of the administrators. The other category received 19 percent of the responses with 11 respondents mentioning some type of formal professional improvement or growth plan which was summarized by one participant as, "document problem, develop plan for improvement, establish time line for improvement, follow up." Five administrators selecting the other category mentioned non-specific assistance or staff development activities as being appropriate responses, and one administrator preferred to assign the faculty member in question to a master teacher. The dehiring option received 10.1 percent of the responses.

Item II.2. A non-tenured faculty member has been with the college 2-3 years, but has become unresponsive or unproductive to new leadership or goals. Administrative response would be . . . . Table 11, pages 77-78 shows that 37.3 percent, over one-third of the respondents, preferred the dismissal option in this situation. The
Table 11

Responses to Personnel Situations 1 - 9, n = 158

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Deh</th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(29.1)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(37.3)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(24.7)</td>
<td>(18.4)</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(51.3)</td>
<td>(19.6)</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(60.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(60.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(15.2)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>(48.1)</td>
<td>(20.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(19.6)</td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(51.9)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(48.7)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11. Continued.

**Key:**
- **Dis** = Dismissal
- **Tr** = Transfer
- **Dem** = Demotion
- **PM** = Position Modification
- **Deh** = Dehiring
- **ER** = Early Retirement
- **C** = Counseling
- **O** = Other
- **MR** = Multiple Response
- **N** = No Response
- **n** = Number Responding
- **%** = Percent Responding
counseling and other categories were second and third in frequency of responses. Dehiring was the choice of 10.1 percent of the administrators. Most of the responses in the other category were from California administrators who noted that they were having difficulty answering the question because under the California Education Code tenure takes effect after the second probationary year. Additional comments from respondents selecting the other category included building a case file, calling for a series of evaluations, probation, and this remark from one administrator, "reduction-in-force—same effect as dismissal but easier to accomplish."

Item II.3. A tenured faculty member has been with the college 2-3 years, but has become unresponsive or unproductive to new leadership or goals. Administrative response would be . . . . This personnel situation was the same as the previous question except a tenured faculty member was involved. Table 11, pages 77-78 shows that 51.3 percent of those responding selected the counseling option and 19.6 percent selected the other category. Only 7 percent chose the dismissal option in contrast to the 37.3 percent who selected dismissal on the previous question. Two respondents selecting the counseling option commented that it was the only possible choice in California. Several respondents selecting the other category noted that
tenure was not awarded so quickly at their institutions. Other administrative responses offered as appropriate in this situation included formal improvement needed plans, continued evaluations, probation, formal warning, and "confront--deny advancement."

Item II.4. A non-tenured faculty member has been with the college 4-5 years. The total incompetence of this faculty member has recently been clearly and legally documented. Administrative response would be . . . . Just over 60 percent of the administrators chose the dismissal option in this situation (see Table 11, pages 77-78). The other category received 17.1 percent of the responses. Most responses in this category noted that the situation did not apply to them. One administrator working under a hiring freeze wrote that his answer "would depend on [the] reason for claimed incompetence--could the person be profitably used elsewhere on campus?"

Item II.5. A tenured faculty member has been with the college 4-5 years. The total incompetence of this faculty member has recently been clearly and legally documented. Administrative response would be . . . . Question five was the same as question four with the exception of the faculty member's tenure status. Responses, as shown in Table 11, pages 77-78, were similar. The counseling option received a slightly greater percentage of the responses
when compared to question four, but the dismissal choice remained the most frequently selected at 60.1 percent. Other responses mentioned were professional improvement plans and suspension without pay. Several respondents selecting the dismissal category wrote that gaining clear, legal documentation was very difficult, and one respondent noted in reference to the unsatisfactory faculty member that "he suddenly becomes very competent as judged by faculty witnesses."

Item II.6. A non-tenured faculty member has been in the position and the organization for many years and has had past satisfactory performance. The faculty member's current performance is unsatisfactory. Administrative response would be . . . . Table 11, pages 77-78 indicated that almost half of the administrators preferred a counseling technique in this situation. Only 10.1 percent selected the dismissal option, but several respondents wrote that they would seek dismissal if counseling or other technique did not achieve results. Most frequently mentioned other options included professional growth plans, assistance, encouragement, and probation. Several administrators wrote that the situation was not applicable on their campuses, because faculty would be tenured after many years.

Item II.7. A tenured faculty member has been in the
position and the organization for many years and has had past satisfactory performance. The faculty member's current performance is unsatisfactory. Administrative response would be . . . . Table 11, pages 77-78 presented the responses to this personnel situation. Fifty-seven percent of the administrators preferred counseling the employee and 19.6 offered other solutions. Most frequently listed other responses were professional improvement plans, assistance, attempts to correct problem, probation, and suspension without pay. Only 2.5 percent selected the dismissal option, in contrast to the 10.1 percent dismissal response to the previous question.

Item II.8. A non-tenured minority faculty member has been with the institution 3-4 years. The unsatisfactory performance of this faculty member has been clearly documented. Dismissal of this faculty member may be difficult for affirmative action reasons. Administrative response would be . . . . Dismissal was chosen most frequently as the appropriate response in this situation (see Table 11, pages 77-78). Several respondents wrote that affirmative action considerations would not interfere with their dismissal decision. One administrator noted that he would "have to take a stand [and] take the heat" and another respondent wrote, "incompetency should not be protected because of affirmative action or for other
reasons." The other category was selected by 17.1 percent of the respondents who favored professional improvement plans, comprehensive evaluations, probation, and avoidance as appropriate solutions to situation eight.

Item II.9. A tenured faculty member has been with the institution 4-5 years. The unsatisfactory performance of this faculty member has been clearly documented. The faculty member is politically influential or has influential friends. Administrative response would be . . . Table 11, pages 77-78 presented the responses to the situation. Almost half of the respondents favored the dismissal option, but the written comments emphasized the difficulty in implementing the dismissal decision. One administrator wrote, "I too have influential friends. That's part of [the] job and it is important in a smaller community." Another wrote, "thank God, we have not had to face this one yet. I hope when it happens we are able to do what is proper." One respondent selecting the dismissal option warned, "but be ready for problems" and another wrote, "then get another job." The other response category was selected by 17.1 percent of the administrators with professional improvement plans, probation and avoidance or nothing being the most frequently noted responses. Counseling was selected by 15.8 percent of the respondents.

Data were next examined to test the seven hypotheses
presented in Chapter one on page 6.

Hypothesis 1. There are no statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level among administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at very large, large, medium-sized or small institutions. The chi square statistic was used to determine significant differences at the 0.05 level between expected and observed cell frequencies (see Tables 12-20, pages 85-93). Chi square analysis revealed no statistically significant response differences at the 0.05 level among the administrators based upon institutional size (question one chi square = 10.87, df = 6, \( p = .09 \); question two chi square = 5.59, df = 6, \( p = .47 \); question three chi square = 3.30, df = 3, \( p = .35 \); question four chi square = 4.27, df = 3, \( p = .23 \); question five chi square = .54, df = 3, \( p = .91 \); question six chi square = 2.93, df = 3, \( p = .40 \); question seven chi square = 4.13, df = 3, \( p = .25 \); question eight chi square = 6.78, df = 3, \( p = .08 \); question nine chi square = 1.96, df = 3, \( p = .58 \)).

Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at single campus or multi-campus institutions. The results of data analysis have been presented in Tables 21-29, pages 94-102. Chi square analysis revealed no statistically significant
Table 12
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 10.87, df = 6, p = .09

Key: Dis = Dismissal
C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses—includes transfer, dehiring, other, and multiple responses
Table 13
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.59, df = 6, $p = .47$

Key: Dis = Dismissal
C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses—includes transfer, position modification, dehiring, other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 14
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.30, df = 3, p = .35

Key:  C = Counseling

OR = Other Responses—includes dismissal, transfer, position modification, dehiring, other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 15
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.27, df = 3, $p = .23$

Key: Dis = Dismissal

OR = Other Responses--includes position modification, dehiring, counseling, other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 16
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .54, df = 3, p = .91

Key: Dis = Dismissal
OR = Other Responses—includes demotion, position modification, dehiring, early retirement, counseling, other, no answer, and multiple responses
### Table 17

Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.93, df = 3, \( p = .40 \)

**Key:**

- **C** = Counseling
- **OR** = Other Responses—includes dismissal, transfer, position modification, early retirement, other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 18
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question Seven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.13, df = 3, p = .25

Key: C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses—includes dismissal, transfer, position modification, early retirement, other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 19
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question Eight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 6.78, df = 3, p = .08

Key: Dis = Dismissal
OR = Other Responses—includes transfer, position modification, dehiring, counseling, other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 20
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Question Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.96, df = 3, $p = .58$

Key: Dis = Dismissal
OR = Other Responses—includes transfer, position modification, dehiring, early retirement, counseling, other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 21
Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.13, df = 4, $p = .39$

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
Table 22
Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.11, df = 4, $p = .71$

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
Table 23
Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.22, df = 4, $p = .69$

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
Table 24
Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question Four

Alternative Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>PM/Deh/C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.45, df = 3, $p = .69$

Key: Dis = Dismissal  
PM = Position Modification  
Deh = Dehiring  
C = Counseling  
O = Other  
MR = Multiple Responses  
N = No answer
Table 25
Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question Five

Alternative Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Dem/PM/Deh/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.25, df = 4, p = .87

Key:  Dis = Dismissal  
      Dem = Demotion  
      PM = Position Modification  
      Deh = Dehiring  
      ER = Early Retirement  
      C = Counseling  
      O = Other  
      MR = Multiple Responses  
      N = No answer
Table 26  
Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 13.89, df = 4, p = .008

Key:  
Dis = Dismissal  
Tr = Transfer  
PM = Position Modification  
ER = Early Retirement  
C = Counseling  
O = Other  
MR = Multiple Responses  
N = No answer
Table 27
Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question Seven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 12.62, df = 3, $p = .006$

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
ER = Early Retirement
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
### Table 28

Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question Eight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.89, df = 4, p = .30

Key:  
- **Dis** = Dismissal  
- **Tr** = Transfer  
- **PM** = Position Modification  
- **Deh** = Dehiring  
- **C** = Counseling  
- **O** = Other  
- **MR** = Multiple Responses  
- **N** = No answer
Table 29
Crosstabulation of Type of Institution by Question Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single campus</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.30, df = 4, p = .51

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
ER = Early Retirement
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
response differences at the 0.05 level among administrators based upon type of institution for question one to five, eight and nine. Statistically significant response differences at the 0.05 level were found for questions six and seven (question one chi square = 4.13, df = 4, p = .39; question two chi square = 2.11, df = 4, p = .71; question three chi square = 2.22, df = 4, p = .69; question four chi square = 1.45, df = 3, p = .69; question five chi square = 1.25, df = 4, p = .87; question six chi square = 13.89, df = 4, p = .008; question seven chi square = 12.62, df = 3, p = .006; question eight chi square = 4.89, df = 4, p = .30; question nine chi square = 3.30, df = 4, p = .51).

Administrators from single campus institutions responded differently to questions six and seven than did administrators from multi-campus districts.

Hypothesis 3. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at campuses with written personnel policies and campuses without written personnel policies. As shown in Table 5, page 68, 88.6 percent of the respondents had written personnel policies. Since only 13 institutions reported no written policies, a statistically meaningful method of analyzing the data from the two groups was not possible because many of the cell frequencies in the crosstabulation tables were zero. The
presence or absence of written personnel policies was not a factor in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty with this sample of Western community college administrators.

**Hypothesis 4.** There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at campuses which grant tenure and campuses which do not provide tenure. The results of data analysis have been presented in Tables 30-38, pages 105-113. Chi square analysis revealed no statistically significant response differences at the 0.05 level among the administrators based upon the presence or absence of tenure for questions one, and four to nine. Statistically significant response differences at the 0.05 level were found for questions two and three (question one chi square = 8.01, df = 4, p = .09; question two chi square = 13.80, df = 3, p = .003; question three chi square = 9.86, df = 2, p = .007; question four chi square = 4.03, df = 2, p = .13; question five chi square = .34, df = 2, p = .84; question six chi square = 3.07, df = 2, p = .22; question seven chi square = 3.69, df = 2, p = .16; question eight chi square = 1.48, df = 2, p = .48; question nine chi square = 2.68, df = 2, p = .26). Administrators from institutions which grant tenure responded differently to questions two and three than did administrators from
Table 30

Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Column Total       | 50  | 17     | 45  | 30  | 15 | 157*  |

Chi square = 8.01, df = 4, p = .09

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key:  Dis = Dismissal
      Tr  = Transfer
      Deh = Dehiring
      C   = Counseling
      O   = Other
      MR  = Multiple Responses
Table 31
Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question Two

-----------------------------------------------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>157*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 13.80, df = 3, p = .003

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses—including other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 32
Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>157*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 9.86, df = 2, p = .007

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key: Dis = Dismissal  
Tr = Transfer  
PM = Position Modification  
Deh = Dehiring  
C = Counseling  
OR = Other Responses--includes other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 33
Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>PM/Deh/C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>157*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.03, df = 2, p = .13

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses—includes other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 34
Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Dem/PM/Deh/ER/C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>157*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .34, df = 2, $p = .84$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Dem = Demotion
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
ER = Early Retirement
C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses—includes other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 35

Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>157*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.07, df = 2, p = .22

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
ER = Early Retirement
C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses—includes other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 36

Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question Seven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>157*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.69, df = 2, $p = .16$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
      Tr = Transfer
      PM = Position Modification
      ER = Early Retirement
      C = Counseling
      OR = Other Responses--includes other, no answer, and multiple responses
Table 37
Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question Eight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh/C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>157*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.48, df = 2, p = .48

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
     Tr = Transfer
     PM = Position Modification
     Deh = Dehiring
     C = Counseling
     OR = Other Responses—includes other, no answer, and multiple responses
### Table 38

Crosstabulation of Presence of Tenure by Question Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Tenure</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh/ER/C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>157*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.68, df = 2, $p = .26$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the tenure question

Key:
- Dis = Dismissal
- Tr = Transfer
- PM = Position Modification
- Deh = Dehiring
- ER = Early Retirement
- C = Counseling
- OR = Other Responses—includes other, no answer, and multiple responses
Hypothesis 5. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who have dismissed faculty within the last five years and administrators who have not dismissed faculty within the last five years. The results of data analysis have been presented in Tables 39-47, pages 115-123. Chi square analysis revealed no statistically significant response differences at the 0.05 level between administrators based upon faculty dismissals within the last five years (question one chi square = 8.34, df = 4, \( p = .08 \); question two chi square = 7.88, df = 4, \( p = .10 \); question three chi square = 4.70, df = 3, \( p = .20 \); question four chi square = 0.86, df = 3, \( p = .83 \); question five chi square = 1.83, df = 3, \( p = .61 \); question six chi square = 5.98, df = 3, \( p = .11 \); question seven chi square = 4.68, df = 3, \( p = .20 \); question eight chi square = 5.28, df = 4, \( p = .26 \); question nine chi square = 5.70, df = 4, \( p = .22 \)).

Hypothesis 6. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who have successfully dismissed faculty and administrators who have not successfully dismissed faculty. Table 9, page 74 showed only two institutions reporting unsuccessful
Table 39
Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years by Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dismissals within Last Five Years</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 8.34, df = 4, $p = .08$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member.

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
### Table 40
Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years by Question Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dismissals within Last Five Years</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 7.88, df = 4, $p = .10$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
### Table 4.1

**Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years by Question Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dismissals within Last Five Years</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = $4.70$, df = 3, $p = .20$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member.

**Key:**
- **Dis** = Dismissal
- **Tr** = Transfer
- **PM** = Position Modification
- **Deh** = Dehiring
- **C** = Counseling
- **O** = Other
- **MR** = Multiple Responses
- **N** = No answer
Table 42
Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years
by Question Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Dismissals within Last Five Years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>PM/Deh/C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .86, df = 3, p = .83

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member

Key: Dis = Dismissal
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
Table 43
Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years by Question Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Dismissals within Last Five Years</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Dem/PM/Deh/ER/C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.83, df = 3, p = .61

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Dem = Demotion
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
ER = Early Retirement
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
Table 44
Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years by Question Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dismissals within Last Five Years</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.98, df = 3, $p = .11$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
ER = Early Retirement
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
Table 45
Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years by Question Seven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.68, df = 3, $p = .20$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member.

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
ER = Early Retirement
C = Counseling
O = Other
MR = Multiple Responses
N = No answer
Table 46
Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years by Question Eight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Dismissals within Last Five Years</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.28, df = 4, $p = .26$

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member

Key:  
Dis = Dismissal  
Tr = Transfer  
PM = Position Modification  
Deh = Dehiring  
C = Counseling  
O = Other  
MR = Multiple Responses  
N = No answer
Table 47
Crosstabulation of Dismissals within Last Five Years by Question Nine

Alternative Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dismissals within Last Five Years</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>MR/N</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>156*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.70, df = 4, p = .22

* N not equal to 158 because one respondent did not answer the dismissal question and one respondent was in the process of dismissing a faculty member

Key: Dis = Dismissal
     Tr = Transfer
     PM = Position Modification
     Deh = Dehiring
     ER = Early Retirement
     C = Counseling
     O = Other
     MR = Multiple Responses
     N = No answer
dismissals, therefore, the success or lack of success of dismissal attempts was not a factor with this group and the data were not further analyzed.

Hypothesis 7. There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who prefer to delegate disciplinary tasks and administrators who do not delegate disciplinary tasks. Meaningful data analysis with the chi square statistic was possible for questions one to three, and six, eight, and nine (see Tables 48-53, pages 125-130). Insufficient expected cell frequencies in the crosstabulation tables prevented analysis of questions four, five and seven. Chi square analysis revealed no statistically significant response differences at the 0.05 level between administrators to questions one, three, six, eight and nine based upon delegation or non-delegation of personnel tasks. There was a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to question two (question one chi square = 3.00, df = 4, \( p = .56 \); question two chi square = 14.00, df = 4, \( p = .007 \); question three chi square = 7.16, df = 4, \( p = .13 \); question six chi square = 5.20, df = 4, \( p = .27 \); question eight chi square = 1.50, df = 4, \( p = .83 \); question nine chi square = 5.20, df = 4, \( p = .27 \)). Administrators who delegate, don't delegate, or use a combination of
Table 48
Crosstabulation of Delegation of Personnel Tasks by Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation of Personnel Tasks</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/Deh/C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Delegates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Delegation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>149*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.00, df = 4, $p = .56$

* N not equal to 158 because nine respondents did not answer the delegation question

Key:  Dis = Dismissal
      Tr  = Transfer
      Deh = Dehiring
      C   = Counseling
      OR  = Other Responses--includes other and multiple responses
Table 49

Crosstabulation of Delegation of Personnel Tasks by Question Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Delegation of Personnel Tasks</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh/C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Delegates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Delegation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>149*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 14.00, df = 4, $p = .007$

* N not equal to 158 because nine respondents did not answer the delegation question

Key: Dis = Dismissal  
Tr = Transfer  
PM = Position Modification  
Deh = Dehiring  
C = Counseling  
OR = Other Responses--includes other, no answer and multiple responses
Table 50
Crosstabulation of Delegation of Personnel Tasks by Question Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation of Personnel Tasks</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/Deh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Delegates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Delegation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>149*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 7.16, df = 4, p = .13

* N not equal to 158 because nine respondents did not answer the delegation question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses—includes other, no answer and multiple responses
Table 51
Crosstabulation of Delegation of Personnel Tasks by Question Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation of Personnel Tasks</th>
<th>Dis/Tr/PM/ER</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Delegates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Delegation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>149*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.20, df = 4, $p = .27$

* N not equal to 158 because nine respondents did not answer the delegation question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
     Tr = Transfer
     PM = Position Modification
     ER = Early Retirement
     C = Counseling
     OR = Other Responses--includes other, no answer and multiple responses
### Table 52
Crosstabulation of Delegation of Personnel Tasks by Question Eight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Delegation of Personnel Tasks</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh/C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Delegates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Delegation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>149*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.50, df = 4, $p = .83$

* N not equal to 158 because nine respondents did not answer the delegation question

**Key:**
- Dis = Dismissal
- Tr = Transfer
- PM = Position Modification
- Deh = Dehiring
- C = Counseling
- OR = Other Responses—includes other, no answer and multiple responses
Table 53
Crosstabulation of Delegation of Personnel Tasks by Question Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Answers</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Tr/PM/Deh/ER/C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Delegates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Delegation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>149*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.20, df = 4, p = .27

* N not equal to 158 because nine respondents did not answer the delegation question

Key: Dis = Dismissal
Tr = Transfer
PM = Position Modification
Deh = Dehiring
ER = Early Retirement
C = Counseling
OR = Other Responses--includes other, no answer and multiple responses
approaches to personnel tasks responded differently on item two.

It was determined from inspection of the raw data concerning delegation of personnel tasks that preference for delegation might be related to institutional size. Chi square analysis was used to test the unhypothesized relationship between the two factors. Results of analysis have been shown in Table 54, page 132. A statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level in preference for delegation based upon institutional size was revealed (chi square = 12.36, df = 4, $p = .01$). Administrators from small institutions delegated personnel tasks less often than did administrators from larger institutions. Administrators from larger institutions used personnel procedures involving more administrative levels representing a combination of delegation and no delegation.

Results of the content analysis of the 76 personnel documents from 70 institutions have been shown in Tables 55 and 56, pages 133 and 134. The most frequently appearing personnel items found in the documents were evaluation procedures; procedures for dismissal, termination, or nonrenewal; grievance procedures; and faculty responsibilities. Disciplinary procedures were found in approximately half of the documents received. Grievance procedures and evaluation procedures were the most
Table 54
Crosstabulation of Institutional Size by Delegation of Personnel Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4999 or under</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 or over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>149*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 12.36, df = 4, p = .01
* N not equal to 158 because nine respondents did not answer the delegation question
Table 55

Frequency with Which Thirteen Items are Included in Seventy Western Community College Personnel Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Documents in which Found</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Procedures</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal/Termination/Nonrenewal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Retirement Options</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Procedures</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Procedures</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrenchment/RIF</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure*/Probationary Period</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes continuing appointment, regular status, and permanent employment
Table 56
Extent to Which Seventy Western Community College Personnel Documents Include Various Types of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Information</th>
<th>Number of Documents Including Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Procedures</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal/Termination/Non-renewal</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Retirement Options</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Procedures</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Responsibilities</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Procedures</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrenchment/RIF</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/*Probationary Period</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes continuing contract, regular status, and permanent employment
completely described in the documents. A summary of findings from the documents has been presented below by topic.

**Disciplinary Procedures.** Seventeen documents from the following six states contained complete descriptions of disciplinary procedures: Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. The information was taken from 12 complete documents and five partial documents. Five personnel manuals, and four each of the negotiated agreements, board policy manuals, and faculty handbooks contained the disciplinary information. Most documents described a progressive disciplinary system. Most frequently mentioned steps were: verbal counseling or conference, written reprimand, suspension with pay, suspension without pay, not awarding salary increment, and demotion. Several documents included dismissal as the final step in progressive discipline. Five documents mentioned that disciplinary actions were grievable, and two documents outlined appeal procedures suggested by the 1958 AAUP Guidelines. Frequently listed grounds for dismissal were: inefficiency; incompetence; insubordination; neglect of duty; refusal to perform duties; conviction of a felony; conviction of a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; failure to comply with board or district policies; conduct grossly unbecoming an employee of the district; damaging,
abusing or misusing board or district property; unauthorized entry or use of district facilities; being under the influence of intoxicants or drugs; falsification of documents; and unauthorized absence or abuse of leave privileges.

**Dismissal/Termination/Nonrenewal.** Thirty-four documents from the following eight states contained complete information about dismissal, termination, or nonrenewal: Arizona, California, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. Eighteen complete documents and 16 partial documents were examined. Thirteen documents were negotiated agreements, nine were board policy manuals, eight were personnel manuals, and four were faculty handbooks. Most commonly listed grounds for dismissal were: incompetency, moral turpitude, mental or physical incapacity, neglect of duty, insubordination, and failure to fulfill contract provisions. Dismissal procedures included some provision for a hearing by a five member appointed or elected committee if requested by the faculty member. The grievance procedure could also be used on some campuses. Most documents encouraged informal counseling or professional growth plans and reevaluation before formal dismissal procedures were implemented. The governing board was most often listed as having the final decision making authority for dismissal unless court
appeals were sought.

**Early Retirement Options.** Nine documents from the states of California, New Mexico, Oregon and Washington contained detailed information about early retirement. Six complete documents and three excerpts contained the information. Five of the documents were negotiated agreements, two were personnel manuals, and the remaining two were a board policy manual and a faculty handbook. The five California documents outlined very similar reduced work programs. At age 55 with 10-15 years prior full-time employment, the faculty member could elect to teach half-time for half the salary, but all benefits. The Washington document described a purchase of tenure plan. The district would pay the retiree a lump sum of one-third of the base salary for retirement before age 60, one-fourth salary for retirement before age 65, or one-fifth salary for retirement before age 68 not to exceed $9,500 per individual. A similar plan in Oregon would pay the retiree with ten years prior service $300 per month from age 58 until age 62. The other two plans encouraged retirement by offering full benefits to early retirees.

**Evaluation Procedures.** Forty-four documents from the states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington contained complete descriptions of faculty evaluation
procedures. Twenty-nine documents were complete and 15 were excerpts. Twenty negotiated agreements, 11 personnel manuals, seven board policy manuals and six faculty handbooks contained the evaluation information. The following six questions concerning evaluation were addressed: (1) Who was evaluated? (2) What was evaluated? (3) Who evaluated? (4) How often was evaluation done? (5) What evaluation instruments or mechanisms were used? (6) Were there procedures described for handling the unsatisfactory performer? Analysis of the documents revealed that 40 institutions evaluated all faculty and four colleges evaluated only non-tenured faculty. Most commonly cited evaluation categories were teaching performance, knowledge of subject or mastery of discipline, ability to communicate with students, and college service or relationships within the organization. Evaluation was most commonly done by administrators and students. Frequency of evaluation varied from only at the time of tenure review to three times annually. Most commonly, all faculty were evaluated annually or probationary faculty evaluated annually and tenured faculty evaluated biennially. Student ratings, classroom visitation, and summary administrative evaluations were most frequently employed. Sixteen documents provided guidelines for handling unsatisfactory faculty performance. Seven
documents described formal improvement needed plans which included a time line and specifications for reevaluation, and six documents made reference to a less formal assistance and reevaluation procedure. One college specified that salary increases would be withheld, another institution provided for three semesters of continued evaluation until improvement, and one college referred the problematic employee to an evaluation appeals committee.

Faculty Responsibilities. Thirty-nine personnel documents from the following seven states contained complete descriptions of faculty responsibilities: Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. Twenty-eight complete documents and 11 excerpts contained the information. Twenty negotiated agreements, eight personnel manuals, seven faculty handbooks, and four board policy manuals were examined. Seventeen documents specified the number of contracted days per year. The range was 169 to 196 days with 175 days being the modal response. Most frequently mentioned work weeks were 30-35 hours in length. Teaching contact hours varied from 12 to 30 per week depending upon teaching area. The most commonly found teaching hours were 15-16 lecture hours or equivalent per week. Most colleges requiring posted office hours requested five hours per week. Faculty responsibilities most frequently listed were teaching,
advising students, college service and committee assignments, and evidence of professional growth. Curriculum development was listed in seven documents, and only three colleges required community service. No reference to research activities was found.

**Grievance Procedures.** Forty-seven documents from the following states contained detailed grievance procedure information: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. Thirty-eight complete documents and 9 partial documents were analyzed. Twenty-five of the documents containing grievance procedure information were collective bargaining agreements, ten were faculty handbooks, seven were personnel manuals, and five were board policy manuals. The majority of the documents defined a grievance as a violation of the terms of the collective bargaining agreement or established policies and procedures of the college. Seven documents did not allow grievances for personnel decisions such as dismissal, suspension or nonrenewal. The grievance process varied from three to seven steps with 37 of the 47 colleges preferring a three, four or five step procedure. In general, all colleges encouraged informal resolution of the grievance before filing of the formal complaint and outlined a sequential review process up the college administrative hierarchy.
Three main methods of final resolution were used: (1) an in-house appointed grievance committee of three to five members making recommendations to the president or governing board, (2) an outside professional arbitrator whose decision was binding, and (3) an outside advisory arbitrator making recommendations to the governing board. Most colleges specified that the grievance must be initiated within 10-15 working days, although the range was 5 working days to 180 calendar days.

**Merit.** Only two college documents described detailed merit plans. One college governed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs outlined a merit promotion plan, whereby employees could advance within the Bureau based upon supervisory evaluation. The other document described a plan dividing 75 percent of the merit funds equally among all full-time faculty performing satisfactorily. An additional fifteen percent of the merit money was given to those full-time faculty who completed specified professional development activities as planned. The remaining ten percent of the merit pool was given to part-time faculty successfully completing planned professional development activities.

**Promotion.** Twenty-three personnel documents from Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, and Washington contained information on faculty promotion.
Fifteen of the 23 documents were from California or Washington. Twenty complete documents and three excerpts were reviewed. Fifteen documents were collective bargaining agreements, five were faculty handbooks, and three were personnel manuals. Four schools provided for academic rank advancement as well as movement on the salary schedule. The most commonly described procedure used by 18 of the 23 schools involved column and step advancement contingent upon additional educational or professional improvement credits and additional experience.

Resignation. Thirteen personnel documents contained complete information for the employee concerning resignations. Eight complete documents and five partial documents presented the information. Four documents were faculty handbooks, four were personnel manuals, and two were board policy manuals. Six of the documents were from California, and the other states represented were Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, and Washington. Five colleges required written notification to be sent to the board or college president with a mutually agreed upon effective date to be established for resignation. Four colleges specified a date during the spring semester by which time a resignation must have been received to be effective at the end of the school year. Three colleges required 30-60 days written notice and provided for some sort of penalty if the
notice period were violated. The remaining college required two weeks notice with no mention of a penalty.

**Retirement.** Twenty-three documents discussed faculty retirement from the following eight states: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. Eighteen complete documents and five excerpts were reviewed. Negotiated agreements and faculty handbooks accounted for seven each of the documents. Six personnel manuals and three board policy manuals also contained retirement information. Six documents specified that there was no mandatory retirement age at their respective colleges. Two of these documents noted that the employee could retire as early as age 62. Four colleges listed age 70 as the mandatory retirement age. Four colleges listed age 70 with yearly contracts possible thereafter at the discretion of the administration. Four additional colleges listed age 70, but specified that the employee could continue on yearly contracts until age 75 pending health examination. Five documents still listed age 65 as the mandatory retirement age in violation of federal law.

**Retrenchment/RIF.** Retrenchment policies were contained in 31 documents primarily from Washington, Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico. Alaska, Hawaii, Montana and Oregon documents made reference to reduction in force
to a lesser extent. Nineteen documents were complete and 12 were partial documents. Negotiated agreements accounted for 13 of the documents. Seven documents were board policy manuals, six were personnel manuals, and five were faculty handbooks. Four main reasons were listed for retrenchment: (1) financial exigency, (2) enrollment declines, (3) program reduction or elimination, and (4) lack of work. The seven most commonly mentioned guidelines for a reduction in force were: lay off of tenured faculty was by seniority, faculty members were to be recalled in reverse order of lay off, part-time faculty were laid off first, the retrenchment decision was grievable, tenured faculty must be given other employment options within the college or district before lay off, orderly lay off should proceed by employment categories or teaching area, and probationary faculty were laid off before tenured faculty. Eight documents described a procedure whereby merit or competence rather than seniority was used to select faculty who would be retained.

**Tenure.** Twenty documents described tenure in a complete fashion. Eight of the 20 documents were from Washington. Other states describing tenure in their college personnel documents were Alaska, California, Hawaii, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, and Oregon. Fifteen complete documents and five excerpts were examined.
Fourteen documents were negotiated agreements, three were faculty handbooks, two were board policy manuals, and one was a personnel manual. Tenure is generally granted to community college teachers, counselors or librarians after three years, but the probationary period ranged from one to seven years. Two documents outlined a five year review procedure for all tenured faculty. Tenure review committees of three to five members were mentioned in 12 documents, and the governing board was listed as the appointing authority. Other terms used instead of tenure included permanent employment, regular status and continuing contract. Teaching excellence and favorable student ratings were most often mentioned as tenure criteria.

Transfer. Twenty documents contained detailed information about the transfer of faculty. Nine documents were from California. Other states represented included Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, and Washington. Twelve complete and eight partial documents contained the information. Ten of the documents were collective bargaining agreements, six were board policy manuals, and four were personnel manuals. Both voluntary and involuntary transfers were described. Fifteen of the 20 documents made reference to involuntary transfer as well as voluntary reassignment. The three most common reasons listed for involuntary transfer were: (1)
for the good of the district, (2) enrollment changes, and (3) greater need for services at another campus. Voluntary transfer requests generally could be submitted at any time, but three schools required three to five months notice.

Discussion

The following discussion has been presented in relation to the specific questions raised in the statement of the problem.

Question 1. What were the strategies used by community college administrators to cope with unsatisfactory faculty? Dismissal and counseling were the most frequently selected responses to the nine questionnaire items concerning unsatisfactory faculty. The most frequently listed strategy in the other response category was some form of professional improvement plan in apparent compliance with the 1958 AAUP Guidelines which recommended that faculty be advised of their shortcomings and allowed time for remediation (1, 1958, p. 270-74). Professional improvement plans were generally described by respondents as involving: (1) a conference with the unsatisfactory performer in which he or she was confronted with previous poor evaluations, (2) diagnosis of the problem and organization of a specific plan for improvement involving a time line, and (3) follow up evaluation. Of the remaining five response choices listed on the
questionnaire (transfer, demotion, position modification, dehiring, and early retirement) only dehiring was selected to any appreciable degree in questions one and two. Possible explanations for the infrequent use of some of these strategies could be that: (1) almost half the respondents were from small institutions and single campus institutions where strategies such as transfer would be inappropriate, and (2) there has been little precedent in higher education for demotion or position modification since college teachers have been hired to occupy a one level job category. Some changes in salary, academic rank, teaching load, or course assignments might be possible, however.

Administrators in this survey were most likely to select the dismissal option when confronted with faculty whose incompetence was clearly documented (see Table 11, pages 77-78). The fact that the unsatisfactory performer was from a minority group or was politically influential somewhat lowered the overall percentage of administrators selecting the dismissal option has also been shown in Table 11, pages 77-78. More administrators were inclined to use the counseling approach in these two instances. The interpersonal counseling approach was preferred by community college administrators in this survey when dealing with recently tenured faculty who had become
unresponsive or with unsatisfactory faculty who had been with the institution many years and had a history of satisfactory performance (see Table 11, pages 77-78). Preference for a specific strategy for dealing with unsatisfactory faculty was less clear cut in the case of new, untenured faculty as shown by the varied responses to questions one and two (see Table 11, pages 77-78). These two questions also generated the highest percentage of dehiring responses found on the survey as previously mentioned.

The results of two situations from Kavina's 1981 survey of public and private school systems, government agencies, and private non-educational organizations were comparable to questions one and two/three in the present survey. Seventy-five percent of Kavina's respondents to situation one involving the newly hired employee preferred the dismissal option, whereas only 31.6 percent of the community college administrators selected dismissal in a like situation (34, 1981, p. 2). Thirty-nine percent of Kavina's respondents to a situation involving an unsatisfactory employee who had been with the organization two to three years preferred dismissal and 38 percent selected the transfer option (34, 1981, p. 3). Kavina notes, however, that only one percent of the public school executives selected dismissal in this situation. In the
present survey 37.3 percent of the respondents preferred dismissal if the unsatisfactory faculty member were untenured and seven percent chose dismissal if the involved employee were tenured. Very few community college administrators selected the transfer option. The present findings supported Kavina's conclusion that public agency administrators were more restricted in their responses to unsatisfactory employees than were private institution executives. Community college administrators in this survey, however, were more inclined to choose the dismissal option than were the public school executives in Kavina's study. Possible explanations for response differences between public school and community college administrators might involve differences in: (1) availability of other options such as transfer, (2) perceived threat of dismissal litigation, or (3) prevalence of collective bargaining agreements. Such explanations, however, are purely speculative and research comparing the two groups is needed to test such hypotheses.

Question 2. Were there differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty based upon size of institution? The results of the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis that there are no statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level among administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at very
large, large, medium-sized or small institutions. Data failed to support the presence of statistically significant administrative response differences to the questionnaire based upon institutional size. It was originally thought that larger institutions might allow the administrator more diverse strategies for coping with unsatisfactory faculty. Responses from all institutions in the transfer, demotion, position modification, dehiring, and early retirement categories were so infrequent that the categories were combined to allow for analysis with the chi square test. This hypothesis requires further testing with a much larger sample size.

Question 3. Were there differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty between single campus or multi-campus institutions? The results of the analysis rejected the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at single campus or multi-campus institutions. Data supported the presence of response differences to questions six and seven based upon institutional type. Inspection of Tables 26 and 27, pages 99 and 100 revealed that multi-campus institutional administrators selected a less diverse range of strategies for these particular questions than did single campus administrators, preferring the counseling
option most frequently. This result is opposite to the original prediction. It was thought that multi-campus institutions, being more administratively complex, would allow executives a wider range of options when dealing with unsatisfactory faculty. The data supported the reverse conclusion that multi-campus institutions, being more complex and possibly more bureaucratized, provided for fewer administrative options in dealing with unsatisfactory faculty in these two situations. No statistically significant response differences between single or multi-campus institutions were found to the other seven questions.

Question 4. Did the institutions studied have written personnel policies addressing the unsatisfactory performer and such related personnel issues as termination, transfer, promotion and tenure? Table 5, page 68 showed that 88.6 percent of the respondents had written personnel policies. Seventy colleges sent personnel documents of which sixteen described guidelines for unsatisfactory faculty performance. Improvement needed plans were the most frequently mentioned strategy for unsatisfactory performance. It appeared that very few Western community colleges had written policies specifically addressing the unsatisfactory performer, but additional research is needed to validate this finding since less than half of the
Termination policies were claimed by 82.9 percent of the respondents, and 70 percent of the examined documents contained termination information (see Tables 6 and 55, pages 70 and 133). Approximately 58 percent of the respondents indicated that their college had a transfer policy and 35.7 percent of the documents addressed transfer. Promotion guidelines were reported by 46.2 percent of the respondents, and 35.7 percent of the documents contained such information. Over 80 percent of the respondents indicated that their college had tenure policies and 52.8 percent of the documents described tenure procedures. In all cases a greater percentage of the respondents reported such policies than could be found in the documents. In view of the facts that less than half of the respondents submitted documents and many of the documents were excerpts, the discrepancy between reported policies and the written evidence can be explained in three ways: (1) the college had a policy, but it was not in written form, (2) the college had not submitted the written policy, or (3) the policy was contained in state law and not repeated in campus personnel documents, for example, California tenure laws. The present findings did not particularly correspond with earlier research by Kintzer; Kemerer, Mensel, and Baldridge; or Moore (36, 1961, p.
Since the findings of these studies did not agree with each other either, the explanation for the discrepancy was probably due to the different samples studied, out of date data, and the different types of documents analyzed. Only the generalization that transfer and promotion information was less frequently found in personnel documents than termination and tenure information agrees with previous research.

**Question 5.** Were there noted differences between written personnel policies and reported personnel strategies? As mentioned previously a larger percentage of respondents reported termination, transfer, promotion and tenure policies than could be found in the submitted documents. The most frequently described method for handling the unsatisfactory performer was a formal improvement or professional development plan, however, only 13 documents contained this information. The most frequently listed administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty in the other category on the questionnaire was also a formal professional growth plan. There appeared to be fairly close agreement between what is written in policy and reported personnel strategies as judged by the written comments to the questionnaire.

**Question 6.** Were there differences in administrative
response to unsatisfactory faculty between campuses which provide tenure and campuses which do not grant tenure? The results of analysis rejected the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between administrative responses to unsatisfactory faculty at campuses which grant tenure and campuses which do not provide tenure. Data supported the presence of statistically significant response differences to questions two and three based upon tenure status. Inspection of Tables 31 and 32, pages 106 and 107, revealed that administrators from campuses with tenure were more likely to choose the dismissal response for untenured, unsatisfactory faculty who have been at the institution two to three years than were administrators from institutions which did not grant tenure. When the faculty member in the same situation was tenured, as in question three, the opposite result was seen. Administrators from campuses with tenure were more likely to select a counseling approach than were administrators from institutions which did not grant tenure. The presence of tenure did appear to decrease the likelihood of dismissal for unsatisfactory performance in the situation described by question two and three among the administrators in this sample. No statistically significant response differences to the other questions based upon presence or absence of tenure were
found.

Question 7. Were there differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty based upon past history of successful dismissal of faculty? The results of the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between responses to unsatisfactory faculty from administrators who have dismissed faculty within the last five years and administrators who have not dismissed faculty within the last five years. Data failed to support the presence of statistically significant administrative response differences to the questions based upon history of dismissals. Only two respondents reported unsuccessful dismissal attempts. Although several respondents wrote that dismissing tenured faculty was nearly impossible, it appeared that once the dismissal decision was made the administrators had been very successful at accomplishing dismissal.

Question 8. Did administrators who preferred to delegate faculty disciplinary tasks respond differently to unsatisfactory faculty than did administrators who personally disciplined faculty? Findings from the analysis rejected the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between responses to unsatisfactory faculty from
administrators who preferred to delegate disciplinary tasks and administrators who did not delegate disciplinary tasks. Data supported the presence of statistically significant response differences to question two based upon delegation or non-delegation of personnel tasks. Table 49, page 126 showed that respondents who used a combination of delegation and non-delegation (respondents in the other category) preferred the dismissal option less and had more responses in the other category than administrators who either delegated or did not delegate personnel tasks when answering question two. Referral to the raw data indicated that 12 of the 18 other responses were in the other category and six respondents selected more than one answer. As mentioned previously, professional development plans were the most frequently described strategy in the other category. Referral to Table 54, page 132 indicated the unhypothesized relationship between institutional size and preference for delegation. Administrators from large institutions used a combination of delegation and non-delegation to a greater extent than administrators from small or medium-sized schools. One possible explanation for these findings was that larger more complex institutions must rely upon more complex combinations of delegation and non-delegation because of their size. No explanation can be offered as to why dismissal would be
used less frequently in question two by these institutions. Perhaps the relationship can be explained by the possibility that respondents who marked "other" in response to one question also tend to mark "other" for additional questionnaire items.

A major limitation to this study was the low percentage of compliance with the request to submit personnel documents. Although nearly 70 percent of the Western community college administrators responded to the questionnaire, only 30 percent submitted personnel documents. Forty-five percent of the documents submitted were incomplete representing excerpts of larger documents. Possible explanations for the low rate of compliance with the request for documents were:

1. The presence of lengthy, bulky personnel manuals.

2. Scattered personnel policies making retrieval time consuming.

3. The expense of mailing a large document exceeded the postage stamped on the return envelopes. Although all manuals with postage due were received and paid for by the researcher, the administrator did not know this would be the case.

4. Funding limitations prevented some administrators from printing or photocopying an extra personnel policy manual.
It would appear that these factors could have biased the analysis of the documents by excluding lengthy, possibly more complete documents. If this were the case then the figures obtained represented underestimates of the frequency with which the 13 personnel items are actually included in Western community college documents. Further research and documentary analysis is required to validate the present findings.

Summary

This chapter has presented the results of data analysis and discussion relative to administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance as determined by a survey of selected Western community colleges and a content analysis of college personnel documents. Analysis has shown that dismissal, counseling, and professional improvement plans were the most frequently used strategies for coping with unsatisfactory faculty. No differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty were found based upon size of institution; however, multi-campus institutions provided for fewer administrative options than did single campus colleges in selected personnel situations. Nearly 89 percent of the colleges surveyed had written personnel policies, and there was close agreement between written policies and reported personnel strategies. Only 16 college documents addressed the problem of
unsatisfactory performance. The presence of tenure decreased the likelihood of dismissal in certain situations. Only two respondents reported unsuccessful dismissal attempts.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of Chapter five was to present a summary of pertinent findings, conclusions based upon the findings, and suggestions for future research.

Restatement of the Problem

Very few investigations had been directed at administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty. An increase in involuntary dismissals and dismissals which were appealed had been predicted. Factors contributing to this situation were funding difficulties, enrollment decreases, calls for greater accountability, and decreased reemployment opportunities for dismissed faculty. This study was conducted to add to the body of knowledge accumulating on strategies used by administrators when confronted with unsatisfactory performance and on faculty dismissals in higher education.

One hundred and fifty-eight Western community college administrators completed a questionnaire designed to determine seven institutional variables and responses to nine personnel situations. Seventy-six personnel documents from 70 colleges were analyzed. The chi square test was
used to determine if statistically significant differences in administrative response to the nine personnel situations occurred based upon the seven institutional variables. Content analysis of the 76 documents was used to determine the extent and frequency to which 13 personnel issues were addressed in the documents.

Summary

Results can be summarized as follows:

1. Nearly 72 percent of the surveyed colleges reported faculty dismissals within the last five years.

2. Dismissal and counseling were the most frequently employed strategies used by Western community college administrators confronted with unsatisfactory performance.

3. The most frequently described strategy used by respondents selecting the other response category was some form of professional growth plan involving a time line for improvement.

4. Dismissal was the strategy of choice in situations describing clearly documented incompetence. Respondents were somewhat less likely to choose this strategy if a minority faculty member or a politically influential faculty member were involved.

5. Counseling was preferred for recently tenured faculty who had become unresponsive, or for unsatisfactory faculty who had been with the institution for many years
and had a history of satisfactory performance.

6. The transfer, demotion, position modification, dehiring, and early retirement options were infrequently selected by the administrators studied.

7. No statistically significant differences in administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance were found based upon institutional size or history of dismissals within the last five years.

8. Administrators from multi-campus institutions preferred the counseling strategy more frequently than single campus administrators in situations involving unsatisfactory faculty who had been with the institution many years and had a history of satisfactory performance.

9. Administrators from campuses with tenure were more likely to choose the dismissal response for untenured, unsatisfactory faculty who had been at the college two to three years than were administrators from institutions which did not grant tenure. When the unsatisfactory faculty member was tenured in the same situation, the administrators from institutions with tenure were more likely to select the counseling approach than administrators from non-tenure granting institutions.

10. Respondents who used a combination of delegation and non-delegation preferred the dismissal option less in a situation involving an untenured, unsatisfactory faculty
member who had been with the college two to three years
than did administrators who either delegated or did not
delegate personnel tasks.

11. Nearly 89 percent of the colleges reported that
they had written personnel policies. Only 13 colleges
reported a lack of written personnel policies.

12. Only two respondents reported unsuccessful
dismissal attempts.

13. Sixteen documents addressed the unsatisfactory
performer. Thirteen of these documents described
professional improvement plans.

14. A larger percentage of the respondents reported
termination, transfer, promotion, and tenure policies than
could be found in the personnel documents.

15. Nearly 60 percent of the administrators did not
delegate personnel tasks such as transferring, dismissing
or confronting faculty.

16. The most frequently appearing personnel items in
the documents were evaluation procedures, 74.3 percent,
procedures for dismissal/termination/nonrenewal, 70
percent, grievance procedures, 68.6 percent, and faculty
responsibilities, 61.4 percent.

Conclusions

The results and experience gained from this
investigation supported the following conclusions and
suggestions:

1. Written policies were often bulky, scattered, incomplete and inconvenient to use. Perhaps colleges could explore the use of different formats for personnel documents. Printed documents reduced in size with each policy on a separate page maximized content while minimizing bulk. This format allowed for updating with the use of adhesive-backed replacement pages. Newsprint formats were also able to condense large amounts of information to a manageable size. An index or table or contents is mandatory for ease of referral.

2. A very narrow range of strategies was used by administrators when confronted with unsatisfactory faculty. An increase in the use of transfer and early retirement options might be possible in some cases. Few documents described the professional improvement plans noted by many respondents choosing the other response category. Essentially this strategy was the same as that recommended in the 1958 AAUP document and by many legal advisors. It is important to put such a policy in writing for use by faculty and administrators.

3. The type of institution, preference for delegation, and tenure status did effect administrative responses in certain situations. Dismissal of tenured faculty was claimed to be difficult, yet 71.5 percent of
the surveyed institutions reported dismissing faculty in the last five years. Only two respondents described unsuccessful dismissal attempts. Perhaps there were many more times administrators would have preferred to dismiss faculty. The increased use of formal professional improvement plans should increase the likelihood of actual faculty improvement or make dismissal documentation more systematic. As would be expected from an experienced and successful group of administrators as college presidents must be, there was widespread knowledge of this strategy for aiding unsatisfactory faculty.

**Recommendations**

Considering the results and limitations of this study the following recommendations for future study have been made:

1. Conduct research comparing administrative response to unsatisfactory employees among community college, public school, and private industry executives.

2. Study additional variables such as years of administrative experience and age.

3. Replicate this investigation on a national level to increase the sample size and validate the present findings.
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Appendix A

COVER LETTER FOR FIRST MAILING

March 28, 1983

Dear Colleague:

What strategies are community college administrators currently using to handle unsatisfactory faculty? Do personnel policies contain useful guidelines for administrators regarding this problem? These questions are of concern to many community college administrators.

We ask that you participate in determining the answers to these questions by enclosing a copy of your campus personnel policy and completing a brief questionnaire. Please follow the directions on the questionnaire carefully.

For your convenience a pre-addressed postage paid envelope is enclosed. Please return your questionnaire and policy manual as soon as possible.

Envelope code numbers will be used to contact non-respondents. Due to the sensitive nature of this research, the envelope will be destroyed upon receipt of your questionnaire and all individual responses will remain anonymous. The results of the survey will be reported in group form only. Every person who contributes to the study may be informed of the results. Simply return the enclosed post card if you would like to receive the results of this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation.

Sincerely,

Approved by:

Adele C. Koot, R.D.H., M.S.
Doctoral Candidate

Anthony Saville, Ed.D.
Professor
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QUESTIONNAIRE

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Department of Educational Administration
and Higher Education

Survey of Administrative Response To
Unsatisfactory Faculty Performance

A difficult task for the college administrator is to
develop more responsive personnel. Your answers to this
questionnaire may reveal strategies to cope with the
problem of unsatisfactory faculty. Please return the
completed survey and your personnel policy in the envelope
provided. If the envelope is misplaced, mail the survey
and policy manual to:

Adele C. Koot, R.D.H., M.S.
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Administration
and Higher Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154

I. Background Data

DIRECTIONS: Please check ( ) only one response.

1. The enrollment of this institution is (headcount of
full and part-time enrollment for credit courses only)

(1) _____ 4999 or under
(2) _____ 5000-9999
(3) _____ 10,000-19,999
(4) _____ 20,000 or over

2. This institution is

(5) _____ a single campus
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(6) _____ part of a multi-campus college

3. Does this institution have written personnel policies or guidelines?

(7) _____ Yes, a copy of campus personnel policy or guidelines is enclosed
(8) _____ No, written personnel policy or guidelines not available
(9) _____ Other, please explain

4. This institution has definite personnel policies regarding the following (for this question only, please check all those that apply):

(10) _____ termination
(11) _____ transfer
(12) _____ promotion
(13) _____ tenure
(14) _____ none of the above

5. Have you dismissed faculty in the last

(15) _____ 1 year
(16) _____ 2 years
(17) _____ 3 years
(18) _____ 4 years
(19) _____ 5 years
(20) _____ no faculty dismissed in last 5 years

6. If the faculty have been dismissed in last 5 years, was case(s) appealed?

(21) _____ yes
(22) _____ no
(23) _____ not applicable
(24) _____ other, please explain

7. If case(s) appealed, what was result?

(25) _____ college won
(26) _____ college lost
Appendix B. Continued.

(27) _____ decision pending
(28) _____ not applicable
(29) _____ other, please explain

8. When it comes to transferring, dismissing, or confronting faculty, I most often

(30) _____ delegate the task to a subordinate
(31) _____ do the task myself by written or oral communication
(32) _____ other, please specify

II. Personnel Situations

DIRECTIONS: Please respond completely and honestly to the following personnel situations by placing a check ( ) beside the one response which most closely reflects your most likely decision.

1. A new faculty member is hired, expectations clearly outlined, and orientation provided and completed. After one semester it is evident that the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory or inadequate. Administrative response would be

(33) _____ dismissal
(34) _____ reassignment to another job comparable in pay and status (transfer)
(35) _____ reassignment to a job of lower pay and status (demotion)
(36) _____ increase or decrease responsibilities of position (position modification)
(37) _____ encourage resignation (dehiring)
(38) _____ encourage early retirement
(39) _____ counseling
(40) _____ other, please explain

2. A non-tenured faculty member has been with the college 2-3 years, but has become unresponsive or unproductive to new leadership or goals. Administrative response would be
Appendix B. Continued.

(41) _____ dismissal
(42) _____ transfer
(43) _____ demotion
(44) _____ position modification
(45) _____ dehiring
(46) _____ early retirement
(47) _____ counseling
(48) _____ other, please explain

3. A tenured faculty member has been with the college 2-3 years, but has become unresponsive or unproductive to new leadership or goals. Administrative response would be

(49) _____ dismissal
(50) _____ transfer
(51) _____ demotion
(52) _____ position modification
(53) _____ dehiring
(54) _____ early retirement
(55) _____ counseling
(56) _____ other, please explain

4. A non-tenured faculty member has been with the college 4-5 years. The total incompetence of this faculty member has recently been clearly and legally documented. Administrative response would be

(57) _____ dismissal
(58) _____ transfer
(59) _____ demotion
(60) _____ position modification
(61) _____ dehiring
(62) _____ early retirement
(63) _____ counseling
(64) _____ other, please explain

5. A tenured faculty member has been with the college 4-5 years. The total incompetence of this faculty member has recently been clearly and legally documented. Administrative response would be

(65) _____ dismissal
(66) _____ transfer
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(67) _____ demotion
(68) _____ position modification
(69) _____ dehiring
(70) _____ early retirement
(71) _____ counseling
(72) _____ other, please explain

6. A non-tenured faculty member has been in the position and the organization for many years and has had past satisfactory performance. The faculty member's current performance is unsatisfactory. Administrative response would be

(73) _____ dismissal
(74) _____ transfer
(75) _____ demotion
(76) _____ position modification
(77) _____ dehiring
(78) _____ early retirement
(79) _____ counseling
(80) _____ other, please explain

7. A tenured faculty member has been in the position and the organization for many years and has had past satisfactory performance. The faculty member's current performance is unsatisfactory. Administrative response would be

(81) _____ dismissal
(82) _____ transfer
(83) _____ demotion
(84) _____ position modification
(85) _____ dehiring
(86) _____ early retirement
(87) _____ counseling
(88) _____ other, please explain

8. A non-tenured, minority faculty member has been with the institution 3-4 years. The unsatisfactory performance of this faculty member has been clearly documented. Dismissal of this faculty member may be difficult for affirmative action reasons. Administrative response would be
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(89) _____ dismissal
(90) _____ transfer
(91) _____ demotion
(92) _____ position modification
(93) _____ dehiring
(94) _____ early retirement
(95) _____ counseling
(96) _____ other, please explain

9. A tenured faculty member has been with the institution 4-5 years. The unsatisfactory performance of this faculty member has been clearly documented. The faculty member is politically influential or has influential friends. Administrative response would be

(97) _____ dismissal
(98) _____ transfer
(99) _____ demotion
(100) _____ position modification
(101) _____ dehiring
(102) _____ early retirement
(103) _____ counseling
(104) _____ other, please explain
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POST CARD REMINDER

Dear Colleague:

The Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education has not yet received the questionnaire on administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance that was mailed to you on March 28, 1983.

So that this study will most accurately reflect the experiences of a representative number of community colleges, we again request your participation in the study by returning the survey and your personnel manual. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Adele C. Koot
Doctoral Candidate
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COVER LETTER FOR SECOND MAILING

Dear Colleague:

We are concluding the data collection phase of our study on administrative response to unsatisfactory faculty performance and have yet to receive your response.

Please take the time to participate by enclosing a copy of your campus personnel policy and completing the brief questionnaire.

If you have any further questions or desire clarification of any aspect of the study, please contact Adele Koot at (702) 643-6060, extension 376. Thank you for your time and cooperation. We are eager to receive your completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Adele C. Koot, R.D.H., M.S.
Doctoral Candidate

Anthony Saville, Ed.D.
Professor