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Abstract

Many community colleges have three levels of administration. The first level is the chief administrator, the second level is the group of deans or vice presidents, and the third level is the group of division directors or the associate deans. This descriptive dissertation examines the third level administrator who manages in the instructional areas in relation to the perception of the role utilizing Guba and Getzel's Administrative Theory of Social Systems. Employing a selective sampling throughout the United States over five hundred third level administrator responded to a survey which asked them to describe their general responsibilities, their current issues and frustrations, and the perceptions of their role. The study includes the perceptions of the respondents of the role of the third level administrators. In addition there are recommendations for reform to make the institution more effective in relation to the role of the third level administrator.
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CHAPTER I

The Problem

Introduction

When institutions of higher education faced the problem of defining and implementing the administrative structure and processes which would enable them to achieve the set objectives of these institutions, they had to adapt the administrative structure to facilitate the stated objectives. The community college responded to different societal needs than other forms of higher education while it responds to similar societal aspirations. The general objectives of the community college were: (a.) to promote educational experiences to aid the individual in the realization of personal goals; (b.) to serve the community by offering programs to meet the educational needs of the area; and (c.) ensuring competency for entry into appropriate occupational fields. The properly functioning community college was a societal laboratory geared to adult, postsecondary, occupational and higher education needs of its constituents.

The community college strove to adapt its administrative structure to meet its objectives. Generally the administrative organization of the community college included
the chief administrator (the president) and three or more area heads (the deans). The areas usually included transfer education, technical education, continuing education, student services, and business services. Reporting to these deans were the associate deans or division directors or chairpersons who were responsible for their divisions. These divisions usually included general education with related special technological courses.

The administrative structure of the community college could be called a bureaucracy as in Max Weber's terms:

A bureaucracy is a system of administration by means of departments or bureaus, each headed by a chief. Organizations dealing with great numbers of clients are generally structured and administered as bureaucracies. A bureaucratic organization creates a need for coordination to insure that the component units work smoothly together to achieve a common goal. (Griffith, 1979, p.4)

To understand the administrative structure of the community college it was necessary to review the basic theories of management.

Max Weber was part of the Classical School of Administrative Theory which was prominent approximately 1910-1930. The ideal bureaucracy according to Weber had five
basic characteristics: hierarchical structure, functional specialization, prescribed competence, written records, and stable rules and policies. These characteristics were true of the administrative structure in the community college.

The administrative structure of the community college also could be placed in the theory of Henri Fayol. According to Fayol's administrative theory the five major elements were planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. (Hoy, 1978, p.4) These elements were the activities of the administration in any educational institution, including the community college.

Later, Luther Gulick amplified these elements into an acronym, POSDCoR6 which represented the seven administrative procedures of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. He stated:

In summary, the basic features of the traditional or classical administration models are contained in the following list:

1. Time and Motion Studies. Is a task carried out in a way that minimizes time and effort required?

2. Division of Labor and Specialization. Efficiency can be attained by subdividing any operation into its basic components to ensure workers' performance.

4. Unity of Command. To coordinate the organization, decision-making is centralized, and there is a man-to-man responsibility from top to bottom.

5. Span of control. Unity of command and coordination are possible only if each superior at any level has a limited number of subordinates (5-10) to direct.

6. Uniqueness of Function. One department of an organization should not duplicate functions performed by another.

7. Formal Organization. The focus of analysis is the official organizational blueprint: semiformal and informal structures created by the dynamic interaction within the formal organization are not analyzed.

(Hoy, 1978, p.5)

These features were all found in the administrative structure of the community college. (See Figure 1:1)
Figure 1.1 Sample Administrative Structure of a Community College.
The third approach to Administrative Theory was termed the Behavioral School. It, in part, synthesized the first two schools and used modern behavioral social science in its analysis. In this philosophy the school was considered a social system.

Social systems are comprised of bounded, purposeful, and mutually interacting elements and may be open or closed. Regulated by feedback, such systems continuously attempt to maintain equilibrium. [Hoy, 1978, p.46]

A model of the school as a social system was developed and refined by Getzels and Guba, Abbott, Bidwell, and Litterer. Their theory was that social behavior was affected directly by at least three internal elements: bureaucratic expectations, group intentions, and individual needs. In addition, internal and external feedback mechanisms reinforced appropriate organizational behavior. The model had three elements, the institution, the individual, and the informal group. These elements were described thus: [Please see figure 1:2]
Figure 1:2 From *Educational Administration* by Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel
The institution element. Getzels and Guba stated that social systems had specific functions for accomplishing society's goal. Some institutions were specifically established to carry out the functions for governing, educating, and policing. Schools were the formal institution which was responsible for educating the people and was a bureaucratic structure.

Institution --> Role --> Expectations

According to Getzels and Guba, the most important subunit of the institution is the role. The following characteristics describe the nature of roles.

1. Roles represent positions, offices or statuses within the institution. In a school building, these would include principal, teacher, student, and custodial positions. In our terms, this is the hierarchy of authority.

2. Roles are defined in terms of expectations or normative rights and duties. (Hoy, 1978, p.41)

Bureaucratic dimensions, which were rules and regulations or policy, explained the concepts better than role expectations. They delineated such specific and general expectations as arrival times, building assignments, and job
descriptions. The institution element of the schools was conceptualized thus:

Bureaucracy ---› Hierarchy of Authority Rules and Regulations Specialization ---› Social Behavior

**Individual element.** The next element in social systems was the person. The individual occupied a role or a position in the school. Like the institution element, Getzels and Guba broke down this element into personality and needs. Personality was defined as a dynamic organization within the individual containing need-dispositions that governed idiosyncratic reactions to the environment. Each individual had desires which caused him/her to behave in a different manner under the same conditions. For example, teachers and administrators reacted differently to changes in their jobs because of different needs for security. The individual element was conceptualized thus:

Individual ---› Personality and Especially Work Motivation ---› Needs ---› Behavior

After defining the institution and individual subsystems, Getzels and Guba make a fundamental generalization from their model: observed social behavior \( (B) \) always is a function \( (f) \) of the interaction between role \( (R) \) and personality \( (P) \). The mathematical equation is

\[ B = f(R \times P), \]
in a school is the result of forces from the bureaucratic expectations interacting with the worker's needs. (Hoy, 1978, p.42)

The ratio of bureaucratic expectations to the individual needs, which at least partially determined behavior, would vary with the specific type of organization, the specific job, and the specific person involved.

**Informal group element.** An informal group was formed when individuals were brought together in an organization, such as a school. This informal group balanced bureaucratic expectation with individual needs. As the groups formed, climate and intentions developed that also affected the individual behavior. The informal group element was conceptualized thus:

Informal group ---> Climate ---> Intentions ---> Behavior

The informal group affect upon the individual happened because communication of feelings was easy among peers, especially friends. Informal groups maintained cohesiveness and a feeling of personal integrity, self-respect, and independent choice. As a result, the members received rewards and used their groups' norms to guide their behavior. This, in turn, formed accepted procedures and not formal rules.

The formal school organization provided an official
definition of the position, its rank in the hierarchy, and a set of expected behaviors. The bureaucratic structure established an incentive pattern for ensuring appropriate behavior. School social behavior was also monitored by the culture of the community which provided environmental constraints that directly influenced bureaucratic expectations and group intentions and indirectly influenced individual needs.

Figure 1:3 illustrates the Social Systems Model in relation to the formal organization of the school as reformulated by Getzels and Guba. (Please see p.12.)

An important part of higher education administrative structure was the academic department of the college. Traditionally the department in an institution of higher education represented an organizational unit as well as an intellectual discipline, and the department head was expected to serve in the roles of the leader, the manager, the scholar, and the "first among equals". First among equals meant that he/she was a peer who was serving a limited term as head of the group. The department head was concerned with the potential changes in the mission, the faculty and the curriculum of the institution.
Reformulated Elements for a Social Systems Model of Schools

Bureaucracy → Hierarchy of Authority → Expectations
Rules and Regulations
Specialization

Formal Organization → Informal Groups → Climate → Intentions → Behavior
as a Social System

Individual → Personality → Needs

Figure 1:3 From Educational Administration by Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel
The division director in a community college was similar to
the department chairman but had more responsibilities than
that of the department chairman in a large university. The
attitude and approach of the community college was different
in a way that it had a strong emphasis on service of the real
and apparent needs of the community. Adding to the duties of
the department chairman who hired and supervised the faculty
and clerical help, did the budgets, kept the records, and
planned and scheduled the curriculum, the division director
was responsible for recruiting and placing students and
represented the college and his/her division to the
community.

The advocates of the division system said that it
afforded a more logical structure for the community college
because it lent itself to interdisciplinary cooperation and
it cut down on the departmental warfare which was common to
the four-year institutions.

Historically, community colleges have used
the term dean to describe the delegated leaders
of various operations and programs within a
given situation. Thus, we have witnessed such
distinct deans as the dean of faculty or
instruction, the dean of students or of student
development, the dean of career transfer,
general or developmental studies program, and
dean of community services. Generally these positions are in a conventional line and staff that uses the chain-of-command principle. The structure in which division and department personnel report to a central authority.

(Dolan, 1976, p.25)

The community college, having been the newest educational institution, had room to experiment with its administrative structure without being bound by tradition. In addition to the system of divisions with related subjects, the community college also had the concept of the cluster college.

The cluster college was grouped into interdisciplinary units of faculty and students, usually with transfer courses and a proportionate distribution of the vocational technical curricula. There were as many clusters formed in order to maintain a given student-faculty ratio in order to provide the best possible instruction for students in a totally integrated, interdisciplinary organization and to attempt to cope with the problem of growth. Dolan and Mittler described the cluster college:

A cluster college system modifies the structure so that authority is dispersed broadly among institutional members, and a less vertical organization chart results. Although
the chief administrator, president and vice-
president, coordinate the activities of the
several clusters, the cluster dean is in effect
the leader of the internal operations of the
institution. (Dolan, 1976, p.25)

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze
position of the division director or the associate deanship
in the community college. The specific position was the
third level administrator who worked in the instructional
area of the college. The following questions served as a
basis for the analysis of the data:

1. What were the principle responsibilities of the
   third level administrator in the community
college?

2. How did the first and second level administrators,
   the faculty, the peers, the students and the
   community perceive the role of the third level
   administrator and how did the third level
   administrators perceive themselves?

3. What were the current issues facing the
administrator in the third level of the community college administrative structure?

4. What were possible reforms in the role of the third level administrator which will make the college and their role more effective?

Significance of the Study

Review of the literature revealed that there were many studies concerning the role of the presidents and deans in higher education, and many other studies regarding the role of the department chairman. The role of the third level administrator in the community college had been neglected. (Brann, 1972,p.3) The role could be compared to the traditional department chairman in other institutions of higher education, but the objectives of the community college caused the role to be defined in a different manner.

The position of the division director or chairman was a very important position in the community college because it maintained and reformed the curriculum of the college as well as managed the affairs of the faculty. Included in this study is the letter from Dr. Paul Meacham, President of Clark County Community College, formerly Executive Dean of Austin
Community College, in which he concurred that the analysis of the role of the division director was a viable study (See Appendix III).

Assumptions

Certain assumptions were made regarding the data which was collected. The assumptions were:

1. Community colleges had similar educational objectives but also had different educational objectives from the four-year institutions of higher education. [Morgan, 1972, p.162]

2. Most community colleges today were organized with diverse divisions of the curriculum with third level administrators assuming the role of the leader.

3. The roles of the third level administrator in the community college needed to be examined for description, definition, and refinement.
Limitations

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. This was a descriptive study to find the central tendencies of the role of third level administrator in the community college.

2. There was difficulty identifying the third level administrator because of the varied titles that they possessed.

3. The study was a selective arbitrary sampling from 275 schools of the 1219 community colleges in the United States with responses from 507 third level administrators. The instrument used was a survey questionnaire with answers expected from the division director.

4. This study was concerned with the community colleges which had division structure.

5. The ever changing administration in the community colleges could cause the structures to change during the study.

6. Distribution of the survey questionnaire was through mass mailings. The responses were limited to those who chose to answer the survey. The study represented only those who responded.
Design of the Research

This study was accomplished in three stages:

1. A selective and up-to-date review of the literature related to the administrative structure of the community college was conducted. This review provided insight into the current functions, the current trend in administrative structure, and the philosophy of the community college. The literature also provided the role expectations of the division head in the administrative structure of the community college.

2. A pilot survey was conducted at Clark County Community College to determine the role expectations of the Division Director at that school.

3. A refined survey was sent to selected community colleges in the other 49 states to find the general trends in the role expectations of the third level administrator in the community colleges in America.

After these steps were completed, recommendations for reform for effective administration were recorded and summaries and conclusions were drawn.
Definition of Terms

**Education Terms**

*academic department.* The basic administrative unit of the college, housing a community of scholars that is relatively autonomous and responsible for instruction and research within a specialized field of knowledge. (Anderson, 1977, p.1)

*dean.* Administrators who are usually responsible for more specific and specialized functions of the institution. Community colleges use the term to describe the delegated leaders of various operations and programs within a given situation.

*department chairperson or head.* Someone acceptable to his colleagues and sufficiently capable administratively to be a point of communication with the dean, who is in charge of a department of instruction. The chairperson of a department may be regarded as the presiding officer at department meetings who is held responsible for routine
business. On the other hand, the head of a department is usually regarded as the leader of the department, the person who sets the pace and maintains the standards. (McVey, 1952, p.107)

**division.** A division is an area of activity organized as a functional unit. It is a self-contained tactical unit, a territorial section marked off for administrative purposes. The academic division is larger and more diversified than a traditional department. A division will contain general transfer as well as technical courses.

**division director or chairperson.** The division director is closer to a dean than to a department chairman. The position should be thought of as the chief administrator of a division of the institution, and not as a junior level central administrator. (Koehline, 1972, p.5) The division chairperson is an academic administrator, manager, coordinator, but at the same time the sort of head teacher, the role that the dean serves in smaller colleges. (Underwood, 1972, p.154)
Administrative Theory Terms

administration. A social process concerned with creating, maintaining, stimulating, controlling, and unifying formally and informally organized human material energies within a unified system designed to accomplish predetermined objectives. (Stoops, 1975, p.6)

Administration refers to the performance of the administrative process by an individual or a group within the context of an organization in its environment.

Administration is a human activity with at least the following four components: (1) the task, (2) the formal organization, (3) the work group (or work groups), and (4) the leader (or leaders). (Morphet, 1967, p.136)

Ordway Tead defined administration as a function within an organization which is responsible for establishing its objectives, purposes, aims or ends, for implementing the necessary organizing and operating steps toward the desired end. (Koehline, 1972, p.2)

administrator. Those who are officially charged with the functions of administration. The educational administrator has been described as a generalist in education and a
specialist in the process of administration.

The purpose and function of administrators in any institution or business are to ensure that the aims of their particular establishment are realized in the most efficient and consistent fashion. (Foresi, 1974, p.7)

authority. Authority is institutional power. A subordinate may be said to accept authority whenever he/she permits his/her behavior to be guided by a decision reached by another, irrespective of his/her own judgement as to the merits of that decision. Authority is always backed by power. Therefore, it might be said that a person has authority when he/she is perceived by the group to have the institutionalized right to "move" other men to act in relation to themselves or in relation to organic or inorganic things. (Morgan, 1967, p.139)

bureaucracy. A system of administration by means of departments or bureaus, each headed by a chief.

role. A set of expectations applied to a position.
social system. A model of a school organization that possesses a distinctive total unity (creativity) beyond its component parts; is distinguished from its environment by a clearly defined boundary; is composed of subunits, elements, and subsystem that are at least interrelated within relatively stable patterns of social order. (Hoy, 1978, p.37)
CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

In order to analyze the role of the division director, or the third level administrator in the community college, this selective review of the literature was divided into five stages. The first stage was the review of the history, philosophy and function of the community college. The second stage was to review related administrative theory. The third stage was to review the role of the department chairman in higher education. The fourth stage was to review the general administrative structure of the community college. The last stage was to review the literature concerning the community college division director, associate dean, or division chairperson.

The literature revealed that the community college began to change its organizational structure from the traditional four-year college structure to other structures to accommodate its objectives. Its objectives followed closely the political needs of the community.
The Community College, Its History, Philosophy, and Function.

This review of the literature started with Edmund Gleazer, Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1968, who wrote *This Is the Community College*. Gleazer answered the questions concerning the difference between the community college and the junior college. He stated that the junior college was the older term that was used and it described an institution which offered the first two years of college, that is, the preparation of students who transferred to a four-year college or university. The junior college was limited to academic courses leading to a four-year degree, allowing students to complete their first two years of their Bachelor's degree in a different environment. In contrast the community college offered the same courses as the junior college with the addition of technical, occupational, developmental and community education courses which might or might not require additional education upon graduation from the community college. The general recognition was that the community college was a kind of junior college but had broader educational functions and was most often supported by public funds.

The term "community college" was used by the President's Commission on Higher Education in 1947 to refer to public junior colleges which were
"community-centered" and "community serving".

(Dolan, 1968, p.27)

The community college took on the word "comprehensive" in its title quickly. Gleazer defined the comprehensive community college thus:

The concept of comprehensiveness, although still a subject for occasional debate, generally is accepted. This means preparation for employment as well as transfer to a four-year college and includes a number of other community-related services. The comprehensive community college exists to give students opportunity beyond the high school to find suitable lines of educational development in a social environment of wide range of interests, capacities, aptitudes, and types of intelligence. (Dolan, 1968, p.28)

Another book which gave an excellent background of the origins of the community college was by Medsker and Tillery, Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year College. They stated that the community college movement in America developed slowly from privately controlled two-year postsecondary institutions already in operation in the middle 1800s whose curriculum was designed to provide traditional lower-division offerings for a selected group of youth of
particular faiths. The movement made progress in the Midwest under William Rainey Harper who was President of the University of Chicago, who set up a system of affiliated colleges that were attached to an academy or public high school.

In 1911, Fresno, California, the high school established a junior college with three teachers and fifteen students, thus giving birth to what would become one of the most extensive public junior college systems in the country. (Medsker, 1971, p.14)

There were other states, such as New York, Oklahoma, and Mississippi who established state-supported systems of public junior colleges during that early time, principally to provide opportunities for rural youth who moved to urban centers.

However, up to the time of World War II, private junior colleges substantially outnumbered public institutions. The public two-year college movement was yet vaguely understood, supported by only meager enrollment, and often labelled an institutional curiosity. (Medsker, 1971, p.14)

The Smith-Hughes vocational education legislation passed in 1917 and the reaction to the pressing economic needs which
grew out of the Great Depression, fostered and stimulated the implementation of the comprehensive community college because they added occupational programs to the junior college. World War II stimulated phenomenal growth of the community college. The factors responsible were (1) an expanding job market especially in the broad area of industrial technology; and (2) the passage of the G.I. Bill of Rights (Public Law 16). Returning military personnel who attended vocational schools in the services swelled the enrollments of the existing colleges and universities seeking new training programs of varied intensity and scope.

At some point during this postwar resurgence of the two-year college, it came to be known as the 'people's college'. The vague and lingering distinctions made between post-secondary and higher education now served only as bureaucratic conveniences for state and local agencies of education. For the growing number of consumers of varying ages and needs, such semantic niceties had little meaning. The two-year college now merged its parochial efforts with those of four-year institutions to bring to the local community the full thrust of comprehensive postsecondary education. (Medsker, 1971, p.15)
The pressures of the Korean War and the Vietnam conflict, the minority Americans, the urban disadvantaged people, and other poverty groups demanding equal educational opportunities were the causes of the rapid growth of the two-year colleges in the 1960s. The Commission on National Goals in 1960, and the Educational Policies Commission of the National Educational Association in 1964, under the Presidential administration of Eisenhower reinforced the need for the community college. They predicted that more than fifty percent of students entering college for the first time would enroll in the community college, because it allowed any high school graduate access to higher education. Thus the public community college became a part of the updated version of the American Dream which was unrestricted opportunity for higher education for all citizens.

Foresi clarified the aims and the characteristics of the community college in his book *Administrative Leadership in the Community College*. He stated that there were six basic aims and/or characteristics that provided justification for the community college movement. These basic aims were:

1. to prepare students for transfer to a four year institution,
2. to prepare individuals for semitechnical and technical positions,
3. to retrain adults for new jobs created by
automation,
4. to place post-high school education within reach of a wide range of skills and potentials,
5. to provide services of guidance, counseling, and remedial training, and
6. to provide community education.

He wrote "Fundamental to the present community college is the traditional American belief of providing equal opportunity through education to all its citizens". (Foresi, 1974, p.3)

Like Gleazer, he stated that President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1947 proposed the abolition of all barriers to educational opportunity and the community college, with its "open-door policy" of admissions, was dedicated to realizing this aim of providing educational opportunity to all who might derive profit from it.

Profit may have come in the form of getting the first two years of traditional liberal arts education at the community college and profit may have come in the form of getting a vocational education. Profit could also have meant getting the skills and training needed by an evolving society through continuing community education or getting the remedial skills missed during the high school age. Foresi stated:

The last basic characteristic of the community college that an administrator can never omit from his institutional philosophy
is that the community college is in truth a community institution. In brief, this means that the community college must function not only as a center where individuals of the community receive an education but also a center that surveys the changing community needs for educational services. Transcending the traditional 'ivory tower' posture of American higher education, the community college must develop programs that extend both spatially and educationally beyond the confines of the campus. (Foresi, 1974, p.10)

Ralph Fields discussed the basic characteristics of the community college in his book *The Community College Movement*. He stated that the chief characteristic of a college with the title "community" was their "accessibility". Another characteristic was that the community college was nonselective and therefore provided the opportunity to receive a higher education to those who would not otherwise be able to attend a college. An additional characteristic of a community college was that they were often free of tuition and were public supported by taxes and were governed by representative groups of citizens. Each of these characteristics, according to Fields, were closely related and their relationship expressed the central characteristic,
which was that the community college was democratic.

The key to this democratic feature is that it brings higher education within reach of all in the community who wish it and who possess the ability to profit by it. In a democratic society, constant effort to democratize the education program is essential; if the community college contributes to the democratization of higher education, that becomes its greatest achievement. (Fields, 1962, p.64)

In the 1980s the community college was concerned with the problem of increased enrollments while the services and facilities were not matched by additional local, state, and federal revenues. In addition the public was demanding high standards academically, there were high rates of attrition, and there were political problems for students who wished to transfer to four-year institutions. Richard Richardson in his paper "The Community College in the 80's: Time for Reformation" wrote:

In the next decade, education leaders will need to address three key issues: (1) an increasing incompatibility and tension between adult education and community service missions and transfer and occupational education missions; (2) problem of defining,
measuring, and maintaining education quality given fixed declining resources; and (3) an increasing faculty unwillingness to commit themselves to administratively defined priorities when their chances of success as teachers are declining. These issues center on institutional integrity and quality rather than institutional diversity and quantity and require the establishment of and commitment to community-based priorities. (Richardson, 1982)

In summary, the community college had acquired the correct title of community, because its goal was to educate the community. The administrative structure of the community college should develop around these objectives.

**Administrative Theory and Education.**

Administrative theory history could be divided into three periods: The Classical School - 1910-1930, the Human Relations School - 1930-1960, and the Behavioral School - 1960 to present. The Classical School was composed of writers who looked on individuals and segments of an organization as discrete units and emphasized the formal structure without recognizing that an informal structure co-existed with it. The Human Relations School focused its
attention on the Human element in the work place. It concerned itself with such areas as motivation and human needs. The Behavioral School was a synthesis of the Classical School and its scientific management and Human Relations School with some modifications.

Max Weber of the Classical School defined bureaucracy as a system of administration by means of departments or bureaus, each headed by a chief. He said that a bureaucratic organization creates a need for coordination to ensure that the component units work smoothly together to achieve a common goal. Basic to bureaucracy was Weber's concept of authority. There were three kinds of authority:

a. Charismatic authority, which was the influence exerted by an individual through his personality;

b. Traditional authority, which was based on age and experience; and

c. Legal or administrative authority, which was based on law.

According to Max Weber, there were five basic characteristics in an ideal bureaucracy:

1. Hierarchical structure, in which each subordinate is supervised by someone immediately above him in the line of command;

2. Functional specialization, by which administrators are selected on the basis of demonstrated
competence to perform the tasks of a particular position;

3. prescribed competence, in which each incumbent has the responsibility and commensurate authority to carry out his functions;

4. written records, in which administrative decision and rules are recorded are essential for the interpretation and enforcement of rules; and

5. stable rules and policies, in which rules facilitate orderly, rational and equal treatment of clients. (Falk, 1979, p6.)

School organizations are bureaucracies. The characteristics listed by Weber apply to individual schools as well as to school districts. There is a hierarchical structure: Teachers, supervisors, principals, assistant superintendents and superintendents. Appointments and promotions are presumably on the basis of merit. The staff is composed of specialists - Kindergarten teachers, teachers of secondary school subjects, reading consultants, guidance counselors, and so on. The responsibilities and authority of each position are clearly defined and adhere to
the position rather than to the individual who occupies it. Policies adopted by the board of education and rules promulgated by the superintendent are stated in writing. (Falk, 1979, p.7)

In his article "Has the College Organization Kept Pace", Jerry Burroni placed community college administrative structure in perspective as it was compared to other institutions of education. Burroni stated that by the twentieth century, free public education was widely accepted and that the high school was generally acknowledged as an instrument of socialization, especially for the immigrant. (Morgan, 1972, p.2) The high school crystallized the industrial management model of power flowing from the top down the specialized pyramid of work which made school similar to business. On the other hand, university education moved in other directions but showed a similar organization.

The new research orientation was causing profound repercussions. For the organization it meant that research colleagues could have much to say about the operation of departments, but they also were becoming more alienated from the governing of the entire institution. The college has been viewed as another big business in which authority still flowed from
above....An authoritarian, directive system with its hierchical specialization was considered the most efficient way to run society. And as is regularly the case, the educational system reflected the society. (Morgan, 1972, p.2-3)

In this setting the junior college arrived and it was viewed simply as a transitional stage between the secondary school and the university. The gap between these two stages of education had become so great that it was difficult for the student to make the change. Thus the junior college was a transfer institution.

Another portion of the Classical School was the Scientific Management movement led by Frederick Taylor, whose primary aim was maximizing profits and minimizing costs of production. To achieve maximum prosperity for both the employer and the employer was the principle object of management. The elements of scientific management may be summarized as follows:

a. The development by management of science of each work operation, with rigid rules for each worker's motions, and the perfection and working conditions.

b. The careful selection and training of all workers and the elimination of all who refuse or are unable to adopt the
best methods.

c. Constant help and watchfulness by management to insure that all work is done according to scientific principles and stimulation of productivity by paying each man a daily bonus for working fast and doing what he is told to do.

d. An almost equal division of work and responsibility between management and workmen. Managers work all day long side with the men, helping, encouraging, smoothing the way for them.

e. Definite tasks set each day for each worker. Workers receive daily written instructions describing not only what is to be done, but how it is to be done, and the exact time allowed for doing it. (Falk, 1979, p.10)

To tie scientific management to education, one would find that it might not be tracable to this movement, but the contemporary emphasis on accountability, behavioral objectives, merit pay, and competency-based certification reflected education's concern for measurable results and efficient operation. This was a definite tie to the Scientific Movement.

Henri Fayol made a significant contribution to
administration, which was used in education administration. His theory was an analysis of the administrative process into five major elements: planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. When an administrator planned he/she typically told the future and prepared to meet its needs and opportunities. When an administrator organized, he/she typically constructed an organizational chart showing the duties of each position and relationship to other positions; he/she recruited, and he/she assigned personnel. When an administrator commanded, he/she typically stimulated the employees to do their best for the organization; he/she issued and enforced regulations; he/she eliminated unfit personnel; and he/she avoided concern with detail. When an administrator coordinated, he/she typically unified the efforts to achieve the organizational goals. And when an administrator controlled, he/she typically rectified weaknesses and prevented their recurrence; he/she evaluated progress to see that all occurred according to predetermined plans; and he/she appraised things, people, and actions. This five step formulation was as applicable to education as it was to industry.

Fayol described fourteen principles upon which he/she based the soundness and good working order of an organization. These principles were:

1. Division of work.
2. Authority.
3. Discipline.
4. Unity of command.
5. Unity of direction.
6. Subordination of individual interest to general interest.
7. Remuneration of personnel.
8. Centralization
10. Order.
11. Equity.
13. Initiative.
14. Esprit de corps.

Fayol emphasized that these principles were adaptable and should be applied with a sense of proportion. They were a distillation of experience and wisdom which, if adapted to circumstances and applied judiciously, could facilitate the education administrator's job.

Concerning the Human Relations School and its relationship to education:

The Human Relations school came into prominence at a time when there was a growing unrest among educators with the mechanistic approach of scientific management. It
coincided with the publication of John Dewey's *Democracy and Education* and the rise of the progressive educational movement which stressed the need for humane treatment of children and more participation of teachers in the direction of education. (Falk, 1979, p.25)

The effects of the human relations movement in education were beneficial because it caused the autocratic school administrator to disappear. It was part of the feeling of the whole society which helped to create the community college.

The Behaviorist School synthesized the best parts of the Classical School and the Human Relations School and produced models which helped educational administration considerably. The Getzels and Guba model of social systems of schools was an excellent example of this new way of thinking. Their elements of this social system had three parts. The first element took the school as a Formal Organization as a Social System which made it a Bureaucracy which had a Hierarchy of Authority, Rules and Regulations, and Specialization, which made Role expectations which caused certain Social Behavior. The second element concerned the Informal Groups in the Formal Organization which placed them in a certain Climate which moved toward certain Intentions to cause certain Social Behavior. The third element illustrated the Formal
Organization exerting pressure on the Individual which caused certain Personalities with certain Needs resulting in a certain Social Behavior. (Refer to Figure 1:3 on p.12)

In their book *Management of Organizational Behavior*, Hersey and Blanchard explored the different theories in administration and concepts of leadership, and synthesized the research of others into their own model which the entitled Situational Leadership. They defined leadership as the process of influence in the activities of an individual or group and they stated that the style of leadership depended upon the maturity of the individual or group one was attempting to influence.

Situational Leadership is based on an interplay among (1) the amount of guidance and direction (task behavior) a leader gives; (2) the amount of socioemotional support (relationship behavior) a leader provides; and (3) the readiness or objective. (Hersey, 1982, p.150)

The elements which dictate leadership in the Situational Leadership model were:

a. Task Behavior, which was one-way communication consisting of explanations to followers by the leader of what they were to do, when they were to do it; where they should do it, and how the tasks were to be accomplished;
b. Relation Behavior, which was two-way communication by providing socioemotional support, "psychological strokes", and facilitating behavior; and

c. The Maturity Level of the followers which is the readiness to perform a specific task, function, or objective. (Hersey, 1982, p.162)

In the concept of Situational Leadership, maturity was defined as the ability and willingness of an individual to accept the responsibility for directing his/her own behavior in relation to the task which must be performed. There were two dimensions of maturity: job maturity, which was the ability to do something; and psychological maturity, which was the willingness or motivation to do something. (Hersey, 1982, p.151)

The styles of leadership in the Situational Leadership model could be described using a single word for each style. These styles were described as follows:

1. **Telling.** This was a directive style which provided clear, specific directions and supervision. It was task behavior oriented. This style was most effective with persons of low maturity who were unable and unwilling to take responsibility to do something.

2. **Selling.** This style required two-way communication and explanation in which the
leader attempted to "sell" desired behaviors.
This style was most effective for low to moderate
maturity levels, or persons who were unable but
willing to take responsible but lack the skills
at this time.

3. Participating. In this style the leader and
followers shared in decision-making with the
main role of the leader having been facilitating and
communicating. This style was effective for
persons with moderate to high maturity, who were
able and willing to what the leader wished.

4. Delegating. In this style, the leader gave
the authority to the follower to carry out the
plans but kept the responsibility for solving
the problem. This style could be used only with
persons with high maturity levels, or who were
able and willing, or confident enough to take
responsibility.

Implicit in Situational Leadership was the idea that a
leader should help his/her followers grow in maturity as far
as they were able and willing to go. With very mature
people, the need for socioemotional support was not as
important as the idea of autonomy.

In working with experienced faculty, the low
relationship/low task style (delegating)
characterized by a decentralized organizational structure and delegation of responsibility to individuals may be appropriate. The level of education and maturity of these people is often such that they do not meet their principal or department chairperson to initiate much structure. Sometimes they tend to resent it. In addition, some teachers desire or need only a limited amount of socioemotional support. (relationship behavior). (Hersey, 1982, p.167)

In their article "How to Choose a leadership Pattern", Tannenbaum and Schmidt agreed with the Situational leadership model when they said that a successful manager was neither a strong or permissive leader. (Griffith, 1979, p.166) He/she was the one who maintained a strong and high "batting average" in accurately assessing the forces that determined his/her most appropriate behavior. These forces included the forces in the manager, in the subordinate, and in the situation.

The forces in the manager included (a) his/her value system, (b) his/her confidence in his subordinate, (c) his/her own leadership inclinations, and (d) his/her feelings of security in a certain situation. When the manager considered the forces in the subordinate, he/she could permit more freedom for his/her subordinate if the following
conditions existed:

a. if the subordinate had relatively high needs for independence.

b. if the subordinates had readiness to assume responsibility for decision making,

c. if they had a relatively high tolerance for ambiguity,

d. if they were interested in the problem and feel that it was important,

e. if they understood and identified with the goals of the organization,

f. if they had necessary knowledge and experience to deal with the problem, and

g. if they had learned to expect to share in decision making. (Griffith, 1979, p.175)

Finally the forces in the situation included the type of organization, the group effectiveness, the problem itself, and the pressure of time.

Fred Fiedler seemed to be describing the administration in higher education when he stated that people who became leaders tended to be somewhat more intelligent, bigger, more assertive, more talkative than the other members of the group. He continued, "What most frequently distinguishes the leader from his co-workers was that he knows more about the group task or that he can do it better". (Griffith, 1979,
He asserted that those who had seniority became leaders.

Donald Walker in his book *The Effective Administrator* provided insight into the characteristics of the less effective and the more effective administrator in higher education. In his discussion of the less administrator he stated:

As I have observed them, poor executives tend to be much taken with the status of their position and preoccupied with its authority and privileges. They often see the need to defend the scanty of their office as a fundamental obligation, not necessarily on a personal basis, but because they regard themselves as inseparable from the status of the office. As they see it, maintaining the strength and prestige of that office is fundamental to the health of the university. Thus, they tend to react with threat and often counteraggressive behavior when under attack. And because they seem to consider strong punitive behavior the best deterrent to future attack, they 'go after' them. They regard critics and opponents as 'trouble makers' and commonly demean their motives and objectives. Protest and criticism
are considered individual acts of malcontents who might influence others to follow them if they are not resisted or stopped....these administrators also often believe that the heart of their responsibilities is to make hard, unpopular decisions and then to see that the derivative 'orders' are obeyed and rules enforced. (Walker, 1979, p.2-3)

In comparison, he described the characteristics of the more effective administrator:

These people accept the privileges and status of their office, but wear them lightly. They separate themselves, as individuals, from their office. And thus although they willingly assume the ceremonial obligations and honors of their position, their egos are not bulky. Compared to their ineffective counterparts, the successful feel much more deeply that they are primus inter pares. They regard themselves as working with faculty colleagues who deserve respect as fellow professionals. From time to time, they may be annoyed with faculty members, and sometimes students, but the annoyance is always tempered with affection. They are not afraid of the faculty or the students. In a
community of equals, other's eccentricities are to be received with tolerance and good humor. There is no one who 'doesn't count' from groundskeeper to dean.... The most effective administrators regard themselves as serving an enterprise larger than they.... Their administrative style is basically pragmatic. Since their job is to solve problems, they are always willing to accept alternative solutions, including, or even especially, solutions proposed by others. Reluctant to embrace irrevocable strategies, they regard their principle qualifications as wisdom and diplomacy rather than strength. (Walker, 1979, p.4)

The Role of the Chairperson or Head of the Department.

The department chairperson was someone who was elected by the tenured faculty who usually hold the rank of professor and associate professor in an institution of higher education. The department chairperson must have been acceptable to his/her colleagues and sufficiently capable administratively to be a point of communication with the dean. The department chairperson was principally concerned with three areas of potential change: mission, faculty, and
The chairperson usually held the term for three years and might have been renewed consecutively once. Permanent chairmanship was usually avoided because the permanent chairpersons tended to develop omniscience and omnipotent attitudes which were difficult to change.

Too frequent (the) result of having a chairman in office a long time is that the other members conform to a minimum standard but do not take a lively interest in general improvement.

(Salman, 1971, p.68)

Because faculty elected the department chairperson, they had certain expectations of his/her role. James Delahanty in his article "What Do Faculty Want in a Department Chairmen" stated that faculty thought the department chairperson had four principle tasks. The first task was to ward off outside aggressors. This meant he/she must fend the claims of other departments, he/she must manage the conflicts caused by due process when a student claimed a grievance, he/she must have maintained the proper distance between faculty and an unduly inquisitive public, and he/she must have pacified the inquiries of the administration. Delahanty continued:

If this task is performed to the satisfaction of the faculty, the chairman can then get to his second most important task which is pushing paper
to and fro on his desk....In the delicate task of dealing with paper pushing, the chairman is expected to represent, not lead. Thus he may present the department viewpoint, but may not compromise it; he may articulate it, but God help him if he tries to examine it. (Delahanty, 1972, p.222)

Delahanty emphasized that the most significant power available to a chairperson was to advance the careers of his/her colleagues. If he/she failed in this task, the faculty would turn on him/her.

The third task of the department chairperson was to promote harmony and esprit de corps. This was Henri Fayol's fourteenth principle of a good working organization. Delahanty said that conflict between personalities and values ultimately had deleterious effects on the personal record of the chairperson. He/she had to be careful not to offend, he/she had to be free with rewards, and he/she had to be parsimonious with criticism.

Finally, there is the implicit task of department chairman to lead the faculty into green pastures and still waters. That is, the department shall at minimum survive and at maximum thrive with increased positions, increased enrollments, and increased budgets, preferably at the expense of the
birth rate.... By and large, the faculty view the chairman as one who must somehow help connive with fate to permit us to fulfillment of the real American dream — more money for less work. (Delahanty, 1972, p.224)

Thomas R. Plough took another view of the department chairperson in his paper, _Academic Leadership Development for Department Chairpersons_. He advocated a four year program for academic leadership development of department chairpersons as a strategy for institutional renewal. His program was based on three assumptions:

1. that the department chairperson was a primary filter affecting academic change and climate with an institution of higher learning;

2. that an academic leadership program was not likely to impact a university if it was not conceived within the context of the characteristics of the professionals who were to participate and the needs of the particular institution that they served; and

3. that academic leadership development, rather than management training, was an organizing concept more congruent with the milieu of the university. (Plough, 1979)

Kay J. Anderson provided a historical background of the
department structure in higher education in her article "In Defense of Departments". (Anderson, 1977, p.1) Referring to the period beginning at Harvard College in 1739, she said, "Departmentalization became necessary in these early years when it proved impossible for one tutor to teach a single class in all subjects". (Anderson, 1977, p.3) Harvard had four departments: the department of Latin, the department of Greek, the department of logic and metaphysics, and the department of mathematics and natural philosophy. Thomas Jefferson opposed consolidation which caused the University of Virginia to departmentalize. Thus, with its early beginnings, the academic department had a firm position in function and tradition.

Anderson listed the faults and the advantages of the academic department in the university. The faults were:

1. Lack of planning made it difficult for the institution to develop objectives that could be implemented.

2. Departments influenced support of faculty resistance to change in terms of modifying curricula, requirements, and instructional practices.

3. Departmental specialization deterred the sharing of ideas among disciplines.

4. Departmental rigidity made the reduction of
instructional costs difficult. (Anderson, 1977, p.6)

She stated that

Departments, like political and social blocs, can enhance as well as frustrate action within the institution, especially when departments bring themselves together to solve particular problems. (Anderson, 1977, p.7)

The advantages of department included:

1. Throughout the history of higher education, departments have provided the milieu most suitable for the development, preservation and transmission of knowledge.

2. The department possessed the advantage of familiarity, formal simplicity, and a clearly defined hierarchy of authority.

3. The department provided a milieu in which faculty members could interact with a minimum of misunderstanding and superfluous effort; and it supplies the new faculty with a means to acquire the professional understanding necessary to adjust to his/her institution.

4. The department, as a unified group, could operate more effectively in the university organization than could individual faculty members and it
afforded the scholar protection from those persons both within and outside the academic community who demanded more intellectually from the academician than he should have been prepared to deliver.

A scholar's achievement and promise could not be appraised wisely except by his professional colleagues within the discipline, and the department provided an understandable and workable status system within which the faculty member may orient himself and be professionally evaluated. (Anderson, 1977, p.7)

Martin Trow in his article "Departments As Contexts for Teaching and Learning" continued the idea of the advantages of the department when he stated "The academic department was the central building block - the module - of the American university". (Trow, 1977, p.12) He continued,

The academic department is the central link between the university and the discipline, that is to say, between an organized body of learning - a body of knowledge and characteristic ways of extending knowledge - and the institution in which teaching and learning occur. It links an international fraternity of scholars who carry on a tradition of work in a defined area of inquiry.
to an institution that supports and houses the people who are actually engaged in transmitting and extending knowledge. (Trow, 1977, p.13)

Trow listed the function of the department. These functions included:

1. Graduate education, which was helping students acquire competence in their subjects and develop their capacity to do creative and original work on their own.

2. Recruitment and promotion of academic staff members.

3. Research.

4. Undergraduate education.

Undergraduate education brought the relevance of the discussion of departments to the functions of the community college. Trow discussed the aim of the department in higher education for the undergraduate:

(T)he department's emphasis on specialized research and the doctoral degree, it is not able to develop or usefully contribute to a nonspecialized liberal education. Liberal education, as some perceive it, aims to free students from narrow prejudices and assumptions of regions, class and ethnic group by extending their understanding of the human condition and their range
of sympathies through an exposure to literature, poetry, philosophy, mathematics, the sciences, and social sciences. Such education is intended to refine sensibilities and strengthen the capacities for making independent and informal judgements in art, in science, and in life.

[Trow, 1977, p.22]

The Community College Administrative Structure.

Administration was defined in 1950 by Ordway Tead in his book The Origin of Administration as the function within an organization which was responsible for establishing its objectives, purposes, aims or ends, for implementing the necessary organizing and operating steps and for assuring adequate performance toward the desired end. To be consistent with this definition of administration, the community college should develop its administration according to its stated objectives. This first step of the process of organizing the administration was to analyze the curriculum into a minimum number of administrative units, to make each unit a manageable size, to define those units in order to ensure logical coherence, and finally to define the roles of the individuals who were responsible for administering those units. At their inception, the community college adopted the traditional department/division structure.
For most community colleges, the most effective operational units are divisions, and the key of the success of the program is the position of the division chairman. (Brann, 1972, p.3)

According to Dr. David Underwood, most community junior colleges had one of the two organizational patterns:

1. The college president had three area heads reporting to him/her: Instruction, Student Services, and Business. All instruction, including transfer, technical, and remedial education, as well as library services, was the Dean of Instruction's responsibility.

2. The college president had more than three heads reporting to him/her: Transfer education, technical education, continuing education, student services and business services. (Underwood, 1977, p.153)

Under each of these heads was a person who reported to the dean which might have the title of chairperson, director, associate dean, etc. This person's duties were clustered into the functions of curriculum, faculty, and resources. The division chairman is now a sort of fulcrum or lever operated at both ends. He is academic administrator, manager, coordinator, but at the same time is the sort of head teacher, the role that the dean may have served in when colleges
were smaller. (Underwood, 1972, p.154)

Underwood stated that the ideal division chairman planned, organized, evaluated, communicated, and controlled the job, not the people.

Upon discussing the administrative structure of the community college, it became evident that the structure was simple enough to understand, but the titles of the persons performing certain roles became confusing and depended entirely upon the school. For example, the title of "dean" could be given to anyone from the chief administrator to the department chairperson, spanning the top three levels of administration.

Dr. Don Morgan wrote in his article "Instructional Deans and Chairmen in the Community College: A New Identity Crisis On an Old Theme":

The deans in a community college organization are administrators who are usually responsible for more specific and specialized functions of the institution. They may also be titled, in addition to the term 'dean', as directors, coordinators or, in some cases, chairmen. Some common subdivisions for which they may be responsible are student activities, instructional services, financial aids, admissions and records and occupational education. The deans are
generally in direct supervision classifications
both certified and classified, who work under
their jurisdiction. (Morgan, 1974, p.21)

Generally the positions of dean were in conventional line
and staff structure that used the chain-of-command principle.
This structure was basically a pyramid in which divisions and
department personnel reported to a central authority. Many
community colleges had a division director reporting to the
dean and a department chairperson or coordinator reporting to
the division director. Within the usual structures of
community colleges was the concept of the cluster community
college.

A cluster college system modifies the structure
so that authority is dispersed broadly among
institutional members and a less vertical
organizational chart results. Although the
chief administrator, president and vice-president
coordinate the activities of the several
clusters, the cluster dean is in effect the
leader of the internal operations of the
institution. (Dolan, 1976, p.25)

The cluster dean was a composite of deans, as he/she
functioned as the dean of faculty, a dean of students, and a
dean of various transfer and career programs. The principle
organization base of the cluster college was
interdisciplinary groupings of faculty and students. Usually a full complement of Baccalaureate courses were offered within a given cluster college along with a proportionate distribution of the technical curricula represented by each learning cluster. In order to maintain a given student-faculty ratio, there were as many learning clusters formed as necessary. An example of this ratio was thirty full-time faculty with thirty part-time faculty to serve one thousand students. Each learning cluster was supervised by a cluster dean.

The basic intent of the cluster college was to provide the best possible instruction for students in a totally integrated, interdisciplinary organization that emphasizes the actual teaching-learning process and total development of its students. A second intent of the cluster college was an attempt to cope with the problem of growth which had been facing the community college. The cluster arrangement allowed the small college atmosphere within a large, growing institution.

In the community colleges which were organized in divisions, the academic division was larger and more diversified than a traditional department. A division would contain general transfer classes as well as technical courses. For example, at Clark County Community College in Las Vegas, Nevada, in 1983-84 the Business Division was
headed by a division director and had the curricula of accounting, automotive, business management and marketing, mathematics, and real estate. In addition the Director was responsible for the education in the small towns surrounding Las Vegas of Indian Springs, Jean, Mesquite, and was responsible for the coordination of such high schools as Indian Springs, Rancho, Valley, and Virgin Valley where college courses were taught.

In the continuum including the department chairman at one end and the dean at the other the division chairman is closer to a dean than he is to a department chairman. There is a temptation to describe him as a kind of assistant dean, but this is misleading. It is an adequate analogy so long as the emphasis falls heavily on dean, but quite misleading if the emphasis falls on assistant. A similar mistake is made when the dean is regarded as an assistant president. Just as a dean should properly be regarded as the chief administrator of a part of an institution, the division chairman should be thought of as the chief administrator of a division, not as a junior level central administrator". (Koehline, 1972, p.5)

The duties of the division director included his/her
annual report in which he/she summarized problems, progress and prospects for his/her division and, he/she represents his/her division in relation to other divisions within the college and in relation with other colleges. Next, he/she managed the practical detail of the operation of the division, such as making sure that texts were on hand for the instructors, maintaining the records for the division, and supervising the office operation of the division. Finally, he/she edited the work of the division and prepared reviewed and revised materials for the catalog that fell within the area the responsibility of his/her faculty.

The division director was not only a scholar but a leader of teaching faculty. Koehline stated:

The division organization is flexible. If the chairman has the kind of personality that is needed, he gives his division and thus to the college as a whole the capacity to change to meet circumstances; thus, he is ready to serve the needs of society with a current program rather than a cut and dried pattern established by tradition and hallowed by time. (Koehline, 1972, p.8)
Summary of the Literature

The community college had objectives to meet the community's needs and it worked to make the institution accessible to the community and to all those who could profit from its services. It was part of the democratic way of life in the United States, having brought higher education within reach of most people.

Like any school, the community college was a bureaucracy, building its administrative structure in a hierarchy. The third level of this hierarchy took on many titles but was generally a leader of a specific subdivided interdisciplinary area which included academic transfer classes as well as specialized technical courses.

The third level administrator was a scholar and maintained the business of his/her division, caring for the faculty, the resources, and the curriculum. In the search for effectiveness, the third level administrator was studied considering the democratic nature of the community college, and the administrative theories of Getzels and Guba and their model of social systems and Hersey and Blanchard and their model of situational leadership.

The role of the third level administrator in the community college fell somewhere between a department chairperson and a dean, but was more like the position of a dean. The duties of this person were many and extremely
important to the existence of the college. To illustrate their duties, Appendix IV is an example of a description of the third level administrator in community colleges.
CHAPTER III

The Study

A Study of the Role of the Division Director at Clark County Community College

An example of a community college as a social system was Clark County Community College located in North Las Vegas, Nevada, with a satellite campus in Henderson, Nevada and classroom locations all over the city of Las Vegas in such facilities as the High School buildings. Clark County Community College was a public urban community college located close to the largest city in Nevada, Las Vegas which served the counties of Clark, Esmeralda, Nye, and Lincoln. The "community" the College served had as its primary industry tourism. Many residents commuted to the Nevada Test Site and the largest tactical air base the United States which was Nellis Air Force Base and was located less than miles from the College. The cities of Clark County included Las Vegas, Boulder City, Henderson, and North Las Vegas. The total headcount enrollment of the College ranged from 9000 to
12,000 students in the past five years.

The College was public supported, part of the University of Nevada System, which was governed by a Board of Regents and a Chancellor. This support was shared by two universities, three other community colleges, and the Desert Research Institute. Clark County Community College began in 1971 and shared its community with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas which was located 10 miles south of the college.

C.C.C.C. was a comprehensive community college. Its philosophy as stated in the 1984-85 edition of its "Administrative Handbook" was:

Education is a continuous process of the development of awareness, goals, satisfaction, and new awareness. At its best, it is a uniquely human process of dynamic self-renewal; C.C.C.C. is dedicated to meeting the educational, social, and cultural needs of all people within its district by helping those who would be students in the understanding of self, society, work, and citizenship. It is our major responsibility to assist all students in the development and realization of full potential and competence in the leading of productive and rewarding lives. By assuming responsibility for a major role in educational leadership within our community, we seek to enhance the quality of life, the capacity to know, and the ability
to accomplish for all whose lives we may touch.

[C.C.C.C., 1984-85, p.3]

Having stated its philosophy, Clark County Community College gave its mission:

The mission of C.C.C.C. is to bring post-secondary educational opportunities within the regional, psychological, and financial reach of all who seek them. C.C.C.C. seeks to offer quality, economical, accessible, and convenient instructional and other services in career education, general education, transfer education, developmental training, guidance and counseling, and lifelong learning whereby:

1. Students may obtain the knowledge and skills needed for careers in business, industry, and government.
2. Students may prepare themselves for transfer to other collegiate institutions to obtain the baccalaureate or other degrees.
3. Students may benefit from developmental and special programs tailored to enhance individual student success.
4. Students may effectively utilize advising, counseling, and other personal services at any stage of experience.
5. Students enrich their lives and the life of the community by means of lifelong learning programs and services. (C.C.C.C., 1984-85 p.3)
To illustrate that it was a comprehensive community college, the "Administrative Handbook" stated and defined the functions of the college. It reported that the C.C.C.C. Master Plan reflected the Nevada Statute which described a five-fold purpose for an open-door, comprehensive educational institution.

Training is mandated in the areas of occupational education, university parallel programs, community service, developmental education, and counseling and guidance. (C.C.C.C., 1984-85 p.4)

The administrative structure of the College was pyramidal in form with a President, two Deans, and several functions at the third or Director level. In addition there were several staff positions reporting to the President. The two Dean positions were those of the Dean of College Services and the Dean of Educational Services. The staff positions reporting to the President were the Business Manager, the Assistant to the President, the Director of Community Relations and Development, and the Director of Personnel and Affirmative Action.

Reporting to the Dean of College Services was the Director of Community Education, the Director of Learning Resources Center, the Director of Operations and Maintenance, the Director of Student Services and the Registrar. Reporting to the Dean of Educational Services was the
Director of the Business Division, the Director of the Communications and Fine Arts Division, the Director of the Henderson Campus, the Director of the Science and Health Division, and the Director of the Social Science and Service Occupations Division.

In its Introduction the "Handbook" stated the bureaucracy of the social system through its administrative structure. It said:

College management is a delicate enterprise which balances the diverse and often competing views of students, faculty, and administration to create an environment which promotes teaching and learning activities. The hallmark of effective management is systems and processes which maximize fiscal and human resources to produce efficient college operation. (C.C.C.C., 1984-85, p.1)

It continued that there was broad-based college decision-making utilizing student, faculty, and college-wide committees. "Primary responsibility for daily college operation rests with the Directors; procedural and policy issues were primarily the responsibility of the Deans; and ultimate administrative authority rests with the President." (C.C.C.C., 1984-85, p.1)

The "Handbook" listed the general duties and responsibilities of all the administrators in the College.
The primary responsibilities were:

1. Planning, organizing, and administering the activities of the assigned office or division in accordance with University of Nevada System Code, College policies, and/or applicable statutes.
2. Establishing management objectives which are complements of institutional objectives and providing the leadership necessary to achieve both management and institutional objectives.
3. Recommending the organizational structure and staff required for the efficient operation of the area.
4. Recommending and supervising appropriate personnel for the area and evaluating their performance periodically.
5. Establishing and maintaining a climate which encourages staff development and the retention of competent personnel, and assure a favorable working atmosphere.
6. Maintaining the reporting relationship to his/her immediate supervisor by providing information about activities of the unit, apprising him/her particularly of major or unusual developments, and seeking his/her advice and counsel.
7. Recommending and administering the budget for the office or division within established limitations,
including allocation and control of the assigned fiscal
resources and equipment.

8. Keeping informed of new developments relating to the
assigned functions, some of which may be used to improve
the effectiveness of the unit.

9. Meeting regularly with assigned staff in order to
keep them informed of College activities and to provide
leadership to the staff.

10. Preparing periodic written reports for his/her
immediate supervisor and/or the President of the College
describing past activities, evaluating and appraising
such projects, and outlining immediate plans for the
future. (C.C.C.C., 1984-85, p.7)

Secondary responsibilities included serving on
committees and in organizations, attending professional
meetings and performing other duties as assigned or delegated
by the immediate supervisor and/or the President of the
College. A combination of responsibilities included
cooperating with other administrators and staff and
maintaining effective relations with faculty, students,
classified staff, the community at large, and other
educational institutions.

Directors were responsible in general for the planning,
development, organization, coordination, management, and
evaluation of their divisions. In 1984-85 the Director of
the Business Division was responsible for the management of all business and math programs and courses. The instructional areas of responsibility included accounting, banking/finances/savings and loans, business management/marketing, mathematics, office administration and automation, and real estate. The Director of the Communications and Fine Arts Division was responsible for the management of all communication and fine arts programs and courses which included art, English, foreign languages, speech, theatre, Developmental courses, Adult Basic Education and English as a Second Language.

The Director of the Industrial Technologies Division was responsible for the management of all Industrial Technology courses which included auto, computer technician, drafting, engineering, electronics, graphic arts, solar energy, and welding. The Director of Occupational and Technical Education assisted the Dean of Educational Services, having had a leading role in the development, implementation, and management of credit instruction in the area of occupational education. He/she served as the institutional liaison with Federal, state, and local agencies with regard to application for the utilization of occupational programs funding, managing, implementing, and soliciting funding for specialized occupational programs.

The Director of Science and Health Division was
responsible for the management of all science and health programs and courses. The science program included biological sciences, chemistry, computer science, ornamental horticulture, physical science/astronomy, and environmental sciences. The health programs included practical nursing, emergency medical services, dental hygiene, respiratory therapy, and leisure service/recreation/physical education.

The Director of Social Sciences and Service Occupations Division was responsible for the management of all social science and service occupations programs and courses. The social sciences included anthropology, economics, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion, and sociology. The service occupations included criminal justice, child development, human services, legal assistant, fire science, and resort occupations.

The Director of the Henderson Campus was responsible for the management and daily supervision of the physical plant, instruction, personnel, budgetary resources, and community relations. This Director reported directly to the Dean of Educational Services for the instructional and budgetary functions of the Henderson Campus and also to the President of the College on matters related to community affairs and public relations. He/she also coordinated with the Dean of College Services and the Instructional Directors to fulfill the assigned duties and responsibilities for the Henderson
To gain further insight into the role of the Division Director at Clark County Community College, each Director was interviewed at the end of the Fall Semester of 1984 using seven basic questions:

1. What is your general responsibility?
2. What are the pressing issues you face as a director?
3. What is your perception of your mission? Are you an educational leader?
4. How do you think others perceive you?
5. What can be done to improve your role?
6. What should be the coordinator's role?
7. What questions should be asked in the general survey for the remainder of this study?

General Responsibilities

The Directors concurred that their general responsibilities included personnel, budget, curriculum, public relations, leadership, program development, faculty and program evaluation, legislative and legal issues, and division philosophy, goals and objectives. Some felt that they did everything no one else would or could do. Most felt that their span of control was close to being unmanageable. One Division Director reported that he/she had to make personnel decisions for sixteen full-time faculty, one
hundred part-time faculty, and five coordinators. He/she was responsible for hiring all the part-time instructors and had to conduct student evaluations on all instruction in his/her division and visited all the part-time instructors. Another Director stated that his/her responsibilities could be best described as a "nightmare". He/she was responsible for 50-55 lab sections with supplies, equipment maintenance and preparation required for each one. He/she thought that the volume of purchasing was too large. For example, there were 1000 items to be purchased for the Dental Hygiene Clinic alone to serve the 225 patients weekly. In addition the equipment broke down constantly. This same Director operated a planetarium, a micro-computer lab, science-health learning labs, physical education technology, and the labs on the Henderson campus. His/her other responsibilities included preparation of affiliation contracts annually with special items which had to be negotiated and approved, liability insurance for faculty and students, advisory committees for the health programs and student problems in the clinics. Room assignments had to be made weekly and students' schedules had to be managed.

Another Division Director had a student head count of 4700 in his/her division which were served by 117 faculty members. He/she had to be concerned with student grievances, development of schedules, curriculum evaluation, and course
descriptions based on the needs of the community. In addition, the diverse personalities in his/her division made it difficult to motivate the faculty and even more difficult to motivate with faculty who were not granted tenure and who refused to work.

Pressing Issues

The pressing issues which faced the division director ranged from a temporary situation to major frustrations. The Directors at C.C.C.C. reported their pressing issues as:

1. Articulation with the University and the School District;
2. Competition within the division;
3. Supervising part-time faculty;
4. Resources, facilities, and equipment;
5. Too much paperwork;
6. Staff development;
7. Responsibility without authority to carry out their work;
8. Quality control of their span of control;
9. Student grievances;
10. Faculty evaluations; and
11. Faculty with other jobs on the side and who did not spend enough time at the College.

Mission

The questions were asked, what is your perception of your
mission and are you an educational leader? The answers varied. One Director expressed that directors could achieve short-term but not long-term goals because what he/she achieved disappeared when he/she left that position. This Director did not feel like an educational leader at that time but more like a "stepping stone." Another Director said educational leadership varied with the organizational structure and that authority was vested in the role. The leadership depended on the decision-making authority. At that time there was limited authority because most of the authority was centralized at the upper level.

Still another Director said that he/she was a paper-shover. This person said that in theory he/she was an educational leader but not in reality. In contrast, another Director stated that he/she was an educational leader as he/she enabled people to see possibilities that they had not seen by relating to their personal interest. This Director said he/she made opportunities for leaders by creating an environment and resources so that faculty could perform to excellence. Another Director concurred that he/she employed the expertise of the faculty and subtly led them with suggestions. This Director said he/she saw what needed to be done and induced people to do it.

Another Director thought that the institution was in trouble because all the leadership was concentrated at the
top and the "lieutenants" received no respect. Plans were not made and decisions were made in the form of "boat bailing" and "putting band-aids on things."

Perception of Self

The fourth question concerned the way in which the directors thought they were perceived by others. One Director thought that the faculty perceived him/her as a paper-pusher and that the highest priority was having a meeting. He/she thought that the Dean gave him/her so many things to tell the faculty that the faculty had begun to ignore all the paperwork. This Director said that so many things filtered through him/her that if a bad director had the position, the work would "bottle neck." He/she said that the system caused overachievers to work hard to justify the institution while others just survived.

Another Director stated that internally faculty perceive him/her in a semi-leadership role because he/she lacked control and authority. Externally this Director had a strong leadership role. He/she thought that the position would be viewed differently if there was a title change to Associate Dean or Dean. Another Director concurred with the need for a title change, having said that the change was critical and complementary. It would have established the person so that the position would not seem non-essential and others would be
more aware of the time and the paperwork demand.

The Director of the Henderson Campus said that the community perceived him/her as a public official who was important to the community. He/she said that he/she meant more to the Henderson community than the President of the University meant to the Las Vegas community. Internally he/she thought he/she "skated on thin ice" in order to keep out of the other directors' territories.

Another Director said that the faculty perceived him/her as a leader because he/she was selected as the acting Director before being confirmed into the position. He/she said that the faculty thought he/she was a good educator because he/she was a fair and honest individual. Still another Director thought that the faculty regarded him/her as an oddball and they were gracious in their support while they expected him/her to fight for and take care of the division.

Improvement of the Role

The fifth question asked was what could be done to improve your role? One Director wanted to reorganize the College by decentralizing it. He/she thought that there should be three Deans with one over University Parallel programs, one over Vocational programs, and one for College Services. He/she thought that department chairpersons should have a substantial amount of release time and be elected for
accountability to the faculty. Roles should be redefined with teaching faculty doing research. University Parallel faculty should see that the students read and write for the integrity of the program. Directors should be given authority with responsibility for discipline.

Three Directors thought more flexibility and authority should be provided to the directors as well as more opportunity for leadership creativity. They wanted to delegate more authority and responsibility to the coordinators.

Another Director said that their titles should change to dean and coordinators' titles to directors. Ideally, it would have been good to grant a raise along with the new title. Another Director concurred having said that the position was underpaid for the amount of work required.

One Director thought that no change was needed in his/her role but there was a need for an outsider to look at the organization and the policies. This person thought that procedures were out of control, that there were good intentions to involve faculty but there were too many committees.

Coordinator's Role

The sixth question concerned a definition of the role of the coordinator. The unanimous answer was that coordinators
should be given more authority with their responsibilities. For example, more personnel authority should be given to the coordinators such as evaluation of their faculty. The Directors said that the role of the coordinator should be clearly defined: if the coordinator was only to assist, then authority should be limited; but if the coordinator must manage and supervise, then authority should be transferred with those functions. With authority they should recruit students, evaluate faculty, prepare program curriculum, etc. These changes would allow the director to do more long-range planning.

**Summary**

The perception of the Instructional Directors of their role at Clark County Community College was that their role was important but they thought that the faculty and upper administration did not perceive their role in the same manner. Half of the directors thought they were educational leaders and half thought they were not afforded the authority to be educational leaders. All the directors felt overworked, and all wanted more authority to carry out their responsibilities. Some of the directors wanted a title change to Dean or Associate Dean and more compensation for the position. All the directors thought that the coordinators who reported to them should be delegated more authority.
Methodology

There were approximately 1219 community colleges in the United States. This study was a selected sampling of those institutions. Five hundred institutions were chosen from the Directory for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Community and junior colleges were chosen from each of the 50 states, selecting from each state the largest and smallest public institution, the largest and smallest private institution, two or three median sized public and private institutions, and the oldest and youngest institution.

After the institutions were selected, information from the year of 1983 was collected. This information included total enrollment, total faculty, total professional staff, and total administration. Total enrollment was defined in this study as the headcount of full-time and part-time students enrolled for credit hours only. Total faculty was considered both the full-time and part-time personnel who teach. The professional staff were professional employees who were librarians, counselors, etc., if these staff were not designated by the college as either faculty or
administration. Administration was defined as the executive and managerial staff who spent fifty percent or more of their time in administrative work.

**General Characteristics of the Institutions Selected**

1. Year classes began:
   - Oldest: 1828
   - Youngest: 1983
   - Average: 1971

2. Total enrollment in 1983:
   - Smallest: 40
   - Largest: 35534
   - Average: 5704

3. Total faculty in 1983:
   - Least: 13
   - Most: 1670
   - Average: 275

4. Total Professional Staff in 1983:
   - Least: 0
   - Most: 194
   - Average: 16
5. Total Administration in 1983:
Least: 0
Most: 128
Average: 14

Perhaps the various titles of the third level administrators was caused because the titles of the chief administrators varied. There were 20 variations of chief administrator titles in the 500 schools chosen which illustrated the differences in the institutions. The following is a list along with the frequency:
1. President: 387
2. Campus President: 4
3. Executive Vice President: 1
4. Vice President: 5
5. Vice President-Dean: 5
6. Dean: 16
7. Executive Dean: 2
8. Campus Dean: 1
9. Chancellor: 5
10. Administrator: 1
11. Campus Administrator: 1
12. Director: 11
13. District Director: 16
14. Dean/Director: 1
15. Campus Director: 2
16. Superintendent Director: 1
17. Superintendent: 3
18. Superintendent/President: 18
19. Provost: 15
20. Rector: 1

After the institutions were chosen and the information was collected, letters were sent to each of the 500 institutions addressed to the chief administrator. These letters explained the purpose of the research and requested a copy of the administrative organizational structure and the name or names of persons who were considered third level administrators whose responsibilities were faculty and instruction, and who would respond to the survey. The organizational structure was requested in order to check that the persons selected to answer the survey would indeed be the correct position (Refer to Appendix 1). These letters were sent on Clark County Community College stationary from Dr. Paul Meacham, President. His signature was used to insure a prompt response. Of the 500 letters sent, 274 institutions responded for a 55% response rate.

The survey instrument was then designed, utilizing the review of the literature and the suggestions from the Directors at Clark County Community College. The survey was
then tested utilizing three persons who had not been interviewed in the pilot study because one was a newly appointed director, one was an acting director, and one was not available during the personal interviews. Next the survey was reviewed by the President of Centralia College in Centralia, Washington and the Dean of Educational Services at Clark County Community College. The survey was again modified using the suggestions of the Directors, the Dean, and the President.

The Survey

Utilizing the designated third level administrators recommended by the chief administrations and the positions from the organization structure charts, 697 surveys were sent to the 274 institutions. Five hundred eight responses were received from 255 schools resulting in a response rate of 93% from the schools and 73% from the third level administrators. The survey was accompanied by a letter on Clark County Community College stationary with each letter individually signed by the researcher, designed to provide the personal touch. The letter explained the project and advised the third level administrator that their names were recommended to respond to the survey by their chief administrator (Refer to appendix II).
There were 15 variations of the titles of the third level administrator who responded. The following lists the frequency of the use of the title by the states rather than by each response:

Title: Number of states which use this title
1. Division Chairperson: 24
2. Director: 17
3. Associate Dean: 17
4. Program Dean: 13
5. Assistant Dean: 10
6. Division Head: 4
7. Coordinator: 3
8. Vice President: 3
9. Division Dean: 2
10. Department Chairperson: 2
11. Department Head: 2
12. Dean of Academic Affairs for ...: 2
13. Dean of Instruction for ...: 1
14. Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs: 1
15. Dean 1, 2, 3, etc.: 1

The survey was divided into four sections. The first two sections required simple yes-no answers with one question which required a small list. The third and fourth sections required written responses (Refer to Appendix II). The
survey was divided into three subject areas: 1.) general responsibilities, 2.) mission and perceptions, and 3.) issues and frustrations. The fourth section requested recommendations for reform for more effectiveness.

**General Responsibilities**

The first section, general responsibilities, had eleven items to address the question of the study "What are the principle responsibilities of the division director?" The questions and responses were:

1. Do you directly supervise the full-time faculty in your division? Yes: 302 No: 97
2. Do you directly supervise the part-time faculty in your division? Yes: 361 No: 121
3. Is there another level of administration which reports to you? Yes: 255 No: 230

The yes responses reported the following ten titles of administrators who reported to them:

1. Chairpersons: 86
2. Coordinator: 54
3. Department Head: 42
4. Director: 42
5. Supervisor: 11
6. Assistant Dean: 6
7. Team Leader: 5
8. Associate Dean: 6
9. Lead Instructor: 2
10. Dean: 1

The remaining questions with their responses were:

4. Do you make personnel decisions for your division, such as hiring, promotions, evaluations, etc? Yes: 437 No: 29

5. Do you delegate any of the above personnel decisions to others in your division? Yes: 229 No: 240

6. Are you responsible for more than one department or area? Yes: 456 No: 29
   a. If yes, are those departments or areas similar in discipline, i.e. social sciences? Yes: 282 No: 139
   b. Are those departments or areas a mixture of general education courses and occupational and technical courses? Yes: 272 No: 180

7. Do you have complete responsibility for your budgets? Yes: 350 No: 124

8. Do you delegate responsibility for your budgets to others in your division? Yes: 249 No: 228

9. Do you have student services responsibilities, such as recruitment or admissions? Yes: 158 No: 273

10. Are you responsible for the curriculum in your division? Yes: 453 No: 23

11. Considering all your responsibilities, do you have a manageable span of control? Yes: 420 No: 70
The first two questions were asked in order to establish the closeness of the third level administrator to the faculty. The third question established what were the titles of the next level in the administrative structure.

In response to the fourth question concerning personnel, some respondents added that they only recommended in the hiring process and other respondents that their only personnel function was to evaluate the faculty.

Questions five and six established the makeup of the divisions of the responding institutions. Questions seven through ten tested the authority of the targeted administrator by establishing the budget responsibilities and a general idea of the span of control.

The eleventh question was in response to the personal interviews with the Directors at Clark County Community College and the review of the literature. These references created the suspicion that many persons who worked as third level administrators thought they were overworked. The suspicion was not confirmed.

Mission and Perceptions

To answer the second question of this study, which was "How do the first and second level administrators, the faculty, the peers, the students, and the community perceive the role of the third level administrator and how do they
perceive themselves?", the second section of the survey was created. Five questions were asked for yes-no responses.

The questions and responses were as follows:

1. Do you think you have an important role in the institution? Yes: 476 No: 8

2. Do you think that you have enough authority to perform your responsibilities? Yes: 370 No: 104

3. Do you formulate the philosophy for your division? Yes: 348 No: 112

4. Do you think that your administration perceives you as an educational leader? Yes: 448 No: 26
   a. the faculty? Yes: 434 No: 29
   b. the students? Yes: 404 No: 58
   c. your peers? Yes: 461 No: 10
   d. the community? Yes: 406 No: 44

5. Do you perceive yourself as a "paper-pusher"? Yes: 174 No: 291

The responses showed an overwhelming perception that the role was important to the college and the community.

The review of the literature and the interviews with the Clark County Community College administrators prompted the request for the fifth question of this section concerning the perception of a "paper-pusher". The question could be taken seriously or humorously with a little sarcasm. Many of those who responded yes placed little notes beside their responses,
such as "not really", "sometimes", and "it goes with the territory!". One respondent chose to define paper pushing by writing that it could be viewed as a "pointless activity used to fill time" or "a necessary evil of administrative recordkeeping."

**Issues and Frustrations**

In order to find what were the issues which concerned the third level administrator and to obtain more detail from the previous questions, the next section was developed. The objective was to gain insight into what was happening in the community colleges and what were the true, not just stated, responsibilities of the third level administrators. The question was asked on the survey "Please list current pressing issues in your division or in the institution with which you must work in your present position." The second part was "What are your frustrations?" Three spaces were provided for each response. There was the suggestion that more space could be used by utilizing the back of the paper. It should be noted that sometimes the pressing issues and the major frustrations could be one and the same response.

The responses were organized into major subject with respondents commenting in sub-groups. The following is that organization:

A. Budget and Enrollment: 255
1. Decreasing budget: 215
2. Budget for equipment: 45
3. Space allocation: 31
4. Declining enrollment: 111
5. Marketing and recruitment: 33
6. Advisement and placement of students: 23

B. Authority, Control and Decision-making: 71
   1. Ineffective leadership: 43
   2. Lack of institutional planning: 46

C. Curriculum: 156
   1. Curriculum revision and development: 47
   2. Developmental and remedial education: 28
   3. General Education: 26
   4. Vocational Education: 16
   5. Class schedules: 14
   6. Testing: 12

D. Use of the Computer: 35

E. Not enough time: 211
   1. Too much paperwork: 39
   2. Too many meetings: 21

F. Faculty: 205
   1. Hiring or replacing faculty: 37
   2. Too many part-time faculty: 58
   3. General personnel problems: 17
   4. Staff development: 31
5. Faculty evaluations: 38
6. Faculty morale: 15
7. Lack of professionalism: 21
8. Tenured faculty: 35
9. Unions: 37
10. Sexism and prejudice: 3
11. Bureaucracy and politics: 22
12. Conflict: 45
13. Lack of an adequate reward system: 9

G. Communication: 32

H. Perception: 13
   1. Salary: 9

I. The Public: 41
   1. Public relations: 12
   2. The public and other institutions: 13
   3. Accreditation: 16

J. Responsibilities versus span of control: 55

A. Budget and Enrollment

The main issue which concerned the third level administrators was a concern of the entire institution. That issue was one of declining enrollment which was one of the causes of a decreasing budget. This decreasing budget had created the problem of the lack of funds needed to maintain and purchase equipment and obtain classroom space. This, in
turn, limited creativity and innovation which then affected faculty morale. Complaints concerning the budget ranged from the budget being too slow to be approved, to too much money spent on non-educational things. Examples of comments were:

1. How does one adjust programs and service to declining budgets?
2. There are not enough resources to fully carry out the mission of the institution.
3. There are a lack of resources to meet the increasing community demands and needs.
4. Funding is a major frustration when you depend on the legislature every year to determine what might or might not be able. It is very hard to plan for the future when so many changes occur each year.
5. The budget seems to be closing in. Each year we seem to have less money to do more!

The need for the replacement and repair of old equipment and the purchase of new equipment was a definite pressing issue and a major frustration. Those comments spoke of the changing technology which required new equipment which was very costly and that there was the lack of the funds to take care of this need.

Space allocation was another need which was controlled by the declining budget. Space was needed to serve the student body, to expand to new labs or classrooms, and for clinical
experiences for the students. There was a need for more classrooms at popular hours and a need to keep up building maintenance.

Many of the comments focused on the effort to try to solicit the needed funds. Pressing issues included soliciting donations, passing a tax referendum, complaints about the fund-raising activities by the President and the Development Office, activities of grant-writing, and being creative with limited finances.

The largest budget reductions had come from county, state, and federal sources. Another large reason for the declining budget was the declining enrollment. There were declines in almost every state. Some of the reasons given for the decline in enrollment were that there were less 18 year olds now, there were reductions in federal student financial assistance, and there were increases of tuition. One school thought that their enrollment would decline if their courses became non-credit. The areas of the enrollment decline were in liberal arts programs, the humanities, forestry, nursing, and recreation programs. In contrast, four institutions in Florida, California, and Nebraska were experiencing increases in enrollment.

To counteract the declining enrollments many respondents considered a pressing issue or a major frustration was that of marketing the institution or the recruitment of students.
Along with the recruitment, they searched for ways to prevent the attrition of the students. Across the country the interest was in the recruitment of older students, and the recruitment of students into vocational education programs, and the recruitment of recent high school graduates.

Following recruitment as a pressing issue was advisement. Most of those responses concerned improving the advisement and placement of the students. There was a need to get timely assessment and proper advising and placement for students. There was also a need to develop admissions standards and criteria. Some schools were seeking to define academic advising versus counseling, or which was the responsibility of the faculty and which was the responsibility of the counselors. Other schools were concerned about the demographic changes in the student population, that the students were getting older, and that they worked full-time and did not have time to study. One Director in Texas thought that his/her pressing issue was the failure on the part of the faculty to accept the population and learning characteristics of the area.

Texas was not alone in trying to adjust to the new population of students. Directors in California, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, etc. were concerned about the "woefully underprepared students". They were experiencing faculty burnout because they had to deal almost exclusively
with very underprepared students. They were working toward increasing the offerings of remedial programs. Some were blaming the poor quality of students in part on reduced advising. In contrast, Directors in North Carolina and Oregon were forming honors programs.

B. Authority, Control and Decision-Making

The responses which concerned lack of authority in decision-making generally expressed that there was insufficient authority and control to carry out responsibilities. One Director said "My major frustration is my lack of real authority; for example, if it is correct, no one notices, if it is wrong, I am responsible with no leverage over the faculty." The Directors were attempting to bring a balance between authority and responsibility, because they thought that responsibility was given but not the authority to manage.

This authority had to do with decision-making and power to get the faculty to do what was required of them. One Director said that he/she had no authority over division chairpersons who sent in class schedule Director would have liked the authority to determine and assign the appropriate number of teaching contact hours for each instructor.

The loss of control and authority also had to do with
decisions being made about the director's division without
the input from the director. This was done by Presidents who
thought they should make all the ultimate decisions. It also
occurred when power was centralized for schools in districts
and multicampuses. This occurred also when it was perceived
that some Deans of Instruction held on to power and authority
and would not share it. The directors complained that
decisions were made on the basis of money instead of what was
best for the students. They complained that administration
made decisions in the dark and without the use of
institutional data in making plans and decisions. Some
perceived that there was a general orientation of the
institution to a "crisis" management style with not enough
participative decision-making in its management style. They
wanted more input into decisions such as enrollment,
registration procedures and scheduling practices.

In contrast, there were other directors who complained
that there was too much participative management, that there
was a lack of movement in the decision-making process with
too much committee, forum, group process without conclusion.
Another said that there was a philosophy that all decisions
must be made only after everyone had input and basically
agreed upon it.

Too much participative management could be viewed as
ineffective leadership. The respondents wrote of weak Deans
of Academic Affairs, ineffective Deans of Instruction, and the Dean's idiosyncracies. They complained of procrastination by the Deans in pushing through issues and decisions concerning their divisions. They commented that there was a lack of interest and understanding and that some administrators were indecisive and reactive. There was also a Vice President who frustrated the third level administrator because he/she never responded.

There were responses from third level administrators who were frustrated by their Presidents. One Director said he/she had a President who was mercurial and was too concerned with details better left to others who could do the job better. Another Director wrote that his/her President talked of excellence but there was no connection between what he/she said and the problems with which they had to deal in the trenches on a day to day basis. Still another Director commented that his/her President talked Theory Y, but operated on Theory X. Another Director responded that his/her President and other non-instructional deans lacked comprehension of what was instructional management and operation. They perceived that faculty were "labor" and not professionals which led to poor relations between instruction and administration. Another Director said:

I often think that the upper administration has forgotten that the only reason my staff and I are here
is to educate students and that the only reason that they are here is to assist me in that endeavor.

The complaints against administration continued and are briefly listed here:

1. Top administration priorities were not always reflective of what was needed for day to day instruction, i.e. money for computer instruction in an improperly heated/cooled instruction area.

2. There was an administrative interest in image above quality education.

3. There was a failure of chief administrators to function as their positions should. One Dean had about 23 subordinates, yet insisted on being involved in all details while schedules were arbitrarily being changed by him/her.

4. Poor leadership in other administrative offices caused bottlenecks.

5. There was a central office whose policies were not in tune with reality and who had too much power.

6. The administration was unable to re-organize college structure along more efficient lines.

7. There were too many layers of administration.

8. There was a lack of clarity and an inability of administrators to work toward the good of the institution. They were unable to see the big picture and
focus on it.

9. Administrators were paying "lip-service" to faculty concerns.

10. There was constant turmoil and unrest created by the District Superintendent and the Board of Trustees.

11. There was a lack of support from the administration when a student failed. Faculty have felt very "alone" and were made to feel like "ogers".

12. There was an overemphasis by central administration on doing more things, as opposed to doing the right things and doing things right.

Another frequent complaint about administration was the frustration the middle-managers have felt during a reorganization. Such upsets in the routine occurred because of the replacement of the current president, replacement of the vice president, or the replacement of another academic associate dean. Another upset was the move toward standardization and away from creativity. One school had reorganized four years previously and they still had not adjusted to that reorganization. Another dean was alarmed because there was a reorganization plan calling for the elimination of all deans and several department heads. At least six institutions expressed their frustration about changing administrative leadership every couple of years. And some institutions in Texas and Tennessee were changing
from quarter systems to semester systems.

Other directors were saying that the organization was too bureaucratic, that there were too many levels of administration. At the same time others expressed that they needed a clarification of the organizational structure, or they were trying to find a meaningful governance system.

A pressing issue, but not necessarily a major frustration, was working in a new college. Some of the comments received from the third level administrators were: "We are a new institution and an administrator must wear many 'hats' which results in being spread too thin" and "as a new college [2 years old] we are constantly developing and planning curriculum". Another school was trying to create a good, respectable community college in a short period of time by creating an educational and physical environment that would attract good college students to their campus. Still another college was merging two institutions of different natures (a liberal arts oriented two-year college and a technical institute). "This has created a variety of problems from philosophical, organizational, academic, curricular differences to personal and security concerns."

A much expressed pressing issue or major frustration concerned a lack of institutional planning. The reasons for this lack of planning included the administration which lacked strategic vision, had no research done to support
planning, and had continual budget cuts due to a depressed economy which prevented long range planning.

A Director in Michigan wrote:

A pressing issue is planning and implementation. Having a significant plan and the opportunity to move forward with steps that would accomplish the ultimate goals. There were too many details and distractions to keep the momentum going toward broader aims.

As mentioned in the discussion of budget and the discussion of institutional planning, there seemed to be a move toward more state involvement in the institution of the community college. Many community colleges were state supported which had caused problems in managing and operating a budget. Some of this state support was declining which caused class size management to be difficult. Salary increases were tied to the state legislature. State procedures also made purchasing and approvals for plans lengthy.

Increasingly states were mandating procedures for curriculum. In Florida, North Carolina, Illinois, New Jersey, and Washington the state governments were trying to develop standards for each curricular area. They were imposing laws and rules which were restricting some of the divisions and lessening the ability of students to opt for liberal arts electives. The state of Florida was mandating
percentages of placement of students and legislation regarding vocational/occupational education. In Tennessee the State Board of Regents was initiating a comprehensive program of remedial and developmental education for which the community college was largely responsible. Directors in California and Connecticut complained that there were too many state studies, reports, requests for applications, deadlines, etc. There seemed to a centralization of decision-making which made it difficult for the institution to run smoothly. Directors complained that this centralized decision-making was done without the benefit of a realistic picture of what was happening on the campus.

While the states were intervening into the community college curriculum, the Directors were concerned with the quality of instruction and endeavored to promote educational excellence. They wanted to raise the achievement level of the students' grades and have consistency of instruction by establishing clearly defined performance standards. They were concerned about an occasional lack of commitment to academic quality by higher administration. They were also concerned about instructor competencies and faculty who could not manage the classroom.

C. Curriculum

Curriculum was another high response area. The directors said that there were continuous curriculum evaluations,
revisions and updates to meet the job requirements in industry. Some of them said that they needed help in this area. Others wanted to work on the inter-campus inconsistencies, while others wanted to provide incentives for faculty to develop new courses and/or programs of study. They were working to try to keep up with technology within a limited budget. At the same time they were working hard to keep each program nationally and state accredited. Some directors faced a lack of commitment from the total faculty regarding curriculum revisions. Some directors were bored with maintaining the current curricula and would have liked to spend more time determining program innovations possibilities.

A Director in Texas wished to increase the standards in college level work without disrupting enrollment and jobs for faculty. Directors in Iowa and Florida wished to make the course work responsive, responsible, and relevant to students' needs. Other states were trying to articulate and coordinate the curriculum with other campuses. A Director in Colorado wanted to determine the future direction of his/her programs, and to find which were the "priority" programs that needed particular nurturing in order to achieve their potential.

In regard to the subject of curriculum, the next most commented response concerned developmental and remedial
education. Several states were pondering the role of developmental education; should it or should it not grant college credit. Some directors were upset because they had to convince faculty in other areas that developmental studies courses were helpful and that developmental pre-requisites should be fulfilled which would benefit the students. In Washington, a Director was establishing a college wide developmental program that integrated ABE (Adult Basic Education) through sophomore tutoring. Another Director in Oregon was developing an ABE/GED software curriculum and general program.

The next most commented response in curriculum concerned general education. There was a need to reform and refine general education. The question was how much general education to require in the certificate and degree programs. There was a need to create a common core of general education for all programs. In South Dakota there was the question of the role of general studies in a Indian Reservation community. In Texas one school was making curricular changes to meet "common learning". In Ohio, several Directors complained of lack of support from the state for general education courses.

Many directors were fighting to maintain social science, fine arts, and humanities programs in a climate of high-technological advancement. They wanted to define the
role of humanities and its importance in a technical society and curriculum. There was a decline of student interest in social science classes. A Director in the state of Washington said that his/her most pressing issue was that the Liberal Arts facilities were decaying and falling down, and the operating budget for Liberal Arts needs came last even though it was the least expensive. He/she said he/she spent his/her time trying to hold ground rather than advancing and he/she could foresee English classes giving away to computer language and clerical skills classes.

There were many responses concerning vocational education in the community college. The responses were in regard to the competency in vocational programs, to keep pace with the rapid technological changes, to upgrade vocational programs from apprenticeship models to high-tech models, to develop business and industry courses, and to change admission requirements that may preclude many students from entering vocational-technical programs. One school said that their pressing issue was the Carl Perkins Vocational Plan.

Some directors were concerned about reading and writing courses. Their pressing issues included making writing instruction more effective; obtaining procedures, facilities, equipment, staffing, etc. for reading and writing labs; establishing writing and thinking across the curriculum; and mandatory placement on different levels of writing courses.
Some directors were concentrating their efforts on math and science curriculum. They were concerned about the standardization of the math curriculum; the possible combining of the Math and Science Departments, and a complete revision of curriculum in biology and in math.

Directors in the Health Professions had unique concerns. They were worried about the future professional level of education for nurses. There were sudden and severe changes in the entire Health Services Delivery systems and nursing issues which had an impact on ADN and PN programs. In addition, small programs in Health were costly, there was difficulty obtaining adequate clinical experiences for nursing and respiratory therapy students in the shrinking health care arena, and enrollment was declining in the health care area.

The curriculum responses reached a variety of areas. A couple of directors were interested in restructuring the "Police Academy" to meet state requirements. A couple more directors were concerned about the growth of new Native American Studies programs and periodically having to justify the need for an Ethnic Studies curriculum. Two more directors were interested in language assessment issues and English for foreign students. Other directors were working on the establishment of a Child Development laboratory, attaining a balance between athletics and physical education,
the development of a Fashion Merchandising Program, the
development of television and independent study courses,
competency-based education, the development of an Alcoholism
Counseling Program, and off-campus teaching sites for the
Fire Department. They were concerned about grade inflation,
small classes and how to deal with them, and a slow down in
remodeling some areas. A California Director wrote that the
community stressed the need for secretaries who could take
 shorthand, yet students did not seem to be interested in the
program. Another director was concerned about the
repeatability of classes for students. He/she wrote that the
state would not allow a student to take a class over once
he/she had passed the class, and some areas of fine arts,
such as Orchestra, needed the same students every term.

Some directors responded about class schedules. They
said they wanted to publish an error-free, quality class
schedule. They were also trying to develop a master schedule
so they did not have to start from scratch each term.

Testing was another area of frequent response. In
Florida the legislature were increasing the requirements for
the AA degree. They had implemented CLAST (College Level
Academic Skills Test) for graduating students in math,
English, reading, and essay. There was also placement
testing in mathematics which caused concern for at least one
Director because of the way the students were placed in
courses. In Tennessee they had implemented basic skills testing to assure appropriate academic skills to challenge college level course work. And in New Jersey there was a development of a Sophomore-Competency philosophy as an evaluation tool.

D. Computer

In this computer age with high technology having entered every facet of life, education and community colleges are part of the revolution. The third level administrators said that their pressing issues were obtaining and using computers for instruction and administration. In instruction, computers were needed for tutoring, for clinical settings in the health care industry, for the library, for accounting and management curriculum, for lab activities, for vocational areas, and for all curricular areas. The directors wanted to offer more high technology courses and programs. They were asking "To what extent should we emphasize the automated office? And where is the money to come from?" and they were trying to train the office staff in the use of the computer. They were finding difficulty bringing office technology faculty into the computer age and were frustrated with the slowness of the transition to electronic data processing. They needed access and control of computing equipment and software. They wanted information regarding student
attrition, the effectiveness of developmental education offerings, and information on former students, employers, and transfer institution perceptions of degree programs.

Then, when the school started to use the computer, there were many complaints about such things as limited access to database at "prime time", lack of computer assistance when needed for reports, and trying "to get used" to the computer system. There were always conflicts with the people who had control of the computer, whether on the campus or at the district office. One Director wrote about the friction between a "Computer Czar" who oversaw all computer matters at the college versus the need of instruction and a Data Processing faculty who were consistently at odds with decisions coming from that office.

E. Time

The third level administrator, a middle manager, was a very busy position because there were many and varied tasks to perform. As a result there were many responses regarding the lack of time. The time that they needed referred to what the directors considered their responsibilities. The common responses were the lack of time to:

1. think, plan, create, etc.;

2. deal with faculty concerns;
3. meet deadlines;
4. study/research new methods, technologies, and curricular modifications; and
5. Keep up with the discipline.

The comments included that the day to day work was performed on an "urgency" basis leaving the important tasks undone. The tasks which took up most of the time were paperwork, meetings, interruptions, and short deadlines. The directors complained often about the many reports, surveys, and applications that they were obliged to write. They also complained often about the short lead times for the many deadlines that they had to meet.

Part of the problem with the overload of paperwork was the complaint of the lack of staff support. The responses indicated that the directors did not have enough clerical help, or the clerical help that they had was poor, or they needed more professional help with the paperwork.

Another time consuming activity which caused many comments was having to attend meetings. They were especially irritated with meetings that were not action-oriented.

F. Faculty

Under the broad heading of faculty there were numerous responses. The main theme in the responses concerning hiring and replacing faculty was that the third level administrators
were trying to hire the right persons for instruction to meet the quotas and hiring practices while not having enough funds to attract the best people. There was a need to replace retired and ill faculty as well as faculty who had left the institution for better contracts. Some of the difficulties encountered caused by salary level inadequacies were hiring faculty in the health-related programs, finding appropriate staff to coordinate and teach high-tech program areas, and finding faculty to teach math, physics, and electronics.

A wide-spread problem in community colleges was the dependency on part-time faculty. The complaint was that there were too many part-time faculty and there was a need to have more full-time faculty and to pay the part-time faculty better salaries. The impermanence of part-time faculty, the need to maintain standards and academic integrity in courses, the supervision of part-time faculty, adequate office space for part-time faculty, and appropriate evaluation tools for the part-time faculty were the issues associated with the part-time faculty.

Some of the third level administrators expressed that there were too many personnel problems and not enough training on managing personnel. One Director said that he/she "baby-sat" more than anything. Another Director expressed the experience thus:

Some faculty are easy to please and keep happy; others
are more difficult; a few are seldom or never happy or pleased. I have come to accept this as a fact of an administrator's life.

Other difficulties were employees who did not follow the chain of command, a lack of an adequate system of rewards for high performing teachers, tenure and promotion guidelines that were not objective, more authority in the process of hiring personnel, providing assistance to a new department chair, and having a mother and daughter as faculty members.

Faculty concerns experienced by the third level administrators were balancing student needs with faculty needs, faculty release time, dealing with faculty frustrations and feelings of insecurity. They wrote that faculty needed support: financial, collegial, and emotional. They struggled with the definition of an appropriate faculty role with regard to duties other than classroom instruction.

A pressing issue for one Director was working with a faculty member who was given a negative evaluation the previous year.

Staff Development was another much discussed area from the responses to the survey. The concerns were keeping track with changing technology, retraining and updating the skills of the faculty and finding graduate programs available for faculty development.

The subject of faculty evaluations was discussed often. Third level administrators sought to define effective
teaching and to find a good, objective faculty evaluation system. Some directors complained that their evaluation system was weak and the few weak faculty could not be identified, so that they could be helped to improve or fired. The weak systems made it difficult to encourage faculty to give more than the minimum.

Another response regarding faculty concerned the morale of faculty and their job satisfaction. One director said that the faculty morale problem was common throughout his/her institution because they needed a new campus and many problems existed, plus there was a lack of strong leadership at the top. Other institutions had faculty morale problems because there was a lack of incentive or recognition activities, egos were hurt, and class size was increasing during the economic retrenchment. The directors sought to maintain commitment and motivation.

Faculty low morale was fed by the lack of professionalism of some of the faculty, by the complacency of tenured faculty, by the force of the unions, by prejudice, by conflict, and by lack of reward. Those non-professional acting faculty were not committed to academic excellence and tried to take shortcuts and compromise standards in the process. Some directors said that there were faculty who were apathetic and refused to look at education in the light of the new technology and understand what it could do for
teaching. Other directors wrote that some faculty were not meeting teaching responsibilities, e.g. not holding office hours, cancelling classes, and inadequate preparation. Declining enrollments have caused a reduction in faculty, leaving the division staffed with tenured faculty, some of whom were not motivated and apathetic about change. A few directors wrote that their pressing issue was stimulating a "graying" faculty to today's students. Some directors expressed that they felt helpless because they were unable to terminate or retire faculty who refused to update themselves and who had lost their zest for teaching.

Another problem of faculty concern centered around the existence of faculty unions. The directors in many states discussed their work with union grievances and contract negotiations.

Sexism and prejudice were also subjects in the responses. Two responses were about sexism among administrators, students and faculty. One response concerned a faculty member who had no patience with christians.

There were comments that bureaucracy tended to stagnate progress and that the institution had hidden agendas. One Director wrote that administrative appointments were very political at his/her institution. Another Director wrote that the front office was playing politics with problem staff members.
The third level administrator had the role of a middle manager which put him/her in the middle of many conflicts. Some directors said that their loyalty was questioned on both sides, as a faculty advocate by the administration and as a management advocate by the faculty. Some wrote that they were liaisons between faculty and administration, between faculty and students, between their campus and the mother campus, between faculty and their chairpersons, between the district and campus issues, and between instruction and student services. They had to solve people problems caused by a few faculty and students who had particular personalities. They said that some faculty were conflict oriented rather than compromise oriented. One Director said that he/she had to deal with individuals who felt that there could be no opinion but their own. Another Director related the importance of his/her role by using the evidence of the communication problems between the faculty association and the Chancellor in the institution caused by not consulting the Division Chairpersons.

Another conflict third level administrators had to face was student grievances. Some directors were concerned with alcoholism. Among the conflicts that existed was the divisiveness felt with other units in the college. The competition which existed within the college structure were between Instruction and Student Services, Academic
Instruction and Vocational Instruction, and Developmental Education and College Transfer Education. There were responses which complained of their dealings with the Business Office. The directors wrote that the fiscal officer was too conservative and would not support innovation and that they were besieged by requests for information and justification.

The problem of conflict continued because of the lack of consensus on institutional goals. Some directors had to deal with the attitudes of some faculty who were not in sympathy with community college philosophy. A change in philosophy from one of helping the student succeed to helping the student fail created problems for decisions and curricular matters. Without a solid philosophy the overall vision of the task of the community college within the community or region became muddled and caused a problem of coherence and unity.

The last item on the subject of faculty that the third level administrator wrote about was the lack of an adequate reward system for faculty who performed admirably. They wrote of not being able to support innovation, of the lack of academic promotional opportunities, and a lack of clarity concerning what actions would warrant merit pay.

G. Communication
An ongoing problem which existed in any administration was a lack of communication. They wrote of the lack of communication between the administrative units in the college, lack of communication from the faculty up to the top administration, lack of communication from the top administration down to the students. They complained about the higher administration not listening or taking very little action on recommendations. They wrote that they needed more adequate information to make decisions. There was also a problem with the violation of the chain of command and the lines of communication. A couple of responses reported that centralized administration weakened communication and they were not privy to all the information which affected their performance. There were "after the fact" communications, conflicting directions or instructions, and intractable instructions. Physical barriers, such as being housed in two buildings, caused miscommunications at times. One Director admitted that there was a failure on his/her part at times to convey ideas and thoughts to others.

H. Perception

Role definition was also an issue to the third level administrators. A third level administrator in Pennsylvania asked the questions:

Should directors be elected by the faculty or appointed
by the administration, or some combination? Should directors be in, or out of, a faculty union? How does either option effect their leadership or supervisory roles?

Another Director in Wyoming said that his/her position was elected by the faculty and it limited his/her effectiveness. Other directors said there was role ambiguity and conflict and that there was a lack of appreciation and understanding of their actual duties.

A Director in the Southern part of the United States was not happy in his/her role and lamented on his/her loss of mobility due to longevity of service and various financial commitments. He/she said that he/she would suffer a loss of income if he/she were reassigned to the classroom. The problem that he/she perceived was that there was a loss of identity as an educational leader because of his/her mid-management classification. Another Director in the Eastern part of the United States said that he/she lacked work to keep busy, that he/she was just a paper-pusher, and that his/her position could be abolished.

Some Directors talked about their own salary. They wrote that there was not enough money associated with the job, the pay was low for the high responsibility. They explained that the pay was not comparable with industry. One Director said that he/she suffered in a salary structure which rewarded
faculty significantly greater than administration and many faculty members made more money each year than he/she did.

I. The Public

Another responsibility of the third level administrator was public relations. They commented that they were improving and broadening their relationships with business and industry while trying to stay abreast in their divisions with the advancements in industry. Other directors wrote of the ever increasing concern about legal issues, potential lawsuits, and other safety issues when dealing with safety and clinical management. One Director complained about the lack of cooperation from outside agencies such as public schools and hospitals. In contrast another Director in the same state wrote about his/her great involvement in the community and by the community. Another Director wrote of the ignorance on the part of higher education of community expectations of the community college. Still another Director was irritated by the continual scrutiny by the newspaper as decisions were made in the institution because of someone in the division who was passing information.

There were responses which concerned the public and other educational institutions. Some institutions were defending their philosophy and mission as a comprehensive community college because they were one unit within the University
System administered by one Board of Regents. Another school was administered within a system designed to promote the four-year, senior colleges. Another school experienced competition from a local university that had become a four-year institution rather than a two-year institution. Another school was concerned about the possible merger of their college with the university.

Articulation was an ongoing issue. There were responses concerning articulation with secondary schools, proprietary schools, and universities.

Another entity which created an issue in an educational institution was the accrediting agencies. These agencies had a great impact because it was the third level administrator who had to prepare for these accreditations, program reviews and audits.

J. Responsibilities versus Span of Control

To correspond with the eleventh question on the survey "Considering all your responsibilities, do you have a manageable span of control?". Directors wrote under pressing issues and major frustrations and discussed their span of control and how it was unmanageable. The directors said that they had to "wear many hats" and that they had to be all things to all people.

Among the responsibilities related in the responses were
to:

1. Obtain new advisory committee members for 50 committees.
2. Encourage program brochures and portions of the catalogue.
3. Divide time between two campuses, one urban and one suburban.
4. Work with a diverse division with 7 programs, each with their own problems and plans.
5. Work in community activities and service clubs.
6. Supervise college classes which are 60 miles away from the home campus.
7. Develop and administer new programs and grants.
8. Evaluate faculty and programs.
9. Counsel faculty and resolve faculty and student problems.
10. Coordinate four sites in surrounding counties.
11. Coordinate three branch campuses.

Many third level administrators wrote that the supervision of adjunct faculty should be the responsibility of department chairmen and not of the associate dean. One Director expressed how he/she felt about his/her span of control by having written "Sometimes I feel I am up to bat in a baseball game and there are five pitchers!"

The details included in the responses of this study
should aid community college administrators at many levels to examine their problems for possible solutions. It should also comfort individual institutions to know that other similar institutions suffer the same frustrations.
CHAPTER IV

Recommendations for Reform

The final section of the survey asked the third level administrators to describe briefly how their position could be reformed for more effectiveness. This section was designed to answer the fourth major question of this study, "What are possible reforms in the role of the third level administrator which will make the college and the role more effective?" These responses were divided into eight sections with headings of Funding, Authority, Communication, Planning, Organization, Perception, Personnel, and Computerization.

Funding

The suggested simple solution to the declining budget was to provide adequate funding to operate the division in a professional manner, to pay the faculty and staff commensurate with the salaries paid in industry and other similar positions in colleges and universities, to support staff development, and to pay higher salaries to part-time instructors to help recruit students. A respondent wrote that the view the society had regarding education was linked
to the funds and professionalism. "If society as a whole again supported education, faculty and staff could improve and so would the level of professionalism."

To address what should be done with the budget, one recommendation was that the budget could be a "block" amount rather than line items that had no flexibility. Also monies could be "rolled over" to the next fiscal year to avoid waste and to disregard the "use it or lose it" stance.

Another recommendation was to allow the division to include in its budget and control expenses for recruiting, marketing, community relations, and software and library volumes.

**Organization**

The next recommendations were grouped under the heading of organization. The first recommendations were that there should be clear organizational charts with clear reporting channels and the chain of command maintained in all matters. In addition, a good job description would be the foundation for effectiveness, with a clear definition of the role with a set of values, direction, and objectives that was relevant to the overall design of the management plan. Each division director could be given an area of responsibility covering the activities of all divisions:

1. academic advising coordination;
2. recruitment of students;
3. curriculum development;
4. better pay with longer than a ten month contract; and
5. teach one course a year in order to keep abreast of faculty concerns in the classroom.

A recommendation from a Director whose college was part of a district suggested there should be more local control and that the consolidation of the three colleges into a single college with three campuses would be far more effective and much less expensive.

Another suggestion was that there should be two levels for administering vocational programs: (1) a dean's level specifically for vocational education to handle functions less close to the daily operation and (2) administrative authority to the persons working on a daily basis with the programs. Leadership and coordination would come from the dean's level and responsibility for the regular operation of the programs would come from the director's level.

Another suggestion was to provide a structure utilizing three academic deans plus a careers division for 2-year terminal programs.

There were many recommendations that the third level administrator have department chairpersons or coordinators to help manage all program areas. The rationale was that the
division director could then spend more time managing and less time scheduling, advising, and general paperpushing. They wrote that the faculty wanted and needed these department chairs. In addition, the fourth level of administration would provide a more manageable sphere of supervision, especially if the coordinator had authority to match the responsibility.

Other help suggested for the third level administrator were:

1. additional non-instructional administrative staff to coordinate the budget and the laboratory;
2. some released time for faculty to assist in day-to-day program development/evaluation/scheduling issues; and
3. a system of internships implemented to alleviate some of the routine administrative tasks.

Many recommendations centered around the suggestion that the division be made smaller to a manageable span of control. The recommendation was that there should be a definition of the administrative units by size and comparison so that there would not be very large divisions compared to very small divisions in the same institution. These units should have a rational grouping of disciplines and a geographic location of
division faculty in one area.

Recommendations concerning the student service side of the institution were that there should be more support from the admissions office and that there should be student and prospective student advisement procedures clearly spelled out prior to actual enrollment.

Authority

The majority of the recommendations concerned authority. Many of the division directors wrote "Simply give this position the respect and authority it needs to carry out the goals of the institution." They required more autonomy and power to formulate academic policy, to participate in the budget-making process, to determine when a vacancy should be filled, and to reprimand a tenured instructor who suffers from apathy.

One Director expressed the sentiment well when he/she said:

I believe the Division Dean, if considered a little more in the decision-making process for the college or for the campus, would better understand their role and be in a better position to present and interpret college policy to the faculty and staff.

Communication
To solve the problems of communication the directors suggested that there should be more meetings at the administrative, faculty, and student levels. Division directors should be included in senior administrative meetings which deal with matters which concern faculty, such as salary, equipment, etc. One recommendation was that the meetings with the Dean should allow the division directors to bring forth issues which they viewed as important to them, their faculty and their students; rather than so many meetings in which they were simply informed by the Dean what his/her problems were and how they could help him/her and what messages they should take back to the division meetings.

Other recommendations concerning communication included requiring that institutional communication and action pass through the proper channels; there should be better coordination and communication between sites, especially in relation to part-time faculty; there should be more communication and coordination with administrators across department and division lines; and there was a need to have more direct input from the fiscal officer concerning how money had been allocated, re-allocated, frozen, etc.

Planning

Third level administrators expressed that there must be institutional planning so that they could be effective in
their jobs. The following recommendations were offered concerning planning:

1. Have an open forum for discussion of direction and planning for the college.
2. Have better institutional research available for better planning.
3. Develop an adequate data base for the program planning function.
4. Provide more time for consultation, brainstorming and planning.
5. Catalogue the skills of the college's instructional staff.
6. Develop master plans for each discipline.
7. Develop a system-wide faculty development strategy.
8. Have an administrative negotiating team consult with division administration before bargaining contract matters directly affecting division faculty, workloads, evaluations, etc.

Perception

Recommendations in relation to perception concerned how the third level administrators perceive themselves and how they thought others perceived them. They wrote that they could use a more positive attitude toward themselves, they needed to become more of an administrator and less of a
go-between for faculty and administration. One Director wrote that more effectiveness could be achieved by having upper administration understand the heavy work load of the associate dean, and the executive dean of the campus should bring them together to work as a team. On the same subject, another administrator wrote that he/she believed that the position could be reformed if leadership of that institution were willing to recognize the Associate Director of Academic Affairs as being a part of the administrative team and not merely a 24 hour a day, seven day a week administrative assistant. Another Director wrote that the division chairs should not be seen as an exploitable and expendable resource.

Some third level administrators actually disliked their positions and would have liked to return to teaching. The reason for their low morale was that the perception of the leadership role of the associate dean had little opportunity for creativity and very little reinforcement for such a posture at that level. A Director in Washington wrote his/her thoughts on the perception of the third level administration position as follows:

The divisions do and should report the Dean of Instruction. Make the associate dean a training position for deanship. The position is one of middle management. It requires a team player whom the Dean trusts. The associate dean is the right hand to the
Dean and carries on his/her duties in the Dean's absence.

**Title**

There were many recommendations that there should be a change in the title of the third level administrator. A Director of Instructional Services recommended that a change in title would be of benefit when dealing with the central office personnel and when attending administrative conferences. A couple of Associate Deans from Ohio and Arizona wrote that the position would be more effective if the title was changed to Dean aided by department heads, an administrative assistant, and a private secretary. Directors from Illinois, Connecticut and Massachusetts recommended that their titles be changed to Associate Dean with coordinators (faculty given release time to handle administrative functions) and working on 12 month contracts.

**Personnel**

Recommendations regarding personnel concerned mostly the need for more help to do the administrator's job. There were recommendations that someone be assigned to help the director with paperwork who was above a secretary level. Suggested persons were faculty with release time, department lead faculty, more department heads, an assistant division dean,
or an administrative assistant.

There were recommendations for better secretarial help. They needed more stable, reliable clerical help with typing, computer and accounting skills. The need was for full-time secretaries that were not shared with other divisions.

Some directors tried to recommend solutions to the tenured faculty problem. Some wanted to eliminate tenured faculty and place faculty under three year contracts. They recommended retraining and revitalizing tenured faculty who have become apathetic. Also the recommendation was to provide ways to reward the dedicated faculty members who were willing and flexible enough to adapt to the continually changing need and interests of the students. Other faculty recommendations were:

1. Reduce the number of part-time faculty by hiring additional full-time faculty.

2. Establish a merit pay system.

3. Set aside more leave time so instructors could get into industry for seminars and training.

4. Develop a schedule for the replacement or non-replacement of staff as they retire.

Training

Some directors expressed a need for their own training and training for new division directors. One Director wrote
that he/she needed more training in counseling for alcoholics and general help in working with all sorts of "characters". Other recommendations for training included staff development programs for faculty and staff and inservice training for division classified and certified personnel.

**Computerization**

In a computer age, one should expect recommendations concerning computerization. The recommendations included a microcomputer to relieve some of the paperwork, software packages for the organization of information, more up to date data retrieval and enrollment equipment, more research support to facilitate decision-making, and reorganize computerized management to revolve about the instructional programs and not for the financial strategy of the Business Office.

**The Contented Third Level Administrator**

This study has revealed many issues, frustrations, complaints and recommendations for improvement for the role of the third level administrator. There were also many comments which indicated that the respondent was happy with his/her position. The responses confirmed some of the recommendations written by others. Some of those positive responses were:
1. Our administrative structure was remodeled recently with the result that Division Chairs and Deans were given greater responsibility for all aspects of instruction and governance of their respective areas. In addition, aside from the President of the College, Division Chairpersons must report to two Deans only. In my estimation, this system was most effective and allows for direct and full supervision and policy and decision-making by the Division Chair.

2. Presently, this college's philosophy is for delegation of authority and responsibility downward to the faculty. It is a highly participatory and collegial atmosphere. However, the director position still retains authority and support from higher administration for many aspects of decision-making. The atmosphere is extremely supportive of this department with adequate funding still available.

3. A lot of the clerical, computing and other detail work has been given over to qualified staff, particularly my secretary whom I hope to make an administrative assistant. This frees me for the committee work with administration and faculty as well as all the individual faculty conferences which go on regularly and informally as well as formally.

4. In my role as a Division Dean I have felt influential
in providing opportunities for faculty growth, curriculum change and development, facility development, and institution-wide reform. I may be idiosyncratic among Division Deans. Many of my colleagues do express frustration about what they perceive as powerlessness and they are looking for reform, i.e. they want more control over scheduling and special projects budgets. I do not think position reform is the solution. Division Deans must operate at a political level in gathering support for their projects and ideas. No amount of top down position reform can create power for them.

5. The position as presently organized is fine. What makes it work is the commitment of higher administrative officials to letting each person do his/her own job with no interference and with complete backing for decisions/positions taken.
CHAPTER V

Summary and Conclusion

Summary

The purpose of this dissertation was to describe and analyze the role of the third level or middle level administrative structure of the community college. The first level of the administration functioned as the chief administrator and was identified as the president, chancellor, executive dean, etc. of the institution. The second level of the administration functioned as the heads of the broad areas of the college, such as instruction, student services, and administrative services. This level was often identified as the vice president, dean, provost, etc. of their educational institution. The particular position that this study attempted to describe was the third level or middle level which functioned in the instructional area. The titles of this level of administration varied, but were commonly known as the division chairperson, division director, associate dean, etc.
In order to describe the role of the third level administrator, four questions should have been answered:

1. What were the principle responsibilities of the third level administrator in the community college?

2. How did the first and second level administrators, the faculty, the peers, the students, and the community perceive the role of the third level administrator: and how did they perceive themselves?

3. What were the current issues facing the administrator at the third level of the community college structure?

4. What were the possible reforms in the role of the third level administrator which would make the college and the role more effective?

Personal interviews were performed at Clark County Community College in Las Vegas, Nevada and a survey questionnaire was designed and sent to a selected sampling of third level administrators in every state in the United States to answer those questions.

**Principle Responsibilities**

To answer the first question, What were the principle responsibilities of the third level administrator in the community college?, the study first turned to the principle responsibilities of any administrator as defined by Henri Fayol and Luther Gulick from the Classical School of
Administrative Theory. Gulick's seven administrative procedures were the same responsibilities of the third level administrator in the community college. Those procedures or responsibilities were planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. To add to that list, the survey indicated that other responsibilities of the division director in the community college included development, evaluation, and communication.

The third level administrator was found to have principle responsibilities to five entities:

1. the community;
2. the administration;
3. the faculty;
4. the students; and
5. the curriculum.

He/she should have served the community by bringing the educational programs needed to them. The position was responsible for communicating with those persons in the community who could identify the educational needs and communicating to those persons who had those educational needs that they could be fulfilled at his/her institution.

The division directors were responsible to the higher administration to perform their responsibilities of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting their area. They had to communicate their status
of the area to the higher administration and worked with the higher administration to perform those responsibilities for the betterment of the institution.

The third level administrator managed the faculty. He/she did that by participating in the hiring of the faculty, reviewing and performing the evaluation of the faculty, communicating with and advising the faculty, and helping the faculty to develop professionally.

The division directors were responsible for the educational development of the student. They helped recruit and advise the student. They developed the educational program for the students, by developing, reviewing, evaluating, and maintaining the curriculum for the student.

The responses to the survey indicated the general principle responsibilities of the division director. The position supervised both full and part-time faculty. Over half of the third level administrators had another level of administration or responsibility who reported to them. Those were usually department chairpersons, coordinators, or department directors who were responsible for specific, generic programs. The third level administrator made or participated in the decisions concerning the hiring, promotions, evaluations, etc. of faculty and staff. Approximately half of the respondents had departments with similar disciplines, the other half had departments with a
mixture of general education courses and occupational or technical courses.

The majority of the respondents wrote that they had complete responsibilities for their budgets and over half wrote that they delegated responsibilities of the budget to others in the division.

Most of the respondents did not have students services responsibilities such as recruitment and admissions. The majority were responsible for the curriculum in their division. The majority of the respondents considered that with the responsibilities that they had, that they had a manageable span of control.

**Perception**

The second question was "How do the first and second level administrators, the faculty, the peers, the students and the community perceive the role of the third level administrator and how do they perceive themselves? To answer this question this study started with Max Weber's definition of a bureaucracy which was that a bureaucracy had a hierarchical structure, functional specialization, prescribed competence, written records, and stable rules and policies. Next the study turned to Getzels and Guba's administrative theory of a social system. In their definition, a social system was bounded and purposeful with mutually interacting
elements regulated by feedback and continuity attempting to maintain equilibrium.

In the Social System Model the community college was the formal organization and was the social system. The formal organization, or the social system provided the official definition of the position, its rank in the hierarchy, and a set of expected behavior. The bureaucratic structure established an incentive pattern for insuring appropriate behavior. Community college behavior was also monitored by the culture of the community which provided environmental constraints that directly influenced individual needs.

The first element of this social system was the institution element and could be illustrated thus: Formal Organization (the community college) --> Bureaucracy --> Role or Hierarchy of Authority with rules and regulations --> Expectations --> Social Behavior.

The bureaucracy was the institution whose function was education. The role, according to Getzels and Guba, was the most important subunit of the institution element because it represented positions, offices, and status within the institution. The role in this study were the third level administrators who wanted more authority to carry out their responsibilities. The role was defined in terms of the expectations or normative rights and duties. The social behavior was the way in which the division directors
performed their responsibilities.

The second element of this social system was the individual. It was illustrated thus: Formal Organization (the community college) --> individual (the division director) --> personality --> needs --> social behavior. The individual was the concept of self. The personality was a dynamic organization within the individual containing the need dispositions that governed the idiosyncratic reactions to the environment.

The third element of the social system was the informal group. It was illustrated this way: Formal organization (the community college) --> informal group --> climate --> intentions --> social behavior. The informal group was the group of individuals brought together in an organization which balanced the bureaucratic expectations with individual needs. The informal group's affect upon the individual happened because of the communication of feelings was among peers, especially friends. Informal groups maintained cohesiveness and feelings of personal integrity, self-respect, and independent choice. The members of the group received rewards and use of their groups' norms to guide their behavior. The informal group occurred in the formal organization when individuals perceived that their personalities and roles were compatible.

The questionnaire survey was designed in an attempt to
discover the perceptions of the role of the third level administrator in relation to the social system. A vast majority of the division directors thought that their role was important to the institution, which answered the question of how they perceived themselves. Most of the respondents thought that they did not have enough authority to perform their responsibilities. Most of them formulated the philosophy of their division.

A majority wrote that the administration, the faculty, the students, their peers, and the community perceived them as an educational leader. This meant that they perceived that everyone who was important to them perceived them as having the expected social behavior.

Most of the division directors responding did not perceive themselves as paperpushers. They commented that paperwork was just part of the job. Indeed, as part of a bureaucracy, records must have been kept, policies must have been written, and reports must have been made.

Current Issues

The third question was "What are the current issues facing the administrator at the third level of the community college administrative structure?" To discover the answer to this question, the survey requested that the third level administrator list his/her current pressing issues in his/her
division or in the institution with which he/she must work and to list his/her major frustrations.

The central issues throughout the country which were causing most of the frustrations were budget and enrollment. Enrollment was declining everywhere but a very few isolated places which caused decreases in budgets. There was also a decrease in the allotment of funds mostly from the states, some from the federal government and the counties. The decreased budgets caused the need for more and the maintenance of equipment and space.

Other issues centered around the administrative issues of authority, control, span of control and decision-making. The third level administrators were frustrated with the lack of authority to carry out their responsibilities and the lack of control to be involved in decision-making which directly concerned their divisions. Some were concerned about the definition of their role, their title, their salaries, and the overload of their responsibilities.

Another important issue was the subject of faculty. Many third level administrators were concerned about the low morale of faculty who were not functioning as they should. They were concerned about staff development and evaluations. They were frustrated because most of the community colleges were staffed with many more part-time faculty than full-time faculty. There were also personality conflicts with the
full-time faculty and the frustrations of dealing with the unions.

Curriculum as a principle responsibility became a major issue with the constant development and review of the curriculum and the states becoming involved in the development of the curriculum. State involvement was in the areas of developmental and vocational education.

Other issues dealt with getting involved in the computer, time management problems, communication, and conflicts with other agencies. The directors complained about getting faculty to use the computers, getting the school to buy a computer, and/or getting time to use the computer. They worried about the lines of communication throughout the school. They were frustrated with the conflicts with the Business Office, the District Office, the Computer Office, and Student Services Offices. Many wrote about their lack of time to think, to create, and to carry out duties which they considered important. Their time was taken by meetings and paperwork.

Conclusion

The third level administrators perceived themselves as
having important roles in their institutions and 78% thought they had enough authority to perform their responsibilities. They perceived that the faculty, the students, their peers, and the community did perceive them as educational leaders.

The targeted part of the social system for the purpose of this study was the individual. The individual has an affect on the role and how the role was perceived by others. Each individual had desires which caused him/her to behave in a different manner under the same conditions. This explained why there were varied reactions from the respondents to the survey. Some of them were happy, some wanted to change jobs, some were extremely serious, some had a sense of humor, some desired power, some wanted companionship, and all of them wanted a sense of accomplishment.

The Getzels and Guba Social Systems Model stated that the observed social behavior was always a function of the interaction between the role and the personality. The behavior seen by others was a result of the forces from the bureaucratic expectations which interacted with the needs of the third level administrator. For example, the observed behavior of a division director counseling a faculty member with a bad evaluation would be done because of his/her role as supervisor and because of his/her caring nature.

Another example was a division director who sought to improve the work he/she did without limiting him/herself to
the written general responsibilities could be observed as a mature individual who sought self-fulfillment. In contrast, the individual director who wished to eliminate the position and return to the classroom or to retire as soon as possible was not meeting his/her needs and his/her behavior could be observed and his behavior could lose the respect of others. The job thus became either unmanageable or extremely boring. Their position became a "paperpushing" job instead of an important job which must be accomplished.

The responses concerned with authority, control and decision-making demonstrated the needs and personalities of the directors also. The need for power and status motivated their behavior. That person was observed as being an educational leader and possessed all the authority, control and power needed to perform his/her responsibilities. The higher administration observed this behavior and generally consulted the director concerning his/her area of responsibility when possible. But the higher administration had its own personalities and needs which sometimes confused the situation. The director would not feel the respect or any status in this case because the higher administration feared to share the power of decision-making with the lower levels. Sometimes the formal organization was too large, such as the case when colleges were administered by a district, and the personalities and needs of the directors
could not be observed or even considered when decisions were made. In that case the third level administrator perceived him/herself as having no control or authority. The observed behavior was one of frustration and powerlessness. The power-seeking individual would have problems adjusting to the limits of authority on his/her position.

The curriculum responses illustrated that some directors struggled to maintain the status quo while others became bored with the usual and yearned to create new things. An example would be the directors of humanities divisions who felt threatened by the new technologies. Their personalities were suited to the humanities which made it difficult to match the personalities of those who loved to work with electronics and computers. One could observe their struggle for identity and the fear that their role might no longer be needed. Their personalities and needs must be modified in order to change their expected behavior which would then enable them to establish the place of humanities in the technological era.

An excellent area to observe behavior was on the subject of computers. The observed behavior was one of confidence in the technology while striving to educate in its use and benefits. In contrast, others struggled to understand it or complained about gaining access to the main frame computer.

Another subject which brought together the personality
and the needs with the observed behavior was the management of time to perform the responsibilities. Many directors complained that they did not have enough time to think, plan, meet deadlines or to research new methods. Others found the time to do those things. The personal philosophy of time could be observed by the responses of each individual. The action-oriented individual felt an overload with paperwork and an irritation to attend many meetings. The time manager was not as frustrated.

The personality of the educational leader was most observed on the subject of faculty. It took a special person to lead and inspire the various personalities of the faculty members. As a leader the person must be effective enough to overcome the conflicts among the factions, to raise the morale of the instructors during adverse times, and to inspire the lagging spirits of the burned out teacher. The director was observed to be an educational leader if he/she could develop the faculty professionally.

The role of the division director or the associate dean in the community college was the adhesive which held the college together and fostered the whole purpose of the institution. It provided influence for faculty growth, curriculum change and development for the students, and institution reform. To maintain the purpose of the community college future research was recommended to monitor the
changes in the role of the division director by employing this study at intervals of five to ten years. The evolution of the community college should be observed and information should be gathered to aid in the improvement of the structure and management of the community college.
APPENDIX I

Letters to Chief Administrators
February 15, 1985

Dear Chief Administrator:

As a faculty member at Clark County Community College, I became aware that the organizational structures of the community college vary from institution to institution. I have also found that the responsibilities and the titles of the director or associate dean in the community college vary from school to school and there is very little research done in this area. As a result, the title of my dissertation for my doctoral degree at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas is "An Analysis of the Role of the Division Director or the Associate Dean in the Community College." The position that I am targeting is the third level administrator, with the President as the first level and the Dean as the second level. The particular person that I would like to address is the person who leads the teaching faculty.

I am requesting only two items from you. First, please recommend a person from your staff who is a third level administrator who will respond to my survey. Second, please send me a copy of your organizational structure. Please respond by April 19, 1985, on this form.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Patricia J. Butler

NAME____________________________________________________________________
TITLE______________________________________________________________

NAME____________________________________________________________________
TITLE______________________________________________________________
March 20, 1985

Dear Colleague:

A letter was mailed to you in February from Mrs. Patricia J. Butler requesting a copy of your organizational structure and a recommendation of a person on your staff to answer her short survey. If you have not yet responded to her, please do so by April 19, 1985. The information is necessary for her doctoral dissertation which will in turn help in decision-making at Clark County Community College.

The title of her dissertation is "An Analysis of the Role of the Division Director or Associate Dean in the Community College." She is particularly interested in the administrators who lead the various instructional divisions.

Again, Mrs. Butler needs a copy of your organizational structure and the name or names of persons who can answer her survey. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Paul Meacham, Ph.D.
President

NAME:________________________________________________________

TITLE:_______________________________________________________

NAME:_______________________________________________________

TITLE:_______________________________________________________
APPENDIX II

The Survey
Dear Colleague:

I have written to your chief administrator to request an appropriate person to respond to my survey. You were suggested to be that person.

I am currently a director/coordinator at Clark County Community College and I am pursuing my Doctoral Degree in Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I have become aware that the organizational structures of the community colleges vary from institution to institution. I have also found that the responsibilities and titles of the director or associate dean in the community college vary from school to school and that there is very little research done in this area. As a result I have entitled my dissertation "An Analysis of the Role of the Division Director or the Associate Dean in the Community College". I am particularly interested in the person who leads the instructional faculty and his or her perceptions of that role.

I would very much appreciate if you will respond to the enclosed survey and return it to me by May 24, 1985.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Patricia J. Butler
Survey Concerning the Role of the Division Director or Associate Dean in the Community College.

Please respond to the following survey as honestly as you can. This study is based on the perceptions of the people involved. Your responses will be kept confidential.

For the purposes of this study a "division" is defined as an area of activity organized as a functional unit. It is a self-contained tactical unit, a territorial section marked off for administrative purposes.

Name: ___________________________________________
Title: ___________________________________________
School: ___________________________________________

A. General Responsibilities.
   Please place a check mark next to the appropriate response.
   1. Do you directly supervise the full-time faculty in your division? yes__ no__

   2. Do you directly supervise the part-time faculty in your division? yes__ no__

   3. Is there another level of administration which reports to you? yes__ no__ If yes, what is their title?

   4. Do you make personnel decisions for your division, such as hiring, promotions, evaluations, etc? yes__ no__

   5. Do you delegate any of the above personnel decisions to others in your division? yes__ no__

   6. Are you responsible for more than one department or area? yes__ no__
      a. If yes, are those departments or areas similar in discipline, ie social sciences? yes__ no__
      b. Are those departments or areas a mixture of general education courses and occupational and technical courses? yes__ no__

   7. Do you have complete responsibility for your budgets? yes__ no__
8. Do you delegate responsibility for your budgets to others in your division? yes__ no__

9. Do you have student services responsibilities, such as recruitment or admissions? yes__ no__

10. Are you responsible for the curriculum in your division? yes__ no__

11. Considering all your responsibilities, do you have a manageable span of control? yes__ no__

B. Mission and Perception. Please place a check mark next to the appropriate response.

1. Do you think you have an important role in the institution? yes__ no__

2. Do you think that you have enough authority to perform your responsibilities? yes__ no__

3. Do you formulate the philosophy for your division? yes__ no__

4. Do you think that your administration perceives you as an educational leader? yes__ no__
   a. the faculty? yes__ no__
   b. the students? yes__ no__
   c. your peers? yes__ no__
   d. the community? yes__ no__

5. Do you perceive yourself as a "paper-pusher"? yes no__

C. Issues and Frustrations.

1. Please list current pressing issues in your division or in the institution with which you must work in your present position. Write on the back of this paper if you need more space.
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
2. What are your major frustrations?
   a.
   
   b.
   
   c.

D. Describe briefly how your position could be reformed for more effectiveness.
APPENDIX III

Letter of Need for the Study
Dr. Anthony Saville  
Department of Educational Administration  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 Maryland Parkway  
Las Vegas, NV 89154

Dear Dr. Saville:

I am writing this letter in behalf of Ms. Patricia J. Butler, a member of the professional staff at Clark County Community College.

Ms. Butler has shared with me her plans to conduct a dissertation study examining the role of the Division Chairperson in the community college. Since the Division Chair occupies such a crucial spot in the organizational makeup of community colleges in general, I feel that a study focusing on this area of concentration could provide a worthy addition to the existing body of knowledge relating to community college practices, problems, and potentials.

Cordially yours,

Paul E. Meacham, Ph.D.
APPENDIX IV

Duties of a Division Chairman at Harrisburg (Pa.) Area Community College
Duties of a Division Chairman at Harrisburg (Pa.) Area Community College

Reporting to the heads of each of the three service branches of the College (Instructional Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services) the Division Chairman administers the programs of his division, leads the faculty of the division and shares in the general administrative duties of the institution. His responsibilities, to the institution as a whole and through the three branches of the College, are as follows:

1. General Responsibilities

   a. In May of each year, prepare an annual report of the activities of his division, for use by the President and other administrative officers of the College.

   b. Represent his division in relationship to the community and in rendering service to the community.

   c. Represent his division in relationship to other divisions within the College and in relationship with other colleges.

   d. Arrange with the College bookstore for availability of those texts, reference books, and general supplies needed for courses in his
division.

e. Maintain official records of the work of his division and his college-wide developments that are of concern to his division.

f. Maintain the security of confidential matters entrusted to the division, including standardized tests, locally prepared tests and examinations, etc.

g. Prepare, review, and revise materials for the College Catalog related to his division.

2. Responsibilities for Instructional Services

a. Responsibility for Faculty

1. Initiate action for recruitment for faculty.
   a. Search
   b. Review credentials
   c. Check credentials
   d. Interview applicants
   e. Make recommendations to the Dean of Instruction.

2. Share responsibility for orientation of new faculty
   a. To the institution
   b. To colleagues
   c. To administration
d. To community

3. Supervise evaluation of divisional faculty
   a. Salary
   b. Promotion
   c. Tenure
   d. Dismissal

4. Assign teaching load and other responsibilities related to instruction.

5. Assist and support divisional faculty through counseling and professional advice.

6. Through the Division Counselor, assign responsibility for student advises and academic counseling.

7. Encourage the professional growth of divisional faculty.
   a. through professional society membership
   b. through travel
   c. through additional formal study

b. Responsibility for Programs and Courses

1. Supervise the design and maintenance of instructional programs and courses within that part of the curriculum to which his
division is assigned.

2. Recommend library purchases of books, periodicals, and other study materials related to the curriculum of his division.

3. Prepare schedules for courses and sections within his division.

4. Prepare schedule for instructional spaces that may be assigned to his division.

5. Assign faculty responsibilities for programs, subjects, and courses.

6. Recommend to the Dean of Instruction persons to be asked to serve on curriculum advisory committees.

7. Prepare proposals for special projects related to the instructional programs of division.

c. Teaching

1. Develop and maintain teaching and grading standards and a common understanding of these standards within his division.

2. Encourage the appropriate and effective use of all media for instructional purposes within his division.

3. Encourage responsibility innovation and controlled experimentation in instructional
methods within his division.

3. Responsibilities for Student Personnel Services
   
a. Through the Division Counselor, assign responsibility for student advises and academic counseling.

b. Take an active part in the recruitment of students for the College and for the specific programs and courses assigned to the division.
   
1. Provide information to prospective students directly and indirectly by word of mouth.

2. Prepare copy for brochures and other printed materials within the general administrative plans and policies for recruitment of students.

3. Assist students and graduates in finding their program of studies.

4. Share with the Director of Counseling Services in the supervision of counselors to the division.

5. Coordinate the scheduling of students for courses and programs within the division, and for divisional advises in all courses.

c. Responsible for Advising and Counseling
1. Advising and Counseling
   a. Provide advising and counseling service.
   b. Provide for scheduling courses for new students.
   c. Keep divisional faculty informed about registration procedures, etc.
   d. Interpret students to faculty.
   e. Help to evaluate course placement and admission criteria.

2. Record Keeping
   a. Report grades and grade changes
   b. Certify for graduation
   c. Handle change of roster forms
   d. Cooperate in academic registration of students

3. Recruiting and Placement
   a. Visit high schools and businesses to meet with appropriate personnel
   b. Hold orientation sessions on campus for prospective students
   c. Conduct follow-up.
   d. Meet with professional groups.

4. Responsibilities for Administrative Services
   a. Assign, supervise, and evaluate clerical
personnel and student help within the division, in accordance with established board College policy.

1. Salary
2. Promotion
3. Dismissal
4. Working Schedule
5. Professional development

b. Initiate divisional budget requests.

c. Administer approved budget, including expenditures for professional travel, within his division.

d. Prepare requisitions for supplies and equipment.

e. Maintain inventory of equipment assigned to his division.

f. Prepare reports related to absence of personnel:

1. Vacation
2. Emergency leave
3. Sick leave
4. Payment of substitutes
5. Work-related accidents

g. Initiate action for securing funds for special projects related to the work of his
division.
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