University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1983

A Study of the Organizational Effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Gail Prentiss EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Prentiss, Gail EdD, "A Study of the Organizational Effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges" (1983). *Dissertations*. 476.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/476>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

A STUDY OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by
Gail Prentiss

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

1983

Doctoral Committee:

Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D., Director
Wallace F. Cohen, Ed.D.
William P. Foster, Ed.D.
Irene S. Palmer, Ph.D.

A STUDY OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ACADEMIC
SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

PRENTISS, GAIL, ED.D. University of San Diego, 1983. 496pp.

Director: Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D.

The purpose of this research was to study the effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The four major objectives were: describe the historical development of the Senate; determine the effectiveness of the methods by which the Senate provides for community college faculty to participate in academic and professional governance; determine the effectiveness of the Senate, as understood by the membership and others with whom it interacts, in meeting the purpose and goals which the organization and relevant others have established for it; and, interpret the impact of the Senate on its environment.

The method of study was naturalistic and included: (1) Participant Observation, centering on accreditation issues; (2) Questionnaires, distributed to three groups (faculty--46%, senate presidents--70%, college presidents--70%); (3) Interviews, elite and informal, conducted with individuals who had special knowledge about the Senate; (4) Paradigm (three), developed as a perspective for data analysis, based on organizational effectiveness behavior, which are

conceptually discrete but empirically related, were used to frame and integrate the analysis.

The findings indicated the Senate history has been influenced by legislative and cultural/social events, as well as California economy. Historically, the senate participated in shared governance and collegial activities in numerous ways. The data analysis revealed that, in general, the Senate was viewed as less effective by the faculty and college presidents, and most effective by senate presidents and interview respondents. Questionnaire respondents were requested to provide an overall effectiveness evaluation of the Senate. The faculty thought the Senate Moderately Effective while the senate and college presidents considered it Effective.

When the effectiveness behavior characteristics of the paradigm were juxtaposed against Senate behavior, characteristics of all three paradigm were often demonstrated singularly, as well as simultaneously.

The conclusions identified four major problem areas: (1) Communication with faculty members; (2) Need for local senates to develop more uniform strength statewide; (3) Need for the Senate to actively consider its role as a political force; (4) Concern for whether the Senate can maintain or increase its effectiveness without a formalized method or program for leadership development.

DEDICATION

To Jospeh C. Rost, who directed this research with encouragement, insight and enthusiasm while providing a continuing source of strength throughout the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study could not have been undertaken and completed without the support and cooperation of the Executive Committee and members of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. My heartfelt gratitude is extended to the Academic Senate.

Appreciation is expressed to my Committee members, Joseph C. Rost, Dr. Wallace Cohen, Dr. William Foster, and Dr. Irene Palmer, who were superb in their thoughtful contributions and assistance.

My colleagues at MiraCosta College deserve special recognition, as I believe that our long-standing commitment to collegiality and our Academic Senate provided the roots for my interest in this study. Special acknowledgement is extended to: Leon P. Baradat and Julie S. Hatoff who provided a constant source of encouragement and stimulating discussions about academic governance; Robert Crabtree who exhibited great patience and understanding as I dabbled in his world of data processing and the HP-3000; and to Sharalee C. Jorgensen with whom I shared all of the years and rigors of doctoral study.

To Pam Dowler, who took this document from my handwritten pages to final copy, my very special "Thank You!"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiv
CHAPTER I. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
Purpose	1
Background	2
Objectives of this Research	4
Need for the Study	5
Research Design	6
Questionnaire Methodology	8
Interviews	9
Participant Observation	10
Archival Research	11
Delimitations	11
Definitions of Terms	13
Organization of the Study	17
CHAPTER II. FRAMING THE ORGANIZATION	18
Academic Governance	19
Governance in California Community Colleges	24
Senate Building--The Five-Year Period 1963-1968	26
The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges	34
Organizational Environment of the Statewide Academic Senate	38
Organizations	45
Voluntary Professional Organizations	52
Collegiality in Organizations	59
CHAPTER III. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	68
Effectiveness Defined	70
Foundations for Effectiveness Studies	74
Political Model	79
Rational Choice and Bureaucratic Models	86

CHAPTER III. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (cont.)

Effectiveness Research	88
Role of the Organization Member	101
Organizational Structure	103
Assessing Organizational Effectiveness	105
Summary	116

CHAPTER IV. PERSPECTIVE FOR DATA ANALYSIS 119

Paradigm A--Prototype Model	121
Touchstone for Analysis	121
Basic Assumption of the Paradigm	121
Effectiveness Definitions	122
Principle on Which Analysis is Based	122
Analysis of Effectiveness--Based on	
Organizational Choice	122
Paradigm B--Modus Operandi Model	123
Touchstone for Analysis	123
Basic Assumption of the Paradigm	124
Effectiveness Definitions	125
Principle on Which Analysis is Based	125
Analysis of Effectiveness--Based on	
Organizational Output	125
Paradigm C--Strategic Model	127
Touchstone for Analysis	127
Basic Assumption of the Paradigm	128
Effectiveness Definitions	128
Principle on Which Analysis is Based	129
Analysis of Effectiveness--Based on	
Political Activity	129

CHAPTER V. INTERVIEWS 133

The Respondents	134
Arrangements and Sites	136
Protocol	137
Analysis	138
1. Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions	142
Mason Interview	143
Bischof Interview	148
Conn Interview	151
Hinkley Interview	154
Callan Interview	157
Zoglin Interview	159
Trapnell Interview	161
McCallum Interview	163
Hughes Interview	165
Effectiveness Evaluation	171
2. Effectiveness of Senate Activities	176
Edith Conn	178
Barbara Hinkley	180

CHAPTER V. INTERVIEWS (continued)

Patrick McCallum	182
Mary Lou Zoglin	183
Edith Conn	184
Patrick M. Callan	188
Norbert Bischof	190
Jean Trapnell	190
Robert Prescott	193
Gus Guichard	194
Effectiveness Evaluation	197
3. Effectiveness of Senate Representation	201
Mary Lou Zoglin	202
Patrick M. Callan	204
Edith Conn	207
Barbara Hinkley	208
Andy Mason	211
Robert Prescott	212
Patrick McCallum	213
Effectiveness Evaluation	215
4. Political Effectiveness of the Senate	219
Patrick M. Callan	220
Patrick McCallum	224
Barbara Hinkley	227
Williams Interview	229
Teresa Hughes	236
Jean Trapnell	238
Robert Prescott	240
Effectiveness Evaluation	243
Summary Observations	248

CHAPTER VI. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES 250

Purpose for the Survey	250
Procedure	252
Validation of the Instrument	254
Description of the Instrument	255
Sample Selection	257
Distribution of the Questionnaire	260
Data Entry	262
Don't Know/Missing Data Responses	263
Data Analysis	265
Faculty Responses	267
Characteristics	267
Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions	
(Section G)	269
Effectiveness of Senate Activities	
(Section H)	274
Effectiveness of Senate Representation	
(Section I)	279
Political Effectiveness of the Senate	
(Section J)	283

CHAPTER VI. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

Senate Presidents' Responses	287
Characteristics	287
Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions	
(Section G)	289
Effectiveness of Senate Activities	
(Section H)	295
Effectiveness of Senate Representation	
(Section I)	300
Political Effectiveness of the Senate	
(Section J)	304
College Presidents' Responses	308
Characteristics	308
Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions	
(Section G)	309
Effectiveness of Senate Activities	
(Section H)	315
Effectiveness of Senate Representation	
(Section I)	321
Political Effectiveness of the Senate	
(Section J)	325
Senate Overall Effectiveness--All Groups	
(Section K)	329
Summary Observations	331
Selected Comments - All Groups	334
Faculty	337
Senate Presidents	338
College Presidents	339
Paradigm Analysis	339
Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions	340
Effectiveness of Senate Activities	344
Effectiveness of Senate Representation	348
Political Effectiveness of the Senate	357

CHAPTER VII. PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION 360

Academic Senate Spring Conference--April, 1982 . . .	361
Foundations for the Issues	363
Accrediting Commission Hearing--May 11, 1982 . . .	372
Pre-Hearing Caucus	372
The Hearing	373
Post-Hearing Caucus	374
Accrediting Commission Hearing Meeting--	
June 14, 1982	376
Pre-Meeting Caucus	376
Commission Meeting	377
Post-Meeting Caucus	383
Accrediting Commission Sub-Committee Meeting--	
August 6, 1982	384
Academic Senate Fall Conference--November, 1982 . .	387
Accreditation Break-Out Session	387

CHAPTER VII. PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION (continued)

Senate Resolutions	390
Accrediting Commission Meeting--	
January 17, 1983	391
Post-Meeting Caucus	396
Update	397
Analysis	398

CHAPTER VIII. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS	414
Summary	414
Background	414
Conduct of the Study	419
Findings	426
To Describe the Historical Development of the	
Academic Senate for California Community	
Colleges	427
To Determine the Effectiveness of the Methods	
By Which the Academic Senate Provides for	
Community College Faculty to Participate in	
Academic Governance	430
Interviews--Senate Activities	432
Questionnaires--Senate Activities	432
Comparison of Interview and Questionnaire	
Responses	434
Interviews--Senate Representation	435
Questionnaires--Senate Representation	435
Comparison of Interview and Questionnaire	
Responses	436
Interviews--Political Effectiveness	436
Questionnaires--Political Effectiveness	437
Comparison of Interview and Questionnaire	
Responses	438
Participant Observation	439
To Determine the Effectiveness of the Academic	
Senate as Understood by the Membership and Others	
With Whom It Interacts in Meeting the Purpose and	
Goals Which the Organization and Relevant Others	
Have Established For It	441
Interviews--Purposes, Aims, Functions	441
Questionnaires--Purposes, Aims, Functions	441
Comparison of Interview and Questionnaire	
Findings	442
To Interpret the Impact of the Academic Senate	
On Its Environment	443
Senate Overall Effectiveness--All Groups	445
Conclusions	445
The Paradigm	445
Description of the Academic Senate	448
The Academic Senate's Problem Areas	454
Recommendations	462

CHAPTER VIII. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS (continued)

Organizational Effectiveness Definition	462
Research Design and Methodology	463
Communication with Community College Faculty Members	465
Need to Strengthen Local Senates	466
Role as a Political Force	467
Future Leadership Development	468
Recommendations for Future Research . . .	468
Final Observations	470
APPENDICES	475
REFERENCE NOTES	481
REFERENCES	483

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Effectiveness Indicator of Interview Statements as to Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions	172
2.	Summary Tables for Interview Statements by Single and Combination Paradigm Indicating Effectiveness Indicator for Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions	174
3.	Effectiveness Indicator of Interview Statements as to Academic Senate Activities	198
4.	Summary Tables for Interview Statements by Single and Combination Paradigm Indicating Effectiveness Indicator for Academic Senate Activities	200
5.	Effectiveness Indicator of Interview Statements as to Academic Senate Representation	216
6.	Summary Tables for Interview Statements by Single and Combination Paradigm Indicating Effectiveness Indicator for Academic Senate Representation	217
7.	Effectiveness Indicator of Interview Statements as to Academic Senate Political Effectiveness	245
8.	Summary Tables for Interview Statements by Single and Combination Paradigm Indicating Effectiveness Indicator for Academic Senate Political Effectiveness	246
9.	Demographic Data--Faculty	268
10.	Faculty Response to Statements as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate	270
11.	Faculty Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate	272
12.	Faculty Response to Statements as to the Activities of the Academic Senate	275

Table

13.	Faculty Focus of Response Among Categories as to Identified Activities of the Academic Senate	276
14.	Faculty Response to Statements as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty	280
15.	Faculty Focus of Response Among Categories as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty	282
16.	Faculty Response to Statements as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate	284
17.	Faculty Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate	286
18.	Demographic Data--Local Senate Presidents	288
19.	Senate Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate	291
20.	Faculty and Senate Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate	293
21.	Senate Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Activities of the Academic Senate	296
22.	Faculty and Senate Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to Identified Activities of the Academic Senate	298
23.	Senate Presidents' Response to Statements as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty	302
24.	Faculty and Senate Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty	303
25.	Senate Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate	305

Table

26.	Faculty and Senate Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate	307
27.	Demographic Data--College Presidents	310
28.	College Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate	312
29.	Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate	313
30.	College Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Activities of the Academic Senate . . .	317
31.	Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to Identified Activities of the Academic Senate	318
32.	College Presidents' Response to Statements as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty . . .	322
33.	Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty . . .	324
34.	College Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate	327
35.	Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate	328
36.	Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Overall Effectiveness of the Academic Senate	330
37.	Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories and Evaluation Pattern as to the Overall Effectiveness of the Academic Senate	332

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

1. Summary of Patterns of Response for All Groups
as to All Statements 335

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendices

A. Interview Questions	475
B. Survey Questionnaire	476
C. Colleges Used in the Survey	480

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

Purpose

Organizations achieve uniqueness in their functions despite similarities in their structure. This uniqueness which is peculiar to a specific organization is accomplished as the organization works to survive in the environment by modifying and controlling its behavior, as well as the internal and external influences on the organization.

This research focuses on one unique professional organization, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (Academic Senate) and seeks to determine the effectiveness of the Academic Senate in relationship to the goals it, and others with whom it interacts, have established and to interpret the impact of the organization on its environment.

While there are a variety of recognized definitions of organizational effectiveness, the definition developed by Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957) provides the foundation upon which this research was developed.

We define organizational effectiveness as the extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain upon its members (p. 535).

The selection of this definition was made on the basis that it incorporated the key elements of organizational effectiveness--meeting objectives, having means and resources, organization as a social system--and emphasized the need to maintain means and resources while not placing burdensome demands on the membership. Because the statewide Academic Senate is a voluntary, non-profit, professional organization, its membership may be its most vital resource and, therefore, deserving specific consideration. Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum address the importance of organization members more cogently than do other definitions, many of which consider members under the umbrella--resources. Further, the definition seemed to be consistent with the characteristics of the Academic Senate.

Background

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges was founded in 1968 when representatives of community college local senates convened to write the constitution. By 1980, 102 colleges had formed individual senates and 96 had affiliated with the Academic Senate. A position paper of the organization stated "thus it is the responsibility of the ASCCC to inform local senates as well as to coordinate and represent their views on statewide educational issues such as academic standards, accreditation, articulation, basic skills, credentialing curriculum, community involvement, grading policies, professional growth, student services, and

the like" (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 1980, p. 2).

The rise of the Academic Senate to predominance as the exclusive voice of the community college faculty on matters of academic and professional concern in a relatively brief period of time is related directly to a series of internal and external forces which were exerted on the educational system. These forces were manifested in legislative action which separated the junior colleges from the secondary school systems, provided for the establishment of local senates or faculty councils, created the California Community Colleges and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

In July of 1979, Chancellor William Craig of the California Community College system recommended, and the Board of Governors approved, a series of statements which outlined the means by which the Academic Senate and Chancellor's Office could implement academic governance as a truly cooperative effort. The points, which Chancellor Gerald Hayward, the current Chancellor, has continued to support, include: regular meetings with Academic Senate representatives and the Chancellor; inclusion of the Academic Senate officers on the Chancellor's mailing list for receipt of agenda items, reports and pertinent papers of interest to faculty; invitation of the Chancellor to attend Academic Senate meetings; urging of district administrators to involve local senates in reports and information provided to the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office; and consultation by the Chancellor with

the Academic Senate in appointing faculty to Chancellor's task groups and committees (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 1980, p. 12).

Since the creation of the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office for California Community Colleges (1968), there has been a consistent attempt to develop more uniformity of policy and procedure throughout the system while maintaining the unique characteristics of the individual colleges. The community college faculties have demonstrated an increasing desire to participate in community college governance, both locally and at the state level. The Academic Senate has become the principal means through which the faculties communicate their academic and professional concerns.

Objectives of this Research

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is a complex organization with exclusive legal jurisdiction and financial support to represent approximately 15,000 full-time community college instructors and thousands of hourly instructors concerning academic and professional matters. This project, which proposes to study the effectiveness of the Academic Senate, has four major objectives.

1. To describe the historical development of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.
2. To determine the effectiveness of the methods by which the Academic Senate provides for community

college faculty to participate in academic and professional governance.

3. To determine the effectiveness of the Academic Senate, as understood by the membership and others with whom it interacts, in meeting the purpose and goals which the organization and relevant others have established for it.
4. To interpret the impact of the Academic Senate on its environment.

Need for the Study

California has the largest system of community colleges in the United States and is recognized nationwide for its leadership in community college education. The Academic Senate is the largest organization of its kind in the United States, yet there is a dearth of research available about academic senates in California or the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

Provision for the establishment of academic senates on college campuses, the statewide Academic Senate and the original structure of the senates in the community college system is based on legislative statute.

Because of the exclusive legal jurisdiction to represent the community college faculty and the legislative financial support, the Academic Senate must be recognized as an organization operating from a substantial power base. No published research or evaluation was identified which has attempted to

determine the effectiveness or interpret the impact of the Academic Senate in relationship to the goals it has established for the organization and the environment in which it functions.

The review of the literature revealed very little research concerning professional organizations and no research designed to determine the effectiveness of any professional organization similar to the Academic Senate.

Community college leaders must analyze and understand the forces which affect the structure or system within which they function. The Academic Senate is identifiable as one of the forces within the California Community College system because the organization has the exclusive legal jurisdiction to represent approximately 15,000 instructors on academic and professional matters and, as indicated previously, speaks directly to the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Research Design

This study of the effectiveness of the Academic Senate incorporates a research design and procedures characteristic of ethnographic/naturalistic inquiry. The focus is that of a comprehensive study such as described by Levinson (1972) and Lawler, Nadler, and Cammann (1980), which includes an evaluation of the organization, its interactions with other systems and descriptions of the organization's concept, objectives, both operative and publicly stated, and its leadership. This

research concentrates on the goal-centered case study model summarized by Campbell (1976, p. 31) which assumes that the organization has defined goals and rational leadership and focuses on the Academic Senate as a composite organization.

Naturalistic inquiry includes a variety of methodologies, such as participant and behavior observation, questionnaires, interviews and evaluation of archival data. As indicated by Lawler et al. (1980), Campbell (1976), Pfeffer (1977) and others, an organization should be studied as it exists with and in its environment. Naturalistic inquiry, as defined by Tikunoff and Ward (1980, p. 265), centers on the behavior of organizations within the usual environment. It is designed to limit the research arena to the way in which an organism interacts with other organisms and utilizes qualitative and quantitative data obtained from natural behavior in a natural setting.

Faulkner (1982) discussed this form of research as a triad mode of data collection which is based on multiples of data, including, for example, observation, interviewing and archives. "A triad advocates a distinctive stance toward qualitative information, namely, that it takes multiples and complexities in the data collection to capture and preserve multiples in the phenomenon of interest (i.e., industries, organizations, career)" (p. 81).

Each leg of the triad is unique. Interviewing strengthens the "actor viewpoint" and permits questions and issues to emerge. Observation of people can be coupled with

interviewing while the third leg--archives, documents and records--provides information about and support for some of the data collected.

The research objectives and design which focus on the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges as a composite organization interacting with its internal and external environment in a natural setting indicate the appropriateness of both qualitative and quantitative data-gathering methods.

Questionnaire Methodology. Since the Academic Senate has a large membership whose opinions must be known to accomplish the objectives of this study, a paper and pencil survey incorporating questions pertaining to the historical development of the Academic Senate; methods and procedures through which the Academic Senate provides opportunities for community college faculty to participate in governance; the purpose and goals of the Academic Senate; the organization's effectiveness in meeting its goals and the goals imposed by others in its environment; and questions pertaining to direct impact of the organization on its internal and external environment was conducted.

Items on the questionnaire were constructed so as to allow a six-choice response (including "don't know") similar to a Likert scale. The questionnaire was designed so that respondents can complete it in 10-15 minutes (see Appendix B).

Questionnaires were sent to 751 instructors.

Fifty-three colleges were randomly selected from a total of 107. Instructors were selected using stratified sampling techniques and chosen from the 1982-83 college catalog faculty listings. Additionally, questionnaires were sent to all California community college presidents (107) and all local senate presidents (109).

Analysis of this data was accomplished through use of MiraCosta College's HP 3000 computer and the SPSS program. Descriptive statistical procedures, primarily percentages of response, were used to determine the Academic Senate's effectiveness, as understood by membership respondents, the college presidents and local senate presidents.

In addition to the questionnaire, this study includes the use of observation, interviews and document analysis in meeting its stated objectives. Using these methods, the researcher sought to discover and review concepts, measures and samples as more was learned about the effectiveness of the Academic Senate.

Interviews. The Academic Senate, in meeting its mission, interacts directly with the Board of Governors, California Community Colleges, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Academic Senate, University of California System; Academic Senate, California State University System; college presidents; legislators; the membership; Faculty Association for California Community Colleges; California Association of

Community Colleges, formerly California Community and Junior College Association, to name but a few.

Interviews (see Appendix A for sample questions) were conducted with many representatives of the above groups. The purpose for conducting interviews was to determine what the individuals thought about the Academic Senate and to expose those things that cannot be observed, such as the respondent's thoughts, feelings, knowledge (Patton 1980, p. 197). The interviews were "elite" interviews and concentrated on the individual's viewpoints.

Many of the techniques developed by oral historians were incorporated in the interview process. Cutler noted that oral history served four functions: (1) to serve to fill the information gaps in the written record; (2) to help the historian understand the atmosphere or milieu of the period under scrutiny; (3) to illustrate what it was like to live during the times described; and (4) to use reminiscences to corroborate or discredit other sources of information (1971, p. 186).

Participant Observation. The Academic Senate Executive Board meetings and conferences are open meetings, and they provided an excellent opportunity to gather data in a natural setting using established techniques of participant observation. McCall identified the goal of participant observations as an analytic description of a complex social organization. The researcher employs " . . . (1) concepts, propositions and

empirical generalizations of a body of scientified theory as a guide for analysis and reportings; (2) employs thorough systematic collection classification and reporting of facts; (3) generates new empirical generalizations based on this data" (1969, p. 3).

Archival Research. The Academic Senate, Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), California Association of Community Colleges (CACC), State Department of Education and Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges archivists and leadership provided the best sources of unpublished documents which were analyzed and included in the data.

Delimitations

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the research arena. The approach has been to view the State-wide Academic Senate from the organizational effectiveness perspective. To the extent that history and background about the community colleges, academic governance and local senate building in California were considered related to the organizational effectiveness focus, these topics are discussed in the study. No attempt was made to include a comprehensive review of the community college movement, academic governance or local Senate effectiveness.

This study was concerned with the Academic Senate as it existed from its inception in 1968 through 1982.

The community college questionnaire sample was limited by the availability and accuracy of the faculty names listed as full time in the 1982-83 college catalogs. In cases where the 1982-83 catalog was unavailable, the 1981-82 catalog lists were used and the selected names were verified by telephone as full-time faculty, presently employed at that college. To the extent that it could be determined, all respondents were considered full-time teaching faculty. The names of the local Senate presidents were provided by the Secretary of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The college presidents' mailing list was established by using the Chancellor's Office publication, California Community Colleges Directory 1981-1982. Also, the Superintendent/President's office at MiraCosta College provided the names of newly appointed presidents. The response rate was: faculty, 46% of 751; Senate presidents, 70% of 109; college presidents, 70% of 107. The number of non-respondents was considered a limitation.

Subjects interviewed were limited by their availability and willingness to participate in this study.

The statewide Academic Senate's archives were spread among several organization archivists. The most extensive archives, readily available to the researcher, are located in Ventura, California, and were under the supervision of Edith Conn. The Senate was attempting to centralize and possibly computerize the archives. The lack of centralization was a limiting factor in the use of the archives.

Definition of Terms

A characteristic which is present in the development of any profession is the evolution of a vocabulary and language usage which is known and used, sometimes exclusively, by the profession's members. Simultaneous to the development of language is the development of acronyms which become codelike and often require deciphering by those who would interact with the profession.

The reader's attention is directed to definitions of acronyms representing organizations which were influential to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. In several cases, certain elements of organizational theory were applied to the explanations about organizational changes reflected in the new acronyms for the old organization.

In the body of this study, organizations will be identified by their official title or name, initially, and the appropriate acronym in subsequent references.

ACCJC: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The ACCJC was referred to most frequently throughout this study as the Commission.

ACCCA: Association of California Community College Administrators.

ASCCC: Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. While the organization was frequently referred to as the ASCCC in its early years, the leadership has chosen to change its identity to the statewide Academic Senate or the statewide Senate in an attempt to eliminate the confusion

associated with the many community college organizations having several C's in their names. In this study, the preferred references will be used unless a citation or quotation uses another identifier.

AS-CIO: Academic Senate-Chief Instructional Officers.

BGCCC/BoG: Board of Governors California Community Colleges/Board of Governors.

BOARS: Board of Admission and Relations with Schools.

CJCA: California Junior College Association.

CCJCA: California Community and Junior College Association.

CACC: California Association of Community Colleges.

CJCA became CCJCA and has recently been reorganized (1982) as CACC. This organization worked cooperatively with other organizations to provide support for the local senate movement and, subsequently, for the development of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The early organization represented faculty, administrators and trustees; later students were included in the organization and the current organization remains inclusive in its representation of these elements. Institutions pay dues to belong to this organization.

CCCT: California Community College Trustees.

College Presidents: The group of individuals whose actual title may be superintendent/president, president or chancellor, to whom questionnaires were sent. Regardless of

title, all were identified as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of their campus.

CSBA: California School Boards Association.

Community college, community junior college and junior college: These are terms which are interchangeable to a large extent and identify two-year colleges. Most often these institutions will be referred to as community colleges in the study.

CPEC: California Postsecondary Education Commission. A State agency responsible for assuring that the State's resources for postsecondary education are utilized effectively and efficiently; for promoting diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to the needs of students and society; and for advising the Legislature and the Governor on statewide educational policy and funding.

CSU: California State University System. The State University System is comprised of nineteen campuses. The primary function of the State University is to provide instruction to undergraduate and graduate students in the liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields and in various professions, including teaching.

CTA: California Teachers Association.

CJCFA: California Junior College Faculty Association.

FACCC: Faculty Association of California Community Colleges.

CJCFA splintered from CJCA (now CACC) when the need for an organization to advocate faculty exclusively was

identified. The organization became FACCC and it provided seed money to aid in the establishment of the statewide Academic Senate. FACCC members pay dues which support a legislative analyst.

Faculty respondents: The individuals to whom questionnaires were sent as a random stratified sample of the community college faculties.

Senates, local senates: Representative faculty groups located on each campus. Sometimes they are called faculty councils. They are concerned with academic and professional matters.

Senate presidents: The individuals elected by their local senate as the leader of the senate. Each of these individuals was mailed a questionnaire.

UC: University of California system. The University system consists of nine campuses. The University of California is the primary state-supported agency for research. It has the sole authority for awarding the doctorate degree (for public institutions). It provides instruction in the areas of graduate and undergraduate education listed for CSU and has exclusive jurisdiction over graduate instruction in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine.

WASC: Western Association of Schools and Colleges--Regional accrediting agency and parent body to the Accrediting Commission for Schools and Colleges.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I has set the stage for the development of this study in the following chapters. Chapters II and III contain the review of the literature which provides the backdrop against which the data collected was measured and interpreted. In subsequent chapters, a perspective for data analysis (Chapter IV), the various data gathering methods--interviews (Chapter V), survey questionnaires (Chapter VI), and participant observations (Chapter VII) are discussed. Finally, Chapter VIII provides summations, conclusions and recommendations about the organizational effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Based on research findings, this Chapter attempts to draw new relationships and interpretations and apply the results to an emerging model of effectiveness.

CHAPTER II

FRAMING THE ORGANIZATION

Literature which is reviewed in the following pages is directed towards the (1) history and evolution of academic governance in the community college as the provider of the roots from which the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges emerged; (2) the Academic Senate itself; (3) the environment in which the organization functions; (4) developing an understanding of organizations in general and voluntary professional organizations such as the Senate specifically; (5) organizational effectiveness as a construct; and (6) the assessment of organizational effectiveness.

The sources for this literature were varied. Several ERIC document searches were obtained through the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges located at the University of California, Los Angeles. The Academic Senate archives, Mira-Costa College Academic Senate Minutes, dissertation abstracts, microfilms and a number of library collections provided the literature reviewed.

Because the objectives of this study are concerned with a comprehensive view of the Senate, beginning prior to its origin and ending with 1982, an extensive review covering many topics is provided in developing the composite picture

of the organization. It should be noted that no truly comparable study was located in the literature.

Academic Governance

Clark and Youn (1976), in their thorough historical analysis of academic power in the United States, indicated that while faculty influence in governance in colleges and universities predates many American institutions, the degree of influence has varied widely.

Governance in higher education is often discussed in the form of theoretical and/or structural models. These models frequently are used for purposes of measuring or comparing organizational functions. Dressel (1981) succinctly identified and discussed the four major paradigms of academic governance which follow:

1. Benevolent Anarchy. The faculty and administration envision the university as consisting of loosely coordinated and generally autonomous groups. Each unit seeks its own funding and is responsible for its own instructional program. Some services are performed by common units. In general, the faculty and administration become independent entrepreneurs in developing resources and programs.
2. An Autocracy. Most significant advances in higher education are, Dressel believed, the result of dominant, dynamic leaders.

Autocratic governance is advantageous in defining an institution, eliminating ambiguity and in making rapid decisions.

3. Collegial or Shared Governance Pattern. Founded largely on the collegium, or community of scholars, faculty members are considered to have a high level of competence based on their years of training and ability. Competence is enhanced by experience and colleague respect. Academic and professional freedom is valued greatly. "Decisions are to be achieved by consultation and consensus with the expectation that they will be more appropriate and more humane because the faculty has a major input to all decisions" (p. 79).
4. Political Model. Governance is viewed as a series of political maneuvers growing from conflict situations. Internal power blocks and external groups attempt to influence both process and procedures. Decisions are the result of negotiated compromise which occurs after focusing on what is internally acceptable to the faculty, to the president, to the governing board and acceptable externally by interested groups. This model lacks the political party with defined goals sub-structure, present in national political governance (pp. 79-81).

Faculty governance in any institution very likely crosses model lines and individual institutional characteristics are often related directly to the governance model in use. Clark and Youn (1976) indicated that greater faculty influence in governance has been apparent in leading private and public universities and private colleges than in public institutions of higher learning. The level of faculty influence generally correlates with the age and prestige of the institution. Traditionally, according to the authors, faculty influence has been relatively low in institutions which emerged from the normal schools (often land grant colleges) whose primary function was to train elementary school teachers. Normal schools became teachers colleges, and for many years retained their singular purpose of professional preparation for all levels of school personnel. As a result, the institutions developed close ties to the state boards of education, responsible for primary and secondary education. Because of this influence, these institutions tended to be dominated by administrators and trustees and their governance patterns were more similar to primary and secondary schools than to those of older, more prestigious institutions.

Trustee/administrator dominance patterns are even more apparent in the historical development of the community colleges. Junior colleges, as community colleges, were formerly known, predate World War II, in existence but their greatest expansion occurred in the 1950's and 1960's. These colleges were established as upward reach systems of secondary

education. As a general pattern, the faculty and administrators were hired from secondary schools, often the local school system, and the colleges were governed by either the local citizen school board, responsible for the primary and secondary schools, or by a similarly patterned governing board.

Bylsma and Blackburn (1972) examined the historical literature relative to faculty governance and community colleges in the United States. They found that the faculties did participate in governance, but indicated that three (Boghe, 1950; Thornton, 1960; Hillway, 1966) of the most often read books on junior/community colleges during the 1950-1966 period failed to recognize that faculty could participate in the governance of an institution. Bylsma and Blackburn further indicated that there was an absence of articles about faculty participation in governance in Junior College Journal prior to 1964 and suggested this was indicative that faculty participation in governance probably was non-existent. The authors discovered a rationale which explained this lack of participation as being a function of the size and complexity of the junior/community college. The rationale postulated that the complexity of the junior/community college may cause faculty to be unable to make intelligent decisions. Further, faculty ignorance may be the result of their concentration on teaching, rather than on issues related to governance.

Bylsma and Blackburn (1972) were in agreement with Clark

and Youn (1976) in discussing their independent but related research which identified the placement of the community colleges in the educational system as an explanation for the comparative historical lack of faculty participation in governance. Since the educational system is progressive and hierarchical, the pressures of the trustee/administrator-dominated secondary schools are exerted from below, while the power of the four-year institutions is exerted from above. Their research indicated, also, that since most faculty considered their move from secondary school to the junior-community college to be a promotion, and a very satisfying one, faculty desire to acquire a place in the decision-making process may have been neutralized. The historical model in which the junior-community colleges were founded is hierarchical. In this model, faculty do not participate. Prior to 1965, there was little indication that faculties were involved effectively in governance.

Monroe (1972), in his profile of the community college, indicated that faculty participation in governance was a matter of recent origin and controversial in nature. From his perspective, the issue was not whether faculty would participate, but how they would participate in governance. Monroe believed the power of governance remained concentrated in the community college trustee boards and college presidents. "Even as community colleges have emancipated themselves from public school districts, the tradition of autocratic control

continues to prevail. But the days of autocracy are numbered" (Monroe, 1972, pp. 321-322).

Governance In California Community Colleges

The historical development of the junior/community colleges in California is very consistent with the identified pattern. The first California junior college was established in 1907 and the colleges experienced a slow, steady growth until the 1950's and 1960's when there was a substantial increase in their numbers. The primary purpose of the colleges, initially, was to provide freshman and sophomore level classes at no cost to students of the local community. The colleges were governed by locally-elected school boards of autonomous districts serving the dual function of governing to local secondary schools and the junior college.

For the variety of reasons indicated previously, the faculties did not unite nor did they align themselves with the traditional governance patterns exhibited by the four-year colleges and universities. A marker event in the development of the California junior/community colleges occurred with the passage of the Donohoe Act of 1960 which translated the Master Plan for Higher Education into law. The net effect of the plan was to grant recognition and status to the junior/community colleges as one-third of the partnership (University of California system; California State University system) in California higher education. Another critical event occurred in 1963 when junior/community faculties were

granted the legal right to participate in policy formation on academic and professional matters. In the same year, junior/community colleges were legally separated from the local school boards and became autonomous community college districts with their own governing boards. It was not until 1967 that the junior/community colleges became systematized as the California Community Colleges with a system Chancellor and Board of Governors. Clearly, local control had been challenged.

About the time the Donohoe Act (1960) was passed, junior/community college faculties began to show an interest in sharing in the governance of the colleges. This interest was demonstrated as faculties exhibited what Blau and Scott (1962) have identified as behavior patterns typical of professionals. These patterns are indicated when professionals group themselves into voluntary organizations for the primary purpose of self-determination. According to the authors, the desire for self-control is the result of the long period of training required of the professional in acquiring his/her expertise and the internal code of ethics which governs professional conduct. Also, self-control is supported by the surveillance of his/her conduct by peers in the colleague relationship. "Every member of the group, but nobody else, is assumed to be qualified to make professional judgements. To implement these values, professional organizations usually seek to have them enacted into laws establishing the exclusive jurisdiction of the organized colleague groups in a

given area of competence, and granting it the right to license practitioners" (Blau & Scott, 1962, p. 63). As Dressel (1981) indicated " . . . there comes a time in maturation when even the most respected autocrat finds board members, faculty, alumni, students, and others asking for some voice in planning and in selecting administrators" (p. 79).

The evolution of college and university governance is steeped in a tradition of faculty sharing the authority and responsibility for governance with administration. Most often faculties have influenced the governing process through organizations known as academic senates or faculty councils. Since their inception, the University of California system and the California State University system have had academic senates on each branch campus and each has a statewide academic senate which speaks for its faculties in the governance process.

Senate Building: The Five-Year Period 1963-1968. As the junior/community college faculties began to agitate for place in the governance process, early leaders chose to organize along the lines of the collegial model outlined by Dressel (1981, pp. 79-81) and implemented through the academic senates. Exhibiting the characteristics outlined previously by Blau and Scott (1962, p. 62) and working through established organizations such as the California State Board of Education, California Teachers Association and

the California Junior College Association, the leaders fought to achieve self control. In 1963, California Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 48 (ACR 48) was passed. With its passage, the junior/community college faculties, minus the tradition and experience in governance of their partners in higher education, were granted the same legal right to participate in policy formation on academic and professional matters through the establishment of academic senates on each junior/community college campus. A period of time would elapse before the emergence of a statewide academic senate similar to those present in the other systems of higher education.

Assemblyman Ben Garrigus, then Chair of the State Assembly Education Committee and a junior college instructor, was responsible for introducing Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR 48). Dissertation research, undertaken by Case (1968), indicated that the legislative advocate of the California Federation of Teachers, as well as the other major junior college instructor organizations, joined in advocacy for the resolution. However, as Case reported, controversy surrounded the passage of ACR 48. Faculties, it was believed would soon lose their enthusiasm once they had experienced the tiring burden of responsible participation. On the positive side, it was thought that the presence of a senate on a college campus would be the sign and seal of bona fide higher education status. According to Case, the 1963-1964 year was a year of study and debate. ACR 48 had directed the

establishment of senates, but there was little information available on how to accomplish it. The Board of Education enacted Sec. 131.6 of Title V, California Administrative Code, as a means of interpreting the issues raised during the early stages of implementation. Of primary importance was the implementation of ACR 48 which provided the academic senates with direct lines of communication to the governing board and access to county counsel legal opinion. Case (1971) cited a survey undertaken by the California Teachers Association in 1965, which showed that by 1964 fifty-two percent of the colleges had held elections preparatory to the establishment of their senate (p. 12).

"The initial impact of ACR 48 was to catalyze the movement, and to hold up a powerfully attractive model for formal faculty participation (the academic senate) which had about it the aura of traditions and conventions of faculty governance as they were supposed to exist in the senior colleges and universities, traditions and conventions hallowed by what was taken to be a long history with origins in the ancient universities of medieval Europe" (Case, 1971, p. 18). The impact of Sec. 131.6 was to legitimate faculty authority. By 1967, faculty participation was an accomplished fact.

Porter (1969) summarized the first five years of senate existence and categorized their problems as organization, a searching for identity within the institutional structure; and flexing of muscles to assert new and unfamiliar power (p. 3). Case (1971) described the processes of

constitution-making that occurred during this five-year period as a prelude to the actual initiation of the senate. The process of legitimating senates required a constitution that would meet with the approval of the majority of faculty on a given campus. This process resulted in legitimating of the senate by the body politic. Another process Case identified was that of education. What a senate could be or should be required exploration, debate and discussion. The education process touched boards and administrators as faculty searched for their senate's identity (p. 39). This period began the process Case characterized as giving the senate life and character that would be ongoing. "A kind of 'tuning up' would continue formally through constitutional revisions, and informally through the hardening of precedents, evolution of traditions, habits of operation, grooving channels of communication, evolving an internal social structure, and the carving out of a role, or roles, within the overall framework of the college organization" (Case, 1981, p. 39).

The uniqueness of each senate is a reflection of the individual characteristics observed among the colleges they represent. The label academic senate is a generic one and is applied to a class of organizations possessing common characteristics. Senates have a strong constitutional-political flavor, are composed of a representative body, often with a dual constituency, and purposes that center on representing the faculty. Variability in senates is reflected in the

structural differences, procedures and degree of power and authority they exercise in their individual college.

The role of the academic senate in governance is one of providing a forum in which to discuss and resolve issues which are of concern to the entire college community. "The senate legitimates the actions of joint committees by providing opportunity for all elements of the college to debate the actions and decide to accept, reject or modify their actions" (Richardson, 1972, p. 203). Richardson further indicated that the senate serves to improve communication and understanding among constituencies. Through vigorous, open debate, the district identity and sense of philosophy can be conveyed to the community (p. 203).

In an attempt to identify specifically how senates fulfill their roles and responsibilities, Richardson (1972, p. 205) provided the following list of possibilities: curricula revision or addition; requirements for degrees and certificates; establishment of class size; alterations in the academic calendar; attendance policies; provisions of service to the community; student affairs and activities; evaluation procedure for administration, faculty and students; allocation of funds; physical facilities; establishment and responsibilities of joint committees; periodic review of responsibilities and functions of the all-college senate.

Clearly, the senate's responsibility is for policy formation and not policy administration. The areas listed have the potential for affecting the entire college

community. Policy revisions or additions should be reviewed by the senate and the senate's position made known to the board and administration so that it serves as a significant factor in any decision-making (Richardson, 1972, p. 205).

In a study conducted to determine the status of senates in junior colleges, Bandley reported that the largest number of recommendations from the senates to the administration and governing boards were in the areas that affect working conditions and personal lives--salary, personnel matters (leaves, insurance, etc.), class size and work load policies. "Secondarily, they have helped themselves and the students on improvement in instructional policy and academic freedom and controversial issues policies" (Bandley, 1967, p. 9). It is noteworthy that the 68 respondents were all college presidents or vice presidents.

The Bandley (1967) study indicated that fifteen colleges granted three units of assigned time to their senate presidents. Others indicated that the authority to grant assigned time was not clearly provided. The majority of presidents who did not provide assigned time, opposed, resisted or refused, on the basis that the senate should be composed of full time faculty members. The senate role in policy recommendations should not cause the organization to act as an administrative body or senate members to function as administrators (p. 17). Additionally, the presidents indicated their belief that the role of the senate was one of policy advisement and recommendation and should function as an

advisory body to the administration. The most favorable expressions about academic senates came from colleges which did not have recognized negotiating councils and the senate consisted of both instructors and administrators.

The meet and confer controversy, ACR 48 and subsequent Title V Regulation 131.6 granted the academic senates "Meet and Confer" rights. In 1965, the California Legislature passed the Winton Act which established a uniform and orderly method of communication between public school employers and employees and provided for "Meeting and Conferring" through the establishment of negotiating councils (Smith, 1971, p. 5). Porter (1969) indicated that the true function and role of the senates had not been clearly established when the Winton Act was passed (p. 12). Reiss (1967) questioned who spoke for the junior college professor in California and commented that the status of faculty organizations was unclear. He identified the academic senate and negotiating councils as the most common faculty voices. At the time, collective bargaining was provided for in California labor law but prohibited by the Winton Act. Reiss projected that conflict between the forces supporting academic senates and those supporting negotiating councils would reach showdown proportions in the Legislature in 1968 (p. 4).

Porter (1969) interviewed college presidents and faculty members as part of his study and found both groups agreed that the major thrust of senates during the five-year period (1969-1974) would be (no significance in order of listing):

(1) work to have all junior colleges free from unified districts; (2) strengthen the academic senate for California community colleges; (3) develop a statewide salary schedule; and (4) work to repeal the Winton Act (pp. 30-31).

A period of extensive debate about the interpretation of the language of ACR 48 and the Winton Act, as well as testimony about the common practices existent on college campuses for "Meeting and Conferring", occurred. Smith (1971) and Brydon (1971) provided extensive detail of the debate and both indicated the cooperative and supportive effort demonstrated by instructor organizations such as California Teachers Association (CTA), Faculty Association for California Community Colleges (FACCC) and California Junior College Association (CJCA), in the effort to clarify the issue. The net effect was to amend the Winton Act. Reiss' prediction that the debate would reach the Legislature in 1968 fell short by approximately two years, as Assembly Bill 820 (AB 820) which amended the Winton Act was not passed until 1970.

Smith (1971), an attorney and legislative advocate for FACCC, indicated in his analysis of AB 820 that the "intent of the Legislature was not to restrict or prohibit the . . . full function of any academic senate or faculty council established by a school district with a community college to represent the faculty in making recommendations to the administration and governing board with respect to district policies on academic and professional matters" (Smith, 1971,

p. 14). The final resolution of this controversy represented a major victory in the development of the organizational structure and power base for the fledgling senates.

The Academic Senate For California Community Colleges

In 1968, during the height of the debate surrounding the "Meet and Confer" controversy and just three years following the passage of ACR 48 which caused the legal establishment of academic senates, exclusive legal jurisdiction to represent the community college faculties on statewide matters was granted to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The organization emerged from the constitution, written as a product of the conference of academic senates sponsored by the California Junior College Faculty Association (CJCFA), now known as the Faculty Association for California Community Colleges (FACCC). The conference met during the fall and spring and after extensive debate submitted to local senates the proposed constitution for ratification on May 24, 1968 (Standiford et al., Note 1).

One of the delegates in attendance at the Spring 1968 constitution writing conference prepared the following report (exerpted) for his local senate. The following were some of his observations:

9. The whole meeting was spent in working toward an agreeable wording on the constitution. We really began work on this at 2:00 Friday afternoon and went on to 10:00 p.m. that night.

Saturday we worked from 0900 to 4:00 . . .
 one hour out for lunch. Ordinarily I hate this
 kind of thing but I'll have to admit that I got
 involved and gained much from the discussions.

10. I have never been an organization joiner but as
 I was exposed to a recounting of events from
 many, many districts and colleges I can see
 where, if a united voice at the state level is
 going to be accomplished for faculties, then
 this is the organization to do it.
11. The purpose of the organization is to represent
 faculty interests to the state board in matters
 of interest to faculty in all community col-
 leges. It is not, as proposed to be an axe
 grinding, bickering, individual interest thing
 but an organization that will take the concerns
 of California community college faculty to the
 board for discussion and solution (Meier, Note
 2).

As Blau and Scott (1962, p. 63) indicated professionals
 are want to do, the organizers of the academic senate for
 California community colleges sought legal recognition as a
 means of implementing the expressed values of the organiza-
 tion. On May 21, 1969, the Board of Governors for California
 Community Colleges authorized each local senate to request
 local governing boards to subscribe to the statewide academic
 senate (Juric, Fall 1970, p. 3). By the Fall of 1970, more

than two-thirds of the California community colleges had affiliated with the year-old statewide academic senate. Sheridan Hegland, first president of the statewide Senate, stated "It provides for the first time a statewide voice for all faculty without ideological or subject matter or dues barriers" (Fall 1970, p. 2).

Reiss (1979), in a rare study of academic senates, commented that the " . . . establishment of a statewide senate for California community colleges will provide a direct state level voice for local community college senates" (p. 7). He recommended that since his findings indicated both the faculty and administration favored the academic senate and participative management, "community college trustees, administration and faculty should provide maximum support (including financial commitment) to the continual development of the newly-established Academic Senate for California Community Colleges" (Reiss, 1977, p. 187).

In the Fall 1970 ASCCC Newsletter, Hegland wrote "ASCCC is different. Its first official pronouncement expressed eagerness to cooperate with all faculty organizations. Our fall and spring conferences have seen representatives present and participating from CTA, California Federation of Teachers (CFT), FACCC, American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and from state colleges and public and private university campuses. Also participating were spokesmen from CJCA, California Association of School Administrators (CASA) and California School Boards Association (CSBA). Our intent is

to be inclusive, not exclusive; to be responsive and responsible" (p. 3).

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is a voluntary, collegial organization composed of all professionals who are teaching faculty in the public community colleges of California. The purpose of the statewide Academic Senate is to represent the community college faculty in all matters of academic and professional concern. Membership in the organization occurs as a function of being a faculty member at a community college and is, therefore, composed of a very heterogeneous group of professionals. The individual colleges affiliate with and pay dues to the organization. The California Legislature supports the organization with monies allotted through the Chancellor's system budget. This support is similar to the financial support the Legislature provides to the statewide senates of the UC and CSU system, though the amount is much less than that provided to the other senates.

The basic structure of the organization is democratic in nature as the constituent colleges are represented at the semi-annual conferences by their local senate president and one delegate representative. All proposed organizational positions and activities are debated from the floor and only the delegate representatives may vote. Those resolutions receiving a majority vote become the foundation for statewide senate positions and action. Elections are conducted in the

spring with candidate speeches preceding the election. Again, only the representative from each college may vote.

The Executive Committee consists of: President; Past President; Vice President; Treasurer; Secretary; Representatives (three from North and three from South); Representatives at Large (four); and meets monthly. It is responsible for the ongoing organizational activities and for communicating with local senates. The Education Policies Committee is the only standing committee of the Senate.

Also, the community colleges are divided into geographical areas. Area meetings are held prior to each conference and at other times as needed. Colleges often send more than their senate president and delegate to area meetings. Generally, the purpose of these meetings is to determine what resolutions the area may want to offer for debate by the delegate assembly and to identify the interests and concerns of the area colleges.

In addition to the semi-annual conferences, the statewide Senate sponsors special interest meetings on topics such as evaluation, academic standards and basic skills.

Organizational Environment of the Statewide Academic Senate. While the previous discussion provided only a brief description of the statewide Academic Senate, it served to establish a frame for the organization and to identify the uniqueness of the Senate from the perspective of a student of organizations. Academic senates and the concept of

collegiality are historically significant in the study of governance in higher education though they have received limited interest from organizational researchers. It is true, also, that professional associations, in general, have been subjected to very little research scrutiny, yet there is a proliferation of organizations in this general category. When volunteer organizations have been studied, they tend not to have been education-related and when professionals have been studied, the medical, legal and health professions have received the greatest interest. Most organizational research has been conducted in the work place in non-voluntary organizations. Thus, most of the literature and theoretical paradigms about organizations and organizational effectiveness are founded in studies of organizations dissimilar to the Senate. Characteristics identified by such studies must be interpreted and measured in light of the fact that the state-wide Academic Senate, when taken in toto, is profoundly different from the organizations most often studied.

The California community colleges function as locally-organized, and somewhat locally-controlled, entities, as well as part of the 107-member state system of community colleges. Whether looked at as individual colleges or as part of the system, they are bounded by governmental, bureaucratic structure. For example, the internal organization of the majority of colleges identifies a president/superintendent at the top; next, vice presidents; followed by deans and division heads; then department chairs, faculty and students. While a very

intricate sub-unit structure designed to improve communication and encourage participatory activities may exist in lines of authority, responsibility is clearly drawn. Because each college belongs to a district (some districts have more than one campus), district governance occurs through the elected lay board of trustees. There may be several community college districts in one county and county authority and interaction with the districts is variable. Nevertheless, the college district must interact with yet another form of bureaucratic organization.

There was widespread resistance to the creation of the California community college system in 1967 because it carried the organization pattern of an additional bureaucratic superstructure which included a Chancellor and staff which reports to a Board of Governors. The Governor of California appoints the board members and the Board is accountable to the Legislature. Until 1978, the local districts functioned to a great extent on local tax support. The passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 changed the taxation base and transferred control of finances to the State of California. The net effect produced diminishing local control, increasing demands on the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office by the Legislature and increased "systematizing" of the colleges and districts.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission is a primary organization in the environment of the community colleges and the Academic Senate. The Commission is the

successor to the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education and is responsible for coordinating California's plan for education beyond high school. While fulfilling this responsibility, it coordinates the higher education triad (University of California, California State Universities, California Community Colleges) and private universities and colleges. The Commission recommends directly to the Legislature, offering advice on statewide educational policy and funding.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the legal representative organization for the approximately 15,000 community college instructors on all issues of academic and professional concern. It is bound by the organizational structure in which its members function, as well as by bureaucratic bounds exercised by the environment of the organization.

Given the earlier discussion concerning the history of academic senates, it is clear that senate tradition abhors bureaucratic and authoritarian behaviors and structures. Recognition of post-industrial organizational reality has provided methods for tolerable compromise and the subsequent appearance and growth of the local senates and the statewide Academic Senate. Critical to the meshing of the two types of organizations which, in the purist sense, are diametrically opposed, has been the legal foundation and financial support provided to the statewide Senate and local senates by the bureaucracy and the proviso that both local senates and the

statewide Senate can communicate and make recommendations directly to the local boards of trustees and the Board of Governors as an alternative to the rigidity of bureaucratic authority/responsibility lines.

Organizations, such as the Academic Senate, are created when a group of people perform in a coordinated manner to achieve some goal or mission. The achievement of goals is most often accomplished through a division of labor by which individuals are delegated the authority to act for the members or are provided with various mechanisms for coordinating the activities of the organization. A characteristic of organizations is that they have continuity over time; that is, the members continue to use the organization as a means of goal achievement over time. Clearly, both the California Community Colleges and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges are examples of organizations possessing these characteristics.

Brydon (1973) identified three branches to the study of organizational theory: social-psychological; sociological; and administrative. The sociological branch is broad in scope and focuses on organizational goals, division of labor and the role of formal organizations in society. The social-psychologists concentrate on the role of the individual in an organizational system and the effect of the system on the individual. The administrative branch is concerned with the issue of centralization and problems of control (p. 30).

The definition for organizational effectiveness

(Tannenbaum & Georgopoulos, 1957) which is the foundation for this study should alert the reader to the researcher's view that the organization under study is considered a social system possessing resources and means and which attempts to fulfill its objectives without exhausting either. Resources and means are interpreted to include the environment in which this organization or social system functions.

The sociological perspective is broad in scope and focuses on the organizational goals, role of the formal organization in society and the division of labor. Max Weber (1947) provided the foundation work in the theory of formal organization and structure. Paramount to the understanding of Weber's theory of formal organizations and social structure is his conceptualization of the rational ordering of duties and responsibilities and reliance on formal rules. The classic dilemma was identified as how effectiveness and efficiency can be achieved while maintaining control. In Weber's view, efficiency is concerned with the best utilization of resources.

Weber (1947, pp. 324-329) identified the relationship of authority and legitimation as critical to his bureaucratic theory. He distinguished between traditional authority (accepted because that is the way it has always been), charismatic authority accepted because of the leader's personality) and bureaucratic authority (accepted because it agrees with a set of more abstract rules which are considered legitimate and on which decisions are made). The ability to

control in a bureaucracy is based on the ability to justify in accordance with the rules of the group which are accepted voluntarily because the rules are part of the value system. "There is a theoretical assumption that community college leaders are participants in a bureaucratic system which relies on legitimacy for its effectiveness" (Brydon, 1973, p. 34).

The final element of Tannenbaum and Georgopoulos' (1957) definition of organizational effectiveness is concerned with how the organizational objectives can be met without placing extreme strain on the membership. The social-psychologist branch of organizational theory (Brydon, 1973, p. 30) concentrates on the system's effect on the individual. Certainly, in an organization such as the statewide Academic Senate which is voluntary and non-profit, the membership is a vital resource. To strain it unduly courts disaster for the organization.

"Organizations are tools designed to achieve various goals, to understand them fully, one must understand the goals they pursue" (Perrow, 1977, p. 180). Perrow argued that goals are multiple and conflicting, often pursued as problems, but they also provide the best clue to the uniqueness of the organization (p. 180). "Bureaucratic form results from a successful attempt to do what all organizations seek to accomplish - to minimize the impact of extra-organizational influences upon members; to promote a high degree of specialization to ensure efficiency and competency;

and to control as much as possible the uncertainties and variabilities of the environment" (Perrow, 1977, p. 178).

When the environment of the organization is subjected to rapid changes and tasks are not well defined, bureaucratic structure cannot be maintained. The organization must then risk outside intrusion of influences while attempting to minimize these influences through the professionalization of personnel. Environmental influence ensures organizational adaptability (p. 179).

To summarize, the statewide Academic Senate is founded in the tradition of academic senates; is an organization structured as a delegate assembly composed of representatives of each local senate of the 107 community colleges in California who elect the organization's Executive Committee. The organization functions to represent the community college faculty through specifically stated goals and purposes. The statewide Academic Senate exists in an environment which is highly bureaucratic and very diverse.

Organizations

Weber's (1947) classic view of organizations holds that legitimation occurs when the formal rules, divisions of responsibility and delineation of functions agree with a more abstract set of values to which the participants adhere. The alternative is alienation which destroys the effectiveness of the organization in attaining its goals. The idea that some alienation and conflict is inevitable can be traced to

Weber's classic sociological analysis. Meyer and Rowan (1977) extended this view in their lengthy discussion of the formal structure of institutionalized organization. "In modern societies, the elements of rationalized formal structure are deeply ingrained in, and reflect, widespread understandings of social reality. Many positions, policies, programs, and procedures of modern organizations are enforced by public opinion, by views of important constituents, by knowledge legitimated through the educational system, by social prestige, by the laws, and by the definitions of negligence and prudence used by the courts" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 343). The organizational manifestations of rationalized institutional rules may take the form of professions, policies, programs, services, and products which permit the emergence of new organizations and stimulate existing organizations to incorporate new practices and procedures.

Meyer and Rowan cautioned that there may be a sharp distinction between the formal structure of an organization and the day-to-day activities of the organization. "Prevailing theories assume that the coordination and control of activity are critical dimensions on which formal organizations have succeeded in the modern world" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 342). However, researchers have identified gaps between the formal and informal elements of organizations. Recently, research has indicated that formal organizations are often "loosely coupled", a term used to denote the disconnectedness of behavior and outcome. Meyer and Associates (1978, p. 15)

indicated that loose coupling may be the result of preferences of the individuals in the organization and the preferences of the society surrounding the organization. Individual preferences give rise to organizational politics and the development of power relations. Evaluation systems are often subverted or become vague and uncoordinated (p. 342).

Lawrence and Lorsch (1967, p. unnumbered) based their research on questions surrounding what organizational characteristics are required that maintain the linkages between the internal structure and its environment. Their research centered on ten organizations in three industrial environments and studied integration, the state of collaboration which exists between departments to achieve unity of effort to meet environmental demands, and differentiations, the difference in cognitive and emotional orientation among managers in different departments. Differentiation refers specifically to differences in goal orientation and in the formality of structure in the organization.

The Lawrence and Lorsch study originated in 1963 and represented the initial major research designed to challenge whether there was, in fact, one best way to organize. Their findings included: (1) businesses in dynamic environment demonstrated highly differentiated patterns of thought and behavior, while in more stable environments less differentiation was demonstrated; (2) successful organizations achieved the required state of integration; (3) the contingency theory

of organization was established which identified organizational characteristics which lead to effective performance, given the demands of the organization's environment. "It is our view, given the need for differentiated ways of working and points of view in various units of large organizations, that recurring conflict is inevitable" (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967, p. 13).

Individuals bring to organizations certain motives they seek to fulfill. Included are achievement, affiliation and their need for power (McClelland, 1961, pp. 36-62). Organizations which are structured so that members can deal realistically and effectively with the environment promote feelings of growth and personal satisfaction. "Thus, if we concern ourselves with understanding what type of organization meets different environmental demands, we will also be confronting the questions of developing organizations that offer a high probability of satisfying these basic needs of individuals for achievement and competence" (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967, p. 18). The authors further indicated that healthy organizations are under constant pressure to grow and that the pressure may emanate from outside the organization as a result of external requests to undertake new or expanded tasks or as a result of members who desire a broader base for their activities or to identify new opportunities to be developed (p. 230).

It seems apparent, then, that organizations are structured by their environment, that they are interdependent with

it and that they structurally reflect a socially constructed reality. The creation of institutional isomorphism promotes the success and survival of the organization by incorporating externally legitimated structures which causes increased commitment of the internal participants and external constituents (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 349).

Meyer and Rowan (p. 357) concurred with Lawrence and Lorsch (1967, p. 13) in the belief that activities in formal organizations lead to conflicts. The avoidance of the integration of organizational activities leads to decoupling within the organization and minimizes conflict and disputes. March and Simon (1958, pp. 112-135) suggested that delegation, professionalization, goal ambiguity, the elimination of output data, and maintenance of face are all mechanisms for absorbing uncertainty while preserving the formal structure.

The role of the researcher whose interests lie in organizational research is to understand and describe the form and various aspects of organizations. Meyer and Associates (1978) have indicated that researchers have settled the following previously debated issues: (1) comparisons of organizations may not yield meaningful results, but a generally accepted hypothesis is that almost all organizations can be compared in some respects; (2) "open" versus "closed" systems --few can accept studying organizations without references to the external events; (3) acceptance of the contingency theory --there is no best way to organize and probably are no simple generalizations which hold for all organizations (p. 18).

Most often, the results of research curiosity can be placed in two general categories: (1) attempts to explain or predict the growth and decline of organizations; and (2) the effectiveness or fit of the organization in society at large. The following discussion identifies the views of several prominent organizational researchers and illustrates the elements of their diversity, as well as agreement.

Levinson (1972) discussed organizations as open systems, a concept which was drawn from biological studies. "This concept calls attention to the need for studying living organisms in their contexts and to the limitations and difficulty of understanding information about living organisms when that information is taken out of context" (p. 4). In continuing this analogy, Levinson indicated that an organization has three tasks: to maintain balance (1) among its internal subsystems; (2) between the organization as a system and other systems; and (3) between itself and the larger systems of its environments, so that the organization may survive (p. 4).

Evan (1976, p. 19) defined an organization as a social system which interacts with its environment and activates at least four systemic processes: inputs of various types of resources; transformations of resources with the aid of social and/or technical mechanisms; outputs which are transmitted to other systems; and feedback effects, whether negative or positive.

Goodman and Pennings (1977, p. 2) generalized two points

of view regarding organizations. One view discussed was that of an organization as a rational set of arrangements oriented toward achieving certain goals. Another view was that of an organization as an open system, a view similar to Levinson's, in which the organization is concerned with integrating its various parts.

The conceptualization of organizations as markets in which power and influence are transacted was offered by Pfeffer (1977). He expanded on the concept by viewing organizations as open social systems, which must continue to transact with their environments, to import resources and to acquire the necessary support to continue the coalition (p. 145).

Though they differ in their specific definitions of organizations, Levinson, Goodman and Pennings, Evan, and Pfeffer expressed agreement that organizations are composed of interdependent groups or subsystems that are part of the larger organization but may have different goals, different methods of operation, and various degrees of responsibility and power. They further agree that organizations are affected by other systems and they affect other systems. Levinson (p. 4) stated that organizations master their environments and survive by modifying or controlling their own behavior, as well as the external influences. Meyer and Associates summarized, "We find organizations as much - and, in some instances, more - determined by their social and political environments as by technological and economic imperatives

stressed by conventional theories of organizations" (1978, p. 2).

To thoroughly understand an organization according to Levinson (p. 6), the purpose of the organization must be seen as similar to an individual's identity. The organizational purpose is the conceptualized self-image of the organization.

Voluntary Professional Organizations

An understanding of the statewide Academic Senate rests on the conceptualization of a formal voluntary organization which is composed of professionals and founded in the tradition of academic collegiality.

By definition, a voluntary association is a group of people who have a formal structure in which membership is open to all who share a particular occupation or profession, who have a common interest and participate in their own decision (Chapin & Tsouderos, 1955, p. 306). Evan indicated, " . . . the ideal type voluntary association is one in which, among other things, decision-making is decentralized to include the membership at large in order to ensure government by consent, though authority is also delegated through an elected leadership. In contrast, the ideal-type administrative organization is one in which, among other things, authority is centralized and concentrated in the hands of a nonelected leadership" (Evan, 1957, p. 149).

Evan indicated that decision-making and value commitment

are directly related. In his view, as the rate of decision making increases, the rate of value commitment by the participants increases. As the rate of value commitment increases so does the rate of activity (p. 152). But, he raised the question, "Is the transformation of voluntary organizations into administrative organizations inevitable?" (p. 152).

Chapin and Tsouderos (1955) observed the formalization process in ten voluntary organizations which they studied and reported that, as the organization developed the tasks of leadership or executive board and the office staff became more complex, duties became more elaborate, enlarged and specialized. They hypothesized that the extension of the organization's structure begins as an amorphous, informal structure and develops to a formal one. They observed a progression from loose interpersonal to rigid interpersonal contacts which was characterized by organizational hierarchy and by extensive specialization of functions (p. 306).

Using the case study method, Chapin and Tsouderos in their studies of 10 voluntary organizations established the following morphologies:

1. Membership-role-group. Individuals who constitute the rank-and-file membership of the organization.
2. Executive-role-group. Set of positions usually incorporating leadership function which formulates policy to accomplish set goals.

3. Representative-role-group. Organized bodies which arise from the defined roles of members. May vote to approve or reject goals or policies of the organization.
4. Staff-role-group. Organized body of workers, either volunteer or hired, which carries out implementation of executive policy (p. 306).

Additionally, the Chapin and Tsouderos study revealed a growth pattern for voluntary organizations. (1) Initially, membership has the characteristics of the primary group and, while the leadership enjoys higher social prestige, authority is limited by the membership. (2) Structure codification begins when executive positions are differentiated and yearly elections for a hierarchy of executive leaders begins. (3) Differentiation continues with the establishment of standing committees and the discharging of duties under the authority of the executive board. Formulation of separate staff groups is begun, usually with a paid employee working with the executive offices. (4) As the expansion continues, the distance from the executive group continues with further departmentalization and specialization. (5) The control machinery is reinforced through use of nominating committees (pp. 308-309). The organizational growth results in: (1) rank-and-file membership becoming increasingly passive and removed from the executive structure of the organization; (2) executive board is removed from the activities which they formulate and there is increasing dependence on committees

for input; and (3) the long lines of communication create problems which the association may try to solve by improving parliamentary procedures and communication channels (p. 309).

The distinguishing combination of characteristics of a voluntary organization include open membership, common interests and individual decision to participate. But, what are the distinguishing characteristics of professionals in organizations? The professional, according to Bucher and Stelling (1977, p. 124), has the right to say what is to be done and what is necessary to accomplish the task. "Professional membership and organizational memberships are seen as parallel social processes - continuous, overlapping, sometimes complementary, and sometimes in conflict" (Blankenship, 1977, p. 38). Socialization into the complex role of the professional begins in school and continues throughout the career.

As Bucher and Stelling identified, claims to competence are based largely on the degree to which others accept the claim and accord the professional license and recognition of competence. Professionals do not earn their status once and for all. Expertise is specific and not often generalized to other areas (p. 123).

Professional status in relation to the lay public tends to be more apparent than when compared with other professional groups. "What one sees in many organizations is the struggle of different groups for varying levels of professional recognition, with differential success in different

locales" (p. 123). The professional community influences the organizational structure and dictates, to a large extent, the acceptable activities which must be supported by the organizational resources. The reward for success in achieving professional status " . . . is autonomy and influence; the group is accorded the competence to define problems, determine solutions, and monitor the functioning of the system" (Bucher & Stellings, 1977, p. 123).

Characteristic of the professional is the open negotiation and bargaining that takes place and is founded in professional worth and values. Roles in the organization are often determined by the strengths or weaknesses of an individual. Often accommodations are made in program or activities to capitalize on the individual expertise. Situations arise in which one group of professionals in an organization views another group as having a definite place and function and the other groups concerned are not able to make their claims or definitions prevail (Bucher & Stellings, 1977, p. 125). Blankenship (1977) indicated that professionals are not resistive to socially organized activities though they do resist rules, regulations and commands. According to Blankenship, participation in planning, decision making and development is the key. Bargaining and reciprocity are very important (p. 39). "To be accepted as a colleague means to be controlled; the power to check and balance is held by the collegial peer groups" (p. 39).

Bucher and Stellings indicated that most theories of

professionals identify the professional in contrast with the lay public or client, rather than how the professional interacts with other professionals. Their observations indicate that internal differences (segmentalization) arise from differences in professional interest and identity. These segments usually begin as a small group which forms an alliance based on mutual interests or the prospect of achieving a specific purpose. "This internal differentiation is an ongoing process, and there is considerable fluidity in the segments in that new ones arise and existing ones shift and even disappear, as professionals move into or out of the organization, as research interests shift, or as the particular purpose on which a segment was based is accomplished or abandoned" (p. 128).

The potential for conflicts is the greatest over the formulation of policy. It occurs most often when one group or number of groups deems something good for another group and it is, or is defined to be detrimental to them. Bucher and Stellings (p. 133) indicated that the integration of these diverse groups, each working in their own directions and to achieve their own values, occurs "through a continual political process" (p. 133). This process involves a "party phenomenon" in which colleagues search for allies to support their common cause and establish alliances possessing great fluidity.

The Bucher and Stellings (p. 134) model placed competition and conflict at the core of functioning by professionals

in organizations. Typically, the tactics preferred by professional organizations are face-to-face negotiations among key political figures, some caucusing and subsequent compromise. Indeed, Blankenship (1977) described "An organization of professionals . . . as a negotiated order" (p. 396). A negotiated order was defined as an ongoing process of negotiating and bargaining. Bucher (1977) concurred with Bucher and Stellings in his observation of a medical school organization which indicated that the diversity of professionals caused the inevitability of conflict. "Further, as decision-making proceeds in this organization, it has seemed most appropriate to analyze it as a political organization" (p. 389). It should be understood that political organizations have the primary goal of control of government and in developing strategies for that purpose. It follows, then, that professional organizations endeavor to achieve control of the environment in which they function and that "party phenomenon", referred to earlier, is analagous to the functioning of political parties in politics.

Bucher and Stellings (p. 134) identified the goal of political activity as that of influencing policy through the use of power. There is great complexity and fluidity in the groups and individuals who influence goals and practices in professional organizations. Power may not be located in specific portions as would be the case in hierarchical organizations. Shifts in power and influence occur in response to

different issues and as different persons and groups participate in the organization.

Bucher discussed power as a more meaningful concept than authority in academic organizations (p. 390). Bucher and Stellings considered the idea of hierarchical structure in which the authority is vested in the position or office and each level or position has authority over the lower position to be irrelevant (p. 134). In the medical organization studied, Bucher indicated that persons of power manifested their power through the process of persuasion and negotiation. Power is diffuse. "The balance shifts, not with incumbents of offices, but as power blocks among faculty are activated and dispersed" (p. 390).

Bucher and Stellings (p. 135) suggested that while reputation among colleagues is an extremely important component of power, more research is necessary to determine how it operates.

It becomes clear that professional organizations have composite characteristics not frequently described by organizational theorists. The statewide Academic Senate, in addition to being a voluntary professional organization, has publically avowed its commitment to collegiality (ASCCC, Note 3).

Collegiality in Organizations

Weber (1947) commented rather extensively on collegiality as a practice in the separation of power which is

traceable into antiquity, as well as being in practice at the time of his writings. From the historical point of view, there are two forms of collegiality which are of significance. One involved a plurality of incumbents holding the same office or a number of persons with spheres of authority which were in direct conflict with each other--each with mutual veto power. In this instance, the primary purpose was to minimize authority (Roman magistrates, for example). The second significant form was concerned with the collegial decision in which an administrative act is legitimized only when it is the result of the cooperation of a plurality of people and arrived at in accordance with the principle of unanimity or of majority (p. 399).

"Bureaucratic authority in the modern world has . . . everywhere led to a weakening of the role of collegiality in effective control. Collegiality unavoidably obstructs the promptness of decision, the consistency of policy, the clean responsibility of the individual, and ruthlessness to outsiders in combination with the maintenance of discipline within the group" (Weber, 1947, p. 402).

According to Weber, collegiality as practiced under the direction of higher authorities has had as its primary purpose that of promoting objectivity and integrity and, thus, to limit the power of individuals. In purely advisory bodies, collegiality has always existed and very likely will always exist (p. 402). "Furthermore, it divides personal responsibility, indeed in the larger bodies this disappears

almost entirely, whereas in monocratic organizations it is perfectly clear without question where responsibility lies" (p. 399).

The concern of collegiality, then, is the question of specific social relationships of groups which function to limit authority. It favors thoroughness in the weighing of administrative decisions and provides for collegial discussions of differing points of view which make compromise possible (p. 401).

In a study of a community health center extending over a four-year period, Blankenship (1977, p. 396) identified several specific characteristics of the collegial organization. Principally, members had access to each other without intervening layers; matters of policy or program could be raised by a wide range of members; the avoidance of hierarchy was essential to the organizational schema.

Conceptually, the collegial organization is an enacted organization (Weick, 1969). "The enacted organizational situation is the interactions of members, with each other and with members of the social environment, the material products of these interactions, the meanings, careers, systems, and selves thus constructed, and the projections of interactions to come" (Blankenship, 1977, p. 398). Katz and Kahn (1966, pp. 453-454) stressed that human organizations have no physical linkages or tangible structures, only the indirect suggestion of structure indicated by the interactions of members. Also, the authors indicated that organizations were

totally dependent on persons as members to enact organizational performances (p. 453-454).

Blankenship (p. 398) described the model of an enacted organization as based on two assumptions. (1) Changes in the symbolic order or in the systems of joint activity can directly influence a member; and, (2) the member cannot exert reciprocal change except by negotiating an agreement with others. The model stressed social interaction--what cannot normally be accomplished alone can be achieved with others.

"In this discussion agreement does not imply consensus of opinion about desired outcome, but indicates a state of concensus concerning the salience, urgency or importance of staging interaction in which some perceived problem is centrally involved" (p. 322).

Commenting on power struggles in collegial organizations, Blankenship observed that high agreement and/or high conflict levels must be present for the struggle to occur. The elements must come together and be focused on issues and means, or rules, or goals. "Generally we can posit that high agreement is associated with latency and passivity" (p. 323). It follows that high conflict is associated with high probability of change while low conflict usually signals affirmation of the status quo.

In Blankenship's observations goals and rules, because they are abstractions, rarely caused action. Instead, they were used to explain action. Issues and disputes over specific courses of action were the most common basis of conflict

in everyday organizational activity. If the question was resolved at the issue level, organizational change was unlikely. When the question escalated to a higher level, the potential for change was greater. When escalation occurred, the opposition was forced to respond and there is a high risk of power loss and, therefore, this strategy is used infrequently. Escalation results in fragmentation of the coalition which is usually loosely organized and formed on a tentative basis with interests centered on a specific issue. Most collegial confrontations are issue-focused and remain issue-focused (p. 324).

"The comparison of industrial and collegial settings can be characterized as a difference between collective behavior (Blankenship, 1976) - spontaneous, episodic, and issue-forced - and collective bargaining - institutionalized, formal, and rule focused" (p. 324). Controversy is present in both settings but the controversy is less likely to result in change in collegial settings because of the absence of permanent organization among members. Blankenship believed this to be the basic difference between professional power and administrative power. His belief is consistent with that of Evan (1957, cited Chapter II, p. 53).

Administrators in collegial settings are often selected from the teaching ranks though it is not uncommon for non-professional managers to be hired to perform purely administrative tasks. The preference for selecting administrators from the ranks is often expressed as a key to

understanding--to understand how and why a professional acts, the administrator must have been one. Whether or not the administrator is a professional, there are many lateral networks of peers, interest groups, coalitions, and cliques which cause lines of control and authority to be somewhat transparent (p. 330).

Leon Baradat (1980, Note 4) captured the essence of the model as it applied to the statewide Academic Senate, in an address to the delegates when he described colleges historically as collective enterprises where scholars came together to study and teach in a cooperative effort to do education. Early colleges were governed by the faculty with basic decisions being made by the groups (an early form of democracy). In fact, college is derived from the Latin "collegium" which means partnership. "Collegiality, however, no longer means simply faculty governance. Surely no reasonable person could deny that the administration rightfully plays a crucial role in the development of educational policy-making. Today, collegiality must mean shared governance" (p. 3).

In detailing aspects of what will be important in the future shift from industrial production to providing services, Naisbitt (Megatrends, 1982) commented, "In education we are moving from the short-term considerations of completing our training at the end of high school or college to a lifelong education and retraining. The whole idea of what education is will be re-conceptualized during the next decade" (p. 93). Further, this process is constant and is

affected by what goes on outside the institution but occurs inside the institution. "It is . . . colleagues questioning every aspect of the institution's purpose - and questioning the purpose itself. The purpose must be right, and it must be a shared vision, a strategic vision" (p. 94). Naisbitt defined strategic vision as a clear image of what is desired which causes every step to lead toward that goal. To move in that direction, the people in the organization must share the sense of direction.

According to Naisbitt, more and more decisions will be made from the bottom up in a participatory fashion. The key behind participatory democracy is whether people whose lives are affected by the decision are part of the process of arriving at the decision. This re-conceptualization of roles may provide the long-range perspective that leads to a return to the ideal of a generalist education. "As a generalist, committed to lifelong education, you can change with the times" (p. 96).

The foregoing discussion provided a conceptual framework of the statewide Academic Senate as a complex organization that was described as a professional, voluntary organization founded in collegiality. Blankenship (1977) proposed that previous theoretical models of complex organizations have not recognized the function of the individual organization member. He offered a theoretical perspective which placed organizational careers in the central relationship to the symbolic structure of a collegial organization, as well as to

the internal activity of and the external activities of the organization. "The only reality adhering to the organization per se, or to its symbolic goals or its programs of action, is the social reality which is created when members symbolize these and treat them collectively as an organizational situation" (p. 206).

Blankenship defined symbolic goals as having three levels: 1) the general, abstract goals of the organization; 2) the program objectives of the formal subdivisions and functional groupings of the organizations; and 3) the personal goals, the activities undertaken to attain them, and the perceptions of them held by members and interested non-members, represent the symbolic order (p. 208). Blankenship continued by indicating that organizational goals are largely defined by the type and limited number of programs which are actually selected from the infinite number of possibilities. However, "efforts to enact personal careers are the primary acts which define, modify and limit each of the other elements of the organizational situation" (p. 209).

Professionals belong to their profession and to their organizations (college; membership groups) simultaneously. Some consider their organization membership to have greater value than their membership in the profession and sustain themselves on local rewards. Others seek recognition and identity from the profession. "Their need for the organizations is perceived strictly in terms of its support for their professional activity, and they look to the professional

college beyond their place of employment to provide the recognition and identity by which they are sustained" (Blankenship, 1977, p. 330).

CHAPTER III

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The objectives for this study of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, which are based largely on the stated purposes of the organization, include: (1) a determination of the effectiveness of the methods by which the statewide Academic Senate provides for community college faculty to participate in academic and professional governance; and (2) a determination of the effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate as understood by the membership and others with whom it interacts in meeting the purpose and goals which the organizations and relevant others have established for it.

Having provided the reader with extensive information about the statewide Academic Senate, its history and evolution, organizational structure, and place in the arena of higher education in California, as well as an overview of organizations and relevant research, attention is now focused on the specific construct in organizational research which is germane to the study's objectives--organizational effectiveness.

Throughout the literature on effectiveness, researchers wrestle with identifying the importance of organizational goals in the discussion of effectiveness and, ultimately, in the theory and research about organizational effectiveness.

Effectiveness researchers and theoreticians tend to fall into several camps: goal oriented, natural systems, open systems, closed systems, political, for example. Steers (1977) believed that goals were central to any discussion about organizational effectiveness and that most definitions of organizational effectiveness rested on how successful an organization was in attaining stated objectives. In his view, effectiveness is best achieved by finding ways for members to integrate personal motives and goals with organizational objectives (p. 17).

More specifically, Steers identified the functions of organizational goals for the whole organization and for individuals. For the organization, goals provide: direction in resource use and acquisition; a rationale for the organization's existence; the communication patterns; power structure; division of labor; a means of assessing its effectiveness and efficiency in meeting purposes; legitimation and justification for its existence to various groups; and assistance in the acquisition of needed human resources. For the individual, organizational goals provide: direction and focus for one's job activities; a rationale for working--a sense of meaning; a vehicle for personal goal attainment; a sense of psychological security; and a sense of identification and/or status (pp. 19-21).

Additionally, Steers specified three goal typologies. Official goals are formal statements concerned with the nature of the organization's mission. Operative goals are

the real intentions of the organization and reflect what the organization is actually trying to do, irrespective of what it claims to be doing. Operative goals may not be widely known or understood. Operational goals are those for which there are agreed upon criteria for evaluating whether the organization is able to attain the goal. For the most part, operative and operational goals are used in the judgment of effectiveness (p. 24).

Effectiveness Defined

There are a variety of recognized definitions of organizational effectiveness. In 1957, Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum established the definition which provides the foundation for this study. "We define organizational effectiveness as the extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain upon its members" (p. 535). Tannenbaum, working individually, later altered his earlier definition, "it is the extent to which an organization fulfills its objectives and preserves its means and resources" (1968, p. 56).

Goodman and Pennings (1977) discussed organizational effectiveness as a central theme in organizational theory. However, they indicated there is no agreed upon definition of organizational effectiveness. Using a systems approach, Goodman and Pennings defined effectiveness as the "ability to acquire scarce resources that make it possible for an

organization to survive and preserve its integrity" (p. 147). Using the goal centered approach, the authors defined effectiveness as the "degree to which the organization achieves ideal end states" (p. 147). According to the authors, a main problem with the current literature is that not much is known about the construct validity of organizational effectiveness. The domain has not been specified and the effect of studies using differing time periods (extended as opposed to short term) on knowledge about effectiveness has not been identified (p. 3).

Goodman and Pennings continued the discussion by indicating that there were two major issues in the study of organizational effectiveness. One, the role of the constituencies in judging effectiveness (employees, suppliers, other organizations or groups) has not been determined, yet constituencies frequently establish the standards by which effectiveness is judged in studies of effectiveness. Two, there has been no theoretical delineation of organizational effectiveness determinants nor have the internal and external determinants of organizational effectiveness been clearly distinguished.

Evan (1976, p. 19) believed that in order to appraise the effectiveness of an organization, its performance must be measured using the systemic processes, inputs, transformations, outputs and feedback effects and all of their interrelationships. Organizational inputs consist of capital, people, information, and ability to mobilize resources which

may be dependent on size, diversity and structure, etc. Transformation processes are the applications of social and physical technology to various organizational inputs. Effectiveness with transformational processes is, in part, a function of the authority structure, division of labor and system of rewards. Outputs are the products, services, decisions channeled to other organizations, to consumers and clients, etc. Feedback effects are the organization's response to decreasing the deviations from a predetermined goal. This approach was based on systems theory of organization and suggested a new way of conceptualizing, as well as operationalizing, organizational effectiveness. "As a multi-dimensional concept, organizational effectiveness may be defined as the capacity of an organization to cope with all four systemic processes relative to its goal-seeking behavior - however explicit or implicit this may be" (p. 21).

Stewart (1976), demonstrating fundamental agreement with Evan in the development of his model, indicated that effectiveness was related to organizational objectives which stem from the functional requirements of the organization and, therefore, any definition was multidimensional (p. 109).

Pfeffer (1976) identified the study of organizational effectiveness as involving an examination of three processes: the process by which various groups and interests within and outside of the organization develop and articulate preferences; the process by which the organization comes to perceive the various demands confronting it; and the process by

which actions and decisions are finally taken in this environment of frequently conflicting interests and demands.

"From this perspective, effective organizations are those that accurately perceive patterns of resource interdependence, correctly perceive demands and then respond to those demands made by those groups that control the most critical interdependencies" (pp. 144-145).

Katz and Kahn (1966) defined organizational effectiveness as a handy catch-all identifier of the "totality of organizational goodness - sum of the elements of productivity, cost performance, turnover, quality of output, and the like" (p. 150).

Pfeffer (1977) stated that the goals of an organization legitimate it and the organization's activities are directed toward its survival. Therefore, survival may be one way to define effectiveness (p. 139).

As Goodman and Pennings (1977) so aptly indicated, the number of definitions of organizational effectiveness varies with the number of authors conceptualizing it. These differences are based largely upon the differing views of organizations discussed previously. Recall that Steers (1977, p. 2) believed most definitions of organizational effectiveness rested on how well the organization achieves its goals. Though a series of divergent definitions have been cited, each definition has elements which are attributable to organizational or individual goals.

Foundations for Effectiveness Studies

Campbell, Bownas, Peterson, and Dunnette (1974), in their extensive review of the organizational effectiveness literature which encompassed primary sources covering a 20-year period in the fields of sociology, psychology, political science, management, administration and management science, organization theory as well as public-oriented literature, described some trends and parameters that seemed to characterize the organizational effectiveness literature. (1) Initially, they observed that most of the literature was theoretical in nature and not experimental. "In a sense this is a recognition of the difficulty in doing systematic research in a domain where an entire organization is counted as just one degree of freedom" (p. 2). The notion exists that the study of organizational effectiveness implies that an organization, rather than the individual, should be considered one degree of freedom and severely limits the availability of subjects. As a result, most of the empirical work, usually case study investigations using many degrees of freedom, become classics in their own time. (2) Before the mid-1950's, most organizational effectiveness research was carried on by sociologists performing case studies, such as Selznick's (1966) classic study of the TVA. (3) March and Simon (1958) analyzed organizations in terms of decision-making and choice behavior and began the era of psychology and management science. (4) Prior to the mid-1950's, organizational effectiveness concerns were most often part of

organization theory literature. The 1957 Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum study set organizational effectiveness as a separate and distinct topic. The greatest growth of effectiveness research occurred in the 1960's and declined in the early 1970's. Empirical research has shifted from exploratory studies to studies guided by theory. Research in organizational effectiveness appeared to be concentrating on inter-related studies based on a conceptual framework. (5) In behaviorial science, a parallel development was occurring based on organization development (OD). Generally, OD is practitioner-oriented and directly concerned with making changes in organizational effectiveness using a wide variety of methods (pp. 2-4).

An underlying assumption of Campbell (1977) is that there is no definitive definition of organizational effectiveness and, further, that the usefulness of a particular theory is a function of both the value system of the user-researcher and the reality of organizational life (p. 15). "In sum, the value judgement concerning what goals the organization should adopt and the process by which that judgement is made (for example, by default) can lead to widely differing methods of assessing organizational effectiveness" (p. 16).

Campbell (1977) and Campbell et al. (1974) identified two general models of the effectiveness construct: goal centered and natural systems. The goal-centered view is based on the assumption that the organization is led by a group of

rational decision-makers who have goals that are defined and manageable and for which it is possible to plan strategies leading to goal attainment. The methodology used is largely based on developing criterion measures to assess how well the goals are being achieved. MBO (Management By Objectives) and cost-benefit analysis are variations of the goal-centered view. Overall effectiveness is not one thing but consists of a finite number of basically independent criteria. This model attempts, initially, to describe the major tasks of the organization and test these measures using a large number of similar organizations to establish whether the measures assess something over which the organization has more control (Campbell, p.23; Campbell et al., pp. 5-6). According to Campbell (1977), effectiveness in the MBO centered view is "an aggregation of specific, concrete and quantifiable accomplishments and failures and recognizes a definition for effectiveness which is unique to each organization (p. 26).

The natural systems model, in the view of Campbell (1977) and Campbell et al. (1974), assumes that the demands placed on an organization are so dynamic and complex that a finite number of organizational goals may not be defined in any meaningful way (p. 20) (p. 6). As a result, the organization adopts the goal of maintaining itself over time without depleting its resources. The focus here is on people and not on technology and structure.

The natural systems view incorporates the organizational development model in which the variables are concerned with

people and the Likert-ISR model (Campbell, 1977, p. 33). The organizational development model assumes that when the total organization plans and manages its work to match the organizational goals, when decisions are made close to the sources of information, when communication occurs effectively laterally and vertically, when conflicts are considered solveable, the organization could be considered effective (p. 33).

The Likert-ISR (Institute for Social Research) model assesses an organization through the use of a questionnaire which measures the perceptions of organizational members regarding the organizational leadership; the communication process; the interaction process; process for decision-making; how goals are established; level of performance goals (p. 33).

"The goal-oriented analyst would immediately seek out the principal power centers or decision makers in the organization and ask them to state their objectives" (Campbell, 1977, p. 20). The natural systems-oriented analyst would inquire about conflict among work groups, the nature of communications, about racial tension and satisfaction. The concern is with the overall viability and strength of the system (p. 21). Campbell et al. (1974) indicated that if both the goal-oriented analyst and the natural systems analyst were to take the next logical step, their efforts would tend to at least parallel each other and might converge. For example, a goal-oriented researcher's attempt to analyze scores on a criterion-based assessment would lead

back to systems. The natural systems researcher who attempts to analyze how certain organizational characteristics affect task performance would have to determine which tasks are the important ones on which to assess performance (Campbell et al., p. 8).

Steers (1977) identified goals and goal attainment as the recurring theme in the evaluation of organizational effectiveness. He indicated that individuals join organizations to better accomplish their own goals which may include income, status, work and organizations have goals which bring individuals together to collectively pursue goals such as profit, growth and productivity. On a general level, Steers indicated that effectiveness can best be understood in terms of the extent to which an organization is successful in acquiring and utilizing resources in the pursuit of its operative and operational goals (p. 174).

In a review of seventeen studies concerned with organizational effectiveness, adaptability-flexibility, productivity, job satisfaction, profitability and resources acquisition were the criteria most often used in an attempt to tangibly measure effectiveness. However, only adaptability-flexibility was mentioned in more than half of the studies (Steers, 1977, p. 175). Katz and Kahn (1966) identified efficiency as one of the major components of effectiveness. Efficiency is the ratio of energetic output to energetic input and identifies how much of the input of an

organization emerges as its product. It is primarily a criterion of the internal organizational life (p. 150).

Political Model. A political model for use in the analysis of organizational functioning has emerged as the result of a school of researchers who began to question how decisions were made and where the power in a given organization rested. The reader will recall that Blankenship (1977, p. 39) identified elements of political activity in collegial organizations (coalition, bargaining and negotiation, structure, interest groups). However, in his analysis, emphasis was not focused on the political/power structure.

Pfeffer (1981) indicated that power was derived from the division of labor that results from task specialization occurring in each organization. "Power is first and foremost a structural phenomenon, and should be understood as such" (p. x). Salanick and Pfeffer (1974) described power in social systems as being potentially horizontal or vertical; maybe interpersonal; and may involve relationships between organizational units (p. 453). Tannenbaum and Cooke (1979), in their generalized description, indicated that hierarchical control in one form or another is a universally identified feature of organization (p. 183). Blankenship (1977), in his description of control in collegial organizations, characterized industrial and collegial settings as the difference between collective behavior which is spontaneous, episodic, and issue-forced when compared with collective bargaining

which is institutionalized, formal, and rule focused (p. 324). According to Blankenship, both situations will produce controversy over specific issues. These controversies are less likely to cause change in a collegial setting, due to the loosely coupled interest groups and coalitions that form which are centered around specific issues and because the members lack permanent organization.

The political model described by Pfeffer (1981) assumed that control devices normally present in bureaucracies, such as rewards based on job performance, seniority, rules ensuring fair, standardized treatment for all are not totally effective in producing coherency and unification of goal sets. In the political model, conflict is considered normal. Organizational action results from bargaining and compromise, and the decisions rarely reflect the preferences of any group or subunit within the organization. "Political models of choice further presume that when preferences conflict, the power of the various social actors determines the outcome of the decision process" (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 28). The analyst of organization decision-making who uses the political model must understand: (1) who participates in decision-making; (2) what determines each player's stand on the issues; (3) what determines each actor's relative power; and (4) how the decision is arrived at (majority rule, unanimity, two-thirds vote, etc.) (p. 28).

"An understanding of organizational politics requires an analysis of power, coalitions and bargaining. The power

relationship is the context for political action and encompasses the most basic issues underlying organizational politics" (Bachrach & Lawler, 1980, p. x). Power, coalitions and bargaining are the basis for the theoretical themes offered by the authors. In advocating these themes, Bachrach and Lawler (1980) identified organizations as politically negotiated orders in which the organizational actors can be observed bargaining, forming and reforming coalitions and using influence tactics on a daily basis (p. 1). "Few organizational actors are the totally passive apolitical entities that are presented by industrial psychologists and organizational sociologists. Survival in an organization is a political act. Corporations, universities, and voluntary associations are arenas for daily political action" (p. 1).

Commenting on sociological studies undertaken over the past fifteen years, Bachrach and Lawler observed that they were based on a narrow interpretation of Weber's (1947) approach to organization. Researchers failed to recognize that Weber was primarily concerned with group and individual action and that Weber viewed organizational structure as emerging from the conscious political decisions of interest groups (p. 3).

Bachrach and Lawler identified three groups as critical to the development of their theory of political analysis. Work groups differ from each other in their work activity and/or in ways prescribed by organizational hierarchy. Interest groups are groups of organizational actors who have

common goals beyond workplace interdependence. Coalitions are groupings of interest groups which are committed to achieving a common goal. They are not part of the organization structure, but emerge as products of the informal processes which are central to organizational politics. Coalition activity is based on joint action of two or more interest groups taking action against other interest groups (p. 8). Political analysis must be concerned with the nature of power across all groupings in the organization. The authors were primarily interested in understanding under what conditions interest groups and coalitions formed and the political relationships coalitions have to each other (p. 9). Why and how people mobilize power is critical to the understanding of organizations as political systems.

In a study centering on twenty-nine departments or sub-units at the University of Illinois--Champaign-Urbana, Salanick and Pfeffer (1974) hypothesized that power is used to influence the decision about how resources are allocated which are critical to the sub-unit using the power and which are scarce within the whole organization. Their hypothesis included a projection that sub-units are able to acquire power in the organization to the extent they contribute to critical resources, including knowledge, to the organization (p. 453).

Using essentially the same criteria for analysis listed by Pfeffer (1981, p. 28), Salanick and Pfeffer (1974) concluded that "sub-unit power accrues to those departments that

are most instrumental in bringing in or providing resources which are highly valued by the total organization. In turn, this power enables these sub-units to obtain more of those scarce and critical resources allocated within the organization" (p. 470). The use of power, then, is allocated to the pursuance of those resources which are critical to the survival or effectiveness of the sub-unit. When the resource is also scarce, more extensive use of power by the sub-unit will occur. Salanick and Pfeffer (1974), Blankenship (1977), and Pfeffer (1981) all appear to be in agreement as to the importance of understanding the power of the subgroup in political analysis of organizations.

The mobilization of power by an organization tends to be lessened as the degree of external influence (law, economics, etc.) affecting a decision increases. Salanick and Pfeffer (1974) indicated that the understanding and analysis of power systems complicates the understanding of the organization's ability to respond and cope with changing environments. They indicated, however, that organizations which are more insulated, due to to their source of funding or to a monopolistic position, would more likely be composed of sub-units whose power was based on less important or externally based criteria (p. 471).

Salanick and Pfeffer's position with regard to the difficulty of analyzing the organization on the basis of the political model when the questions of environmental influences are considered was in basic agreement with research

undertaken by Thompson and McEwen (1958). Their model portrays goal formulation as a process in which managers seek to establish and maintain a favorable balance of power with the organization's external environment. Their view was that the more power an organization has, the more autonomy it has in making decisions concerning the future. They conceptualized a continuum of organizational power in environmental relationships in which an organization has total control over the environment, to the environment having total control over the organization. For example, a large multinational corporation has little competition and great control over its environment, while the environment has nearly total control over a grass roots consumer group.

Thompson and McEwen (1958) indicated that the amount of power an organization has dictates its bargaining strategy because organizations must bargain with their environments to obtain resources for input and markets for their outputs. The organization with great power over the environment actually competes with the environment and is generally free to determine its own goals and pursue them without much concern from the environment. As the environmental forces gain a larger share of the power, the organization must shift to a cooperative posture with the environment. Cooperative efforts, based on power distribution, include: bargaining, in which an organization attempts to establish an exchange relationship with the environment; co-optation, in which new and sometimes hostile elements are absorbed into leadership

roles in an attempt to avert threats to stability or existence; coalition, in which two or more organizations join for a common purpose (pp. 25-26). "The location of an organization in relation to agencies in its environment with which it must relate is a clear source of economic advantage and disadvantage. This is true in the absolute reckoning of total costs of production and distribution; it is even more significant in terms of relative costs or the state of the organization in relation to its competitors" (Katz & Kahn 1966, p. 162). Katz and Kahn believed that the organization's transactions are conducted in the environment and are political in that they involve making choices based other than on economics and efficiency. "The pursuit of organizational goals using political means is prevalent in dynamic organizations. Use of political influence to achieve organizational goals takes many forms, such as persuasion of influential people, lobbying, donations, subsidies, legislation, taxes, tariffs" (p. 163). "We have defined organizational effectiveness as the extent to which all forms of energetic return to the organization are maximized" (p. 165). Maximization of return by organizational and technical means is synonymous with efficiency. Maximization of return by political means increases effectiveness without affecting efficiency (p. 170).

Thompson and McEwen (1958) summarized, " . . . organizational independence and power become currency, or medium of exchange, with which an organization purchases needed support

from its external environment" (p. 28). The major difference between the view of the political models and Thompson and McEwen's model is that the political model is largely concerned with sub-units of an organization and how the individuals composing the sub-units use their power and considered the environment. Thompson and McEwen were concerned with the power base of the total organization and the strategies it used to accomplish the desired ends. Blankenship (1977) addressed many of the same concerns but placed them in the framework and context of the collegial professional organization.

Rational Choice and Bureaucratic Models. In Pfeffer's (1981) view, there are, in addition to the political model, two other models which address organizational decision-making: rational choice and bureaucratic. The rational choice model assumes that the various consequences that may result from the selection of a course of action based on the identified alternatives can be identified. A rational choice of action is selected which would achieve the highest values and lead to the achievement of objectives or goals. In this way, decisions are related directly to objectives (pp. 18-22).

Chaffee (1980) (cited in Pfeffer, 1981) developed criteria for defining the requirements of rational choice processes based on the collection and use of information:

- (1) information is received before the decision is made;

(2) information is proven centered and goal directed; (3) the information documents the existence of the problem and the need to solve it in order to reach a goal; (4) the information provides for consideration of more than one alternative for reaching the goal or solving the problem; (5) information has logical, internal consistency in terms of possible cause and effect relationships; (6) the information is oriented toward the maximization of values of the various alternatives considered in reaching the goal; (7) the information identifies the value premise on which choice(s) is based. Pfeffer (1981) added the condition to Chaffee's criteria that the choice would be made by the organization to accept the alternative which, based on the information provided, would result in the likelihood of achieving the identified goals or problem resolution (p. 21).

Pfeffer's description of the bureaucratic model suggested that choices were made based on rules and processes which have been effective and adaptive in the past. "The model of organizations as bureaucratically rational presumes less conscious foresight and less clearly defined preferences and information. Both rely on habitual ways of doing things and the results of past actions, and constrains how the organization proceeds to operate in the future. Decisions are not made as much as they evolve from policies, procedures, and rules which constitute the organization and its memory" (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 23).

The distinguishing differences in the way bureaucratic

and rational choice models arrive at decision preferences are centered on the observations that bureaucratic organizations operate with less extensive information and rely more on standard procedures and rules (p. 24). Political models are distinguishable from both bureaucratic and rational choice because decisions are made which may be inconsistent with goal maximization and result from the power of the various actors who demonstrate their preferences and intentions to determine the decision outcome (p. 28).

The dilemma, if one exists, concerning which model offers the most appropriate foundation for analysis, was resolved nicely by Allison (1971). He indicated that it was not necessary to choose between analytical paradigms. In his view, a better understanding of an organization would be achieved by using all of the models rather than choosing from among them (pp. 258-259).

Effectiveness Research

Effectiveness research differs greatly. For example, some researchers believe their criteria apply to all types of organizations (business, research and development laboratories, educational institutions). Others specify the type of organizations to which their criteria are likely to apply. Some research models attempt to specify what an organization must do to be effective while others describe the characteristics known to exist in successful organizations (p. 175). Steers (1977) offered the following list of recognized

problems found with effectiveness research as a possible explanation for the lack of agreement (1) existing evaluation criteria are often unstable, (2) different criteria may be relevant for different time perspectives, (3) multiple criteria often conflict with one another, (4) some criteria are not applicable to certain types of organizations, and (5) some criteria (for example, adaptability) may be difficult to measure accurately (p. 176).

Stewart (1976) presented a model of organizational effectiveness which was used in a longitudinal study of the National Federation of Priests' Council. "This study illustrates the need for a benchmark from which to evaluate progress or effectiveness of a single organization" (p. 109). Stewart indicated that no external criterion was available; therefore, it was impossible to make a comparative analysis. Further, the analysis of an organization's attainments could be studied in the absence of external criteria, by studying similar organizations or the same organization over time (p. 109).

Stewart summarized effectiveness research as largely based on four conceptual frameworks: (1) goal achievement; (2) systems resource; (3) organizational means and ends; and (4) functional requirements models (p. 110).

Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) offered extensive criticism of goal research. They first separated goal research into two categories, prescribed and derived goal approaches. Prescribed goal research focused on the formal charter of the

organization or on a category of its personnel as the most valid source of information about the organization. Yuchtman and Seashore indicated that this approach has not provided a rationale for the empirical identification of goals as property of the organization. Derived goal research focused on the ultimate goal of the organization from the researcher's theory. Goals may be arrived at which are independent of the awareness or intentions of the members. This approach was criticized by Yuchtman and Seashore as a method for evaluating effectiveness since it takes society at large as the frame of reference for evaluating organizational effectiveness, rather than using the organization as a frame (pp. 891-892).

Yuchtman and Seashore viewed organizations as open systems which exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce resources. Goals are eliminated, in their view, as a dimension of effectiveness and concentration is on the adaptation function. Accordingly, organizations are most effective when resource procurement is optimized. "By focusing on the ability of the organization to exploit its environment in the acquisition of resources, we are directed by the basic yet often neglected fact that it is only in the arena of competition over scarce and valued resources that the performances of both like and unlike organizations can be assessed and evaluated comparatively" (Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967, p. 898).

In his summary of the most relevant research centering

on organizational environment, Steers (1977) identified three major factors which were consistently investigated: (1) degree of predictability of the environment; (2) accuracy of perception of environmental states; (3) notion of rationality in organizational actions (p. 95). "It would appear that these three factors, when taken together, represent the critical variables in any discussions concerning the impact of organization-environment relations or organizational effectiveness (p. 96).

Steers identified three interrelated dimensions of the organization's environment that can be identified on a continuum. (1) Simple/complex: range from few relatively homogeneous external factors which affect the organization to complex environment of changing technology; dependency on others for supplies; and presence of government regulations. (2) Static/dynamic: predictable, static environments require different management approaches than do dynamic. Portions of an organization's environment may remain static while others change radically. (3) Environmental uncertainty: results from a lack of information concerning the environmental factors surrounding a decision; the inability to assess accurately probabilities of how environmental factors will affect the success or failure of a decision; lack of information regarding costs associated with an incorrect decision or action (p. 87). Clearly, the more predictable the environment is the greater the potential for appropriate organizational response. However, "no matter how predictable the

environment and no matter how accurate the perceptions concerning environmental states, organizations and managers still have to determine a course of action to respond to changes in the environment. Hence, the more rational the choice processes are in terms of selection among viable alternatives, the greater the probability is that the chosen response will be appropriate to meet environmental demands" (p. 98).

In their precedent-setting study of organizational effectiveness, Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957) used multiple criteria, based on organizational ends and means, productivity, flexibility, in terms of external and internal adaptations, and the absence of tension and conflict within sub-groups as dimensions of effectiveness. These seem to have applicability to most organizations.

"After borrowing heavily . . . from an article by Basil Georgopoulos and Arnold Tannenbaum ('A Study of Organizational Effectiveness', American Sociological Review, 22, October, 1957: 534-540), I concluded that the concept of effectiveness is multidimensional, involving besides productivity, the organization's ability to adapt to changing conditions both internal and external (adaptability), and its ability to cope with temporarily unpredictable emergencies (flexibility)" (Mott, 1972, p. ix). Mott identified the dilemma which exists when open versus closed systems theories of organization are compared. Closed system theorists assume that an organization maintains natural boundaries. They value balance,

stability, order and quantitative growth. Open system theorists consider the organization to be intimately related to its environment and value autonomy, change, action and qualitative growth in the self esteem of members (p. 5).

Mott viewed organizations "as collections of centers of power in varying degrees of centralization, related to one another through interfaces that vary in degree of organization and directness of connection" (p. 15). The internal organization structure is routinely being created and destroyed by the functions of informal negotiations and formal coordinations. As viewed by Mott, organizational effectiveness is the ability of an organization to mobilize its centers of power for action, production and adaptation. "Effective organizations are those that produce more and higher-quality outputs and adapt more effectively to environmental and internal problems than do other, similar organizations" (p. 17). Mott established the following criteria of effectiveness, based on his centers of power concept. Centers of power are organized for (1) routine production (productivity) which includes quantity, quality and efficiency with which the product is produced; for (2) adaptability including symbolic (staying abreast of technologies, anticipating problems and seeking solutions) and behavioral (prompt and prevalent acceptance of solutions) adaptation; and, for (3) coping with unpredictable work overload (flexibility) (p. 20).

Stewart (1976), agreeing with Mott, indicated that, in

his view, effectiveness researchers were increasingly using a multidimensional approach. Factors such as communication, collaboration, and cohesion have been added to organizational output, adaptive functions and operative goals. "What is needed is a model that will first, specify the multiple dimensions and their specific measures of effectiveness, and second, be useful as a conceptual framework for comparative purposes" (p. 111).

Pennings and Goodman (1977) offered a framework for investigating organizational effectiveness based on viewing organizations as open systems. As such, organizations are viewed interrelating with their environment and the subsystems which contribute to the whole organization and to each other. Sub-units are internal groups with common interests which they attempt to promote. Sub-unit definition may occur as the result of departmental or hierarchical divisions or by clusters of members who share interests and values. This description of organizations as a group of sub-units enlarges the construct of effectiveness because it focuses attention on the internal determinants that account for variations in organizational effectiveness rather than concentrating on output measures such as sales, patient mortality and student opinion (pp. 147-148).

Pennings and Goodman enlarged upon Thompson's (1967) explanation of the role of the dominant coalition as an explanation of how organizations establish effectiveness criteria. The dominant coalition represents direct and

indirect lateral constituencies (sub-units) and hierarchical constituencies (employees, managements, owners), all of whom may have competitive expectations (p. 152). The recognition of the existence of a dominant coalition is conceptually more useful to the researcher than the approach of the investigator who defines criteria rationally or through reasoning based on theory alone (p. 152).

Organizations may have external constituencies such as suppliers, competitors or regulatory agencies which help to define organizational effectiveness. "In this sense one would view the organizational environment as a political economy composed of constituencies" (p. 154). The external actors are often organizations and are usually at the inter-organizational level. Goodman and Pennings indicated that dependence on organizational actors can be described in terms of substitutability--replacement of suppliers or customers from the point of view of the focal organization and centrality--the importance and degree of relationship of the actors to the focal organization (p. 155). The authors continued by stating that substitutability may carry great weight as a predictor of effectiveness. This they based on the assumption that interorganizational associations are loosely coupled and will only exist if the relationship is mutually acceptable and beneficial. If the external organization becomes non-substitutable, the effectiveness of the

focal organization is contingent upon the external relationship (p. 156).

Organizational sets (all organizations with which focal organization interrelates) and their influence on the focal organization is considered the primary environment. The secondary environment--industry, legislature--may have patterns of influence and communication, coordination and stratification but the exchange relationship isn't present (p. 160).

"Organizations are effective if relevant constraints can be satisfied and if organizational results approximate or exceed a set of referents for multiple goals" (p. 160). Constraints were defined as conditions that must be met if an organization is considered effective. Constraints appear as policy statements or rules which guide group behavior. Goals were identified as the desired states specified by the dominant coalition. Both constraints and goals are used in the assessment of effectiveness. Referents are the standards against which constraints and goals are measured. Referents may be external, standards based on information from other organizations, or internal, standards which are unique to the organization.

In summary, Pennings and Goodman stated that organizational effectiveness is multidimensional in nature. The multiple goals, constraints and referents of the various constituencies become inputs to effectiveness criteria by members of the dominant coalition. They are used by the

organization as represented by the dominant coalition to evaluate its effectiveness and efficiency (p. 171). "The problem for the dominant coalition is to assess the consequences of adopting or institutionalizing a set of constraints, goals, or referents advocated by a constituency" (p. 169).

The Pennings and Goodman model addressed organizational effectiveness as multidimensional, as Stewart (1976, p. 111) suggested was necessary, and identified the influence of environmental forces. At the same time, the importance of goals was specified and recognition of the uniqueness of goals to each organization was recognized. However, Seashore (1977) challenged the Pennings and Goodman (1977) model. "Organizational constraints, preferred outcomes, and associated standards are, thus, the products of a continuing political process in which the dominant coalition balances the sometimes conflicting interests of different constituencies by serving as bargainer, mediator, conciliator and (rarely, one might think) as arbiter expressing self interests" (p. 187). In Seashore's view, the Pennings and Goodman model returned persons to the study of organizational effectiveness when recent efforts had attempted to remove individuals as a primary consideration.

Steers (1977) developed a process model for evaluating organizational effectiveness based on his stated belief that human resources and human behavior are the primary focal point in the study of organizational effectiveness (p. 2).

His process model was offered as a means for overcoming the apparent problems when there is any attempt to apply the effectiveness construct to a wide variety of organizations. The model consists of two parts: (1) the interrelated dimensions of goal optimization, systems perspective, emphasis on human behavior in organizational settings; and (2) a framework for analysis (p. 4). Goal optimization is the identification of the organization's optimized goals, that is, the desired goals given the constraints and modified by available resources. This view allows for recognition of multiple and conflicting goals. "This focus on feasible, optimized goals appears to be far more realistic for evaluation purposes than is the use of desired or ultimate goals" (p. 5).

The system's perspective emphasizes the interactions of the organization and the environment and focuses on the internal and external relationships as they influence the organization. Steers viewed goal optimization and the system's perspective as compatible, since goals were viewed within a dynamic framework and subject to change. Steers suggested that it was highly desirable to examine all factors within an organization and in the external environment as they relate to each other and affect and direct behavior (p. 6).

The behavioral emphasis was explained as the emphasis placed on the role of employee behavior on long-term organizational effectiveness. Steers' model recognizes that the only way goals would be achieved was through the behavior of

organizational members (p. 6). The second part of the process model consists of the framework for analysis which includes organizational characteristics (structural and technological), environmental characteristics, employee characteristics and managerial policies and practices (pp. 8-9).

Addressing the topic of organizational control, Tannenbaum and Cooke (1979) reviewed a series of studies which had employed the use of the "control graph" method to determine hierarchical distribution of control as a means for identifying the possible implication this distribution might provide for developing criteria of organizational effectiveness. The control graph was described as a means for conceptualizing and measuring the distribution of organizational control. The graph uses two axes: horizontal, for hierarchical scale; vertical, for amount of control exercised. The result provides a curve which describes hierarchical distribution of control in an organization (p. 183).

The studies reviewed by Tannenbaum and Cooke used effectiveness criteria such as: morale and loyalty of members; productivity, efficiency or profitability of the organization; adaptability to changing environment. Their findings indicated "data do not lend support for the hypothesis that 'power equalization' per se is associated with effectiveness" (p. 194). The studies suggested that the total amount of power is not fixed and that control can expand and contract. The authors indicated that there are generally two schools of thought about organizational behavior. (1) High control must

be exercised at the top of the organization to achieve rationalized efficiency. (2) Organizational effectiveness and member satisfaction require the active involvement of lower-level personnel in organizational decision-making (p. 194). These schools may not be mutually exclusive, if as the review suggested, power is not fixed. Tannenbaum and Cooke indicated "recent studies which take an open-systems perspective suggest that adaptable organization exhibit both mechanistic and organic structures, but that these structures may appear at different times or in different locations in the organization" (p. 195). It is likely that innovative organizations which adapt to changing environmental conditions may be alternating between bureaucratic and participative patterns depending whether innovative or routine decisions are being made. Innovation may require decentralization while implementation may require centralization (p. 195).

Tannenbaum and Cooke summarized their review by indicating that the data suggest the more effective organization to be the more controlled organization and present theories based on democratic/autocratic typology do not provide a basis for understanding this phenomenon. Also, the data indicated that every organization has hierarchical distribution of control but there is a divergence between organizations which culture and political systems may explain (p. 196).

The review, to this point, has identified some of the students of organizational effectiveness who have researched

the construct from various perspectives. The earlier researchers tended to be more purist in their models while the researchers of the late 1970's developed various models which often incorporated aspects of several approaches and began to identify the organization's environment (external and internal) and question the role of political activity as well as the individual in their studies. As Meyer and Associates (1978, p. 18) have indicated, there is generalized acceptance of the contingency theory that there is no best way to organize; there are probably few generalizations that can be applied to all organizations; and studies which do not incorporate external events will be accepted by very few.

Role of the Organization Member. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) called attention to the fact that previous studies using the contingency theory approach had studied the organizational variables and tasks, but paid little attention to the personal characteristics of the organization's members and how they are related to organizational factors and the nature of the work of the organization. Their major concern was to investigate whether a fit among the internal environment, external environment and the individual members was related to effective performance, as well as rewarding to the individual (p.15).

Cummings (1977) suggested that conceptualizing about a specific organization as an instrument or arena within which participants engage in behavior instrumental to their goals

might be advantageous. "From this perspective, an effective organization is one in which the greatest percentage of participants perceive themselves as free to use the organization and its subsystems as instrumental for their own ends" (p. 60). In Cummings' view, scholars from a variety of disciplines and orientations have portrayed organizations as a stage on which the participants play their own agenda or as performances without a script (p. 61). "These perspectives imply that the criterion of effectiveness and its assessment is multidimensional, time-bound and dynamic, subject to negotiation, and organizationally or even unit specific" (pp. 61-62). The author suggested the implication obtained was that research designs of $N = 1$ such as extensive longitudinal case studies would be especially profitable as effectiveness studies (p. 62).

The most direct contribution to organizational success results from the behaviors of the employees since they constitute the structure, make use of the technologies, respond to environmental pressures and work cooperatively to make the organization succeed (Steers, 1977, p. 114). Steers continued by indicating that effective organizations need employees to engage in some form of innovative behavior. They must be able to respond in a way that allows them to capitalize on unique opportunities and respond in accordance with what they feel is best for the organization (pp. 114-115). Commitment to the organization is an active relationship in which the employee voluntarily gives of

himself/herself so that organizational goals may be realized (p. 115).

It is apparent that Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), Cummings (1977), and Steers (1977) are in universal agreement concerning the importance of the member/employee in overall effectiveness of the organization.

Organizational Structure. The structure of an organization is nothing more than the way in which it organizes its human resources toward goal-directed activities. What relationships are fixed and provide interaction directed to goal-centered behavior? How do the organization parts become the whole organization? Structure includes consideration of the span of control (number of subordinates per supervisor), size of the organization, the centralization or decentralization of authority and power, degree of formalization, amount of specialization and the work unit and size (Steers, 1977, p. 59).

Steers provided a summary of the primary findings related to each structure consideration. "Decentralization refers to the extent to which various types of power and authority are extended (that is decentralized) down through the organizational hierarchy" (p. 60). Decentralization is strongly related to participatory decision-making and Steers indicated that it may lead to improvements in several facets of effectiveness--managerial efficiency, open communications, job satisfaction, employee retention. Research concerning

specialization indicated that increased specialization was related to increased friction and conflict, reduced labor costs and increased innovation and creativity, increased job performance while simultaneously being detrimental to job attitudes, mental health and likelihood of remaining with the organization (p. 65).

Formalization is the extent to which work activities are specified or regulated by rules and procedures. It appeared that organizations which exist in unstable environments functioned more effectively and higher degrees of formalization may be preferred in environments which are more stable or task-oriented (p. 66).

The increase in organization size may lead to increased efficiency. However, size may affect employee attitudes toward the organization negatively. Increased work unit size tended to be associated with lower attendance, reduced retention rates and more labor disputes (p. 67).

Steers indicated diversity about the role of technology in the utilization of scarce resources. Technology involves both intellectual and mechanical processes and it is the means through which an organization transforms its inputs or raw materials into outputs in the pursuance of organizational goals. Neither technology nor structure alone show any definite relationship to effectiveness (p. 70). Finally, in Steers' view, " . . . effectiveness may be seen as a function of an organization's ability to successfully integrate

technology, structure and personal characteristics and social factors in a congruent, goal-oriented entity" (p. 83).

Assessing Organizational Effectiveness. Just as there is no generally agreed upon definition of organizational effectiveness, there is no general consensus as to the most appropriate methodology or criteria that should be used in the assessment of effectiveness.

Scott (1981) suggested that this lack of agreement was based on the diversity among researchers in their conceptions about organizations. Each conception of an organization offers a distinctive set of criteria for evaluating effectiveness. He argued that the rational, natural and open systems perspectives accounted for much of the variance in measures of effectiveness. The rational system emphasizes criteria which focus on the number and quality of outputs, productivity, efficiency and goals specific to the organization. The natural systems model emphasizes measures of participant satisfaction and moral survival of the organization, as well as measures of its role as a social unit. The open systems perspective identifies organizations as highly interdependent with their environment. The ability of these organizations to acquire scarce resources and exploit their environment are the primary concerns and are measured by criteria centering around flexibility and adaptability (p. 319). Scott identified time perspective and level of analysis as additional bases of diversity in the study of effectiveness.

The stage of development of the organization in the life cycles of organizations is a critical factor in developing assessment criteria. Scott expressed the view that most analysts consider the organization as a whole as the appropriate level of analysis for assessing effectiveness (p. 320).

"Variations in theoretical perspectives on organizations, in time horizons and developmental stages, and in level of analysis -- these factors help to account for the diversity of criteria proposed in analyzing effectiveness. Yet another source of diversity is to be found in the varying sets of participants and the constituents associated with organizations" (p. 321). Scott offered the following generalizations concerning the criteria that participant groups and constituencies attempt to set. (1) Criteria proposed will evaluate the organization's performance in terms of criteria that are self-benefiting. (2) All criteria will be stated so as to appear universalistic and objective. (3) The presence of multiple sets of actors pursuing their own interests and the existence of scarce resources will cause little commonality and some conflicts in the criteria established to assess organizational effectiveness (p. 323).

Campbell (1976, p. 31) summarized two general points of view, the goal centered and the natural systems points of view, as they related to assessing organizational effectiveness. The goal centered theorist/researcher would study the organizational objectives both operative and publicly-stated

and develop criteria that would measure how well objectives were being taught. The natural systems theorist/researcher would explore and question the degree to which there was conflict, the nature of communication, and the overall viability and strength of the organization.

Since any organization adopts the goal of maintaining itself over time without depleting its resources, Campbell (1977) believed that to assess its effectiveness one must determine: (1) whether there is internal consistency; (2) whether the organization is using coping mechanisms to distribute its resources; and (3) whether resources are being used up faster than they should be (p. 20). "The overall specification of organizational effectiveness, then, is the degree to which the task objectives judged to be 'ends' should be accomplished, given the prevailing conditions in which the organization must work. It is at this point, and not before, that the question of how to measure the degree of goal attainment becomes operative" (p. 49).

Methods for the assessment of effectiveness may vary depending on the objective being considered but may include counting, special instrumentation and subjective ratings. When the organization's goals or objectives are not explicit, the researcher should explore what kinds of goal setting occur; what rewards and punishments influence the goal-setter's behavior. Participant observation, simulation, non-participant observation methods are appropriate under these circumstances (p. 50).

Levinson (1972) identified an apparent lack of widely-accepted comprehensive diagnostic processes for assessing and evaluating organizations, and offered some direction for organizational effectiveness research. Traditional efforts concentrated on bureaucratic structure. According to Levinson, comprehensive studies should include an evaluation of the relationships the organization, as an open system, has with the other systems with which it interacts. Such studies should describe the organization's concept, objectives, plans, its relationships to others and its leadership.

Generally, according to Campbell (1977), research strategies should fall into two general categories--simulation studies and intensive case studies. Campbell emphasized case studies as the more desirable approach. In his view, the case study is longitudinal, focused on a specific organization, and uses a variety of data collection techniques, including observation, interviews, questionnaires and archival records (p. 54). Campbell stated " . . . the task of behavioral science is to assist the people in the organization to articulate what they really mean by organizational effectiveness, show where the gaps and inconsistencies reveal conflicts and help in the resolution of those conflicts" (p. 52).

Lawler, Nadler, and Cammann (1980) defined organizational assessment as the process of measuring the effectiveness of an organization from the behavioral or social-system perspective. Organizational effectiveness focuses on the whole

organization, is essentially behavioral in perspective and is concerned with task-performance of the organization and the human impact of the organization on its individual members.

In a review of seventeen multivariate models of organizational effectiveness, Steers (1975) found that there was a lack of consensus as to what constituted a useful and valid set of effectiveness measures. Adaptability-flexibility were mentioned most often, followed by productivity and satisfaction (p. 549). However, Steers did identify two general types of models: (1) normative-prescriptive models which attempt to specify what must be done to achieve effectiveness; and (2) descriptive models which summarize the characteristics found in successful organizations.

Scott (1981) and Steers (1975) agreed that the problem of identifying the domain of organizational effectiveness rests with the lack of agreement among researchers. Steers suggested that evaluation criteria are a function, in part, of who is doing the evaluating and their frame of reference (p. 551). Steers agreed also with Campbell (1977) and Scott (1981) that time perspective in the study of organizational effectiveness is an important factor. Many criteria used for evaluation are unstable when applied over time and this becomes support for the position that flexibility in the face of change (Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum, 1957) should be the defining characteristic of organizational effectiveness (p. 552).

Perrow (1970) identified three types of effectiveness

studies. (1) Variable analysis designates Y as a legitimate goal and studies the effect on Y of changes in X or multiple X's. X's may be flexibility, adaptability, profitability, etc. and the major criticism of this type of study is that X and Y often are not closely related. (2) Gross malfunctioning analysis. Rarely are highly successful businesses compared with failing ones. There is a tendency to study how organizations work, not why worse ones are so bad and how they can be improved. (3) Revelatory analysis which asks the question, "Effectiveness for whom?" This type of study is founded on a different definition of organizations and sees organizations (1) as intentional human constructions but not necessarily rational systems guided by official goals; (2) as bargaining arenas rather than cooperative systems; (3) as systems of power rather than institutions which reflect cultural norms; and, (4) as resources for other organizations and groups rather than closed systems (p. 101).

Perrow continued by positing that organizations, defined as human constructions where there is competition from within and without for outputs of interest to them under conditions of unequal power, reveal the issue of effectiveness quite differently than the other two perspectives (p. 101). "A revelatory analysis is more likely to reveal what most managers know but social scientist cannot afford to acknowledge, namely, that complex social systems are greatly influenced by chance, accident, luck; that most decisions are very ambiguous, preference orderings that are incoherent and unstable,

efforts at communication and understanding are often ineffective, subsystems are very loosely connected, and most attempts at social control are clumsy and unpredictable" (p. 103).

Price (1972) indicated that the traditional approach to studying effectiveness has been to use the goal approach. While recognizing the criticisms offered by the systems resource or natural systems approach, he remained convinced that the goal approach was the most appropriate. Price concluded that the research should focus on the organizational goals that the major decision-makers actually pursue and data should be collected about the intentions and activities of the decision-makers. The goal approach uses the organization, not society, as the basis for the evaluation of effectiveness (p. 12).

Lammers and Hickson (1979) defined effectiveness as the degree to which an organization attains its goals. They suggested, in assessing effectiveness, that records be used to compare objective indices (productivity, rate of return on investments, profits) and/or that judgments of outsiders or insiders be used to estimate the organization's effectiveness. In their view, the difference between objective and subjective evaluation is less important than might be thought because most objective indicators are biased by the subjective judgments of insiders (p. 396).

Steers (1977) summarized the eight problems encountered in measuring organizational effectiveness. (1) Construct

validity. There are many pieces but there is little evidence that there is something called an effectiveness construct.

(2) Criterion stability. Many criteria have been found unstable over time. Criteria may change as a function of external pressures, demands and interests. (3) Time perspective. Different criteria should be employed in the short, intermediate and long term perspectives. (4) Multiple criteria problem. The major advantage of multivariate studies is the comprehensive nature and integration of factors.

However, criteria may be in conflict. (5) Measurement precision. It is almost impossible to quantify criteria appropriate to the measurement of organizational effectiveness. (6) Generalizability. Organizations are different, making broad generalizations difficult. Criteria must be shown to be consistent with the goals and purposes of the organization under study. (7) Theoretical relevance. What purposes are served by the existence of effectiveness models? Do they allow predictions of future behavior? (8) Level of analysis. Most models of effectiveness are concerned with the organization but ignore the relations between individual behavior and the larger issue of organization success (pp. 54-57).

"Criteria for evaluating organizational effectiveness cannot be produced by some objective, apolitical process. They are always normative and often controversial; and they are as varied as the theoretical models used to describe organizations and the constituencies that have some interest in their functioning . . . We should not seek explanations

for organizational effectiveness in general, since such general criteria are not available; and we must be cautious in celebrating the truism that organizations that are better adapted to their environments are more likely to survive. Adaptation can be achieved in numerous ways, many of which contribute to the survival of the organization but fail to serve the interests of external constituencies" (Scott, 1981, p. 336).

Pfeffer (1977), like Yuchtman and Seashore (1967, p. 898), believed that regardless of the purpose of the comparison effectiveness can only be assessed comparatively (p. 132). "The fact that organizations are social institutions, using and producing resources, including wealth and personal position, which affect many individuals and other institutions in society, makes it inevitable that those coming in contact with an organization will evaluate it in comparison with other organizations in terms of how well it serves their interests, whether its actions are consistent with their preferences - in other words, how effective for them the organization is" (Pfeffer, 1977, p. 142).

Groups and individuals assess an organization's effectiveness and they can be expected to take action based on their evaluation. Support for the organization is given or withheld, based on whether the organization does or does not serve their individual interests (Pfeffer, 1977, p. 142). The organization's ability to acquire resources, legitimacy and to survive is a consequence of this assessment.

Pfeffer observed that organizations attempt to control any assessment of them in order to ensure continued resources and autonomy. Control can be achieved in a variety of ways: keeping secret the information necessary for evaluation; claiming special professional competence which allows only for self-evaluation or peer organizations to judge effectiveness; persuading others that they really desire what the organization provides; re-interpretation of the organization's actions so that they appear consistent with what is demanded. This behavior, it was noted, is typical of schools and education when the strategy of building organizational autonomy is in effect. Under these circumstances, it is very difficult for an independent assessment of organizational effectiveness to occur (p. 143).

In Search of Excellence (1982) by Peters and Waterman, Jr., is a report of an independent research project which identified criteria common to the organizational effectiveness of excellent large companies and attracted nationwide interest. The authors researched a group of excellent companies which were identified by an informed panel of observers of the business world. The companies were categorized as high technology, consumer goods, general industrial, service, project management, and resource based. All were financially successful and at least 20 years old. Data for their research was gathered largely through interviews, observations, and review of organizational theory.

In Search of Excellence results found that the excellent

companies were "brilliant on basics" and attempted to keep things simple in a complex world (p. 13). The authors identified eight attributes of excellent companies which distinguish them from others. One of the eight attributes, simultaneous loose-tight properties, the authors considered the summarizing property (Chapter 12, pp. 318-325). The tight characteristics include: (1) Rigidly shared values and firm, central direction which provide the framework and expectations about what counts. (2) There is regular communication and fast feedback. (3) The external perspective in these companies focuses on the customer which forces extremes of self discipline within the organization. (4) Peer pressure. (5) Effectiveness (quality) efficiency (cost). Quality leads to focusing on innovativeness which stimulates productivity, excitement, and affects the functioning of every aspect of the organization. The external focus is stimulated by organizational values--services, quality. Internal focus is on people--communication, family feeling, informality, fluidity, flexibility. (6) A simplistic focus on the organization's value(s), service, quality; on people--be the best at what you're about--is characteristic of excellent companies.

The loose characteristics include focusing on flexible organizational structures, volunteers, champions of product development, maximized autonomy for individuals, strong social networks. Mostly, loose is trying things out in slightly disorderly (loose) fashion.

The authors point out that the "rules" in excellent companies have a positive bent, dealing with quality, service, innovation and experimentation, and they emphasize building and expanding rather than restraint and control.

One of the major points emphasized by the authors was that these loose-tight characteristics may appear to be conflicting and paradoxical. However, when analyzed, they offer no conflict at all. Further, they exist simultaneously in all excellent companies.

Summary

Recognizing that there is no universal definition of effectiveness and that organizational effectiveness research is a relatively recent phenomenon it should be understood that effectiveness research has produced many questions which have led to a variety of models which attempt to address the recent issues. Just as the research has agreed that there is no one best way for an organization to organize, so, also, is their agreement that there is no simple method by which to study or assess the effectiveness of an organization. Researcher bias for a theory or methodology may be responsible for many "trial balloons" in the research design of an empirical project, but the nature of organizational effectiveness research seems to have evolved to the point where the researcher must first ask what kind of an organization is to be studied. Certainly there are different boundaries for voluntary organizations than for workplace organizations; for

non-profit organizations than for profit; for governmental than private agencies. Also, it follows that a universal definition of effectiveness may not be appropriate or desirable. The question of generalizability remains somewhat unresolved, though Meyer and Associates (1978) have indicated a belief that some effectiveness elements are generalizable to all organizations.

The emerging model which has generated enthusiasm in recent research concentrates on the organization's political interactions with its internal and external environment. The collegial model is clearly one form of the political model and possesses many of the elements identified by Pfeffer, Bachrach, Lawler, and Allison. The Academic Senate was identified as a collegial organization, structured democratically and founded in the tradition that governance of higher education is a shared responsibility. The organization was described as operating in an environment in which the external forces are diverse and complex.

The definition of organizational effectiveness selected for this research emphasized the important role played by the organization's membership in its effectiveness. The Senate as a voluntary (open membership, common interests, individual decision to participate), professional (open negotiation and bargaining present, founded in professional worth and values), collegial (members have access to each other across lines, cooperation is encouraged, decisions affirmed by majority, authority limited compromise paramount)

organization is clearly dependent on the choice of its individual members to participate for its effectiveness.

The collegial model and political model (individual actors bargain, have power bases, personal goals, cooperation, compromise) are indeed very similar and both rely heavily on the individual members of the organization. Yet the Senate was identified as an organization with a focused identity and the appearance of a vocal central leadership which are not characteristics usually attributed to collegial organizations. The following chapter provides one means for integrating the characteristics of organizational models and effectiveness provided in this review of the literature.

CHAPTER IV

A PERSPECTIVE FOR DATA ANALYSIS

According to Ferguson, "A paradigm is a framework of thought (from the Greek paradigma, 'pattern'). A paradigm is a scheme for understanding and explaining certain aspects of reality" (1980, p. 26). The three paradigm which follow are an attempt to consolidate and focus the literature germane to this study into useable frames.

The development of these paradigm represents a paradigm shift, a "new knowing" (p. 30) for this researcher. The foundation for the paradigm rests with the models developed by Graham T. Allison in his work, Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis (1971), in which he analyzed and explained the decisions and activities surrounding this international event. Allison's integration of organizational and political theory and his willingness to accept the fact that models need not be discrete--that parts of each may be in use simultaneously--appear consistent with effectiveness research and the data from this study.

The review of literature did not identify one best way for an organization to structure itself, though some scholars searched for such a panacea. Nor did the literature identify how best to assess organizational effectiveness, though there is evidence that this search has been undertaken with inconclusive results. The review did reveal the probability that

effectiveness is best determined by a thorough evaluation of individual organizations with attention directed to the organizational goals, environment, members, actions, outputs and their integration and relationship to each other. Ideally, this type of evaluation includes a variety of data gathering methods.

Attempting to integrate the analysis of data gathered through various means is problematic. For example, this study's questionnaire is quantitative and the interviews are qualitative. Research analysis methods are quite different for each. Each provides volumes of information about the statewide Academic Senate. The paradigm emerged from an attempt to focus the analysis and provide something against which to juxtapose this information.

These paradigm are an attempt, then, to identify the reality of the Senate--to frame the data so as to produce a composite picture of Senate effectiveness. A word of caution. These are not intended to be three discrete paradigm. They are conceptually discrete but empirically related. The behavior that organizations, sub-groups, individuals exhibit at any one time may reflect one or more of the paradigm simultaneously. They are intended as guides to the development of an integrated analysis of the organizational effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate.

Paradigm A

Prototype Model

Touchstone for Analysis

The core of Paradigm A rests with the concept that the goals/objectives of an organization provide the basis for all organizational activity. That is, Paradigm A behavior identifies the problems, the alternatives and the costs associated with possible choices and identifies organizational activity as analagous to organizational choice. Further, organizational values and axioms are observable.

Paradigm A provides a broad description of an organization guided by centrally controlled leadership/management acting in a rational, unified fashion. The large patterns of organizational activity and the members' shared images of the organization provide the axioms which identify the probability that an organization will respond in a predictable way. Environmental pressures are identified, also.

Basic Assumption of the Paradigm

Organizational activity is based on a combination of values and objectives which are meaningful to the organization. Options are explored; evaluation of various consequences studied individually and in groups. As cost evaluation of course of action increases, the likelihood of selection of that alternative decreases and vice versa.

Effectiveness Definitions

1. Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957). The extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without placing undue strain upon its members.
2. Tannenbaum (1968). The extent to which an organization fulfills its objectives and preserves its means and resources.
3. Goodman and Pennings (1977). The degree to which the organization achieves ideal end states.

Principle on Which Analysis is Based

Organizational activity is based on organizational choice, bounded by organizational objectives. The value of this paradigm as a means of analysis rests on identifying the reason (goal/objective) for the action.

Analysis of Effectiveness--Based on Organizational Choice

1. Organization acts as a unit.
 - a. Options are explored.
 - b. Alternatives are measured on the basis of goals and objectives.
 - c. Choices are made to maximize goals and objectives.
2. Action occurs in response to threat or opportunity.
 - a. Campbell and Campbell et al. (1974). One model of effectiveness construct is based on a

goal-centered view. It is based on the assumption that the organization is led by rational decision-makers who have goals that are defined and manageable and for which it is possible to plan strategies leading to goal attainment. It attempts to describe major tasks of the organization. Criteria is developed to assess how well goals are being achieved.

- b. Steers (1977). Goals and goal attainment are the recurring theme in evaluating organizational effectiveness. Effectiveness can best be understood in terms of the extent to which an organization is successful in acquiring and utilizing resources in the pursuit of its goals.
- c. Pfeffer (1981). Various consequences may result from the selection of a course of action based on the alternatives which can be identified. A rational choice of action is selected which would achieve the highest values and lead to the achievement of objectives or goals. Decisions are related directly to objectives.

Paradigm B

Modus Operandi Model

Touchstone for Analysis

According to Paradigm B, the organization identifies the components which traditionally act on a problem or situation

and their relative influence. The organization is seen as coordinated by a unified leadership/management. Coordinated efforts are based on rules, established programs, standard operating procedures which govern the sub-units. Sub-units are competitors and contributors--often simultaneously. The Paradigm is concerned with how the information is provided--the programs, procedures for obtaining it, and means by which alternatives are investigated. Also, action implementation is identified. Organizational activity is analagous to organization outputs.

Paradigm B behavior of the organization is considered appropriate when defined by organizational goals. It describes the decisions made by a coordinated group of leader/managers as resulting from organizational constraints. The organization's component parts are identified and analyzed with special concern for rigidity of programs and procedures. The information that is available to the organization is considered a reflection of fact, as well as the organization's goals and routines.

Basic Assumption of the Paradigm

An organization consists of sub-units which each have existing goals, programs and rules of operation. Any output flows from established routines and loose coordination of the sub-units. Information is provided by sub-units and may be limited and colored by parochialism. The organization attempts to standardize interactions with its environment and

routinize its activity. Short-term output is based on standard procedure while long-term output is based on organizational goals and programs.

Effectiveness Definitions

1. Goodman and Pennings (1977). The ability to acquire scarce resources that make it possible for an organization to survive and preserve its integrity.
2. Evan (1976). The capacity of an organization to cope with all four systematic processes (inputs, transformations of resources, outputs, feedback) relative to its goal-seeking behavior--however explicit or implicit this may be.
3. Katz and Kahn (1966). The totality of organizational goodness--sum of the elements of productivity, cost, performance, turnover, quality of output and the like.

Principle on Which Analysis is Based

Organizational action is based on output determined by sub-unit goals, programs and standardized procedures. The value of this Paradigm rests with identifying organizational routines that mediate the outputs.

Analysis of Effectiveness--Based on Organizational Output

1. Leaders/managers are at the top of loosely coordinated sub-units.

2. Leadership/management relies on information; alternatives are provided by sub-units.
3. Size prevents unitary decisions.
4. Goals provide definition for appropriate performance.
5. Organizational change is usually brought about by an increase or decrease in money or by major organizational failures.
6. Interaction is standardized with other actors in the environment to avoid uncertainty.
7. Standard operating procedures provide the means for the organization to prepare relevant responses and monitor information.
8. Action is based on standardized responses, programs, rules.
 - a. Campbell and Campbell et al. (1974). The (Natural Systems) Model assumes demands on an organization so dynamic and complex that a finite number of organizational goals may not be meaningfully defined. The organization adapts the goal of maintainance over time without depleting its resources. Emphasis is on people, not structure and technology. The Model incorporates organizational development (OD) which assumes that the organization is effective when:
(1) the total organization plans and manages its work to match goals; (2) decisions are made

close to the sources of information; (3) communication occurs effectively, laterally and vertically; (4) conflicts are considered solvable.

- b. Pfeffer (1981) Bureaucratic Model. Choices are made based on rules and processes which have been effective and adaptive. The model of organizations as bureaucratically rational presumes less conscious foresight and less clearly defined preferences and information. Bureaucratic organizations operate with less extensive information and rely more on standard procedures and rules.

Paradigm C

Strategic Model

Touchstone for Analysis

Paradigm C behavior identifies the existing pathways for producing action in a given situation, as well as the players/actors and their positions who are centrally involved in the action. Bargaining occurs regularly among hierarchically structured actors. It seeks to illustrate how job pressures, past positions and personalities of the key players/actors affect the analysis of the issue. The Paradigm frames the behavior of organizational players acting on many issues without a consistent set of objectives. Often actions are based on various organizational and personal goals. The Paradigm is concerned with the imposed deadlines that will

affect resolution of any issue and attempts to identify the possible misjudgments of the actors.

Organizations acting in Paradigm C ways focus on the many central players of leadership/management and their interrelationships, as well as the behavior of the players--their roles, responsibilities and priorities. Analysis, using Paradigm C, recognizes the sharing of power and identifies power bases. Decisions result from political processes. Organizational activity is analagous to political action.

Basic Assumption of the Paradigm

An organization is composed of many players involved in strategic and political activity. Action results from the bargaining and negotiation that occurs along routinized pathways. Conflict and compromise are everyday occurrences. Political activity provides outcomes which are the result of confusion, compromise and muddling by actors with diverse interests and unequal influence. Organizational activity is not the result of unitary action taken by the whole organization.

Effectiveness Definitions

1. Pfeffer (1981). Effective organizations are those that accurately perceive patterns of resource interdependence, correctly perceive demands and then respond to those demands made by those groups that control the most critical interdependence.

2. Steers (1977). Goals are central to any discussion about organizational effectiveness and most definitions of organizational effectiveness rest on how successful an organization was in attaining stated objectives. Effectiveness is best achieved by finding ways for members to integrate personal motives and goals with organizational objectives.
3. Katz and Kahn (1966). We have defined organizational effectiveness as the extent to which all forms of energetic return to the organization are maximized.
4. Cummings (1977). An effective organization is one in which the greatest percentage of participants perceive themselves as free to use the organization and its subsystems as instrumental for their own needs.

Principle on Which Analysis is Based

Organizational activity is the result of bargaining among groups and individuals. The value of the Paradigm rests with its displaying of the actors, participants and players in the organization's game.

Analysis of Effectiveness--Based on Political Activity

1. Decisions result from compromise, conflict, muddling of actors with dissimilar interests and varying power.

- a. Actors are individuals with position in the structure; position defines role played.
 - b. Multifaceted goals and interests (personal and organizational) affect actors' stand.
 - c. The position of the actors in the organizational structure and provincialism determine perceptions and stand taken.
 - d. Actors define their interest in an issue based largely on personal goals. Their stand results from their defined interest.
2. Decisions do not reflect unitary action of the organization or leadership/management's preferred choice.
 3. Organization rules are established by outside agencies (bylaws or statutes) and may be implicit or explicit.
 - a. Rules establish position power, restrict the organization's activity, sanction some activities (bargaining, coalitions) and declare other activities illegal or immoral.
 4. Power of the actors is a blend of bargaining advantage--authority, responsibility, control of information--skill at using the advantage; careful selection of issues in which to assert power. "Power wisely invested yields an enhanced reputation for effectiveness" (Allison, 1971, p. 169).
 5. Time imperatives force actors to take stands.

Events force issues. Neither promotes nor permits objective focus on the issues. Issues may be raised by various elements of the organization's environment leading to forced deadlines and affecting issue analysis.

6. Formal decisions require implementation. Organizational actors control implementation which is based on their degree of support.
 - a. Blankenship (1977). The political elements present in collegial organizations are identified as: coalition, bargaining and negotiation, structure, interest groups.
 - b. Pfeffer (1981). "Power is first and foremost a structural phenomenon and should be understood as such."
 - c. Salanick and Pfeffer (1974). Power in social systems is potentially horizontal or vertical; sub-unit power increases in those departments most instrumental in bringing in or providing resources highly valued by the organization. This power enables sub-units to obtain more of the scarce and critical resources allocated within the organization.
 - d. Katz and Kahn (1966). The organization's transactions are conducted in the environment and are political because they involve making choices based on other than economics and efficiency.

Use of political influence to achieve organizational goals takes many forms such as: persuasion of influential people, lobbying, donations, subsidies, legislation and tariffs. Maximization of return by political means increases effectiveness without affecting efficiency.

- e. Pfeffer (1981). Political models are distinguishable from both bureaucratic and rational choice models because decisions are made which may be inconsistent with goal maximization and result from the power of the various actors who demonstrate their preferences and intentions to determine the decision outcome.

The following chapters have been developed as methodological entities: survey; interviews; participant observation. Each chapter is introduced by providing the reader with information regarding how the data was collected, followed by analysis of the data presented. The nature of the survey instrument required a somewhat traditional analysis followed by analysis juxtaposing the results against the paradigm developed for this study. For all other data, these paradigm are the primary means used for analysis.

CHAPTER V

INTERVIEWS

Interviewing, by its very nature, is a one-to-one experience. It is both anxiety-producing and exhilarating, often with unpredictable results. As a data gathering technique, interviewing takes many forms and may fulfill several purposes. An interview may be highly structured--the equivalent of an oral questionnaire; it may concentrate on a single event; and, it may be covert so that the subject is unaware of being interviewed. Additionally, the interview may be loose and unstructured, as in the case of oral history; it may be investigative in nature, as is common in journalism. Often, there are informant interviews where an insider to the organization provides appropriate information (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 154).

The singular purpose for all interviews is to determine what is on someone's mind--and, generally, interviews are conducted to find out those things that cannot be observed; thoughts and feelings, knowledge, a person's perspective (Patton, 1980, p. 197).

Patton discussed four general approaches to data collection through the use of interviews.

1. Informal, conversational interview in which there is spontaneous generation of questions and natural interaction.

2. Respondent may or may not realize he/she is being interviewed.
3. General interview guide approach in which the interviewer outlines a set of issues to be explored before the interview begins.
4. Standardized, open-ended interview in which a set of questions is asked of each respondent in the same order. (pp. 197-198).

Guba and Lincoln (1981) categorized interviews slightly differently. They were identified as 1) structured or focused; 2) unstructured or elite. In the structured interview, the problem is defined as it exists before the interview takes place. The unstructured interview allows the problem to emerge (p. 155). "Thus, unlike structured, focused, or standardized interviews, the unstructured or 'elite' interview is concerned with the unique, the idiosyncratic, and wholly individual viewpoint" (p. 156).

The unstructured interview often sounds more like a conversation than a series of questions. The purpose of naturalistic research is best served by nonstandardized interviews (p. 157). "The fundamental principle of qualitative interviewing is to provide a framework within which respondents can express their own understandings in their own terms" (Patton, 1980, p. 205).

The Respondents

The individuals were selected because of their special

characteristics. As identified previously, interviews were established as a methodology of choice for this study because there are numerous and identifiable individual groups which interact with the Senate. "Respondents are usually selected because of their special characteristics; that is, they have special knowledge of, or familiarity with, the situation, they have information (or are likely to have) to which others are not privy, they have special status of some sort, or they are one of a kind . . . " (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 166).

At the outset of this project, it was determined that respondents would be selected because they either currently or had previously performed in roles in which they interacted with the Senate and could respond in such a way that would enlighten the research objectives. In some cases, specific people were obvious choices. In others, formal and informal conversations produced suggestions of individuals to be interviewed. Occasionally, names emerged as part of an interview. The list of formal and informal respondents includes: Jean B. Trapnell and Mary Lou Zoglin, former members of the Board of Governors; Patrick M. Callan, Director of CPEC; Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes (D), Los Angeles; Norbert Bischof and Andy Mason, writers of the original Academic Senate Constitution; Leon Baradat, Edith Conn, Julie S. Hatoff, Barbara Hinkley, current and past members of the Executive Committee; Patrick McCallum, Executive Director of FACCC; Robert Prescott, immediate Past President of CCCT; Gus

Guichard, Executive Vice Chancellor of CCC; Robert N. Williams, Dean of Instruction and participant of AS-CIO.

Arrangements and Sites

In each case, the individual respondent was contacted in writing with an explanation of the general research topic, offered an indication of his/her area of expertise of particular relevance to this study and provided with an abstract of the dissertation proposal. A follow-up telephone call was made to establish the respondent's willingness to be interviewed, as well as the date, place and time. No one refused to be interviewed when contacted by telephone. Two letters were written and were unanswered. Neither individual was telephoned because, in the interim, it was possible to interview two individuals who offered the study greater expertise.

The first interview was conducted on July 30, 1982 and the final one on December 17, 1982. The interviews usually took place in a setting and at a time that was of convenience to the respondent. This afforded the opportunity to travel throughout California and to be invited into offices, to college campuses and into homes, occasionally sharing meals. On several occasions, the interviews occurred at conferences and meeting sites. Probably the most challenging interview sequence occurred on the day this researcher left Vista, drove to San Diego, flew to Los Angeles, taxied across town, interviewed Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes at 9:00 a.m., taxied

back to the airport, flew to Sacramento, interviewed Pat Callan, Director of CPEC, at 3:00 p.m. and was home by 8:30 p.m. that same night.

Protocol

Each interview situation was unique. In many instances the researcher and respondents were unknown to each other (other than by name or reputation). Following the usual greetings and amenities, the researcher offered the opportunity for the respondent to seek general information about the study. Often, very rewarding expressions of interest about the research were shared. Next, permission to tape the interview was requested. In one instance, it was denied because the individual, an Assemblywoman, expressed concern that she might be misquoted by those who would read the dissertation. In several instances, researcher intuition dictated that taping the interview would inhibit the situation. Generally, the opening question was concerned with reviewing how the respondent had interacted with the Academic Senate. The approach taken was to encourage the respondent to teach the interviewer about the statewide Academic Senate from his/her perspective. The remainder of the interview was unstructured, essentially, with information being exchanged, and analyses, opinions, observations flowing and emerging.

The shortest interview was 30 minutes; the longest several hours. Following each interview, the researcher either taped or wrote notes and observations, recapping the

interview. The tapes were professionally transcribed and typed. Each tape was listened to while reading the transcribed copy to verify the accuracy of transcription and to clarify "mumbles" and jargon. In every instance where a specific length of time had been specified at the time of the appointment, the respondents became so involved in the interview that there was mutual agreement to extend the period. Some expressed slight concern that their candor, on tape, could cause repercussions. Within several days of each interview, a letter of appreciation was sent to the respondent.

These, then, were the elite interviews in which the respondents as a composite group were verbal, verbose, articulate, opinionated, jaded, knowledgeable, interesting, analytical and genuinely concerned about higher education.

It should be noted that the majority of the following interviews were taped and transcribed but the necessity of dissecting the interviews to identify the heart of the responses and to provide continuity for the reader has resulted in a rearrangement and pairing of the responses. Therefore, the responses attributed to the individuals should not be interpreted as direct quotations in their entirety.

Analysis

The purpose for using interviews as a data collection technique was to expose what the actors in the environment of the statewide Academic Senate thought about the organization

and its representatives. Further, interviews were used to identify the knowledge and feelings about the Senate which are difficult to observe and are elusive as questionnaire items.

Not all respondents were asked the same questions and the material obtained from each interview was too extensive to be used in its entirety. During the analysis process, the interview responses were dissected, sorted and grouped similarly to the sections of the questionnaire. The selected statements were then analyzed using the paradigm criteria outlined in Chapter IV. It became clear that some statements were attributable to a single paradigm while others clearly indicated the behavior of combinations of paradigm. Not all respondents appear in each section. When the respondent to an interview is introduced initially, a brief statement about the respondent's credentials and expertise is provided.

The next step was to consider the Senate's effectiveness based on the criteria and definitions of effectiveness for each paradigm. Each statement was evaluated for its strength as an indicator of Academic Senate effectiveness. The statements were rated Effective, Moderately Effective, Not Effective, as indicators of effectiveness. This analysis is found at the end of each section.

The core of Paradigm A rests with the concept that the purposes/goals/objectives of an organization provide the basis for all organizational activity and its value is based on its usefulness in identifying the reason--purpose--for the

action. When analyzing organizational effectiveness using this paradigm, the following behaviors provide the basis for the analysis: organization acts as a unit; alternatives are explored and evaluated based on objectives; choices are made which maximize the organization's goals.

The core of Paradigm B behavior rests with the concept that organizations consist of sub-units which have existing goals, programs and rules of operation. Organizational goals provide definitions for appropriate behavior but output flows from established routines performed by sub-units. The primary value of Paradigm B criteria is in identifying the organizational routines that mediate the outputs.

The following criteria provide the basis on which to analyze organizational effectiveness using Paradigm B: size prevents unitary decisions; standardized interaction occurs with other actors in the environment; organization operates through loosely coordinated sub-units; goals of the sub-units define appropriate action; action based on standardized responses, programs, rules of the sub-units; organization attempts to standardize interaction with its environment and routinize its activity; organizational activity analagous to its outputs.

The core of Paradigm C behavior rests with the concept that an organization consists of many players who are involved in strategic and political activity. Action results from routinized bargaining and negotiation with conflict and compromise everyday occurrences. The value of this paradigm

is in the way it displays the key role of the actors and participants in the organization's game.

When using this paradigm as a means of analyzing organizational effectiveness, the following criteria provide the foundation: decisions result from compromise, conflict and muddling of actors with uneven power; decisions do not reflect unitary organizational action; organization's rules (bylaws, statutes) impacted by outside agencies; power of the actors is a result of bargaining advantage; organizational activity analagous to political activity.

Clearly, a response statement resulting in comments about the organization's foundations reflects Paradigm A behavior. But, the actors being interviewed often contributed insight or knowledge beyond the initial observation which identified the other actors, the compromises, power bases (Paradigm C), procedures, programs, routines (Paradigm B) behind the various activity in the same statement. The presence of combinations of behavior reflecting different paradigm simultaneously was consistent with Allison's (1971) research and the organizational effectiveness research reviewed in Chapter IV.

As indicated previously, the interview responses have been sorted and grouped in the same section headings as those of the survey questionnaire. Within each section, the responses are analyzed as they relate to the behavior characteristics of the paradigm. At the conclusion of each section, the responses are summarized and an indication of the

Academic Senate's effectiveness behavior characteristics offered.

1. Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions

During the period 1963-1968, nearly seventy academic senates were established for the purpose of advising their local boards of trustees on academic and professional matters. In 1968, the community colleges of California were unified into a statewide system when the Legislature created the Board of Governors, California Community Colleges. This Board's function is to debate issues and formulate policy on academic and professional matters affecting all of the community colleges. "Thus, in order for the community college faculty to have a formal and effective procedure for participating at the state level in the formation of policies on these matters, local senate presidents perceived the need for a statewide senate" (Note 5).

FACCC, Faculty Association for California Community Colleges, consisting of a dues-paying membership, could not represent all faculty members in community colleges. Norbert Bischof recalls " . . . thus with the blessing and support of FACCC, I called an independent meeting of local senate presidents and representatives in 1968 in Oakland." The convention struggled with the constitutional language and was one of the Senate's greatest and most memorable debates. The voices of Bill Bain, Irwin Boxer, Dick Fairchild, Don Fitzgerald, Andy Mason, Bob Wolf and many other local senate

presidents and representatives made the constitutional convention unforgettable (Bischoff, Note 6).

Mason Interview. Andy Mason is an Emeritus Senator of the statewide Academic Senate. Prior to his retirement, he taught at Los Angeles Valley College and West Los Angeles College. Mason's interview responses provide the foundation for this section which focuses on the historical development of the Academic Senate. This interview was taped and transcribed.

Prentiss: I'm particularly interested in what your early role with the Senate was. Were you on the original planning committee and did you attend the constitution writing conferences?

Mason: I went to the first meeting in Oakland that was called to discuss the need for an organization such as a statewide Senate. Then they had the convention where they set up the organization the following spring.

Prentiss: How did you get together to develop the idea to talk about whether there would be such a statewide Academic Senate?

Mason: Actually, the input came through FACCC. They were the ones who sponsored the initial meeting. Then, of course, there was the next step to say okay, we'll have a Senate, since everybody who attended the Oakland meeting agreed that there was a need.

Prentiss: Why was FACCC interested?

Mason: I have no idea why the people in FACCC were interested. You might ask Norbert Bischof, who is one of the initiators of the Senate, as to why.

Paradigm A, C.

The initial meeting was exploratory--to identify the problem and determine whether there was a need for an organization. In discussions with Bischof, he identified environmental pressures--faculty discontent with CJCA and the recognition of FACCC members that there should be an organization to represent faculty which was not driven by dues (A). The various players/actors came together--each with past positions and various power bases, each playing a leadership role--to establish the Academic Senate (C).

My campus had an interest in the statewide Senate. At the time, I was teaching at L.A. Valley and we had an academic senate before the ACR 48 (see Chapter II for explanation of ACR 48) was even passed. People there were interested in having some say about what went on because there was to be a new president. They were afraid that the president would be appointed over the summer.

Prentiss: So that's how your senate originally got started?

Mason: Yes, because of a problem. There were a lot of bright people on that faculty at the time who understood things and they said, "Hey, this is what we have to have."

So we existed long before ACR 48 ever came on the books and were an effective group.

Paradigm A. Mason's reference to why he and his college senate were interested in developing a statewide Senate demonstrated that they had experienced the benefits of a local senate which exhibited a centralization of its leadership in response to an identified problem (desire to participate in the presidential selection).

Prentiss: Do you remember how many people attended the Oakland meeting?

Mason: Oh, a pretty good attendance; I would say there were something like 40 or 50 people there. That was about a 50% representation of all of the colleges.

Prentiss: And that meeting was followed with the meeting in Los Angeles; what happened in Los Angeles?

Mason: At that meeting in Los Angeles, that's when the so-called Constitution was formed which, when the Senate became a non-profit organization, had to change in title to Bylaws. But, initially, it was called a Constitution. There were only minor changes made in the wording to meet the requirements of a non-profit organization. That was a twoday gambit, in which we hammered out the Constitution.

Prentiss: Was that a fairly large group?

Mason: About the same size as the other and tended to be the same people.

Prentiss: One of the fellows at MiraCosta who passed away a couple of years ago attended the Los Angeles meeting.

He wrote a report, which somehow survived the ages, for our Senate Council. He was very impressed with the intensity and productivity of the group.

Mason: Norbert Bischof was Chairman and he really ran a tight meeting . . . very excellent; everybody got their say but he didn't let people ramble. To me, that was excellent. You had to stick to the subject. Most of the people stayed right on target and that's why we accomplished it.

Paradigm A.

The constitution writing conference was successful because the individuals were acting as an organization with a problem to be solved and the solution was based on their choices. They responded to Bischof's strong leadership with a focused effort.

Mason: So we hammered it out and, of course, the organization couldn't function until the Constitution was ratified. That took about a year.

Prentiss: Once the number of schools needed ratified it, was there a conference called after that?

Mason: Yes, June of '69, I believe, they called the first session of the Senate. That is when a sufficient number of schools had ratified the Constitution.

Prentiss: Do you remember where that was held?

Mason: Yes, San Francisco. That's when Sheridan Hegland from Palomar College was elected President. Incidentally, I'd say that one of the main reasons the organization got off and going and has come along is in the early few years we

had an outstanding group of presidents who really devoted time and were also ably supported by their districts. In those days, there wasn't the money to pay for release time for the president. We managed to find some outstanding people who had the support of their district sufficiently and they really, I think, did the job down in Sacramento to make the group viable.

Prentiss: It's interesting that they were able to get that support from the districts.

Mason: It probably was a personal . . . Yates Greer got excellent support. The Superintendent gave him the use of a car and it's a long way from Weed to Sacramento. So I attribute a lot of that initial credibility for the success to the presidents and that they were outstanding people.

Paradigm B, C.

Once the Academic Senate became a reality, the importance of the coordinated and cooperative efforts of the leaders became critical. FACCC provided seed money but the organization operated at the whim of districts which voluntarily contributed to its treasury. Some districts were very supportive, as Mason indicates, in absorbing extra costs for the good of the faculty the Senate represented. Costs, such as mailing, assigned time, travel expenses, were borne by individual districts in the early years. The importance and identification of the sub-units (colleges) became apparent (B). As Mason has indicated, the players and their roles, jobs and

positions were critical to the development of the strength of the Senate (C).

Prentiss: At that point, did you continue to be active in the statewide Senate?

Mason: Well, in the fall of '69, when my senate joined, I was elected as a delegate from this college and I served continuously as a delegate until I quit which was in '80; so that's about 11 years.

Prentiss: Do you think that the organization has maintained its original purpose? Do you see it as being directed in that same way now? Is it making changes?

Mason: No, I think it's still got the same kinds of goals and interpretation of why it exists. They're there to improve education at the community college level. I don't see those having changed over the years.

Paradigm A.

Mason doesn't view the Senate as having substantially different goals from those which he helped to establish at the constitution writing conference.

Bischof Interview. Norbert Bischof was one of the original members of the committee that called the Senate constitution writing conference which led to the establishment of the Senate in 1968. He teaches philosophy at Merritt College, was President of the Senate in 1979-80 and is currently a member of the Senate Executive Committee. This interview was not taped.

During dinner, we talked about how the Senate idea got its start. At the time, the California Junior College Association (now California Association for Community Colleges) was the only community college professional organization and there were a number of people who didn't think CJCA represented the faculty very well. Also, institutions paid dues and the organization had specific responsibilities to represent athletics, as well as faculty, administrators and students.

Paradigm A.

The stimulus for founding the Academic Senate rested with the identified problem which was the need for a focused faculty voice that would represent faculty on academic and professional issues.

The California Junior College Faculty Association (CJCFA) was the first group to splinter from the CJCA. Its purpose was to represent faculty only. The faculty, however, had to pay dues and it also offered insurance and similar benefits to its members. This organization, now known as Faculty Association for California Community Colleges (FACCC), believed in the need for an organization to represent all faculty and provided seed money to get the Senate started. Thus began a tradition of mutual support and involvement by the membership of both organizations.

Paradigm A.

Clearly, the community college faculties were concerned about their lack of voice. The goal was to represent

all faculty, not special interest groups. The splintering of the groups was in response to environmental pressures. The goals of FACC and the Senate remain compatible.

Bischof: Many of the Senate presidents have served as FACCC officers; Patrick McCallum's (presently Executive Director of FACCC) father was a former Senate president. Terry Marre of Santa Monica City was their senate president and is the current president of FACCC. Also, he served as parliamentarian for the Academic Senate's Fall 1982 Conference.

Paradigm C.

One group--FACCC--retains a legislative advocate and is an organization with dues-paying members. Therefore, it is committed to accomplishing member wishes. The Senate, funded as a public agency, does not have a lobbyist. The players for both groups interact and the interaction is not formalized by structure. There are many leaders, positions, players and action pathways available.

Bischof said that he and Ted Standiford actually wrote the document that was taken to the constitution writing convention. Many changes were made during these two sessions.

We speculated on what had changed in the community colleges that provided the support for establishing the Academic Senate. He thought that the growth factor--adding of large numbers of faculty--as well as the changes in credentialling

law which made it possible to teach with a Master's Degree (no or few education courses and no secondary school teaching experience) may have been very important. These faculty brought the four-year orientation and academic senate traditions directly from their most recent experience--either as a student, teaching assistant or instructor. The break with secondary school influences was made possible by the influx of this previously non-existent mix of faculty.

Paradigm A.

The focus, the goals and some of the organization's choices are often found in the history of the group. While this was a speculation, it is documentable that the environment had changed and may well have provided the diversity needed to support the faculty breaking away from the administrative dominance so prevalent in the early years of the junior colleges.

The Academic Senate represented local senates for nine years without formal legal recognition. In 1978, under the leadership of President Jean Vincenzi, a mathematics instructor at Saddleback College, and Chancellor William Craig, the Board of Governors unanimously recognized the Academic Senate as the representative voice of community college faculty concerning academic and professional matters in Title V of the California Administrative Code.

Conn Interview. Edith Conn, a physical education and dance instructor at Ventura College, was Senate President in

1977-78 and has been active in the Senate for many years. She is a current member of the Executive Committee. Conn's longevity and wide variety of experiences with the Academic Senate made her an invaluable resource to the organization. This interview was taped and transcribed.

Prentiss: Can you trace the steps that finally led to the Senate being recognized in Title V?

Conn: Wanda (Munson, past president) and I met Gus (Guichard, Executive Vice Chancellor, California Community Colleges) at the airport in Sacramento. It was an informal meeting and we were talking to Gus about Senate recognition in Title V. The other thing that we wanted was his support in making it possible for the Senate to make a presentation to the Board. He was acting Chancellor then and controlled the agenda. (Sidney Brossman resigned as Chancellor in the fall of 1976.) At that meeting, he suggested that we write an annual report. And I guess maybe that he was saying, "Well, you'd better have something to show what you're doing." As a result of that meeting, the newsletters (they were just a page and they only went to the Board) were developed and the first Annual Report was written and presented the following year. That meeting would have been in the spring of 1977. (Conn was Senate President at the time.) Then Jean Vincenzi came into office after me and she worked, of course, with Craig. We were recognized in Title V the following year. Craig agreed that all the faculty appointments from the Chancellor's Office would be made by the

Senate. But Gus Guichard has been very supportive of the Senate and those very important things; the Annual Report and our place on the agenda we owe to him. When Wanda and I went to see him, it wasn't really about the Annual Report. He suggested it. He said, if you want to have credibility with the Board and get recognized, you'd better show them what you've been doing.

Paradigm C.

This recounting of events illustrates the importance of players and their positions and the many participants in leadership roles. Guichard's position provided him with a perspective which led to a strategy larger in scope than Munson and Conn had dared to undertake. The rather informal meeting with Acting Chancellor Guichard laid the foundation for formal recognition of the Senate. Craig's appointment was timely, as he quickly indicated his position in his support of Senate recognition. It may very well be that both Guichard and Craig were supporting legal recognition of the Senate as the faculty representative on academic and professional matters as a counter pressure to the collective bargaining issues which were also prevalent at this time. Viewed in the context of their job pressures and power base, collective bargaining may have been an important element in their analysis of the Senate's pressure for recognition.

Hinkley Interview. Barbara Hinkley is the immediate Past President of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (1981-82) and is serving currently as the Chair of the Senate's Educational Policies Committee. Hinkley is a sociology instructor at Palomar College. This interview was not taped.

We talked about the relationship with the Chancellor's Office and she recognized Chancellor Craig and the tremendous good he did for the statewide Academic Senate in his support for it as the voice of the community college instructor. Throughout his tenure as Chancellor, he promoted this role in the Senate. He also understood how to work with statewide Academic Senates and with the whole concept of the college academic senate and the system-wide Academic Senate. Her feeling is that Chancellor Hayward does not come from the same orientation. While he is not unsupportive of the statewide Academic Senate and he goes through all of the motions, the Senate is not conceptually a part of his nature as it was a part of Craig's nature. She knew Hayward well and has worked with him directly in a wide variety of ways. She speaks very highly of Gus Guichard as someone who has been there for a long period of time, who was competent and supportive conceptually of the Academic Senate. They often have not been on the same side of things, but Guichard understands the function of an Academic Senate and so they have been able to maintain their relationship.

Paradigm C.

Hinkley has identified, as did Conn, the importance of the key players in the historical and current environment of the Senate. Hinkley characterized the importance of the personality of the individuals in higher positions of authority (for instance, the Chancellor) and the views and decisions which result in part from those individuals.

Concerning how major issues and major positions were identified, Hinkley said that the Executive Committee identified issues the statewide body delegate assembly ought to discuss which were circulated and offered for debate at either the spring or the fall conference. Of course, delegates also brought their resolutions and they supported those before their fellow delegates at the representative delegate assembly. These resolutions provided direction for the leadership. That is the substance of how the organization has represented the faculty.

Paradigm B, C.

The procedures for debating issues were cast in routine procedures (B) but practice dictated that often, while the debate was in progress or before it began, delegates negotiated for support; i.e., votes, based on their individual goals and power base. The result was often a modified resolution that came to the floor for debate (C).

As an example of typical presidential activities,

Hinkley related that a typical week would include an appointment or conference with the Chancellor of the system, testimony before a legislative committee and/or sub-committee, appearance before CPEC and probably two speaking engagements.

Paradigm A, B, C.

In a given week with the kinds of activities indentified, Hinkley likely operated in a manner typical of all three paradigm. Clearly, though, the political overtones of Paradigm C dominate the activities she mentioned. Each of the activities mentioned occurred in conjunction with defined groups or individuals possessing power bases, individual and organizational positions and widely differing action pathways.

In the strictest sense, Hinkley said that the leaders of the statewide Academic Senate promote collegiality. They want to function and be recognized as academic senates in the tradition of four-year university systems. The presidency has become, in the last two to three years, a full time job and was supported that way. The individuals holding certain positions in the Senate's organization (President, the Educational Policies Chair and several others on the Executive Committee) were given assigned time by their districts. The district was then reimbursed through the statewide Academic Senate for that time. This was also the practice of the statewide Academic Senates in the University of California

system and the California State University system. The three senates are now very similarly organized.

Paradigm A.

The Senate's desire to be associated with the tradition established by the University of California and California State University senates is an indication of its desire to be seen as a focused goal-oriented organization which evaluates issues and bases its activity on choice from among alternatives.

Callan Interview. Patrick M. Callan is the current Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). This is a very influential Commission, as it is responsible for assuring that the State's resources for higher education are utilized effectively and efficiently and is responsible for advising the Governor and Legislature on statewide educational policy and funding affecting all of postsecondary education. This interview was taped and transcribed.

Prentiss: In general, what's your perspective on the statewide Academic Senate; what kinds of interactions have you had with it; and when have you observed it functioning as an organization?

Callan: They've been interested in some of the overall studies we've done on the community colleges' role and mission, some of the longitudinal data on community college students, work we've done in the areas that are related to the

educational program itself. We've done a lot of work in the area of writing skills here. Our staff was usually at their meeting, doing one or two sessions on one subject or another. Bill Craig and I, when Bill was Chancellor of the Community Colleges, worked pretty hard to try to get some State funding for the Senate because we believed that it was necessary to have some group that we could consult with about educational issues on a statewide basis which wasn't involved in collective bargaining primarily. The Senate attend our Commission meeting if they're interested in an issue.

Paradigm A, C.

Callan has identified the Senate as an organization concerned with issues directly related to its goals and has indicated that it chooses from among the issues and evaluates its priorities (A). Callan's references to his and Craig's efforts to achieve State funding for the Senate again reflect the importance of the positions of the actors and their analysis of the situation. Action was based on the various goals of CPEC and the Chancellor's Office. However, the presence of collective bargaining issues may have stimulated the identification of player positions which led to action in behalf of the Senate (C).

Once the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office were established, the California community colleges became a system--at least on paper. This provided the stimulus for local senate presidents to become interested in a statewide

Academic Senate as it was commonly believed that only a statewide senate could coordinate and pool the views of local senates into a policy recommendation to the Board of Governors and to other groups concerned with statewide educational matters.

Zoglin Interview. Mary Lou Zoglin was a member of the Board of Trustees (1961-1974) and Board of Governors (1974-1978). She was in office during the early senate building years and when the Senate achieved recognition in Title V. She is currently an Associate Dean of Alternative Learning Systems at Coastline Community College. This interview was taped and transcribed.

Prentiss: I'm particularly interested in the history of the Senate and the kinds of observations and interactions you might have had with it, both from the local senate interactions at Foothill and your generalized observations, based on your experiences on the Board of Trustees and the Board of Governors.

Zoglin: It might be valuable to know that insofar as I had a platform when I ran for the office the first time, the only thing that I truly recall from that platform was the desire to have faculty more involved in college decision-making. My personal feeling was that faculty members should play a stronger role than they did at that time. Well, that was in 1961 and at my particular college, we did have faculty representation on a President's Council and we were certainly

moving toward faculty input. But I gathered that in a lot of the colleges in the State, they did not have that, particularly in the southern part of the State. People down here were agitating for some legal right to be involved in college decision-making, basically, and that culminated in the law establishing Academic Senates.

Prentiss: When you were on the Board of Governors, was the statewide Academic Senate a contributing body to . . .

Zoglin: Well, I think it was beginning to be because there certainly were many times from the State level that you want to look to faculty representatives. Just as at the local level, it was also very frequently necessary at the State level to have somebody to turn to. I think, during my time there, the Senate was just beginning to establish itself statewide. At first, they even had to fight the battle of whether there would be a statewide Senate, whether that was appropriate or whether they were indeed just local organizations. As I said, there was a need for a more unique faculty voice statewide, because the others were all very clearly vested-interest voices . . . the AFT, CTA, and FACCC were all private membership organizations whose goal was to improve the lot of the faculty person. There was a need for some group that was part of the government structure.

Paradigm A, B.

In this rather brief accounting, the events surrounding the development of the local senates and the establishment of the statewide Academic Senate are reviewed. In

Paradigm A behavior, the structure and purpose for the organization's existence is established. The acceptance of the organization's existence into the larger governmental structure and the routinization of the interactions is characteristic of Paradigm B.

Trapnell Interview. Jean Trapnell is a former English teacher at Los Angeles Valley College and has served as a member of the Board of Governors, as well as the Board representative to CPEC. Her term on the Board expired in 1982. The Academic Senate achieved recognition and legislative funding during her term on the Board. This interview was taped and transcribed.

Prentiss: How have you interacted with the Senate; what is your perspective of the Senate?

Trapnell: I was instrumental in starting the State Senate right after I got on the Board. It was about 1975 and after collective bargaining became a reality. I was a strong union person and I think that the union is very important for faculty; I was disappointed in the union because almost the first item in 1975 that came before the Board had to do with the requirements for general education. The vocational people wanted to eliminate or water down these requirements. When I went to the officials of the union whom I had worked with in L.A. and said, "What are we going to do about this?", they refused to have anything to do with it and said we represent all of the teachers and are not going to take the

part of one against another. And I thought, that's it. We need some professional standards. And I brought to the Board the idea of recognizing a statewide Academic Senate to maintain professional standards. Now I must admit that there were conservative enough people on the Board so that I got my way because they were anxious to not have the union control it either--for different reasons from mine. But I think it was a good thing and I think the Senate has done remarkably well. I think it's been very professional, very thoughtful. I admire the people enormously that have been in charge of it and I think for a fledgling organization, and at first not funded, they've done a remarkable job. They've earned an enormous amount of respect.

Paradigm C.

In this brief recounting of the environment in which the Senate achieved recognition as the representative of community college faculty, Trapnell portrayed the various players/actors and their positions in the action paths that led to Senate legal recognition. Clearly, there was an identification of power bases and how they would be shared or balanced. Player positions were highly interrelated to their past positions and the action taken (that of legal recognition of the Senate) reflected various organizational and personal goals. Here is another indication of the impact collective bargaining issues had on the negotiations and compromises that led to the Senate's recognition.

The next series of interview responses concentrate more directly on the respondent's view of the Senate's purposes. The respondents represent various elements of the Senate's environment.

McCallum Interview. Patrick McCallum, as Executive Director and Legislative Advocate for FACCC, interacted with the Academic Senate regularly in the highly politicized atmosphere of Sacramento where his office is located. This interview was taped and transcribed.

Prentiss: I know that you've interacted with the Senate for over a period of years, both personally and as part of you job. What's your perspective of it as a whole?

McCallum: The thing I remember my father (former Senate president) telling me is that when he testified in the Legislature, he got letters from Gary Hart and John Vasconellos. They were amazed that a group was coming in to talk about academic quality issues and not just about money and working conditions. I think that's something that the Academic Senate has followed in the purist sense. It's concerned about academic quality within the system. They have consistently talked about part-timer issues or about governance issues to the Board and the Legislature. I think they have been able to keep that image fairly well. I have been with FACCC for little over a year and had almost a weekly, if not more than that, dialogue with either Leon Baradat or Barbara Hinkley.

Paradigm A, C.

The reference here was to the commitment the Senate had to its goals, to its willingness to address selected problems (A). The frequent meetings with Baradat (Chair, Academic Senate Educational Policies Committee) and Hinkley (immediate Past President) illustrated McCallum's recognition of the many players and their shared power (C).

McCallum: I have been invited to address ten or 12 or 15 Academic Senates around the State. So I think that it has been a cordial and positive working relationship between the Academic Senate and FACCC for a number of years. It picked up more last year, partially because, I think, they had a trust in me because my father used to be a statewide Academic Senate President.

Paradigm C.

This is a clear reference to the importance of past positions and personalities in organizational behavior.

Pat Callan, Director, CPEC, responding to his view of the Senate's purpose.

Prentiss: What do you see as the goals the Senate pursues; what have their major efforts been directed toward?

Callan: I think it's usually improvement of the educational program. That seems to be what their meetings focus on, or on related areas. As far as the people who come in here and talk, those are the kinds of things they always are

most interested in discussing; they don't even complain about salaries.

Paradigm A.

The goal focus of the Senate in its concern for educational improvement provides the basis upon which their efforts are directed and leads to such activities as the meetings and interactions described.

Hughes Interview. Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes (D., Los Angeles) and her Legislative Analyst, Bill Chavez, contributed their perspective about the statewide Senate. At the time of the interview, Assemblywoman Hughes was the Chair of the Assembly Sub-Committee on Higher Education. She is currently the Chair of the Assembly Education Committee. This interview was not taped.

In response to the question, "What do you consider the goals of the statewide Academic Senate?", Chavez indicated that they have been issues of quality in education. Hughes used the Assembly Bill (2372) on Academic Master Planning (which was defeated), which mandated participation by faculty and administrators in academic planning, as an example of the kinds of issues the Senate supported.

Paradigm A.

The responses of Hughes and Chavez reflected the primary concern of the Academic Senate. Again, it is indicative of the focused effort by a centralized leadership to

portray the aims and purposes of the Senate as of primary importance in its relations with politicians.

Mary Lou Zoglin's responses to questions concerning the Senate purpose.

Prentiss: What would you say is the Academic Senate's purpose and what should the organization really concentrate on now and in the next five years?

Zoglin: Well, I guess number one, I think of the Senate most importantly as being a local. I would like to see the main emphasis on being involved in the local college, just as administrators as a group should be. I think their most important role should be what they're doing in their local college. I see the Senate at the State level as primarily interested in increasing the power of faculty members within the individual colleges. I see that as their primary goal, but I guess I don't think that's a worthy goal. There certainly does need to be some group that the Board of Governors can turn to for advice, and I think that is certainly an appropriate role.

Prentiss: Can you describe or define what an effective organization is? How would you characterize an organization as effective?

Zoglin: Those would be organizations which have goals and meet them. Yes, that's a good point and you know, what I see as a goal (power for the faculty) of the Academic Senate, that may be an implicit rather than an explicit goal. And,

therefore, the Senate was doing what its expected to; what the organization should be doing.

Paradigm A, B.

The two responses clearly indicate recognition of the effectiveness of the Senate in portraying its goals to a long-time Senate observer (A). Zoglin recognized that the Senate's behavior was appropriate because it was defined by the Senate's goals (B).

Barbara Hinkley. From Hinkley's point of view, the goals of the Academic Senate have never been lost. That is, one of the reasons why they have done so well is that they are an organization that lives by its goals. It has been focused organization. They began and ended their debates by asking fundamental questions, such as: Is this issue an Academic Senate function? Is this one of our goals and objectives, purposes? When I asked Hinkley why she thought the Senate had grown so much in influence in the last few years she said because we argued positions that were always on the "right side." We supported academic standards. We argued and supported positions that were pure. It's difficult to argue against standards, and it was difficult for the opposition to argue against the need for a balanced curriculum. The Senate took positions that are very much in line with the goals of the organization and tended always to be "operating with the angels; with motherhood and apple pie!"

Paradigm A.

Hinkley has identified the positions taken by the Senate as goal based, which is characteristic of the core of this paradigm. In her view, the Senate has chosen to take positions after careful evaluation of the issues and their relationship to the goals of the organization.

Jean Trapnell identified what she considered to be two problem areas for the Senate. Both were highly interrelated to the basic purposes of the Senate; i.e., representation of all community college faculty on academic and professional concerns and strengthening of local senates.

Trapnell: My first recommendation to the Senate is to have more representation from and interest in vocational education. I wanted them to change their title. I do not like the title of Academic Senate. I think it should be Faculty Senate.

Prentiss: Academic suggesting too much of the pure classroom . . .

Trapnell: That's right. And the vocational people are very touchy about this. They feel that the academic people look down on them. And they see it as an academic body. And I think that it should be either Academic/Vocational or, better than that, Community College Faculty Senate.

Paradigm A, C.

Trapnell referred to a generalized criticism of the

Senate in which she perceived there to be less than adequate representation of the vocational faculty by the Senate. The Senate must first recognize this as a problem, evaluate the alternatives, including Trapnell's suggestion, and make its choices. The willingness of the Senate, if it chooses to consider this recommendation, would be a clear recognition of environmental pressures (A). The players/actors (vocational people and Trapnell) and their past positions are clearly identified (C).

Prentiss: What's your observation concerning the local Senates?

Trapnell: I think the local Senates are having, at least I judge by the few that I hear from, a rough time with it. They don't have enough power; they don't have release time. I don't know whether the power should be, as it is now, through the state Senate; certainly that's important. But I think it's going to be more and more important that the local Senates be empowered to carry out, without any question, what the statewide Senate now has to gain for them at the state level. I think it's going to be very important.

Paradigm A, B, C.

Trapnell's references to the lack of power in the local senates focuses on one of the primary purposes of the Academic Senate--that of working to strengthen local academic senates (A). The procedures and activities which the Senate uses to meet this purpose are critical

(B), since the implication here is that the gains made at the State level by the Senate will be minimized unless the sub-units have a share in power bases to implement the gains (C).

As the final interview response statement, Andy Mason, one of the founders of the Senate and now retired, urged that the future be met with a continued dedication to the purpose for the Senate's existence.

Prentiss: What do you think is going to happen to the organization in the next five years?

Mason: I don't know. Of course right now, as long as they stick to their purpose, I can see it continuing to be a strong influence with the Board of Governors and the Legislature because I think they've developed an attitude in those bodies that this is an organization that is really dedicated to the improvement of education. They're not out there trying to get any self aggrandizement and what they're saying generally makes sense. I think so long as they stay in that realm and they don't get tied up with anybody, hang themselves up with some other group that has some axe to grind, I don't see any reason why they can't continue to have a strong, maybe even stronger, voice than most.

CCJCA has been after them for years. That's one of the major things I fought. Speak your own voice. And if you and they happen to agree on an issue, okay, go together and push

together. I mean to say that the faculty should stand on its own.

Paradigm A, C.

Mason has been a strong advocate of adhering to organizational goals and of exhibiting shared axioms and images of the organization (A). He recognized that there are other organizations in the environment and approved joint support of an issue, provided that the coalition is a result of choice (C).

Effectiveness Evaluation

Once the dissecting and sorting of the interviews was completed, 9 of the 11 interview respondents had contributed viewpoints and knowledge about the Senate purposes. Table 1 provides a quick reference guide to the names of respondents and number of statements analyzed by single or in combinations with other paradigm for this section.

Insert Table 1 about here

Several interesting patterns emerged from the analysis of this section. There were 10 statements reflecting Paradigm A behavior; no Paradigm B behavior; 5 statements reflecting Paradigm C. Four categories of paradigm combinations were identified: BC; ABC; AC; AB. No paradigm dominated the combination statements.

Of the 10 Paradigm A statements evaluated for strength

Table 1

Effectiveness Indicator of Interview Statements as to
Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions

Name	Effectiveness	Single			Effectiveness	Combination Paradigm											
	Indicator*	Paradigm			Indicator*												
		A	B	C		B	C	A	B	C	A	C	B	C			
MASON	E	3		1	E		1				2	1					
	ME				ME	1						1					
	NE				NE												
BISCHOF	E			1	E												
	ME	2			ME												
	NE	1			NE												
CONN	E			1	E												
	ME				ME												
	NE				NE												
HINKLEY	E	2		1	E	1				1							
	ME				ME		1										
	NE				NE			1	1								
CALLAN	E	1			E						1						
	ME				ME												
	NE				NE							1					
ZOGLIN	E				E								1	2			
	ME				ME												
	NE				NE								1				
TRAPNELL	E			1	E				1		1						
	ME				ME			1		1		1					
	NE				NE												
MCCALLUM	E			1	E							1					
	ME				ME						1						
	NE				NE												
HUGHES	E	1			E												
	ME				ME												
	NE				NE												

* E = Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; NE = Not Effective.

as indicators of Senate effectiveness, seven were Effective, two Moderately Effective, one Not Effective. Five Paradigm C statements were evaluated as Effective indicators of Academic Senate effectiveness. When totaled, the statements attributing effectiveness of the Senate to a single paradigm reflected 12 Effective statements, 1 Moderately Effective and 1 Not Effective (Table 2).

Six of the nine respondents included in this section provided statements about the Academic Senate's behavior which were determined to have elements of more than one of the paradigm (Table 1). Recall that the analysis of the interviews indicated the combination of paradigm and, within the analysis, the elements which were appropriate to the specific paradigm. These combination statements were further analyzed and the strength of the statements in the sub parts evaluated as indicators of Senate effectiveness as outlined previously. This revealed four Effective statements, two Moderately Effective and one Not Effective statements characterizing Paradigm A behavior. Four Effective and one Moderately Effective statements were identified as reflective of Paradigm B behavior. Concerning Paradigm C behavior, four Effective, four Moderately Effective and one Not Effective statements were identified.

Insert Table 2 about here

A matrix (Table 2) for the subanalyzed combination

Table 2

Summary Tables for Interview Statements by Single and
Combination Paradigm Indicating Effectiveness Indicator
for Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions

Single Paradigm	Effectiveness Indicator			T O T A L S
	E	ME	NE	
A	7	2	1	10
B	0	0	0	0
C	5	0	0	5
TOTALS	12	2	1	15

Combination Paradigm	Effectiveness Indicator			T O T A L S
	E	ME	NE	
A	4	2	1	7
B	4	1	0	5
C	4	4	1	9
TOTALS	12	7	2	21

statements revealed a total of 12 Effective, 7 Moderately Effective and 2 Not Effective statements for all three paradigm. Also, there were more Paradigm C behavior statements than A or B.

When the effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate is considered in light of the analysis of the interview responses, several observations can be made. Considering the statements which reflect Paradigm A characteristics, the Senate was clearly effective in meeting its purposes. The respondents also identified the Senate as effective when Paradigm C behavior was observed. This may seem inconsistent unless the importance of organizational goals to all three paradigm and to most definitions of organizational effectiveness are understood. Also, Paradigm C behavior identifies the fact that an actor's personal goals and the organization's goals often converge and result in organizational effectiveness.

The presence of Paradigm B behavior in the combination statements was an example of the way in which organizational routines mediate Paradigm A and Paradigm C behaviors. Also, the standard procedures which operate tend to be identifiable and, therefore, used by the actor in illustrating his/her response.

The primary observation for this section was the emergence and presence of combinations of behaviors characterizing the effectiveness of the Academic Senate as the actors revealed their thoughts and knowledge about the organization.

Not only were the combinations of paradigm identified but the indications were that the Senate was at least Moderately Effective in its behavior when juxtaposed against the various paradigm effectiveness characteristics.

Interestingly, respondent groups to the questionnaire provided a similar, at least Moderately Effective, evaluation of the Senate effectiveness in meeting its goals and purposes. The nature of the questionnaire eliminated the possibility of combination statements so all statements were juxtaposed against Paradigm A.

2. Effectiveness of Senate Activities

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is democratically founded in its representation of the faculty of the community colleges when speaking on academic and professional matters. The organization's primary responsibility is to make recommendations to the Board of Governors on educational issues such as academic standards, credentialing, curriculum, accreditation, professional growth, and other issues surrounding educational quality.

The Senate's involvement in academic and professional matters and, therefore, its representation of the college faculty occurs through a wide variety of activities, including sponsoring semi-annual conferences, forums on controversial topics, such as evaluation, basic skills, collective bargaining, academic standards. Senate members and officers serve on Chancellor's advisory committees, the Accreditation

Commission and visitation teams, Intersegmental Committee (CSU, UC, CC Academic Senate representatives), CPEC study committees and many, many others.

In 1978, the Board of Governors unanimously recognized the Senate as the representative of community college faculty concerning academic and professional matters. In 1980, the Legislature provided partial funding to accomplish the kinds of activities expected of a statewide senate. The University of California and California State University senates have set the example and provided the tradition of faculty participation in governance in California. Recognition of the statewide Academic Senate provided the basis for continuing this policy and for making the community colleges equal partners with the University of California and California State University in providing the best postsecondary education possible for students in California.

The combination of recognition and funding provided the Senate with an official place in the governance structure, thus assuring committee appointments and the necessary credentials, as well as financial support to represent faculty.

The activities undertaken in attempting to meet the purpose of the Senate have been very diverse. Efforts to coordinate and communicate the faculty point of view have taken many forms during the Senate's short (15-year) history. Responses analyzed in the following section are those of a wide variety of people who interact and participate with the Senate.

Edith Conn, Executive Committee member and Past President (1977-78), offers the initial commentary in relation to the age-old problem of communication.

Prentiss: Talking about communication, what about the newsletter and the various efforts at communication that have been made by the Senate?

Conn: None of them have been satisfactory. When you read the resolutions from the spring session, you know that the woman from Yuba College was very distressed. I think if we had a reliable office staff, although not everybody agrees with me, the Executive Committee's minutes could be sent out to the populace. The argument against that is two-fold: one is you can't send out unapproved minutes; the second one is they are too long. Both of those are really not valid. They can be overcome. They're mechanical things. Another concern is that the Senate may meet in September and the minutes would not be approved until October. By that time, the material is outdated or the people don't understand the arguments. I bring it up every year. We've had various elaborate schemes over the years. One of them was, and I remember doing this as Secretary, that the secretary would make a summation of the minutes and send that to one person in each area and that person would send it to the colleges in the area. None of these ideas ever worked out. The woman from Yuba brought this up but she wasn't alone. If you go through all the resolutions--and you'll see various resolutions--the implication in the end is we like what the Executive

Committee is doing. We like the prestige of the Senate, but we are worried that maybe (a) it has too much power; (b) it doesn't let us know what it is doing. Despite the newsletter to local presidents and despite other kinds of communication, none of that equals the specifics of the minutes.

Paradigm A, B.

The Senate Executive Committee seems to be at loggerheads with itself. On the one hand, it is goal-oriented and wants to convey a strong centralized, rational leadership which communicates its activities in the most accurate fashion (A). But its routines are not compatible with the desires of the membership (B). Though Conn has indicated that a variety of procedures have been tried, an impasse exists between the desire for centralized, uniform control of the information for the sake of clarity and accuracy (A) and the need of the sub-units to have information from a coordinated but unique leadership (B).

Prentiss: How was the President's newsletter established?

Conn: Wanda Munson (President, 1967-77) started it. She did a "What is the President of the Senate doing; what is the Senate in particular doing?" type of newsletter. It was just hard for her to keep that up with everything else she had to do. And, of course, the Senate had no funds. It was just impossible for her to do. But she did start it and she

started the directory. There never really was a directory of local senate presidents before that time.

Paradigm B.

The newsletter and directory represent early attempts at coordinated activities and of establishing standard operating procedures. Recognizing the importance of the Senate's environment, Munson was attempting to standardize the Senate's interaction with it.

The following comments are those of Barbara Hinkley, immediate Past President (1981-82).

In discussing the problems of communication, it seems that one of the biggest criticisms or one of the great sensitivities of the officers of the Executive Committee is hearing from the local senate presidents or delegates that they didn't get the information and don't know what's happening. At the extreme is the suggestion that the president and the Executive Committee are not representing the community college faculty member because they didn't ask them what their opinion was first.

Hinkley's response to this kind of criticism was that the Executive Committee mailed voluminous amounts of materials, pretty concise information, and that she felt that more had been done during her term of office in the way of keeping local presidents informed than ever before. Her concern and the Committee's is that the local senate presidents may not be disseminating the information and not only that, they may

not be reading it. I told her that I thought it might be interesting to see what the results of this study's questionnaire will be, since those are some of the questions that will be directed to the faculty members. We speculated that the results will indicate that the community college faculty member doesn't understand how their local senate activities relate to the statewide Academic Senate and how the statewide Academic Senate relates to any other body. She didn't know either, she said, until she got to working with it directly. So it becomes very difficult to try to solve the communication problem.

Paradigm B.

Hinkley voiced a genuine concern for the problem of how to keep the Senate members informed about how they are being represented. The Senate is structured on principles of democratic representation. The Executive Committee members are elected by the voting delegates--one per college--and these delegates are elected by the local senates. The standard procedure was for the communication to be channeled along these paths and in both directions. Representation is based on rather rigid procedures where information was provided by the subunits to the elected officers and by the officers to the membership through the representatives.

The activities or output of the Senate were founded in the resolutions developed and debated by the delegates and officers at the semi-annual conferences. This

prescriptive process may, at times, inhibit the work of the elected officers because position statements may be required in advance of a conference, causing the Executive Committee to be criticized for not asking the delegates to debate the issues first.

Hinkley said that she worked very hard producing periodic reports which were sent to the local senate presidents in an effort to keep them informed. A major break-through for the Senate was to achieve an agreement with the Chancellor's Office that every local senate president would be included in the distribution list of most mailings, especially if the subject has anything to do with the curriculum or with academic and professional behavior. The Senate considered that to be a major victory. If the local senate presidents will disseminate the information, she said, the community college faculty will be very well informed.

Paradigm B.

In addition to the Senate distributing information to local senate presidents, the Senate was successful in establishing a procedure whereby the Chancellor's Office would distribute its directives directly to local senate presidents. This procedure has been in effect since 1981 and is yet another example of the Senate leadership working to standardize interaction with its environment.

Patrick McCallum, Executive Director of FACCC,

considered the attainment of funding from the Legislature by the Senate as critical to the effectiveness of the Senate's activities.

Prentiss: Have you observed what you'd consider to be any real turning points in the development of the Academic Senate?

McCallum: The turning point was when they got funding from the State. Their conferences have been much better. There have been more conferences; the Executive Committee meets once a month; they're able to send their president to Sacramento more often. I think that was a big turning point for them. They're just able to be much more visible.

Paradigm B.

The Senate's success at routinizing its funding provided the opportunity to standardize its interaction with the environment--(FACCC, CPEC, Legislature, BoG, etc., its membership, the Executive Committee).

Mary Lou Zoglin believed that the state funding provided the Senate with a way to perform its activities, especially those in Sacramento, more effectively. But, Zoglin felt that there should be less concentration on statewide activities.

Zoglin: I had not thought of this earlier. I think, to me, the most dangerous part of the Academic Senate is that the Senators see the State as an instrument for getting things they cannot get locally and therefore they go to the State and ask the State to lay down rules and regulations

which, then, everybody in the State has to follow. I feel this is a major problem because I think it brings everyone back to the level of mediocrity; to a middle level.

Paradigm B.

This statement represented an observation of the Senate as operating primarily in a standardized model.

Edith Conn has been active in the Senate activities since 1970 and is recognized as a Senate archivist with substantial credentials.

Prentiss: What do you think are the most important things that the Senate has done; where it made its biggest impact?

Conn: Probably by participating in the studies of the Chancellor's Office which, in turn, has affected our local policies. One example would be the grading study that Mary Amber-Villa was the chair of. And then the General Education and Associate Degree Committee that Lloyd DeGarmo was a chair of. These were Chancellor's committees and Senate people that chaired them. Another example is the course classification which we didn't chair. But Leon (Baradat), as you know, was a very strong Senator and wrote the report and has been goading Jerry (Hayward) about it ever since. I think those, in terms of the statewide impact, would be extremely important, plus the latest, working with the Deans of Instruction, the AS-CIO Committee. They're doing all kinds of things

together. I understand the Telecommunications Committee is very active and is chaired by an Academic Senate appointee.

Prentiss: Those are activities which have occurred since 1978. I'm just trying to determine what preceded them.

Conn: One would have been evaluation, the thing, as we say, saved tenure but brought in instructor evaluation every two years. The big deal over collective bargaining. The Senate really was instrumental in saving local senates. We have had innumerable conferences on collective bargaining and resolutions that define what we felt the role of the Senate should be in placing restrictions on collective bargaining. We were instrumental in the passage of SB 160 (the collective negotiations law) which provided that the role of local senates not be tampered with by collective bargaining. We were very instrumental in the study on basic skills; sought continued support for the teaching of basic skills; asked for restrictions on what would apply for the associate degree. That really led into some of the credit/non-credit course classification issues.

Prentiss: Which also is directly related to the associate degree changes . . . it's kind of a web, isn't it?

Conn: Yes, one thing led to another.

Paradigm B, C.

Once the routine procedures are in place; i.e., right of appointments to key committees and standardized interaction with the various elements of the environment

occur, the various loosely coordinated activities of the organization become its aggregate behavior. In Paradigm B, the appropriate behavior of the loosely coordinated sub-units is defined by the organizational goals. Conn hinted at the importance of the players who are acting as committee chairs or members. This is more characteristic of Paradigm C.

Prentiss: Can you refresh my memory about the Senate's evaluation conference?

Conn: The conference would have been in the fall of 1970 because it was when Yates Greer was President and he was big on evaluation.

Prentiss: That was the year after the Stull Bill came in and before the Rodda Bill was passed and implemented. (Both Bills require evaluation of instructors. Stull pertains to K-12; Rodda to community colleges.) As it turned out, that was a particularly influential conference for Mira-Costa's evaluation procedure. I can see the direct relationship between our evaluation procedure and that conference.

Conn: That was true with Ventura, too. So that was Yates Greer's doing.

Paradigm A, B, C.

Prior to the time the Stull and Rodda Bills were passed, there was a strong pressure throughout California to eliminate tenure for teachers. The Rodda Bill represented a compromise, hammered out in conjunction with faculty, administrators and legislators--many actors,

many leaders, much conflict and compromise (C).

Early in the controversy, the Senate analyzed the criticisms as founded in the need for effective and regular evaluation. Tenure, in the eyes of the critics, prevented effective evaluation. The Senate responded to the threat to tenure with position directed in support of evaluation (A). In a collegial attempt to coordinate the many sub-units, faculty, administration, trustees and their various sub-groups, a statewide workshop/conference was called, inviting representatives from faculty, administration, and trustees from each campus to address the evaluation issues. The conference was well attended and a common information base was built (B). As the year wore on, every characteristic of Paradigm C came into operation, culminating in the Rodda Bill.

Prentiss: it seems that the Senate became very well known just prior to Proposition 13; some of this recognition seems to be associated with a survey that went to all colleges from the Senate in 1976 on grading standards.

Conn: Oh, that was Leon Baradat on Academic Standards. I was President then.

Prentiss: In talking with Baradat the other day, I said I remembered that survey because I was so interested at the time in how it was being conducted. He said he thought that maybe one of the results of the survey was that it provided the Senate with information that nobody else had at that

point, plus the times were such that everybody became interested in grade inflation.

Conn: It probably has to do with Leon (I'm sure it was his idea). It was called the Academic Standards Committee originally, and then we changed it to the Educational Policies Committee. That was Leon's Committee. It caused a lot of controversy, and it provided recognition for the Senate. It did get the attention of CPEC, although it's taken years for CPEC to really recognize the Senate.

Paradigm B, C.

Conn's reference to the Academic Standards Committee identified the Committee as a vital sub-unit of the Senate which gathered and contributed information about academic standards and grading policies unavailable from any other source. Use of this information became part of the Senate's aggregate behavior (B). Again, Conn hinted at the importance of the individual player--in this case Leon Baradat--which characterizes Paradigm C.

Patrick M. Callan, CPEC Director, provided an interesting assessment of the ways in which the Senate can play an effective role which was not identified in any definitions of effectiveness.

Prentiss: Of the most recent issues that the Senate's been involved with, such as the accreditation, general education, Associate Degree, academic standards, grading

policy, which do you think the organization influenced the most?

Callan: I honestly don't know. I mean, if you ask me that question about 10 issues that the Commission has been involved in and ask me to assess which one we have influenced the most or the least, it would be real hard. It is just too complicated to do that kind of sorting out. A lot depends on what you consider to be effective. I have a feeling that a lot of times, just the existence of an organization that's trying to protect the quality in the institutions keeps the worst from happening, even when it may be wrong in its position or when it loses. A lot of it is the environment. I think the one thing that the Senate has done, too, is that it's pretty much maintained its independence, which I like. I don't think it feels compelled to go the way of any other community college organization or group in the State. A lot of times there's been an issue in which the Senate sort of struck out on its own, at least in the sense of not joining up with another group, when there was a group.

Paradigm A, B, C.

Callan recognized the importance of the Senate's goal focus and independence, in spite of environmental pressures (A). Callan developed an interpretation of effectiveness behavior in this response which rested on (1) identifying the complex environment in which the Senate operates; (2) assessing the Senate's influence (very difficult); (3) recognizing the value of routinized

presence and visibility as a means for accomplishing some results (C,B).

Norbert Bischof who, like Edith Conn, has been active in the Senate for a long period of time, offered the following observation as the Fall 1983 Conference was coming to a close. He volunteered that he had a sense of a "coming together of the Senate;" of focused ideas and consensus to support academic standards, i.e., minimum competencies; of a desire to consult and participate; of less parochialism.

Paradigm C.

Bischoff's observation recognizes the coordinated effort and the behavior that the goals of the Senate define as appropriate. The consensus about minimum competencies is a significant organizational output.

Jean Trapnell, former Board of Governors member (1978-1982), has observed and interacted with the Senate over a number of years. In discussing her view of the Senate, Trapnell listed several concrete observations about Senate activities and suggested some courses of action for the Senate.

Trapnell: I have received the resolutions each year and have been pleased, generally, by the resolutions the Senators passed. But I have seen no emphasis of any real follow-up. If the opportunity arises, they have this background of believing in this or believing in that, but there is a lot of time and thought spent by faculty members in bringing these

resolutions up and getting them passed and there's no follow-up. For example, the community colleges are the only level of education that does not have entrance standards and they suffer a lot from this, particularly from CPEC. My suggestion was, and it was adopted by CPEC as one of the best suggestions several years ago and finally adopted by the Senate, that nobody in the community colleges be allowed to take a credit course who does not have either a high school diploma or has not passed the competency exam in high school. I know the exams differ, but they could arrange with the local high schools for their people who have not taken the exam to take it before they're allowed to register for credit classes for the Associate Degree.

Prentiss: Any credit classes, not just transfer level, any credit classes.

Trapnell: Any credit classes. The Senate passed that but the leadership has done nothing to bring it up. Now it may be that the Senate feels it's necessary to keep some resolutions in the background until the organization is more powerful. But the Senate has a perfect right to go to the Education Policy Committee of the Board and say, the Senate passed these resolutions and request that they be taken up with the Board; canvas the members as to whether they will make it a Board item, an agenda item. I think the Board would be happy with it because the Board wants to take leadership. But it has no way of doing it unless it's fed by groups like the Senate or the unions or the trustees.

Paradigm A, B.

The process of resolution writing is fundamental to the way the Senate establishes its positions. The information which supports the resolutions is provided by the sub-units of the Senate and is critical to the coordinated leadership behavior (B). The implication here is that the Executive Committee may have decided not to advocate this resolution (A) or that its standard procedures allowed this resolution to be overlooked (B).

Trapnell: I looked over the latest Annual Report and I think the number of committees is overwhelming. Incidentally, the same people appear on any number of committees. There are 14 Chancellor's committees in which the Senate has members; 3 Senate committees; 9 liaison committees; and 6 more with community college organizations. Now that means that a fairly small group of people participate on all the committees. For instance, there is one member that is on six committees.

I think there is not enough delegation of authority to make statewide decisions. It seems to me that the Executive Committee should have more power and maybe one or two people should have more power; I don't know. That may come with time.

Paradigm A.

Trapnell's criticisms are based on what she perceives as the Executive Committee's tendency to be composed of individuals who are long-time participants in the Senate

and of the tendency to appoint a small group of individuals to committees. This behavior is characteristic of the Paradigm A behavior demonstrated by a rational, unified, leadership which is centrally controlled and whose representatives can convey shared axioms and images.

Robert Prescott served as President of the California Community College Trustees and President of the MiraCosta Community College District Board of Trustees simultaneously in 1981-1982. His comments were directed toward the value of activities which promote interaction with faculty and they with trustees--key actors in each other's environments.

Prescott: I did attend the Senate meetings and, once, I think I was the only Trustee there at the conference. I found it very beneficial to me to be there and then, of course, I represented CCCT to the Senate. I enjoyed it because, frankly, I found that it was helpful to me and I think helpful to the association to have somebody there from the outside. I learned a lot just by sitting and listening to professionals talk among themselves. You get into a lot of details and mechanical problems and, in those terms, I think it reveals a lot of attitudes that don't ordinarily come forth. So I found out a lot and at the same time, I was able to occasionally interpose an idea to bring people back to reality.

Paradigm C.

Prescott recognized the mutual value of hearing other players' position statements and how past positions and personality affect their analysis of the situation.

Prentiss: Do you see that the leadership in CCCT is going to continue to have an interest in some kind of an association with the Senate?

Prescott: I think they should. Whether they do or not, I think probably depends somewhat on the personalities involved. There are some of us who felt this is necessary and also had the time and interest to devote to it. I think there is a recognition that this "press servicing" of ideas, if nothing else, is extremely beneficial. I know I certainly tried to promote it. Francis Compton (Past President, CCCT) did also.

Paradigm C.

Prescott recognizes clearly the the importance of individual players in determing the continuation of organizational activities. This is especially true where informal activities are concerned.

Gus Guichard is Executive Vice Chancellor for the California Community Colleges. In a discussion between meetings at the Fall 1982 Conference, he shared some of his preliminary thoughts about the Senate's need to identify potential Academic Senate leaders. This interview was not taped.

Months earlier, Guichard spoke at the Spring 1982 Senate Conference and recounted the Senate's many past achievements and its current meaningful contributions which have resulted in a focused organization whose advice is being sought by CPEC, the Legislature, Board of Governors, and Chancellor's Office. Concomitant with this change in status, Guichard challenged the Senate to address organizational issues: development of a core of leadership trainees, assurance of a representative membership, commitment to the whole community college system. He concluded by commending the Senate for advancing the causes of quality education and open access (Note 7).

When the opportunity to interview Guichard arose, the remarks outlined above provided the central theme. Guichard indicated a real concern for the apparent lack of a "leadership training program" within the Senate. He didn't see any plan and for leadership development. He believed that for the Senate to progress and maintain its momentum, the organization would have to begin an effort to actively train and provide Senate members with appropriate leadership experiences.

Paradigm A.

The suggestion made by Guichard for a planned program that is an ongoing one is characteristic of this paradigm. The Senate must first evaluate the suggestion and identify the problem. The activity represents an organizational choice (A).

Guichard expressed the concern that many of the same faces are seen year after year and, while this has advantages, there are disadvantages, too. He indicated that credibility based on individuals is short-lived. When they leave, so does the credibility--and he had the feeling that this was the current situation.

Paradigm A.

Guichard's main concern was that he doesn't think the Senate has recognized the problem he has identified yet because the organization is so busy reacting to and dealing with current problems. Guichard suggested that strong, unified action on the part of the centralized leadership was an organizational choice of primary importance.

The concern identified by the Modesto College Senate president in the "Local Senates, Local Concerns Session" of the Fall 1982 Conference was that the senate presidents often don't have leadership skills and urged the Senate to provide workshops to help senate presidents. While talking, Guichard developed a suggestion which he said he hadn't thought about previously. His suggestion was that the Senate adopt a plan and seek foundation funding for the purpose of identifying potential leaders and providing them with opportunities to experience a wide variety of activities--preparing and testifying before legislative committees, interacting with committee members, working with CPEC, etc. Included should be some form of financial support for the participants.

Paradigm A, B.

Both the Modesto College Senate President and Guichard have identified an interrelated problem. Often leadership is identified in the local senates and is tapped by the Senate. Both are suggesting that the Senate act on their suggestions and identify, evaluate, consider alternatives and make organizational choices in a Paradigm A manner. Also, both individuals have provided concrete suggestions for programs and procedures to address the problems and make the programs ongoing organizational activities (B).

Effectiveness Evaluation

The actors interviewed provided insight to the effectiveness of the activities of the statewide Academic Senate. In revealing their knowledge and insight, they identified behavior reflective of all three paradigm. Once again, the statements analyzed illustrated single paradigm and paradigm in combination behavior characteristics (Table 3).

Insert Table 3 about here

Nine of the 11 respondents were included in this section. They contributed statements about the Senate activities, including three which illustrated Paradigm A behavior, five Paradigm B and three Paradigm C behavior. When the strength of each statement was juxtaposed against the

Table 3

Effectiveness Indicator of Interview Statements as to
Academic Senate Activities

Name	Effectiveness Indicator*	Single Paradigm			Effectiveness Indicator*	Combination Paradigm								
		A	B	C		A	B	B	C	A	B	C		
CONN	E				E	1	1	2		1	1	1		
	ME		1		ME									
	NE				NE				2					
HINKLEY	E		2		E									
	ME				ME									
	NE				NE									
MCCALLUM	E		1		E									
	ME				ME									
	NE				NE									
ZOGLIN	E		1		E									
	ME				ME									
	NE				NE									
CALLAN	E				E					1	1	1		
	ME				ME									
	NE				NE									
BISCHOF	E				E									
	ME			1	ME									
	NE				NE									
TRAPNELL	E	1			E									
	ME				ME	1	1							
	NE				NE									
PRESCOTT	E			2	E									
	ME				ME									
	NE				NE									
GUICHARD	E	1			E		1							
	ME	1			ME	1								
	NE				NE									

* E = Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; NE = Not Effective.

effectiveness criteria of the paradigm behavior, a total of eight statements were viewed as Effective--two, Paradigm A; four, Paradigm B; two, Paradigm C (Table 4). Three statements were considered Moderately Effective--one reflecting behavior characteristic of each paradigm. There were no Not Effective statements when the responses were juxtaposed against a single paradigm.

Insert Table 4 about here

Four of the respondents in this section contributed AB, BC and ABC combination statements (Table 3). Note that Paradigm B was present in all combinations. Using the method described previously, the combination statements were sub-analyzed and revealed five Paradigm A, seven Paradigm B and four Paradigm C statements. When these statements were evaluated as indicators of effectiveness based on the previously outlined criteria, a total of 11 statements (3 A; 6 B; 2 C) were Effective. Three were Moderately Effective (2 A; 1 B) and two Not Effective (C) (Table 4). Whether the statements identified behavior of a single paradigm or paradigm in combination, Paradigm B behavior characteristics dominated this section (Table 3).

There is little question that the activities of an organization often reflect its purposes and function. The survey items discussed in Chapter VI indicate a variety of activities in this section of the questionnaire which

Table 4

Summary Tables for Interview Statements by Single and
Combination Paradigm Indicating Effectiveness Indicator
for Academic Senate Activities

Single Paradigm	Effectiveness Indicator			T O T A L S
	E	ME	NE	
A	2	1	0	3
B	4	1	0	5
C	2	1	0	3
TOTALS	8	3	0	11

Combination Paradigm	Effectiveness Indicator			T O T A L S
	E	ME	NE	
A	3	2	0	5
B	6	1	0	7
C	2	0	2	4
TOTALS	11	3	2	16

reflect Paradigm A behavior. The respondents to the survey evaluated the Senate Not Effective to Moderately Effective concerning the identified activities, while those interviewed evaluated the Senate as very Effective in their observations about the activities of the Academic Senate.

The point is not to compare the responses to concrete questionnaire statements with the responses of elite respondents. Rather, it is to offer an observation. It appears that the opportunity to provide an expanded explanation of one's knowledge or insight about the effectiveness of Senate activities which reflect organizational goals may identify behavior which is more often characteristic of the routines and procedures of Paradigm B. Further, the opportunity to add detail to one's response may account for the Effective evaluation of Senate activities provided by those interviewed. Clearly, knowledge about the Senate of those interviewed (and the opportunity to express it) was the single most important factor contributing to their evaluation of the Academic Senate.

Once again, there were distinct examples of the behavior of several paradigm being observed simultaneously and effectively.

3. Effectiveness of Senate Representation

In response to the questionnaire, one college president included the comment: "No one person or organization 'bats 1000' in these hectic and complex arenas." A senate

president commented: "It is probably impossible to represent the great diversity which exists." This comment was received from a faculty member: "I think in educational matters the Senate has been terrific. In response to 'new' types of students, very conservative." Another faculty respondent commented: "The Academic Senate has become 'too academic' and is overly concerned with standards. Also, it seldom reflects the concerns of vocational education."

The success of the Senate in representing faculty professional concerns is based largely on the willingness of individuals to be active in local governance and, subsequently, to participate in statewide Senate activities. The organizational structure is democratic and representative. Through this process, albeit a filtering process, the Senate leadership receives its strongest indication about how to represent faculty. There is great diversity with the community college faculty and in the total environment of the Senate.

The interview responses that follow center on representation and its relationship to leadership in the Senate.

Mary Lou Zoglin offered her observations from the very broad perspective of the need for one voice to speak for the faculty to the Board of Governors and other agencies.

Prentiss: You mentioned that you could see some problems or had experienced some problems with the concept of a single voice as representative . . .

Zoglin: Number one, it's very difficult to get a state-wide voice. We have a Board of Governors not because the Legislature wanted to run a system, but because the legislators wanted one voice for the colleges.

Paradigm A.

There is a certain futility about the desire of any organization to be the sole voice of so many diverse others or to have to listen to only one voice. The "sole voice" syndrome is an attempt to at least control, or even eliminate, many of the behavior characteristics of Paradigm C.

Zoglin: I think the problem often with the faculty voice for the community colleges is one of numbers. You have 107 colleges that are all so different. You have one or two faculty representatives on the committee and, depending upon what kind of college they come from, their own experiences are absolutely different. So when you get to the State level, you have a committee on which you will have two or three faculty people, a couple administrators, and a couple trustees. The trustees and administrators are more likely to have been involved in the whole picture in their own district. Whereas when faculty representatives come, the Senate has developed a cadre of maybe a dozen people over the years who do have the broader picture, from a discipline/orientation. A faculty representative on a committee for general education or something like that might have wildly different views from any other faculty member and from anyone else on

the committee. Therefore, when the Senate speaks before the Board of Governors as the Senate and with its leadership, I think that it's in good shape. I think it's more a problem when the Board of Governors says to the Senate (and I happen to think it is the right way to appoint members to a committee), we need two or three members to be on this committee. They can turn out to be people who aren't truly representative of the faculty voice statewide. That, to me, has been a very great weakness of the Senate at the State level.

Paradigm C.

The players and their positions are identified with the implication that their actions are often based on inconsistent objectives and a wide variety of personal and professional goals.

Patrick M. Callan, as Director of CPEC, has the opportunity to observe and interact with a wide variety of individuals representing organizations.

Prentiss: How would you characterize the leadership of the Senate that you've come in contact with?

Callan: I would say that we've had some people who have been just first rate. I have done this kind of work for 11 years in three different states, and I'd say we've had some people who have been as competent and thoughtful and effective in playing the leadership role as any faculty leaders that I've ever dealt with. We've had some that have been just kind of "out-of-it." Probably did no good or did no

harm. Again this is from my perspective, from up here. And we've had at least one that's been, maybe because of personal style more than substance, just terribly abrasive and not well received. It's just real hard; I mean, it's all a function of people in the last analysis and no organization is going to be able to cough up an outstanding person every time around, I don't think. The best people probably have been a little better than most others. As soon as you get into any kind of statewide responsibilities in the State, in any segment, it's just a whole sort of different environment. You're dealing with people and organizations that you've never heard of before. I think it's fairly perplexing.

Paradigm C.

Characteristic of this paradigm is its display of the players as vital to producing organizational action.

Callan's description of the Senate players illustrates the importance of their personalities, positions, and behaviors.

Prentiss: From your observations and interactions working with the university's senates and the statewide Academic Senate, do you think they really represent their constituencies effectively?

Callan: I think the problem with the community college Senate that the other two Senates don't have is just that the other two Senates are relating to a centralized, legally constituted governing board. The two problems that I see with this community college Senate, one, and it's a fairly common

criticism, the Senate's strength around the State is uneven. There are areas of the State where there isn't much interest and there isn't much going on, and there are areas where the Senate is fairly significant. Secondly, I think the Senate tends to represent the more academically-oriented faculty which is not all the community colleges are.

Paradigm B, C.

The basic criticism here is a structural one over which the Senate has no control which addresses the community college system problem of having one Board of Governors attempting to govern the system but with each district having its own local board of trustees. Consequently, local senates and the Academic Senate must interact with districts and State agencies. As a result, great diversity in governance has been present, making any centrally controlled, unified leadership difficult. What is left is a loosely coordinated group of sub-units (local senates) which may be very parochial in interests (B). The indication that the Senate's influence throughout the State is uneven and that it tends to represent the more academically-oriented faculty are criticisms which were discussed most recently, to some extent, in the Senate President's day-long workshop which was part of the Fall 1982 Conference (C). Apparently, the procedures, programs and coordination of sub-units by which the Senate operates have not been addressing these problems adequately--at least from Callan's perspective (B).

The question as to whether the Senate represents all of the community college faculty has been raised previously. In response to how the teaching disciplines were reflected in the Executive Committee, Edith Conn offered her perspective, extending over thirteen years.

Prentiss: Do you have any feel for the teaching disciplines that are reflected in Executive Committee?

Conn: We've tried to balance them in the past. I think it just kind of goes in waves. There was a time when Don McCuen and Walt McCallum were chemistry teachers. But lately we have Jonnah Laroche, Tyra Duncan-Hall and Susan Pettit who all run tutoring centers. We have, I think, three foreign language teachers--Alexandrina Esparza, Alfredo Mendoza and Carmen Decker all teach Spanish. I think Steve Ruis teaches chemistry. Barbara Hinkley teaches sociology. Bob Silverman is in biology. Leon Baradat was a political scientist.

Prentiss: Have you ever come across any others in dance, physical education?

Conn: I don't think anyone else (Conn teaches in these areas) has ever been elected. Where we have been weak is in the vocational areas. You know, we really haven't had, as I recall, someone like a welding teacher. We had several business people, like Len Herzstein and others, in the past. There were one or two treasurers who taught accounting.

Paradigm A.

The Senate has been recognized as the representative for the California community college faculties. Here is an

identified problem for which the Senate has not yet chosen a course of action to establish procedures which would attempt to guarantee stronger representation from vocational areas.

During the interview with Barbara Hinkley, we talked extensively about what motivated her to become President, how she felt once she was in office, and whether she had given consideration to running for a second term. She said that initially she was interested in specific issues and resolving some of those issues. This was in her early days of participating in the Senate. Then, as she became more involved in the statewide Academic Senate during the period of time she was Treasurer, she began to become very aware of the inter-relationships of a given issue to a philosophical grounding. That philosophical foundation about the relationship of individual issues to a bigger picture then grew into a broader understanding as she became more involved with the Senate. It became a much broader understanding of how community colleges interfaced with each other, with other segments of higher education, with the State Legislature, and, of course, the economy in general.

Much of what Hinkley and I discussed had to do with her most immediate experience as Senate President. She's been active in the Senate for about five years, following her term of office as Senate President at Palomar College. It was as a local president that she first came in contact with the

Academic Senate. By her own admission, she did not know the relationship between the two organizations at the time she was elected President of her local senate.

We discussed the leadership role of the Academic Senate President and the question of how the Executive Committee or statewide Senate identified and encouraged potential leaders. She stated that the program for leadership identification was somewhat unstructured, but the foundation was a form of networking. Also, she indicated several examples of individuals who just emerged. Local senate presidents and delegates attend conferences, and they may or may not identify themselves or be identified as potential leaders. The statewide Academic Senate circulates to every delegate, the Executive Committee and local president, a sheet which asks them to indicate whether they are interested in becoming active in the statewide Academic Senate, either on committees or as an officer. Also, it requests their areas of interest and expertise. When appointments are made, they often result from meeting and observing people at conferences, from resolution writing sessions, from statements made by Senators from the floor at conferences, as well as from the sheets on which the delegates indicated that they were interested in participating and that they have certain areas of expertise. The leadership identification potential then rests upon the individual who says, "I want to be there" the personal motivation of the individual.

Paradigm B.

The identified leadership development activities were formalized by established practice more than by any long-range planning or evaluation process. Based on a review of the Executive Committee minutes, there wasn't any indication that leadership development had been considered a problem. There was some indication that some members and other elements in the Senate's environment (Prescott interview, comments on questionnaires from all groups, Guichard's comments) considered leadership development worthy of serious planning.

According to Hinkley (1983), certain committee appointments are made only from Executive Committee members. The Senate's position is that any committee that can influence the academic and professional life of the community college instructor should be appointed by the Academic Senate as it is the body that represents the community college instructors. Chancellor Craig stipulated this policy at the time the Senate was recognized in Title V. On the other hand, many committee appointments are made from current Executive Committee members because Executive Committee members meet on a regular basis, making communication easier. Also, they have access to more current, generalized information.

Paradigm A.

The appointment of key committee members from among the Executive Committee is a method of maintaining a unified, centralized leadership. The practices associated

with committee appointments have been standardized and are coordinated by the leadership. Implied throughout this response is that the potential committee appointees are very important to the organization's goals (A).

Andy Mason's comments offered a more in-depth look at the motivation for an individual to participate in Senate leadership roles over a long period of time.

Prentiss: Where do Senate leaders come from?

Mason: Well, actually, it's an assembly of people who come from local senates, so obviously they're leaders of some kind on their campuses to begin with. And they're elected to this, so they're leaders to begin with when they get to the delegate assembly.

Prentiss: So the training process is going on on the individual campuses.

Mason: Oh, yes; you've skimmed the top, generally speaking, of the campuses.

Prentiss: Do you think that's an exhaustible supply of leadership? I mean, given that there's not much turnover on the individual campuses, are they going through their second and third terms in office?

Mason: Oh, yes, a lot of people. Like I stayed there 11 years because I felt I wanted to be there and a lot of people are doing that. Although every year, there is a turnover in people from the various colleges. This turnover is highly desirable. And there's also a turnover in the people

who get elected to the Executive Committee. There's a certain number who run for re-election and stay on and then there's a certain number who can't. The Bylaws were changed allowing a person who was on the Executive Committee, even though he/she is no longer the delegate from his/her college, to run for re-election.

Paradigm B.

Mason suggests that leadership development is really under the control of the local senates. The sub-unit colleges provide the leadership which has gone through a screening process on the individual campuses.

Robert Prescott, representing a trustee perspective, volunteered the following comments, indicative of why he believed that the Senate is not representative of all faculty.

Prescott: My observation is that the Academic Senate doesn't represent the entire faculty. It should. If you look at the composition of the Academic Senate, you'll get academic types. I'm talking about those that show up at the meetings. You will invariably have about two, maybe three, from the vocational areas, paraprofessionals, whatever you want to call that side of what we do. I think the whole tone of the Academic Senate is academic. So that you're representing, actually, more the transfer function of the community colleges than you are its broad mission.

Prentiss: Why do you think that exists and why does it

seem to be a perpetuating kind of thing? Do you have any particular observations? Is it the name of the organization?

Prescott: I don't know; I could only speculate. Whether it's the personality or the type that gets in front of the faculty; maybe it's just in the intellectual aspects of the thing; maybe we have more part-time . . . teachers in the present professional world that don't feel the dedication. It does exist. That, in some respects, has made it a little bit difficult for the other segments (trustees, Chancellor) to work with the Senate because it is a limited representation. It's rather interesting because at the same time, what the colleges are doing is moving into the paraprofessional fields. This is part of the problem, as I see it, with the Academic Senate and who they represent and who they should represent.

Paradigm A.

The purposes and aims of the Academic Senate are to represent the community college faculty. Prescott indicated that he perceives the representation of the vocational faculty to be lacking (A).

Patrick McCallum, in his role as FACCC's legislative advocate, indicated his belief in the importance of political effectiveness in the representation/leadership process.

Prentiss: Generally speaking, how would you characterize the leadership of the Senate?

McCallum: I think the Senate leadership has been extremely good. Extremely good. I've been very impressed with the quality of the Executive Board and its leadership; generally, it tends to be better than other faculty associations.

Prentiss: Do you think that there's a problem, and this could be true in FACCC as well as the Senate, in training people to be leaders in an organization where the turnover is structured the way it is?

McCallum: Well, I think there's an inherent problem in being a faculty member for 12-15 years in a classroom and then taking on a statewide association, politically, with a different kind of environment. Some can adapt to it and some can't. Faculty members tend not to be very sophisticated, politically.

Prentiss: How do you learn to be politically effective?

McCallum: I've talked about this many times - when I worked with Baskin, Sollis and other people--and I think it's a natural gift that people have. You may learn it over three or four years, but part of that is just that some people have it and some people don't. It just amazes me; some legislators just have this natural gift. Also, lobbyists up here. How do you learn it? The way we're (FACCC) doing it is by orchestrating workshops.

Paradigm C, B.

Given the importance of the player's personality/

position (C), the learning opportunities directed to developing political effectiveness must occur through established organizational programs (B).

Effectiveness Evaluation

Seven of the 11 respondents reflected on the effectiveness of the Senate in representing community college faculty. It was interesting to note that the statements identifying single paradigm behavior were more evenly spread among the paradigm than they were in the two previous sections (Table 5). There were four Paradigm A and two Paradigm B and C statements. One category of combination statements was identified: BC. Again, Paradigm B was present in all combinations (Table 5).

Insert Table 5 about here

When the four Paradigm A statements were juxtaposed against the paradigm effectiveness criteria, one was considered Effective, two Moderately Effective, and one Not Effective. The Paradigm B and C statements each indicated one Effective and one Moderately Effective indicators of effectiveness (Table 6).

Insert Table 6 about here

Two of the 7 actors interviewed offered observations

Table 5

Effectiveness Indicator of Interview Statements as to
Academic Senate Representation

Name	Effectiveness Indicator*	Single Paradigm			Effectiveness Indicator*	Combination Paradigm							
		A	B	C		A	B	C	A	B	B	C	
ZOGLIN	E				E								
	ME			1	ME								
	NE	1			NE								
CALLAN	E			1	E						1		
	ME				ME								
	NE				NE							1	
CONN	E				E								
	ME	1			ME								
	NE				NE								
HINKLEY	E	1	1		E								
	ME				ME								
	NE				NE								
MASON	E				E								
	ME		1		ME								
	NE				NE								
PRESCOTT	E				E								
	ME	1			ME								
	NE				NE								
MCCALLUM	E				E						1	1	
	ME				ME								
	NE				NE								

* E = Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; NE = Not Effective.

Table 6

Summary Tables for Interview Statements by Single and
Combination Paradigm Indicating Effectiveness Indicator
for Academic Senate Representation

Single Paradigm	Effectiveness Indicator			T O T A L S
	E	ME	NE	
A	1	2	1	4
B	1	1	0	2
C	1	1	0	2
TOTALS	3	4	1	8

Combination Paradigm	Effectiveness Indicator			T O T A L S
	E	ME	NE	
A	0	0	0	0
B	2	0	0	2
C	1	0	1	2
TOTALS	3	0	1	4

about the Senate which contained elements of more than one of the paradigm. When these statements were analyzed by sub-parts, there were no Paradigm A indicator statements, two Paradigm B and three Paradigm C indicator statements (Table 6).

When the sub-parts of the combination statements were juxtaposed against the effectiveness characteristics of Paradigm A, none were identified. For Paradigm B, two Effective indicators were identified. In the case of Paradigm C, one Effective and one Not Effective indicator statements were identified. When these statements were totaled, three were present in the Effective, zero in the Moderately Effective, and one in the Not Effective categories (Table 6).

To the extent that the Senate's effectiveness in representing community college faculty was explored by those interviewed, several observations can be made. First, the Senate is Effective and second, the organization exhibited behavior and effectiveness characteristics which were more uniformly spread among all paradigm than in the previous sections. It would appear that organizational activities which are viewed as primarily concerned with representation of faculty are goal founded, procedurally responsive and flavored with political interaction. Clearly, the behavior and effectiveness characteristics of all three paradigm were present - often simultaneously.

The interview respondents appeared to evaluate the Academic Senate as more Effective in representing community

college faculty than did the respondents to the survey questionnaire. The opportunity to expand on one's responses, as was the case with those interviewed, may explain the discrepancy, as well as the identification, of Paradigm A and C behavior characteristics by those interviewed.

4. Political Effectiveness of the Senate

Weber (1947, p. 401) identified the major concern of collegiality to be centered around the question of specific social relationships of groups which function to limit authority. Collegiality provides for discussions which expose different points of view and make compromise possible. While power is, to a large extent, structural in collegial organizations, there are many lateral networks of peers, interest groups, coalitions and cliques which mediate the lines of authority and control (Blankenship, 1977, p. 330). Blankenship (p. 39) identified some elements of political activity in collegial organizations (coalition, bargaining and negotiation, interest groups).

In the political model, organizational action results from bargaining and compromise, and decisions rarely reflect the sole preference of any group or sub-unit within the organization. "Political models of choice further presume that when preferences conflict, the power of the various social actors determines the outcome of the decision process" (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 28).

A Senate position paper, "Rationale for the Inclusion of

ASCCC in Title V", developed the position that with Title V recognition, ASCCC and the Board of Governors could operate in a collegial rather than adversarial manner. It was further indicated that greater interaction with the CPEC, UC, CSU, Legislature, Board of Governors, and the Chancellor's Office would occur (Note 5).

The point is that the Senate has been an advocate of collegiality. Its environment is highly political. Power is structural. Until the Senate became part of the structure, i.e., recognized in Title V, it was not in a position to influence according to either model. The collegial and political models have some differences, but the models have significant similarities, namely negotiation and compromise. However, it has only been in the last five years that the Senate has been recognized and, therefore, able to participate fully in the environment.

The following section focuses on the views of the interview respondents concerning the Senate's political effectiveness.

Patrick M. Callan, Director of CPEC, offered these observations about the appropriate role of the Senate in the political arena.

Prentiss: Do you have any feel for the function of the Senate as it relates to the political scene in Sacramento?

Callan: I think especially since it's partly funded by the State that to be perceived as a lobby organization would

not be a wise thing to do. What I think the Senate should be doing is making people aware of educational issues. The problem is that up here, you get into finance bills and related issues and people tend to forget what the enterprise is all about. I think the Senate has created an awareness about educational issues but I'm never quite sure. There are so many actors in the area, you're never really sure who's done what to whom by the time we get through with the piece of legislation.

Paradigm C.

Clearly, Callan has identified the muddle of players and the confusion and compromise that surrounds everyday political activity.

Prentiss: How would you describe the role and relationship of the Senate to the Legislature, to CPEC and to the Board of Governors?

Callan: I can't really say about the Legislature. I don't see it as being one of the key political groups in the community colleges in the Legislature and I'm not sure it should be. I guess my general sense about the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office is that, from where I sit, the Academic Senate represents a set of pressures forcing concern about educational issues. I see the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office having a very, very difficult time exercising leadership on educational issues. I think, in the finance area, the Board has been much stronger. The Academic Senate represents pressure for the Board to

look at things in educational terms. I think in the Senate, to some extent, that there are issues that are very real issues in community colleges in the State. One of them that we point to a lot is this whole question of the transfer function and what's happening to it. The Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors should have gotten a hold of that issue by now; they should be looking at it in a very public, intense way. The Senate has been willing to look at it. They've been willing to talk about it. I see them as probably one of the few groups which represents that kind of pressure on the Board.

Paradigm A, B, A.

The transfer function is one of the academic concerns of the Senate (A). Through its routinized access to the Board of Governors, the organization (B) can actively speak out about this issue as a matter of organizational choice (A).

Callan: I think that was basically what we had hoped the Senate would do when Craig and I tried to get some funding for it. I think, as far as the Commission (CPEC) goes, the Senate is interested not in all the issues we deal with but more with those that affect the curriculum. Senators have tended, most of the time, to monitor us very closely, to be in touch with our people who are doing work that they thought was of importance. They're pretty well known around here; they have good access. We've had our share of differences with Senate members but that's true with any group in

higher education in the State. You can't do what we're supposed to do and expect it to be accomplished without disagreements.

Paradigm A, C.

Callan has suggested that the Senate has maintained the goals and focus on the goals that was intended by those who were instrumental in incorporating the organization into the governmental structure (A). Additionally, he has indicated the Senate is selective in its concerns and activities but that conflict and compromise are everyday, acceptable occurrences (C).

Callan: I've been sort of involved as an observer of the work the Senate has been doing with the other two senates on developing these statements of basic skills (reading, writing, computation) competency levels for students planning to do college work. I would not have guessed we could have gotten the three senates to agree on anything. The first time I worked in California (10 years ago), I don't think we could have. So I think that it's both substantively and symbolically important; there's always some give-and-take in that process; it's hard. But I think it's a good thing; it's the kind of leadership we should be able to look to from faculty organizations that wasn't mandated by us (CPEC), the Legislature or anybody else.

Prentiss: How did the three senates begin to interact?

Callan: The leadership of the three senates has been meeting and I think it probably came out of those kinds of

discussions, but I don't know exactly who proposed it and when. I think interacting with the other two senates is a significant thing for them to be doing.

Paradigm C.

The focus is on the interrelationship of the three senates and their respective leaders. Clearly, Callan has identified the development of the competency statements as a bargaining process involving personal and organizational goals and priorities of the many actors in the political environment.

Patrick McCallum, Executive Director of FACCC, advocated the Senate becoming more involved in politics while carefully protecting what he identified as its purist image.

McCallum: One of the concerns that I have is for the Academic Senate's deeper involvement in politics. My feeling was that it needed to become more involved. But, in becoming more involved politically, they would ruin part of their purist foundations concerning academic quality. What we're (FACCC) generally saying to the Senate is FACCC is almost right down the line in agreement with the Academic Senate. Think of us as your lobbying advocacy group and try to develop a relationship in that way. That is definitely being used but is not a policy of the Academic Senate. My feeling is that the Academic Senate has to be careful with its political advocacy. It should be the group that hears the accurate information; should testify as people concerned with academic

quality and on-site experience with the issues that face college faculty members. But to go in and wheel-and-deal and lobby and politicize, I felt might ruin some of the purist respect that it has among the Legislature, CPEC and the Board of Governors.

Paradigm A, B, C.

McCallum's suggestion is that the Senate continue to articulate its focused goals, choosing carefully from among the issues so as to maintain its purist image (A). that the routinized procedures be used for testifying before the Legislature, Board of Governors, and CPEC as academics (B), while recognizing and participating in the political world of conflict and compromise through cooperative efforts with FACCC as the lobbyist (C). Organizational activity is the result of bargaining among groups and individuals (C).

Prentiss: How effectively do you think the Senate deals with CPEC and the Board of Governors?

McCallum: Generally, I think the Senate has been more effective with CPEC, not in creating policy, but in its testimony before CPEC, than it has with the Legislature and the Board of Governors. I think this is true because the Senate tended to focus on one or two issues. CPEC looks to the Academic Senate for input and, in general, I think we (FACCC and the Senate) start off with the same concerns.

Lobbying CPEC is much different than lobbying the Board of Governors. Jerry Hayward (Chancellor, California

Community Colleges) tends to look at things from a political perspective because he's in much more of a political position than Pat Callan (Director, CPEC) is.

Paradigm A.

Once again, the focused, goal-based efforts of the Senate were noteworthy. CPEC, in coordinating higher education in California, has had academic quality as one of its major concerns. Consequently, there was common ground for the two to work together (A).

McCallum: There's two ways to address an analysis of the Academic Senate. One is an organizational kind of study; the other one is the personalities and perception as reality. And perception comes out of individuals. An organization carries a philosophy that carries on, but individuals, whoever they are, affect that philosophy and affect the perception that people have. Who you have as President of the Academic Senate or as your Legislative Advocate has helped create those perceptions. The problem has been more on lobbying, public policy action and how they present it. The Senate people have a lot to learn about how to lobby the Board of Governors and CPEC. Where they're very effective is when they get involved with an advisory committee. They do very well. From Compton College, the librarian there, Lloyd DeGarmo, was on the General Education Committee. He ran the committee because he was just tops over everybody else. Leon Baradat on any committee. He's one of the best public policy people I've ever worked with. He's just a super person.

Paradigm C.

McCallum has identified the importance of the individual players as representative of the organization. The analysis of issues and organizational activity rests on the ability of the players in strategic positions to use negotiation and compromises to achieve resolution.

"The faculty governing bodies of California's public colleges yesterday issued an unprecedented document that outlines the English and math skills they believe high school graduates must have to do college-level work" (Grant, 1982, p. 2). This document is the result of the work conducted by the Intersegmental Committee of the faculty senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University system and the University of California system.

Wilson Riles, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction, commented in the San Francisco Chronicle that he felt the Intersegmental Committee and the alliances between the three academic senates represented one of the most important educational break-throughs in recent years (p. 2). This is the same Intersegmental Committee to which Patrick Callan referred in his interview as "substantively and symbolically important" and as a significant demonstration of leadership.

The following are Barbara Hinkley's comments about the importance of the Intersegmental Committee and other Academic Senate alliances of a similar nature.

The alliances formed with the Intersegmental Committee

which was composed of representatives of the statewide academic senates--the CSU system, the UC system and the Community College system--represents a tremendous force. The alliance with the Chief Instructional Officers represents another dynamic force and certainly the direct access to the Board of Governors to speak for the faculty is vital. So, the Senate has formed wide-ranging interactive alliances that represent a form of power structure that causes it to be involved in all controversies. As a result, the Senate is sought out for participation on committees and for testimony.

Paradigm C.

The formation of these key alliances has provided the Senate with an increase in the number and kind of action pathways available to the organization. Certainly there were many central players and many interrelationships among the leaders who participated in these alliances.

One of the things Hinkley considered the most important she accomplished as President was the agreement established by the Academic Senate and the CIO's, identifying the proficiency levels of basic skills students pursuing the associate degree should have. The first joint meeting of these two groups occurred in 1981. What was interesting to her and to others in the statewide Academic Senate was that when the leaders of the two groups arrived for their first meeting, they walked into the room and discovered that they immediately had an affinity for each other. She said that they

quickly identified the fact that approximately 50% of those in attendance were past officers in their local academic senate. So a tremendous rapport between these two organizations has developed within a very short period of time and while they clearly do not agree on everything, what has been a very rewarding experience was that they do agree on many things and they can talk to each other about the points on which they disagree. Hinkley and other members of the Senate have found that the Chief Instructional Officers were not against academic standards. They were clearly in favor of balancing the curriculum and working on establishing what the basic skills should be and how to identify whether a person has achieved certain levels of proficiency in them.

Paradigm C.

Throughout this report of Hinkley's response to the first meeting of the Senate and CIO leaders are references to the roles of players in certain positions and how their jobs, past experiences and personal and organizational goals interact.

Williams Interview. As Dean of Instruction, Robert N. Williams is the Chief Instructional Officer (CIO) at West Los Angeles College. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the statewide Chief Instructional Officers' organization, when representatives from the executive committees of the CIO's and the statewide Academic Senate held their precedent-setting initial meeting. This organization is now known as

AS-CIO (Academic Senate-Chief Instructional Officers) when the two groups meet jointly. His observations about the joint efforts of the two groups were quite similar to those of Barbara Hinkley.

Prentiss: I was particularly interested in talking to you because you have participated in what appears to be a changing role of the Senate as illustrated by the recent association of the Senate and the CIO's.

Williams: The history behind it was kind of interesting to me personally because I had been president of my own Senate when I was in L.A., as most Deans, I've discovered, have been. I had attended earlier meetings--I guess the last one was about ten years ago--of the statewide Senate when it was newer and a little less organized; a little less involved.

Paradigm C.

This represents a critical point. If most CIO's have been involved in local senates, they have an understanding of the role and function of a senate. They have also been classroom faculty. The position of the actor has changed. The power base has been altered but the past positions of actors contribute heavily to the analysis of issues. This is typical of the traditional collegial interrelationships.

The attitude that I had when I became a Dean of Instruction was an attitude of a suspicion toward what was going on with the senates. As far as I've discovered, I think the main problem has been the fact that there is really a lack of

understanding of what the organization is trying to accomplish. Everybody sees things as power plays and quite often it is not so much that, although it may have some involvement of that, as it is also striving for certain and particular types of goals. We (CIO's) decided, I remember, to invite Barbara Hinkley to attend one of our State conferences, and she came and spoke. She suggested that maybe it was unfortunate that we were at each other's throats all the time.

Paradigm C.

Williams' reference to power is peculiar to a Paradigm C orientation, though the indication of striving to attain certain goals can be identified with all three paradigm. In this context, however, the likelihood is that both personal and organizational goals of the individuals representing the CIO's and the Senate contributed to the observation. Barbara Hinkley, as President of the Senate, was a key actor. She was in an action pathway; had an identified power base; and had enough visibility that her position and personality were quite well known.

Williams: When Barbara came, it was suggested that we hold an informal meeting of five deans and five members of the Senate. We thought we were going to talk about the shape of the table and everything else. Based on that, we got together at Skyline College; that was just a year ago.

Paradigm C.

Past positions contribute to interrelationships. Since these organizations and individuals were in each other's

environment, i.e., instructional programs, they had familiarity with each other but had never met formally as organizations. Williams was ready for the bargaining, typical of individuals asserting their power base in each situation. New action pathways were being created.

Williams: I think that first meeting was an amazing meeting. I'm sure that they had caucused among themselves as to what it was that they would try to bring up on the agenda; how they would work with it. There was an intervening factor in that Chancellor Hayward had called both Barbara Hinkley and Dick Yeo, who was our Chairman at the time, to ask us to consider the competency question and the units of remedial credit to get something to talk about. He had called the two of them independently and without a suggestion of a joint meeting. Well, one of the things that we had thrown on the table was the question of myths. What myths have really grown up about the other organizations that need to be brought out into the open and laid to rest, once and for all, or agreed to. Oddly enough, we never had to get to that. I think the first thing that we decided, probably because Hayward called both groups together regarding the competency question, was that we begin the discussion with those points.

Paradigm A.

Williams' perception was based on the knowledge/assumption that two groups acted to identify the problems and

plan unified position statements. The preparation included evaluating various alternatives and identifying the organization's position based on its goals. Both groups responded to the pressure applied by Hayward's call and were prepared to respond, in some predictable way, to either threat or opportunity. Both groups sent their central leadership--members of the Executive Committees--to the meeting.

Williams: It did not break down into deans and Senate members; you couldn't tell which was which. It was just an open discussion. There was disagreement and agreement among various constituencies, and there was no way that there was a breakdown into the two groups so that you would say the five Senate members sought this and that the five deans sought that. This had an amazing psychological effect; it was almost exhilarating, in a strange way. We just hadn't exchanged points of view.

Paradigm C.

Once the meeting began and the players became known to each other, individual positions and personalities became apparent. Power bases and new action pathways were explored in the issue analysis.

Prentiss: Do you feel like you're getting a particularly good response from the Chancellor's Office?

Williams: We're getting an interesting response from the Chancellor's Office. I don't know whether Hayward had any sense of what he was doing when he telephoned. He

probably thought that it would be something to keep us busy and maybe nothing would happen for a long time. The main problem has been the sense of the Chancellor's staff; that something is going on over which they no longer have direct access or control. They do come; we invited them to our December 1, 1982 meeting.

Paradigm C.

The AS-CIO's began operating outside of the normal and traditional patterns. The rules, standard procedures, did not provide for this association which has been particularly difficult for the Chancellor's staff to handle. The loss of power was identified because the organizations began operating under a Paradigm C pattern where the sharing of power and power bases by the organizations and the actors created new action paths outside the standardized ones.

Williams: There is a sensitivity that this has moved on, on its own, and that two groups which have in the past, remember the politics of the matter, played different things against the other, are now working quite harmoniously together.

Paradigm C.

Clearly, there is bargaining and compromising at every level of interaction. The positions and credibility of the players reflect personal and organizational goals.

Prentiss: I understand that the Board of Governors has shown great support of the Senate as being a defined group

that, at least in theory, represents all faculty in the community colleges.

Williams: They accepted it; in fact, it's interesting to watch them. I have regularly attended the Board of Governors' meetings in this area for the last five years. I know that just a few years ago they really didn't pay much attention to who was speaking. As I watched them one day, it was interesting to see that Barbara Hinkley (Senate President) was testifying about something, and they were stopping her. "Don't speak so fast; I want to write this down," type of a thing, which is a tremendous amount of influence. This was not one or two members; it was a lot of them. I think that's generally true and now, quite often, we've (AS-CIO's) had joint appearances before the BoG.

The AS-CIO alliance has now taken on a different context, such that the joint group has been recognized by the CPEC as the one that should advise them on a number of areas.

Prentiss: I didn't realize that the CPEC had done that.

Williams: Yes; CPEC included it in one of its last reports on the whole question of curriculum. We have been at the CPEC offices now, three or four times, and the staff has invited us to come up and they have come in and worked with us. I think Craig (former Chancellor, California Community Colleges) did a great deal to bring the Senate in place and I

think the Board of Governors now recognizes it as the organization which represents the faculty voice.

Paradigm C.

Williams' observation identifies the importance of players/actors. The fact that the rules provided access to the Board did not guarantee the ear of the Board. The positions taken by the actors and the increased power base resulting from the joint activities have provided for yet another action path--that of routinized contact with CPEC. Again, the bargaining activity and success of the many leaders are based on the players' previous positions and jobs and their being in the action path.

Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes and her Legislative Analyst, Bill Chavez, provided the following comments in characterizing their interaction with the Academic Senate. She indicated that her overall interactions with the Senate were positive. It, as are the CSU and UC senates, is a strong professional organization with very firm convictions about what it should control and direct.

Paradigm A.

Inherent in this description is the picture of an organization centrally controlled and goal-oriented. It has evaluated the issues and has chosen from among them.

Assemblywoman Hughes indicated that she agreed with the Senate's positions on some issues and not on others. She pointed out that much of her interaction with the Senate

occurred in her role as Chair of the Assembly Educational Policies Sub-Committee for Higher Education. In that role, she tends to deal with individuals in an organization from whom she seeks support or who seek her support.

Chavez agreed and volunteered that, at times, the Senate representatives had demonstrated poor timing in their remarks or had caused the discussions of legislative committees and caucuses to go to the point of being self-defeating. Both were quick to point out that this criticism was not peculiar to the Senate but rather characteristic of most organizations and their representatives.

Chavez indicated, also, that he thought the Senate should/could spend some time at conferences, training its representatives in the political processes of Sacramento. Specifically, how to know what to say, and how to know when to be quiet. Assemblywoman Hughes agreed.

Paradigm C, B.

Chavez' reference was to a situation which arose largely because the players/actors were placed in an arena and asked to perform without having the skills. Paradigm C recognizes and uses the political process. Paradigm B behavior characteristics illustrate the programs and procedures whereby the players can become more effective in the political process.

Chavez indicated that because many of the Senate members are leaders in collective bargaining that there is a conflict --not necessarily from the Senate's perspective--in trying to

separate the union philosophy from the academic and professional. He indicated that he understood the dilemma of administrators who must deal with the same individuals in their role changes.

Paradigm C.

The reference to the confusion created by the conflicting and diverse roles played by Senate representatives is characteristic of the Paradigm. The positions and personalities of the players, the shared, sometimes shifting power bases and the interrelationship and behavior of the players affects the analysis and resolution of the issues. Conflict and compromise are realistic expectations for those who participate.

Former Board of Governors member, Jean Trapnell, discussed what she considered was the rather alarming effect of political appointments made to the Board of Governors and their possible future effect on the Senate.

Prentiss: Where do you think the Senate's going to be five years from now? Do you have any projections?

Trapnell: I think the Senate is in a dangerous situation and I'll tell you why. First of all, Jerry Brown (former Governor of California) has used the Board of Governors for his own political ends. The Education Code says that the people on this Board should be advocates for the community colleges . . . lay advocates. This has been by-passed. Most of the people that have been appointed have not known the

first thing about community colleges. Many of them have never been on a community college campus. Gradually, this Board has become . . . well, I'll give you one example. Jerry Brown has relied on the Latinos for political support and five or six appointments to this recent Board were Latinos. Now he's going for money from the technical education people, and we've gotten the Silicone Valley on the Board. The reason I think this threatens the Senate is that these people have absolutely no background in community colleges. And that's why I am going to continue to be active before the Board. I am breaking tradition. A Board member is supposed to fade into the background when he is displaced; he never shows up again, you know. But I think the Senate is more and more threatened as this Board becomes a kind of repository for the political constituencies of the Governor. To some extent, this has happened on the other boards; the Regents have been very upset about the fact that, again, Brown has appointed people from the groups where he wants the votes. The Senate represents teachers and, to be quite realistic, I think the Senate has got to raise the power of the local senates; concentrate on a few issues so that it becomes the authority. The Board now regards the Senators as doing very careful work and that's good; I think they have to preserve that. But they have to be real authorities. They have to be like the lobbyists who know what they're talking about because they really are lobbyists before the Board.

Paradigm C, A.

Trapnell has identified and portrayed, based on her experience as member of the Board of Governors, the highly politicized atmosphere/environment of the Senate. She has identified key players, their positions, the bargaining and shared power bases. Clearly, she has identified that there are various organizational and personal goals exhibited and there are decisions made which do not reflect any unified understanding (C). Yet, she concludes that it is the Senate's ability to focus on its goals with clarity of thought and presentation which will provide the strongest basis for its effectiveness with the Board (A).

Robert Prescott, former president of CCCT, discussed his role in interacting with the leadership of ACCCA and the Academic Senate on an informal basis over a period of time in an attempt to reach common ground on major issues.

Prescott: I think, actually, most of the association that I had with the Senate was off-campus and with the State aspect of it. You know, I was President (CCCT) and I think most of my perceptions are going to be a result of my association with CCCT and in which capacity, as you know, I attended the Academic Senate conferences and also worked with the President and Vice President of the Senate for a year and a half or two years. We had an informal gathering. I don't know if you're even familiar with that or not, but when I was

First Vice President and Francis Compton was president of CCCT, we just started on a very informal basis, getting together with the Academic Senate and ACCCA leadership, to try and iron out some of the philosophical differences. Those meetings occurred primarily when the Legislature was really telling us, "Get your act together before you come up here and don't fight in front of us." It only goes back to about 1980; just the last couple years. We did this, as a matter of fact, when Tyra Duncan-Hall (President, 1980-81) and Barbara Hinkley (President, 1981-82) were in office.

I can't recall how the meetings were initiated; I think we all just sort of sat around and came to the conclusion to meet. In terms of personalities, there was Francis Compton (former President, CCCT) and myself, Tyra Duncan-Hall, Barbara Hinkley, Jack Bessirre and Gerry Angove, primarily. We could take what we thought were major differences that we might have had and at least discuss and get back to the associations and try to reach some common ground, even before we went up to the Chancellor and then on to the Legislature. I think it came to a pretty good end; we did a lot of good until we got to the mission and functions of the community colleges statement. That problem was more a procedural than a philosophical difference. Recently, the informal meetings sort of came untied and just sort of fell apart, to some extent, probably because some of the people didn't want to pursue it because we had resolved a lot of the things that were before us.

Paradigm C.

The individuals identified by Prescott were players participating in leadership roles at an influential level. Because they represented very divergent and conflicting points of view, formal alliances and interactions were unlikely. Yet, all participated in the politicized world of the community colleges and recognized the value of identifying the players and their positions. In this instance, hierarchical bargaining was implied and shared power recognized. Clearly, the trustees have power on individual campuses and as an organization that is often viewed as more powerful than that of the faculty. Yet the Legislature, according to Prescott, has asserted its power and suggested all parties agree before they approach the Legislature. Thus, the individuals met informally to resolve differences when possible.

Prentiss: Do you think that the Senate, as an organization, has been politically effective in any dealing that you've observed or experienced?

Prescott: There's a lot of fragmented representation within the faculty, more so than any other segment. I am not here to say whether this is good or bad as far as the faculty is concerned. I think it is confusing because you can go into any Board of Governors' meeting or anywhere else and find all of these. I think, for that reason, the faculty may be losing something. Although, as I think of it, there are probably two levels to this representation. The CTA and

FACCC--the labor representation--are interested primarily in finances and working conditions. The Academic Senate is the bullwark of standards, criteria and all that sort of thing. It's a different one; I'm not sure as I look at what they're all doing whether or not they should be amalgamated into one organization. I do know that in terms of sheer numbers in representation, if you're counting hands, there's an awful lot of people out there talking for one segment.

Paradigm C, A.

Prescott recognizes the arena of the Senate and the confusing and conflicting views portrayed by the various actors. The numbers of representatives or players in leadership roles is characteristic of Paradigm C, as is the diversity of interests and the seemingly unequal influences. Prescott's reference to the Academic Senate as the bullwark of standards is another reflection of its focused goal-based efforts (A).

Effectiveness Evaluation

Seven of the 11 individuals interviewed contributed observations that identified the Academic Senate's political behavior. On few occasions, a direct question was asked about the Senate's political effectiveness but, frequently, behavior attributable to Paradigm C emerged as part of the interview.

The statements which reflected single Paradigm behavior characteristics revealed an interesting pattern. Three

identified Paradigm A behavior, none Paradigm B, and 14 Paradigm C behavior (Table 7).

Insert Table 7 about here

When the strength of the statements was juxtaposed against the effectiveness characteristics, three of the Paradigm A responses were considered Effective. Thirteen of the Paradigm C statements were considered Effective, and one Moderately Effective (Table 8).

Insert Table 8 about here

Five of the seven actors who were interviewed provided their insight about the Senate, which included combinations of paradigm elements. The combinations were AB, ABC, CA, CB. Using the method described previously, the statements were analyzed by their sub-parts which revealed a rather even distribution among the paradigm--six Paradigm A, three Paradigm B and five Paradigm C (Table 8).

The strength of the sub-part statements was then juxtaposed against the effectiveness criteria. Twelve of the statements were considered Effective and one Moderately Effective (Table 8).

Two observations were obvious immediately. The actors interviewed identified the Senate as politically Effective, while including information about the presence of Paradigm A

Table 7

Effectiveness Indicator of Interview Statements as to
Academic Senate Political Effectiveness

Name	Effectiveness Indicator*	Single Paradigm			Effectiveness Indicator*	Combination Paradigm									
		A	B	C		A	B	A	B	C	C	B	C	A	
CALLAN	E			2	E	1	1	1		1					
	ME				ME	1									
	NE				NE										
MCCALLUM	E	1		1	E			1	1	1					
	ME				ME										
	NE				NE										
HINKLEY	E			2	E										
	ME				ME										
	NE				NE										
WILLIAMS	E	1		6	E										
	ME			1	ME										
	NE				NE										
HUGHES	E				E						1				
	ME	1		1	ME							1			
	NE				NE										
TRAPNELL	E				E								1	1	
	ME				ME										
	NE				NE										
PRESCOTT	E			1	E								1	1	
	ME				ME										
	NE				NE										

* E = Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; NE = Not Effective.

Table 8

Summary Tables for Interview Statements by Single and
Combination Paradigm Indicating Effectiveness Indicator
for Academic Senate Political Effectiveness

Single Paradigm	Effectiveness Indicator			T O T A L S
	E	ME	NE	
A	3	0	0	3
B	0	0	0	0
C	13	1	0	14
TOTALS	16	1	0	17

Combination Paradigm	Effectiveness Indicator			T O T A L S
	E	ME	NE	
A	5	1	0	6
B	2	1	0	3
C	5	0	0	5
TOTALS	12	2	0	14

and B behavior characteristics which were demonstrated, at times, simultaneously. Second, this evaluation of the Senate's effectiveness is nearly diametrical to the evaluation of political effectiveness provided by the faculty and college presidents' groups of questionnaire respondents.

Political activity occurs most often among groups and individuals representing organizations rather, than as a unitary action of a whole organization. Further, political effectiveness is determined by an evaluation of decisions and activities which result from compromise, conflict, muddling of actors with dissimilar interests and power. Therefore, it must be identified by the actors present in the arena.

The items on the questionnaire concerning the Senate's political effectiveness could be considered inappropriate response items since the respondents were asked to evaluate the organization rather than the individual actors. On the other hand, the large "don't know" response from both the faculty and college presidents' groups can be viewed as an honest response since neither group is in the direct observation/communication path of the Academic Senate on a regular basis. However, the Senate presidents did think the Senate was at least Moderately Effective, politically. They responded with a much lower "don't know" response, probably because, as a group, they are in the direct observation/communication path with the Senate. Many of them have been actors in the arena and participants in the Senate's political activity.

Summary Observations

Generally, the respondents agreed that the Senate was Effective in carrying out its purposes, aims, and functions. Effectiveness behavior characteristics reflective of Paradigm A dominated these responses. Statements indicating the effectiveness of Senate activities revealed that the respondents thought the Senate was Moderately Effective. Most of the observed activities were reflective of Paradigm B effectiveness characteristics. Interview responses indicated that the Senate was Moderately Effective when its effectiveness in representing community college faculty was discussed. The effectiveness behavior characteristics were more uniformly spread among the paradigm when these responses were analyzed. Considering the political effectiveness of the Senate, those interviewed thought the organization was Effective when the behavior characteristics of Paradigm C were observed.

As each of the sections were analyzed, it was noted that the effectiveness characteristics of all three paradigm were observed occurring singularly and/or simultaneously.

The revelatory nature of the interview process pinpointed the concern of some that the Senate should be very careful about its political activities for two general reasons. First, the organization is funded from public sources and, second, much of its success has been due to a focused, purist image of concern for academic and professional issues. Also present was the concern that the Academic Senate needed more access and visibility in Sacramento so that the

organization could be more politically effective on a daily basis.

This is what they said. They are players; they know the rules of the game. Each has or has experienced some form of power. Each understands power. All are bargainers, negotiators, compromisers. All have goals and interests that may be reflected by their job or volunteer activities and may be coupled with personal goals and interests which motivate their actions. Each is a participant in the arena in which higher education is done. Of such participants and their value as sources of information, it was said, "If I were forced to choose between the documents on the one hand, and late, limited, partial interviews with some of the principal participants on the other, I would be forced to discard the documents" (Neustadt) (cited in Allison, 1971, p. 181).

CHAPTER VI

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

Purpose for the Survey

The environment of the statewide Academic Senate is very diverse and diffused. Its membership is comprised of approximately 15,000 faculty members teaching in a wide variety of disciplines in 107 community colleges in California. The statewide Senate's structure and activities cause the organization and its representation to interact with a broad spectrum of individuals, organizations, coalitions and interest groups. The research design for this study encompasses several data-gathering methods. Each was selected as particularly appropriate for a targeted element of the organization environment and when the results were combined and analyzed, each contributed to the composite picture of the Academic Senate sought by this research.

Since a primary objective of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the Senate, as understood by the large and diverse faculty membership and others with whom the organization interacts in meeting its stated aims and purposes, a survey questionnaire was identified as the most appropriate method to be used in assessing some of these elements.

The purpose of the survey was to obtain a composite perception of the organizational effectiveness of the Senate

as seen by the several groups surveyed. The survey questionnaire was a Likert-type scale instrument, containing 24 items. Respondents selected from among six possible response choices. Demographic information was requested also. (See Appendix B for sample questionnaires.) The response items were divided into seven groups: demographic information A-F; G 1-7, the purposes, aims, functions of the statewide Academic Senate as stated in its Bylaws; H 1-7, effectiveness of specified activities of the Senate; I 1-4, effectiveness of the Senate in representing faculty concerning current specific issues; J 1-5, the political effectiveness of the Senate in interacting with specific agencies; K requested a composite organizational effectiveness evaluation; and, finally, the comments contributed by respondents.

The questionnaire requested the respondent to evaluate Senate effectiveness by selecting one response along a continuum from "to a very small extent," "to a small extent," "to some extent," "to a great extent," "to a very great extent" and "don't know" response choices. Demographic data was requested regarding gender, principal teaching assignment, number of years of full-time community college teaching, size of respondent's faculty, whether respondent has held office in the local academic senate and whether respondent has attended a state conference or area meeting of the Academic Senate. Respondents were encouraged to comment on the effectiveness of the statewide Senate and the comments were compiled.

In addition to the faculty group, two other elements of the statewide Senate's environment were identified as appropriate groups to be surveyed. The local senate presidents are full-time faculty, a sub-group of the general membership who assume a leadership role for a specified period of time. The statewide Senate identified 109 senate presidents--two districts have district senates as well as local senates--and this group was surveyed. The 107 college presidents were identified as a third large group which impacted the Senate environment and whose understanding about the effectiveness of the Senate would be obtained through use of a questionnaire.

Procedure

This, like most surveys, was designed as a one-time effort administered for the purpose of describing one element of Senate effectiveness behavior. Backstrom and Hursh-César (1981) pointed out that the one-time survey records conditions isolated at a single point in history and that it was hazardous to use them to reconstruct prior events or to predict future behavior (p. 12). "In a one-time survey we take a quick measurement, from many respondents, of aspects of behavior. What we hope is that our measure of that behavior is stable enough so that we don't report variability where it doesn't exist, or fail to see it where it does exist. But our measures of human behavior are error prone, because we

can never know all aspects of any behavior at a single time" (p. 35).

Williamson, Karp, Dalphin, and Bray (1982) indicated that use of survey questionnaires has increased in popularity largely because of their positive effect on measurement reliability. They assure that the same question is asked each time, thus providing consistency which is a primary ingredient of instrument reliability. Reliability is related to the precision of the instrument being used. It is based largely upon the stability of the instrument (does not vary over time) and equivalence, in which the same measurement procedure employed in different contexts will yield the same results (p. 69).

Williamson et al. indicated four factors which affect reliability: personal state of the subject when answering; mood, alertness, emotional well-being, anxiety; variations in the environment and data-gathering procedures; changes in the respondent, not in the instrument. The commonly used test-retest method for establishing reliability is not effective in survey research due to these factors (p. 70).

In the case of the survey undertaken for this research, the reliability of the instrument was established by performing an item analysis to exclude duplicate and unclear items during the initial phase of the pilot study and the selection of a scale instrument as the measuring device. Phillips (1982) indicated that the use of a Likert-type scale provides a form of built-in instrument reliability because the

respondent chooses from a set of responses and thereby increases instrument precision and reliability (p. 206).

Validation of the Instrument

Validation of the questionnaire occurred during the summer, 1982. The initial version of the questionnaire was reviewed by five volunteers who were full-time faculty members at Palomar College. A subsequent, more refined version was distributed in July to the validation group of 34 full-time faculty members of MiraCosta College (a non-sample college) who were teaching during the summer intersession. Seventy-eight percent (27) of the sample returned the questionnaire. Respondent anonymity was protected. A follow-up letter was sent to individuals who had not returned their questionnaire by the requested date.

Analysis of the data was accomplished through use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program (SPSS), run at MiraCosta College on an HP-3000 computer using the same procedures projected for use with the research data. Descriptive statistical procedures were used to analyze the data. Frequency of response and percentages of response for each item were tabulated.

The validation study respondents consisted of 23 males and 4 females and represented about 33% of the total full-time faculty (82; 26 women). The largest groups of respondents were from Business and Vocational areas (7) and Humanities areas (6), though each of the teaching area

categories was represented by the respondents. The respondents were probably an atypical group since 74% (20) of them indicated they were former senate office holders. This may be a function of the large number of years of teaching indicated by the group. Also, MiraCosta College Academic Senate is 18 years old, making it one of the oldest in the state. Fifteen of the respondents indicated 11 or more years of teaching and nine indicated 6 or more years. The high percentage of office holders may indicate that within this group there is or has been a desire by these individuals to participate in the activities of the Senate over a long period of time.

It was interesting to note that over 29% (8) of the respondents had attended a state conference of the Academic Senate. Considering that the conferences are semi-annual and that attendance is generally limited to the local senate president and one delegate from each college, this statistic appears to be particularly atypical.

As a result of the validation study, several minor changes were made in the survey instrument before it was printed and prepared for distribution.

Description of the Instrument

The research sample was obtained from a population of approximately 15,000 full-time California community college faculty who composed the membership of the statewide Academic

Senate. All college presidents and all local senate presidents were mailed questionnaires.

Every attempt was made to utilize the methods and techniques most commonly understood to produce the greatest response rate. For example, this researcher determined that the questionnaire would be mailed to a named individual to make it as personalized as possible; the response time was kept to about 15 minutes; questionnaire design provided for re-folding so that the pre-printed addressee was visible with first class stamp affixed. Also, a time line was established which was designed so that the questionnaire would arrive during the "calm" part of the normal semester (October 11-15, 1982) which occurs normally between the third week of the semester and mid-term examinations.

The faculty group and senate presidents were surveyed using a questionnaire which was identical in content. The college presidents' instrument contained one additional demographic item--item B--number of years as a community college president. Also, item I3 was changed to read " . . . to represent community college faculties . . ." instead of " . . . to represent me"

For ease in identification of returns, the questionnaires were printed on three different colors of paper: faculty--gold; senate presidents--sand; college presidents--brown. Because there is such a large volume of paper in the life of college faculty and presidents, an attempt was made to provide an attractive and distinctive questionnaire

as a stimulus for response. The instrument was professionally typeset, printed and folded. Also, the envelopes in which the questionnaires were mailed were catalog-style and slightly larger than commonly used.

Sample Selection

There was no composite list available which included the name of every full-time community college faculty member. The most readily obtained lists of names were those printed in each edition of the individual college catalogs. Most colleges publish a catalog yearly, though some are experimenting with publishing a catalog every two years. To ensure that the mailing list would be the most current possible, the faculty lists in 1982-83 college catalogs were used. However, some catalogs were not available by September 15, the absolute final date for typing the mailing labels. In those instances, the 1981-82 catalog list was used and each college was called to verify that the individuals selected were employed for 1982-83 as full-time faculty members. Approximately one-third of the colleges were telephoned to verify the mailing list.

A combination of stratified, cluster and systematic sampling techniques was used to identify the faculty sample. Stratified sampling is used when prior knowledge of the population to be studied provides for the identification of various strata. This study identified three strata within the community colleges: full-time faculty (15,000); local

senate presidents (109); college presidents (107). When the strata are large, it is common practice for multi-stage sampling, employing cluster and/or systematic sampling within the strata, to be used. Because the faculty strata was especially large and no single list of full-time faculty existed, it was more practical and convenient to consider each college as a cluster and obtain the list of faculty from each catalog. It was recognized, however, that the convenience and practicality might be obtained at the risk of reduced accuracy. Also, there is an increased potential for sampling error at each stage of multi-stage sampling.

In addition to identifying three strata and considering the colleges as clusters for sampling purposes, systematic sampling was used as a means of randomizing the sample. Because the faculty lists published in each catalog were listed alphabetically, the systematic sample was assumed to be materially the same as a simple random sample.

After carefully considering accessibility, feasibility, practicality and economics, the following steps were taken to establish the sample. The list of institutions and size of full-time faculty was obtained from the 1981 Information Digest, a publication of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (1982 edition had not been published).

1. Faculty Sample. Community college faculty (the strata) were considered members of their respective colleges (clusters) initially and then as individuals (systematic sampling). Each college was

considered a cluster. All college names were placed in a container. A 50% random sample (53 colleges) was drawn (see Appendix C for list of colleges). The 53 colleges selected represented about 7500 faculty--50% of the 15,000 population--and systematic sampling was used to obtain 751 names. This represented an approximate 10% sample of the faculty teaching at the 53 randomly-selected colleges and about a 5% sample of the 15,000 community college faculty.

2. Senate Presidents' Sample. The secretary of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is responsible for maintaining an accurate list of all local senate presidents. This list was provided for use in this study. Since the names of all local presidents were provided, the population (N = 109) was used for the study.
3. College Presidents' Sample. The Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, publishes a directory each year. Periodic updates are distributed to individual campuses. This updated directory was used to establish the mailing list. As with the local senate presidents, the names were known and available and the population (N = 107) was used for the sample.

The list of randomly-selected colleges (clusters) revealed several interesting characteristics. Half of the

California community colleges are located south of Cero Coso College in Ridgecrest. Twenty-six of the sample colleges are located in this region and 27 to the north of Ridgecrest. Fifty percent of the system's small colleges and metropolitan (large) colleges were selected and they contain 50% of the full-time faculty. When the 107 community college faculties were placed in the size of full-time faculty categories established for the questionnaire, it was noted that 18% of the colleges had less than 50 full-time faculty; 22%, between 51 and 100; 30%, between 101 and 200; 24%, between 201 and 300; and 6%, more than 300 faculty. The sample colleges revealed: 17%, less than 50 faculty; 15%, 51-100; 40%, 101-200; 23%, 201-300; and 6%, more than 300 faculty.

Distribution of the Questionnaire

Once the sample names were identified, mailing labels were typed and affixed to envelopes. Each survey instrument was coded so that responses received could be eliminated from the mailing list. The remaining names would be used for the follow-up request to non-respondents. Envelopes were stuffed with the appropriate questionnaire. A total of 751 faculty, 109 senate presidents and 107 college presidents' questionnaires were delivered to a mailing company to be mailed bulk rate.

During the next month, questionnaires were received and the follow-up mailing prepared. Responses dropped off radically after three weeks. A tally of responses indicated 192

of 751 or 25.5% of the faculty sample was received; 46 of 109 or 41.1% of the senate presidents' sample was received; and 59 of 107 or 55.1% of the college presidents' sample was received.

Recognizing that the holiday season and winter recess might inhibit responses to the follow-up request, it was determined that the second mailing should arrive at the colleges during the third week in November. Only individuals who were non-respondents received the mailing. The procedure used was essentially similar to the initial mailing. To call attention to the fact that this was a follow-up request, an easily removed post-it stamped with "your opinion counts . . . send it so it can be counted, Thanks" and "Second Request" was affixed to the letter portion of each questionnaire. Again, a first class stamp was affixed, questionnaires coded, envelopes stuffed and a total of 679 questionnaires were delivered to be mailed at bulk rate.

The second request or follow-up questionnaire returns brought the response percentages to the following levels: faculty, 0.46; senate presidents, 0.72; college presidents, 0.72.

The second set of responses included two returns from senate presidents, one in Northern California, one in Southern California, indicating that they had returned the first questionnaire. Neither had been received. Since they were signed, a note of explanation was written and a third questionnaire mailed. In both cases, the questionnaires were

completed and returned. The likelihood that other questionnaires were lost in the mail is quite substantial.

Two questionnaires were eliminated from the sample. One was returned with the note that the recipient was an administrator now and the other was from an individual who was no longer living and teaching in California. Several responses arrived long after the data was run and analyzed and were not included.

Data Entry

A professional in data entry was hired to enter the questionnaire data into the computer. All entry was performed using a CRT terminal and stored in disc files of the HP-3000.

Several questionnaires were returned with incomplete information. Whenever blanks were encountered, the item responses were entered as missing data (zeros). Since SPSS provides two forms of tabulated data, one column which includes missing data in the totals and percentages and one which excludes missing data, all responses were counted and included in the data analysis. In some cases, individuals provided two responses for a single item or responded in such a way as to make their choice unclear. These responses were entered as missing data.

When the categories used for item B (principal teaching assignment) on the faculty and senate presidents' questionnaire and item E (principal teaching assignment) for the

college presidents were established, it was anticipated that counselors would select social and behavioral sciences and librarians, humanities. No problems with these categories surfaced in the instrument validation. However, some individuals wrote in counseling or librarian and these responses were hand-tabulated. It should be understood, though, that many counselors and librarians who returned the questionnaire did select one of the categories provided. In several cases, respondents indicated a 50-50 split in their teaching assignment. These were entered as missing data and hand-tabulated. Several college presidents selected more than one area in item E. In one case, two areas were selected and a third area listed opposite "Other." Again, these responses were entered as missing data and hand-tabulated.

Don't Know/Missing Data Responses

Perhaps a statement or two about the dilemma of the "don't know" response is appropriate at this point. Some researchers prefer to structure their questionnaire as a forced choice response and thus eliminate the "don't know" choice. Others, recognizing that the survey information is based largely on factual statements about which the respondent may have no knowledge, provide a "don't know" choice option.

However, when the "don't know" option is provided and chosen by the respondent, reasons other than lack of knowledge may prompt its selection. For example, respondents may

wish to evade answering for a wide variety of reasons, including perceived threat if their identity is revealed. In other cases, the response item may be ambiguous or contain conflicting elements which confuse the respondent.

The survey researcher's dilemma is really two-fold: whether to provide the "don't know" choice on the instrument; and, if provided, how to interpret the responses. In some cases, it is possible to follow up on "don't know" responses and obtain information which provides for more accurate interpretation.

For purposes of this study, the "don't know" response was provided because the organization being studied is composed of a very large, diverse and geographically-separated membership and the assumption underlying forced choice format --i.e., every person surveyed would have some knowledge about the Senate--could not be justified. Therefore, it was felt that respondents who had no knowledge should be able to respond appropriately. It was not feasible or practical to try to follow up on the "don't know" respondents. Ambiguity in the statements did not appear to have been a generalized problem for the respondents.

Since the respondents represent an academic community and knowledge is their forte, it seems reasonable to assume that most selected "don't know" because they had no knowledge about the extent of the effectiveness demonstrated by the Senate on a given statement. This study considered the

"don't know" response as a valid choice and "don't know" were treated in the same fashion as the other responses.

Missing data, such as confusing responses, blanks, double responses to a single item, etc., were tabulated separately. Missing data were included in the tabular data representations but not discussed.

Data Analysis

The data are analyzed using the following format. Each of the three questionnaires is analyzed separately and by section of the questionnaire, beginning with the demographic data provided by the respondent group. The data analysis begins with the faculty response, followed by the senate presidents and college presidents' responses. As the subsequent group response is analyzed, similarities and divergencies to the previous group(s) are noted. This technique maintains the independent nature of each response group while providing a cumulative descriptive analysis with the faculty response as the foundation.

The percentage of response was calculated for each response category of each statement on the questionnaire and is the basis for the data analysis. In support of the study's objectives to provide the broad, composite picture of the statewide Academic Senate and as a means of synthesizing the data, concentrations of response were identified and translated into evaluation patterns labeled Not Effective, Moderately Effective, Effective.

The concentration of response was identified by summing the percentages of the response in the sequential categories on the scale. For example, if in response to an item, the percentages were "to a very small extent" (3.0), "to a small extent" (4.5), "to some extent" (10.4), "to a great extent" (38.8), "to a very great extent" (42.6) and "don't know" (2.9), 92% of the response was focused among the "to some extent" (10.4), "to a great extent" (38.8) and "to a very great extent" (42.6) response categories.

The evaluation patterns were established by separating the response scale into three groups which combined three sequential response choices. The three groups and their labels are illustrated by the following chart.

The 92% concentration of responses identified above would be reported as an evaluation of the Senate effectiveness which was focused in the Effective pattern of response.

Following the analysis of each questionnaire section, a brief summary is provided.

Faculty Responses

Characteristics. Three hundred forty-eight faculty members of the total sample (751) responded to the questionnaire. This represents a 46% response rate.

Of the faculty responding, 70% were male (Table 9). Forty-one percent have taught for 16 or more years, while only 12% indicated 5 or less years of experience. The greatest number of respondents were concentrated in the teaching areas of the humanities (24.2) and business and vocational (22.2), followed by social and behavioral sciences (16.2), health and physical education (14.8), physical sciences, including math, (12.5), natural sciences (5.1) and basic skills (5.1) (Table 9).

Insert Table 9 about here

All categories of size of full-time faculty were represented by the sample respondents. The largest percentage (36.3) of respondents appeared in the 201-300 size category. Twenty-three percent of the sample colleges were in this category. Twenty-six percent of the respondents represented colleges of 101-200 full-time faculty; 40% of the sample colleges were in this category. A rather large percentage (23.1) of the respondents indicated their full-time faculty was more than 300 in size. Six percent of the sample colleges were in this category (Table 9).

It was very interesting to note that 46% of the faculty

Table 9

Demographic Data--Faculty

Sample Total: 751				
Characteristic		n	No Response	Percentage of Sample (Missing Data Excluded)
A. Sex (Total)		348	34	9.8
Male		220		63.2
Female		94		27.0
*B. Teaching Area			51	14.7
1. Social & Behavioral Sciences		48		13.8
2. Natural Science		15		4.3
3. Physical Science including Math		37		10.6
4. Humanities		72		20.7
5. Health & Physical Education		44		12.6
6. Business & Vocational		66		19.0
7. Basic Skills including Remedial		15		4.3
C. Years of Full Time Teaching			17	4.9
1. 0-5		40		11.5
2. 6-10		71		20.4
3. 11-15		86		24.7
4. 16 or More		134		38.5
D. Size of Full Time Faculty			23	6.6
1. Less than 50		21		6.0
2. 51-100		28		8.0
3. 101-200		83		23.9
4. 201-300		118		33.9
5. More than 300		75		21.6
E. Held Office in Local Senate			20	5.7
1. Yes		150		43.1
2. No		178		51.1
F. Attended State Conference or Area Meeting of Senate			22	6.3
1. Yes		52		14.9
2. No		274		78.7

* Note: See text for areas added by respondents.

group have held an office in their local senate while 54% have not. Yet, only 16% have ever attended a Senate conference or area meeting (Table 9).

Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions (Section G). Section G of the survey instrument contains seven statements directing the respondent's attention to the purposes, aims, functions of the statewide Academic Senate, as described in the organization's Bylaws. Respondents were asked to evaluate the extent of effectiveness exhibited by the Senate in accomplishing each. Two response patterns for this section were immediately obvious. For each statement, the strongest percentages of response for any one category were found in the "to some extent" category and more than one-fourth of the respondents chose the "don't know" response (Table 10).

Insert Table 10 about here

Further, in the items, Senate effectiveness in representing community college faculties in policy formation (G1), Senate effectiveness in strengthening local senates (G2) and Senate's development and implementation of policies and procedures on matters of statewide concern (G3), the respondents evaluated Senate effectiveness in the Moderately Effective pattern. When the percentages were summed, 62% of the responses to G1, 60% of the responses to G2, and 62% of the responses to G3 were concentrated in this pattern (Table 11).

Table 10

Faculty Response to Statements as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate

G. Listed below are the purposes, aims, functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out the following:							
	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.	7.9	10.7	34.1	17.4	5.2	24.7	5.7
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.	12.6	15.7	31.7	12.9	2.5	24.6	6.6
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.	7.4	9.6	34.6	18.2	5.6	24.7	6.9
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California Community Colleges.	4.9	7.7	29.8	21.2	12.6	23.7	6.6
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California Community Colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.	5.6	11.1	29.1	16.7	2.2	35.3	7.2
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California Community College faculties.	9.0	12.5	24.9	19.6	7.5	26.5	7.8
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California Community Colleges and their role in higher education.	8.8	12.3	27.1	18.0	6.3	27.4	8.9

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.
 N of Sample = 751; N of Respondents = 348; Percentage of Response = 46%.

It was interesting to note that the responses concerning the effectiveness of the Senate in strengthening local senates (G2) revealed 13% selected "to a very small extent" which was the largest percentage in this response category for section G. Also, a noticeably small percentage (2.5) selected "to a very great extent" in evaluating Senate effectiveness for the same item (Table 11).

Insert Table 11 about here

Responses to the request to evaluate Senate effectiveness in making recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California community colleges, item G4, provided a pattern unique in this section. The concentration of response percentages (63.6) was found in the Effective pattern (Table 11). Also, the over 12% response, indicating the Senate was effective "to a very great extent," represented the largest response percentage in this category for Section G (Table 10).

For the items, Senate assumes responsibilities and performs functions which may be delegated to it by local senates and by the Board of Governors (G5), effectiveness of the Senate in providing communication between local academic senates for purposes of coordinating action and requests (G6), and initiation of policy positions relevant to California community colleges (G7), the concentration of response was located in the Moderately Effective pattern. When the

Table 11

Faculty Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate

G. Listed below are the purposes, aims, functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out the following:	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Pattern Of Response
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.			62.0				ME
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.			60.0				ME
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.			62.0				ME
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California Community Colleges.				63.6			E
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California Community Colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.			56.9				ME
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California Community College faculties.			57.0				ME
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California Community Colleges and their role in higher education.			57.4				ME

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

percentages were summed, 57% of the responses to G5, 57% of the responses to G6, and 57% of the responses to G7 were found here (Table 11). A noticeably small percentage of respondents (2.2) evaluated the Senate as effective "to a very great extent" on the item, assuming responsibilities and performing functions that may be delegated to it by local academic senates and by the Board of Governors (G5). This item received the highest percentage of response (35.3) in the "don't know" category for this section (Table 10).

In summary, the faculty respondents indicated that the statewide Academic Senate was Moderately Effective in carrying out its stated purposes, aims and functions. Many respondents "didn't know" whether the Senate was effective.

The very high percentage of "don't know" responses to the item, Senate assumes responsibilities and performs functions delegated by local senates and the Board of Governors (G5), appeared consistent with the responses to the statement concerning communication between local senates (G6) which illustrated that the faculty were not satisfied with the effectiveness of the communication provided by the Senate and the responses to focusing on the efforts of the Senate to strengthen local senates (G2), in which a large percentage of respondents indicated they "don't know." Also, in item G2, 12% evaluated the Senate as effective "to a very small extent." The lack of knowledge expressed by respondents may be related to the fact that the faculty viewed the Senate's communication efforts as only Moderately Effective.

Effectiveness of Senate Activities (Section H). Section H of the survey instrument requested the respondents to evaluate the statewide Academic Senate's effectiveness when some of the Senate's many activities were specifically identified. The highlighted activities were logical extensions of the purposes, aims, functions statements to which responses were directed in Section G.

Insert Table 12 about here

Responses to items, effectiveness of the Senate in communicating its activities to individual members (H1), confidence and trust in the Senate to represent faculty on academic and professional matters (H3), Senate response to changing needs of community college faculties (H6), and the Senate's effectiveness in working to strengthen local senates (H7), were concentrated in the Not Effective pattern. When the percentages for these items were summed, 70% of the responses to H1, 59% of the responses to H3, 51% of the responses to H6, and over 57% of the responses to H7 are found in this pattern (Table 13).

Insert Table 13 about here

Several additional observations were made about individual items in the above group. The item, effectiveness of the Senate in communicating with individual faculty (H1),

Table 12

Faculty Response to Statements as to the Activities of the Academic Senate

H. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?	33.0	20.7	16.7	9.6	3.1	17.0	6.9
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?	8.8	12.5	20.4	8.8	.6	48.9	8.3
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent me on academic and professional matters.	22.1	12.5	24.0	15.0	5.6	20.9	7.8
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.	7.3	11.1	25.6	18.7	10.1	27.2	9.2
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.	10.3	13.5	22.9	17.6	7.2	28.2	8.3
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.	15.1	12.9	23.0	11.3	4.4	33.3	8.6
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates.	17.7	16.8	22.8	6.3	2.8	33.5	9.2

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.
N of Sample = 751; N of Respondents = 348; Percentage of Response = 46%.

Table 13

Faculty Focus of Response Among Categories as to Identified Activities of the Academic Senate

H. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Pattern Of Response
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?		70.4					NE
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?			No Concentration				
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent me on academic and professional matters.		58.6					NE
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.			55.4				ME
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.			54.0				ME
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.		51.0					NE
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates.		57.3					NE

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

received the largest percentage of "to a very small extent" (33.0) and "to a small extent" (20.7) for the entire questionnaire. Also, the smallest percentage (17.0) of "don't know" responses for the questionnaire was noted for the statement (Table 12).

The large percentage (22.1) of "to a very small extent" responses, seen in the confidence and trust to represent faculty (H3), is second only to H1 for the entire questionnaire (Tables 10 & 12).

The items, Senate's responsiveness to changing needs of community college faculties (H6) and the effectiveness of the Senate in strengthening local senates (H7), brought forth 15% and 18% responses of "to a very small extent" which was coupled with more than 30% (33.3; 33.5) "don't know" responses (Table 12).

The faculty response to the item, responsiveness of the Senate to local recommendations and positions (H2), received the largest percentage (48.9) of "don't know" responses for Section H. A miniscule .6%, the smallest percentage for the entire questionnaire, selected "to a very great extent" for this item. It was interesting to note that while the greatest percentage of responses (other than "don't know") was found in the "to some extent" (20.4) category, there was no clear concentration of responses among the categories for this item (Tables 12 & 13).

For items, H4 which focuses on evaluating whether the Senate is active in speaking out on academic and professional

matters and H5, the extent to which the Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties, respondents concentrated their responses in the Moderately Effective pattern. When summed, 55% of the responses for H4 and 54% of the responses for H5 were focused in this pattern (Table 13). For both items, the "don't know" response percentage was more than one-fourth of the total response (H4, 27.2; H5, 28.2). Also of interest was the observation that H4 and H5 received the highest percentage of response in the "to a very great extent" category for this section (H4, 10.1; H5, 7.2) (Table 12).

When the Senate activity section item, Senate activity in speaking out on academic and professional matters (H4), was observed as an associate of the purposes, aims, functions item, Senate recommendations on statewide matters affecting California community colleges (G4), the two highest percentages of responses for the "to a very great extent" category were revealed (G4, 12.6) (Tables 10 & 12).

In summary, it appeared that the respondents firmly believe they do not receive effective communication from the statewide Academic Senate about the activities of the organization. In addition, large percentages of the respondents have indicated they do not know about the Senate's activities.

As to whether the respondents have confidence and trust in the effectiveness of the Senate to represent them, the

response indicated the faculty viewed the Senate ineffective concerning this item.

The effectiveness of Senate efforts at strengthening local senates and its response to changing needs were evaluated somewhat critically by those respondents who had enough information on which to base their response.

For all items in this section, a large percentage of "don't know" responses were present.

Effectiveness of Senate Representation (Section I).

Section I requested respondents to identify the statewide Academic Senate's effectiveness in representing community college faculties concerning identified issues which have been under discussion and in which major changes either have occurred or will occur in the near future.

There are two patterns of response which are similar for all items in this section. 1) The greatest percentages of response were found in the "don't know" category and ranged from 48% to 52% of the responses (Table 14). With the exception of item H2, discussed earlier, these were the largest percentages seen in a single response category for the entire questionnaire. 2) The highest percentage of individuals evaluating Senate effectiveness was concentrated in the "to some extent" category (Table 14).

Insert Table 14 about here

Table 14

Faculty Response to Statements as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty

I. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing the community college faculty in:	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the system-wide grading policy minimum standards?	5.3	8.2	19.4	11.0	4.4	51.7	8.3
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?	8.4	9.4	20.0	10.3	3.8	48.1	8.0
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?	6.7	8.6	17.6	8.6	4.2	54.3	10.1
(4) accreditation?	7.5	6.8	19.5	10.1	4.2	51.9	11.5

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

N of Sample = 751; N of Respondents = 348; Percentage of Response = 46%.

The faculty responses to all items in Section I revealed such large percentages of "don't know" responses that the remaining responses were not concentrated to the degree seen in the previous sections. For all items, the centralization of faculty responses was in the Moderately Effective pattern (Table 15).

For the item, Senate effectiveness in representing community college faculties in establishing statewide minimum grading standards (I1), this focus was 39% of the response (Table 15).

Insert Table 15 about here

In the item, effectiveness of the Senate in representing community college faculty in the CSU revision of the general education requirements (I2), the concentration represented 40% of the response. Concerning the effectiveness of Senate representation in the establishment of associate degree regulations (I3), the focus was 35% of the response. Finally, when the issue of representing faculty concerning accreditation (I4) was observed, the concentration was 36% of the total response (Table 15).

The faculty indicated their lowest (48.1) "don't know" response for this section on the item, effectiveness of representation in the development of the CSU general education requirements (I2). This item had the highest percentage

Table 15

Faculty Focus of Response Among Categories as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty

I. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing the community college faculty in:

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Pattern Of Response
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the system-wide grading policy minimum standards?		-----	38.6	-----			ME
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?		-----	39.7	-----			ME
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?		-----	34.8	-----			ME
(4) accreditation?		-----	36.4	-----			ME

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

of responses for this section in both the "to a very small extent" and "to a small extent" categories (Table 14).

To summarize, clearly, the statement being made by the faculty response was that they didn't know whether the state-wide Academic Senate was effective in representing them concerning these issues. Those who felt comfortable evaluating the Senate as their representative concerning the identified issues responded most often that the organization was Moderately Effective. However, the large "don't know", combined with middle-of-the-scale, responses makes determining Senate effectiveness on these items questionable.

Political Effectiveness of the Senate (Section J). This section focused the respondent's attention on the political effectiveness of the Academic Senate with identified organizations which are part of its environment.

The faculty responses reflected several patterns which were apparent in the response percentages for all items. The greatest percentages of response for any one category were found in the "don't know" category and ranged from 32% to 43% of the responses. Also noticeable were the relatively high percentages of "to a very small extent" responses which ranged from 13% to 20% of the responses (Table 16).

Insert Table 16 about here

Single response items in other sections of the

Table 16

Faculty Response to Statements as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate

J. In representing community college faculties,
to what extent do you think the statewide
Academic Senate is politically effective
with:

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) the legislature	19.6	18.7	20.2	6.5	3.4	31.5	7.8
(2) the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)	15.0	15.4	18.8	7.5	1.9	41.4	8.3
(3) California State Universities (CSU)	12.9	17.9	20.7	5.0	1.3	42.3	8.3
(4) University of California (UC)	15.7	17.9	18.2	4.1	1.6	42.6	8.3
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)	12.9	12.9	25.4	6.3	3.4	39.2	8.3

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

N of Sample = 751; N of Respondents = 348; Percentage of Response = 46%.

questionnaire revealed similar high percentages in this category. In no other section of the faculty questionnaire were the responses for the "to a very small extent" category as high when all items were observed (Table 16). Finally, the concentration of response, in evaluating the Senate's political effectiveness for all items, was located in the Not Effective pattern (Table 17).

Insert Table 17 about here

Whether the political effectiveness of the Senate in representing faculty with the Legislature (J1), CPEC (J2), the California State University system (J3), the University of California system (J4) or the Board of Governors (J5) was being considered, the faculty response was very similar. For each item in this section, approximately 50% (49.2-57.8) (Table 17) of the respondents believed the Senate was not effective. Approximately 40% (31.5-42.6) responded by selecting the "don't know" choice (Table 16).

In summary, the faculty appeared to be more critical of the political effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate than of any other criteria of effectiveness. A large percentage of respondents indicated they didn't know whether the Senate was politically effective with the specified organizations.

Table 17

Faculty Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate

J. In representing community college faculties, to what extent do you think the statewide Academic Senate is politically effective with:

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Pattern Of Response
(1) the legislature	-----	58.5	-----				NE
(2) the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)	-----	49.2	-----				NE
(3) California State Universities (CSU)	-----	51.5	-----				NE
(4) University of California (UC)	-----	51.8	-----				NE
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)	-----	51.2	-----				NE

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

Senate Presidents' Responses

Characteristics. Based on the data provided by the 72% (79 of 109) of senate presidents responding to the questionnaire, the following description of their characteristics is provided.

Similar to the faculty responses, 70% of the senate presidents were male. They were concentrated in the teaching categories of social and behavioral sciences (21.9), humanities (20.3), physical sciences including math (17.2) and business and vocational (17.2) (Table 18). However, all teaching areas were represented: natural sciences (10.9), health and physical education (9.4), and basic skills (3.1). Once again, the choices offered for respondents to select from in identifying their principal teaching area caused some senate presidents to provide their response by writing in the information. Four counselors, two librarians, one communications and three who indicated combinations were hand-tabulated.

Insert Table 18 about here

The senate presidents, as did the faculty group, had considerable teaching experience. Thirty-four percent had taught for 16 or more years while 8% had taught for 5 or fewer years.

Seventy-nine percent had attended a state conference or area meeting of the Academic Senate. It should be noted that

Table 18

Demographic Data--Local Senate Presidents

Population Total: 109				
Characteristic	n	No Response	Percentage of Sample (Missing Data Included)	Percentage of Sample (Missing Data Excluded)
A. Sex	79	5	6.3	
Male	52		65.8	70.3
Female	22		27.8	29.7
B. Teaching Area		15	19.0	
1. Social & Behavioral Sciences	14		17.7	21.9
2. Natural Science	7		8.9	10.9
3. Physical Science including Math	11		13.9	17.2
4. Humanities	13		16.5	20.3
5. Health & Physical Education	6		7.6	9.4
6. Business & Vocational	11		13.9	17.2
7. Basic Skills including Remedial	2		2.5	3.1
C. Years of Full Time Teaching		2	2.5	
1. 0-5	6		7.6	7.8
2. 6-10	26		32.9	33.8
3. 11-15	19		24.1	24.7
4. 16 or More	26		32.9	33.8
D. Size of Full Time Faculty		5	6.3	
1. Less than 50	12		15.2	16.2
2. 51-100	12		15.2	16.2
3. 101-200	17		21.5	23.0
4. 201-300	24		30.4	32.4
5. More than 300	9		11.4	12.2
E. Held Office in Local Senate		3	3.8	
1. Yes	74		93.7	97.4
2. No	2		2.5	2.6
F. Attended State Conference or Area Meeting of Senate		3	3.8	
1. Yes	60		75.9	78.9
2. No	16		20.3	21.1

this questionnaire was mailed and returned, in most instances, prior to the Fall 1982 Conference and area meetings. It is possible that this percentage would be higher if the questionnaire had been received after the conference, since most senate presidents were in attendance.

While the category, size of full-time faculty, as represented by senate presidents was similar to that of the sample, it should be remembered that the entire population (109) of senate presidents was surveyed. There was an apparent discrepancy in the over-300 faculty category. Six of the 107 colleges have over 300 full-time faculty, based on the information contained in the California Postsecondary Education Digest 1981 (the most recent at the time of this study). Three of these colleges were part of the sample. The discrepancy lies with the nine senate presidents who indicated their college had over 300 full-time faculty. The important aspect of the item's data is that the respondents reflected each category of faculty size and in percentages similar to all community colleges in the sample.

Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions (Section G). The senate presidents' responses to section G revealed very small percentages of "don't know" responses. With the exception of the item, Senate assumes responsibilities and performs functions which may be delegated to it (G5) (17.7), the "don't know" responses are all 5% or less (Table 19). This, coupled with the fact that the highest percentage of response for

each item was found spread among several scale responses, not in the "to some extent" category for all items, as was the case where faculty responses were concerned, suggested that the senate presidents have more knowledge about the Senate and can be more discriminating in selecting from among response choices.

Insert Table 19 about here

The senate presidents and faculty responded similarly to Senate effectiveness in strengthening local senates (G2). For this item, as was true with the faculty responses, the concentration (83.6) of senate presidents' responses was found in the Moderately Effective pattern (Table 20). Also, the highest percentage of "to a very small extent" responses (7.6) (Table 19) was found for this item--again similar to faculty response. Both groups, by these response patterns, indicated dissatisfaction with the level of Senate effectiveness where the goal of strengthening local senates was concerned.

Responses to the items, Senate effectiveness in representing community college faculties in policy formation (G1) and Senate development and implementation of policies and procedures on matters of statewide concern (G3), differed with the faculty's Moderately Effective response. The item, Senate effectiveness at making recommendations on matters affecting the California community colleges (G4), revealed

Table 19

Senate Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate

G. Listed below are the purposes, aims, functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out the following:							
	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.	2.5	1.3	29.1	36.7	25.3	5.1	.0
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.	7.6	15.2	45.6	22.8	6.3	2.5	.0
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.	1.3	3.9	23.4	39.0	28.6	3.9	2.5
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California Community Colleges.	.0	2.6	15.4	30.8	47.4	3.8	1.3
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California Community Colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.	2.5	8.9	26.6	30.4	13.9	17.7	.0
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California Community College faculties.	6.4	9.0	33.3	34.6	14.1	2.6	1.3
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California Community Colleges and their role in higher education.	1.3	7.6	16.5	43.0	26.6	5.1	.0

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

N of Population = 109; N of Respondents = 79; Percentage of Response = 72%.

agreement with the faculty's Effective response (Table 20). The senate presidents concentrated their responses in the Effective pattern for items G1, G3, and G4, indicating that they considered the Senate to be effective to a greater extent concerning these items than the faculty did. When the percentages were summed, slightly over 90% of the responses to G1, G3, and G4 were found in this pattern (Table 20). It was interesting to note that no respondents selected the "to a very small extent" choice for item G4 (Table 19).

Insert Table 20 about here

For the items, Senate assumes responsibilities and performs functions which may be delegated to it by local senates and by the Board of Governors (G5), provision for communication between local senates for purposes of coordination of action and requests (G6), and initiation of policy positions relevant to California community colleges (G7), the senate presidents again differed with the faculty's Moderately Effective response and evaluated the Senate in the Effective pattern (Table 20). When the percentages were summed, 70% of responses to G5 and over 80% to items G6 and G7 were centralized among these response choices (Table 20).

Responses to the item, effectiveness of the Senate in assuming responsibilities delegated to it by local senates or the Board of Governors (G5), were similar to those of the faculty in one aspect. They, too, registered their largest

Table 20

Faculty and Senate Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate

G. Listed below are the purposes, aims, functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out the following:

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Group	Pattern Of Response
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.			62.0	91.1			F SP	ME E
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.			60.0 83.6				F SP	ME ME
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.			62.0 91.0				F SP	ME E
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California Community Colleges.			63.6 93.6				F SP	E E
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California Community Colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.			56.9 70.9				F SP	ME E
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California Community College faculties.			57.0 82.0				F SP	ME E
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California Community Colleges and their role in higher education.			57.4 86.0				F SP	ME E

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data. Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents. Pattern of Response: NE=Not Effective; ME=Moderately Effective; E=Effective.

percentage of "don't know" responses (17.7) for the whole of Section G in responding to this item (Table 19).

Item G6 requested a response indicating whether the Senate was effective in providing for communication between local senates for purposes of coordination. Six percent of the senate presidents responded "to a very small extent" and nine percent "to a small extent." These percentages are second highest for these categories--similarly revealed by faculty responses--for the whole of Section G (Table 19). Only in item G2 were the percentages of response greater in these response categories, indicating a critical evaluation of Senate effectiveness (Table 19).

In summary, throughout section G, the local senate presidents appeared to be in disagreement with the faculty responses. Clearly, there was a tendency for the presidents to evaluate the Senate as Effective, while the faculty believed it Moderately Effective, and one would assume this was greater knowledge about the Senate. The senate presidents and faculty have indicated dissatisfaction with the Senate's efforts in strengthening local senates and in coordinating communication between local senates. The high percentages of "don't know" responses, indicated by both groups concerning whether the Senate assumes responsibilities which may be delegated to it by local senates or the Board of Governors, was a good example of the dilemma of the "don't know" response discussed earlier. Lack of knowledge may be related to the reduced communication, identified by both groups,

which may be contributing to the lessened effectiveness in strengthening local senates, expressed by both groups. Because it was not feasible to follow up on the reasons behind the selection of "don't know" responses, this must remain an observation requiring further study.

Effectiveness of Senate Activities (Section H). This section focused on some of the activities of the Senate and requested the senate presidents to provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of these identified activities.

Insert Table 21 about here

Item H1 asked the senate presidents to respond to the effectiveness of the Senate in communicating its activities to individual faculty members. The senate presidents, in a manner similar to the faculty, concentrated their responses among the Not Effective pattern. When summed, these percentages represented nearly 90% of their total response (Table 22). The percentages of response selected for the "to a very small extent" (24.1) and "to a small extent" (24.1) were the largest for these categories for the entire questionnaire (Table 21). Faculty responses for these categories were the highest for their questionnaire, also (Table 12).

The item, concerning the responsiveness of the Senate to recommendations made and positions taken by the local senates (H2), revealed the largest percentage (16.5) of response

Table 21

Senate Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Activities of the Academic Senate

H. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?	24.1	24.1	40.5	3.8	3.8	3.8	.0
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?	7.6	7.6	41.8	17.7	8.9	16.5	.0
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent me on academic and professional matters.	7.7	9.0	15.4	42.3	23.1	2.6	1.3
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.	2.5	6.3	7.6	36.7	43.0	3.8	.0
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.	2.6	5.1	12.8	35.9	39.7	3.8	1.3
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.	6.4	7.7	32.1	33.3	14.1	6.4	1.3
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates.	15.6	29.9	35.1	13.0	3.9	2.6	2.5

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.
N of Population = 109; N of Respondents = 79; Percentage of Response = 72%.

in the "don't know" category for this section (Table 21). Once again, this response was similar to the faculty response to the same category which also indicated the largest percentage of "don't know" response for the section. Unlike the faculty response to H2, where no clear concentration of response was found (Table 13), 68% of the senate presidents focused their responses in the Effective pattern (Table 22).

Insert Table 22 about here

The senate presidents' responses indicated disagreement with the faculty evaluation of the item, confidence and trust in the senate to represent on matters of academic and professional concern (H3), and revealed that they believed the Senate to be more effective when concerned with this item than the faculty did. Approximately 80% of the senate presidents concentrated their responses in the Effective pattern, while the faculty thought the Senate to be Not Effective (Table 22).

Once again, the senate presidents differed with the faculty's Moderately Effective pattern in their response to H4, which focused on whether the Senate was active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern. The senate presidents concentrated 87% of their responses in the Effective pattern (Table 22). Notable was the 43% response in the "to a very great extent" category (Table 21). This was the largest percentage for this category in this section.

Table 22

Faculty and Senate Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to
Identified Activities of the Academic Senate

H. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Group	Pattern Of Response
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?	----- 70.4 -----	----- 88.7 -----					F SP	NE NE
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?			No Concentration -----				F SP	 E
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent me on academic and professional matters.	----- 58.6 -----			----- 80.8 -----			F SP	NE E
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.		----- 55.4 -----		----- 87.3 -----			F SP	ME E
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.		----- 54.0 -----		----- 88.4 -----			F SP	ME E
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.	----- 51.0 -----			----- 79.5 -----			F SP	NE E
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates.	----- 57.3 -----	----- 80.6 -----					F SP	NE NE

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

Also, when the Senate activities section item (H4) was observed as an associate of the purposes, aims, functions item (G4), concerning Senate effectiveness about recommendations of statewide matters affecting California community colleges, the two highest percentages of response for the "to a very great extent" category were revealed (G4, 47.4) (Tables 10 & 21).

Senate presidents centered their responses to the item, Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties (H5), in the Effective pattern (Table 22). While the senate presidents' responses were in agreement with faculty responses, the senate presidents did reveal that 88% of their responses were among these response categories, as compared with 54% of the faculty (Table 22).

The senate presidents, in response to the Senate's responsiveness to the changing needs of community college faculties (H6), revealed that 80% selected responses in the Effective pattern (Table 22). This represented a difference of opinion when compared with the faculty responses. The senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective concerning this item, while the faculty evaluated the Academic Senate as Not Effective.

The senate presidents concentrated 81% of their responses to the item, Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates (H7), in the Not Effective pattern as did the faculty group (Table 22). Unlike the faculty

response which indicated 34% in the "don't know" category (Table 12), less than 3% of the senate presidents indicated a "don't know" response (Table 21).

To summarize, the senate presidents indicated a very small percentage of "don't know" responses throughout this section. They, like the faculty, were critical of the Senate when its effectiveness in communicating and efforts at strengthening local senates were considered. Faculty and senate presidents agreed that the Senate was not effective in demonstrating responsiveness to recommendations made or positions taken by the local senates.

The senate presidents appeared to have more confidence and trust in the effectiveness of the Senate in representing them than the faculty respondents did. Consistent with this observation was the indication that the presidents thought the Senate was active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern and that it demonstrated leadership in initiating policy statements to a greater degree than the faculty respondents did. Also, the presidents seemed to think that the Senate was responsive to the changing needs of faculties.

Effectiveness of Senate Representation (Section I). In responding to statements about the effectiveness of the Senate in representing community college faculties concerning identified issues, the senate presidents revealed an obvious increase in percentages of "don't know" responses. However,

these percentages, ranging from 9 to 20 (Table 23), remained small when compared with the faculty response percentages (48.1-54.3) (Table 14).

Insert Table 23 about here

The responses of the senate presidents were distinctly different from those of the faculty group (Table 24). Their responses to all of the items in Section I were concentrated in the Effective pattern, while the faculty evaluated the Senate Moderately Effective for all items (Table 24).

Insert Table 24 about here

The most interesting response pattern observed for the senate presidents was seen in the item, effectiveness of the Senate in representing faculty concerning accreditation issues (I4). The low percentage of "don't know" (9.5) and "to a very small extent" (2.7) responses were found (Table 23), and 78% of the senate presidents' responses were centralized in the Effective pattern (Table 24). This combination of response patterns indicated greater knowledge about the Senate efforts at representing faculty concerning accreditation, as well as the senate presidents' belief that the Senate was generally more effective in representing faculty concerns about accreditation than in the other issues identified in this section.

Table 23

Senate Presidents' Response to Statements as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty

I. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing community college faculty in:

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the system-wide grading policy minimum standards?	2.5	11.4	22.8	21.5	21.5	20.3	.0
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?	2.6	14.3	29.9	18.2	19.5	15.6	2.5
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?	6.3	7.6	27.8	20.3	21.5	16.5	.0
(4) accreditation?	2.7	9.5	32.4	24.3	21.6	9.5	6.3

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.
N of Population = 109; N of Respondents = 79; Percentage of Response = 72%.

Table 24

Faculty and Senate Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to
Academic Senate Representation of Faculty

I. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing the community college faculty in:	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Group	Pattern Of Response
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the system-wide grading policy minimum standards?			38.6	65.8			F	ME
							SP	E
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?			39.7	67.6			F	ME
							SP	E
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?			34.8	69.6			F	ME
							SP	E
(4) accreditation?			36.4	78.3			F	ME
							SP	E

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

In summary, senate presidents provided an evaluation of the statewide Academic Senate that was considerably more effective than that of the faculty group. The senate presidents differed with the faculty in the extent of their knowledge and, perhaps as a consequence of that knowledge, believed the Senate to be more effective than the faculty when concerned with these issues. The clearest statement made by the senate presidents indicated their belief in the overall effectiveness of the Senate when representing faculty on these issues.

Concerning accreditation, the senate presidents appeared to be aware of the extensive efforts by the Senate. Accreditation, as a Senate activity, is discussed more extensively in Chapter VII.

Political Effectiveness of the Senate (Section J). The responses of the senate presidents to the items in this section were focused on an evaluation of the political effectiveness of the Academic Senate in representing community college faculty with identified organizations. Their overall responses were quite different from those of the faculty group.

Insert Table 25 about here

Recall that for all items, approximately 50% of the faculty

Table 25

Senate Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate

J. In representing community college faculties, to what extent do you think the statewide Academic Senate is politically effective with:

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) the legislature	11.4	7.6	39.2	25.3	8.9	7.6	.0
(2) the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)	13.0	26.0	35.1	14.3	1.3	10.4	2.5
(3) California State Universities (CSU)	6.5	18.2	39.0	20.8	5.2	10.4	2.5
(4) University of California (UC)	13.0	15.6	34.4	16.9	5.2	13.0	2.5
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)	3.9	14.5	25.0	30.3	19.7	6.6	3.8

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

N of Population = 109; N of Respondents = 79; Percentage of Response = 72%.

(Table 26) concentrated their responses in the Not Effective pattern.

For the items, political effectiveness with the legislature (J1) and political effectiveness with the Board of Governors (J5), over 70% (73.4; 75.0) of the senate presidents concentrated their responses in the Effective pattern (Table 26).

Insert Table 26 about here

These items revealed, also, the smallest percentages of "don't know" responses for the section. Item J5 had the smallest percentage of "to a very small extent" responses (Table 25).

Seventy-five percent of the senate presidents' response to the items, political effectiveness with CPEC (J2), 78% of their response to political effectiveness with CSU (J3), and 67% of their response to the political effectiveness of the Senate with the UC system (J4), were concentrated in the Effective pattern (Table 26).

To summarize, clearly, the senate presidents believed the Senate to be more politically effective than the faculty did. Their knowledge appeared to be a major contributor to the increased evaluation of effectiveness, as the "don't know" responses were noticeably less than the faculty group.

Table 26

Faculty and Senate Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories as to the
Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate

J. In representing community college faculties, to what extent do you think the statewide Academic Senate is politically effective with:	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Group	Pattern Of Response
(1) the legislature	-----	58.5	-----	-----	-----		F	NE
			-----	73.4	-----		SP	E
(2) California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)	-----	49.2	-----	-----	-----		F	NE
		-----	75.4	-----	-----		SP	ME
(3) California State Universities	-----	51.5	-----	-----	-----		F	NE
		-----	78.0	-----	-----		SP	ME
(4) University of California (UC)	-----	51.8	-----	-----	-----		F	NE
		-----	66.9	-----	-----		SP	ME
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)	-----	51.2	-----	-----	-----		F	NE
			-----	75.0	-----		SP	E

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

College Presidents' Responses

The third group identified as having impact on the environment of the statewide Academic Senate was the 107 California college presidents.

Recall that the college presidents' survey instrument was slightly different from the faculty/senate presidents' instrument. An additional demographic question, concerning their length of time as a college president, was included and a slight wording change in I3 to read " . . . to represent community college faculties . . ." instead of " . . . to represent me . . ." was made. The addition of the demographic item changed each section identification letter. For example, Section G of the faculty/senate presidents' instrument contains the same items as Section H of the college presidents' instruments, and so on. To make the data analysis clear and manageable, all section references are those established by the faculty/senate presidents' instrument. In addition, the tables established for the college presidents' data will reflect this minor change.

Seventy-two percent of the college president population (79 of 107) responded to the questionnaire and revealed the following college president profile.

Characteristics. The vast majority of college presidents, 97%, were male. Twenty-eight percent were former local academic senate office holders and 29% had attended an Academic Senate area meeting or state conference. The

college presidents served relatively few years as community college teachers before becoming college presidents (Table 27).

Insert Table 27 about here

The teaching areas of the respondents were concentrated in the social and behavioral sciences (38.6), physical sciences including math (17.1), business and vocational (12.9) and humanities (12.9) areas. Also represented were natural sciences (7.1) and health and physical education (7.1). Only the basic skills area was not represented. The college presidents were provided with an "Other" category to use to identify their principal teaching if needed. Two indicated journalism, one counseling, one business, and four wrote in combinations of teaching areas.

Over 70% of the respondents had been a college president for 10 years or less (0-5 years, 45.3; 6-10 years, 28.0). Only 9% of the respondents had been a college president for 16 or more years.

The size of the institution's faculty categories, indicated by the college president respondents, nearly parallels that of the 107 colleges and of this study's sample colleges.

Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions (Section G). Section G requested the college presidents to respond to the

Table 27
Demographic Data--College Presidents

Population Total: 107				
Characteristic	n	No Response	Percentage of Sample (Missing Data Included)	Percentage of Sample (Missing Data Excluded)
A. Sex	77	1	1.3	
Male	74		96.1	97.4
Female	2		2.6	2.6
B. Years as College President		2	2.6	
1. 0-5	34		44.2	45.3
2. 6-10	21		27.3	28.0
3. 11-15	13		16.9	17.3
4. 16 or More	7		9.1	9.3
C. Years of Full Time Teaching		2	2.6	
1. 0-5	36		48.6	48.0
2. 6-10	24		31.2	32.0
3. 11-15	8		10.4	10.7
4. 16 or More	7		9.1	9.3
D. Size of Full Time Faculty		2	2.6	
1. Less than 50	12		15.6	16.0
2. 51-100	17		22.1	22.7
3. 101-200	20		26.0	26.7
4. 201-300	18		23.4	24.0
5. More than 300	8		10.4	10.7
E. Teaching Area		7	9.1	
1. Social & Behavioral Sciences	27		35.1	38.6
2. Natural Sciences	5		6.5	7.1
3. Physical Sciences including Math	12		15.6	17.1
4. Humanities	9		11.7	12.9
5. Health & Physical Education	5		6.5	7.1
6. Business & Vocational	9		11.7	12.9
7. Basic Skills (Remedial)	0		.0	.0
*8. Other	3		3.9	4.3
F. Held Office in Local Senate		1	1.3	
1. Yes	21		27.3	27.6
2. No	55		71.4	72.4
G. Attended State Conference or Area Meeting of Senate		4	5.2	
1. Yes	21		27.3	28.8
2. No	52		67.3	71.2

* See text for explanation.

effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate in carrying out its stated purposes, aims, functions. Noteworthy for this section is the small percentage of "don't know" responses for all items except G5 (Table 28).

Insert Table 28 about here

The items, representing faculties and thereby ensuring a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters (G1) and to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California community colleges (G4), revealed over 80% concentration of responses in the Effective pattern (Table 29). The same concentration of responses in these categories was observed in the senate presidents' responses for G1 and in faculty and senate presidents' responses for G4, also (Table 29).

When the response patterns for the college presidents were compared with faculty and senate presidents on the item, Senate effectiveness in strengthening local senates (G2), similarities were revealed. All groups, including 78% of the college presidents' responses, were concentrated in the Moderately Effective pattern (Table 29).

Insert Table 29 about here

Also, as with the other two groups, high percentages of

Table 28

College Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate

G. Listed below are the purposes, aims, functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out the following:							
	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.	7.9	7.9	40.8	29.8	14.5	.0	1.3
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.	17.1	28.9	31.6	17.1	5.3	.0	1.3
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.	5.3	15.8	42.1	27.6	7.9	1.3	1.3
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California Community Colleges.	4.0	4.0	37.3	34.7	20.0	.0	2.6
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California Community Colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.	9.3	12.0	32.0	14.7	6.7	25.3	2.6
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California Community College faculties.	17.3	16.0	37.7	20.0	5.3	6.7	2.6
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California Community Colleges and their role in higher education.	8.0	18.7	29.3	29.3	12.0	2.7	2.6

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

N of Population = 107; N of Respondents = 77; Percentage of Response = 72%.

Table 29
Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories
as to the Purposes, Aims, Functions of the Academic Senate

G. Listed below are the purposes, aims, functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out the following:	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Group	Pattern Of Response
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.			62.0	91.1			F	ME
				84.3			SP	E
							CP	E
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.			60.0				F	ME
			83.6				SP	ME
			77.6				CP	ME
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.			62.0				F	ME
				91.0			SP	E
			73.7				CP	ME
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California Community Colleges.				63.6			F	E
				93.6			SP	E
				91.3			CP	E
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California Community Colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.			56.9				F	ME
				70.9			SP	E
			58.7				CP	ME
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California Community College faculties.			57.0				F	ME
				82.0			SP	E
			73.7				CP	ME
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California Community Colleges and their role in higher education.			57.4				F	ME
				86.0			SP	E
			77.3				CP	ME

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data. Group: F=Faculty; SP=Senate Presidents; CP=College Presidents. Pattern of Response: NE=Not Effective; ME=Moderately Effective; E=Effective.

response for the category "to a very small extent" were located in response to this item (Tables 10 & 19). No college president indicated a "don't know" response for this item (Table 28).

The college presidents, in their responses to Senate development and implementation of policies and procedures on matters of statewide concern (G3), Senate assumes responsibilities and performs functions which may be delegated to it by local senates and by the Board of Governors (G5), effectiveness of the Senate in providing communication between local academic senates for purposes of coordinating action and requests (G6), and initiation of policy positions relevant to California community colleges (G7), centralized their responses in the Moderately Effective pattern. When the percentages were summed, 86% of the responses to G3, 59% of the responses to G5, 74% of the responses to G6, and 77% of the responses to G7 were found in this effectiveness pattern (Table 29).

To summarize, based on their responses to the above items, the college presidents were in agreement with the faculty and in disagreement with the senate presidents in their evaluation of the Senate's effectiveness for these response items (Table 29). Also noteworthy was the pattern of "don't know" responses for all groups to item G5 (Tables 10, 19, 28). The highest percentage of "don't know" responses for the whole section for all three groups was located in response to G5, the effectiveness of the Senate in assuming

responsibilities and performing functions delegated to it by local senates and the Board of Governors.

The responses of the college presidents appeared to be generally consistent with those of the faculty and senate presidents. The description of the statewide Academic Senate that emerged, with regard to the Senate's effectiveness in meeting its purposes, aims, functions as evaluated by respondent groups, was that of an effective organization.

The college presidents were most critical of the Senate, as were the faculty and senate presidents, when responding to evaluating Senate efforts to strengthen local senates (G2), providing communication between local senates (G6), and the Senate's effectiveness in assuming responsibilities to perform functions delegated to it by the local senates or Board of Governors (G5). Again, the high percentage of "don't know" responses was seen in the evaluation of Senate effectiveness in assuming responsibilities delegated to it.

Effectiveness of Senate Activities (Section H). The items listed in Section H focus the attention of the respondents on specific Senate activities and an evaluation of their effectiveness.

In response to the item, effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate in communicating its activities to individual faculty members (H1), the college presidents concentrated 72% of their responses in the Not Effective pattern, while 18% indicated "don't know" (Table 30). In providing this

Insert Table 30 about here

evaluation of Senate effectiveness, the college presidents concentrated their responses in the same pattern as the faculty and senate presidents (Table 31).

Insert Table 31 about here

When evaluating responsiveness of the statewide Academic Senate to positions taken by local academic senates (H2), 42% of the college presidents indicated "don't know" (Table 30). The remaining 54% concentration of responses was found in the Not Effective pattern. When the concentrations of response were compared for all three groups, there was no agreement about the Senate effectiveness for this item. The faculty responses were dispersed; the senate presidents focused their responses in the Effective pattern (Table 31). Additionally, for all groups, the highest percentages of "don't know" responses for this section were observed--faculty, 48.9; senate presidents, 16.5; and college presidents, 42.1 (Tables 12, 21, 30).

For the item, confidence and trust in the Senate to represent community college faculty (H3), the "don't know" response declined to under 2% (1.3) (Table 30). Again the concentration, 79% of the college presidents' responses, was found in the Not Effective pattern (Table 31). This

Table 30

College Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Activities of the Academic Senate

H. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?	23.7	23.7	25.0	7.9	1.3	18.4	1.3
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?	10.5	19.7	23.7	2.6	1.3	42.1	1.3
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent me on academic and professional matters.	21.1	21.1	36.8	14.5	5.3	1.3	1.3
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.	5.3	5.3	22.4	48.7	17.1	1.3	1.3
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.	9.2	14.5	38.2	22.4	11.8	3.9	1.3
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.	21.1	28.9	25.0	7.9	2.6	14.5	1.3
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates.	28.0	25.3	21.3	6.7	1.3	17.3	2.6

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.
N of Population = 107; N of Respondents = 77; Percentage of Response = 72%.

Table 31

Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories
as to Identified Activities of the Academic Senate

H. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Group	Pattern Of Response
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?	----- 70.4 -----	----- 88.7 -----	----- 72.4 -----				F	NE
							SP	NE
							CP	NE
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?	-----	-----	No Concentration	----- 68.4 -----			F	
							SP	E
		----- 53.9 -----					CP	NE
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent me on academic and professional matters.	-----	----- 58.6 -----					F	NE
				----- 80.8 -----			SP	E
		----- 79.0 -----					CP	NE
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.		----- 55.4 -----						
				----- 87.3 -----				
				----- 87.8 -----				
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.		----- 54.0 -----					F	ME
				----- 88.4 -----			SP	E
		----- 75.0 -----					CP	ME
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.	----- 51.0 -----						F	NE
				----- 79.5 -----			SP	E
		----- 75.0 -----					CP	NE
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates.	----- 57.3 -----						F	NE
		----- 80.6 -----					SP	NE
		----- 74.6 -----					CP	NE

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

effectiveness evaluation was the same as the faculty response while differing from the senate presidents' evaluation which was in the Effective pattern (Table 31).

Eighty-eight percent of the college presidents' response to the effectiveness of the Senate in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern (H4) was concentrated in the Effective pattern (Table 31). This was a noticeably more effective evaluation than that seen for any other item in this section. Also, the "don't know" response was less than 2% (Table 30). It was interesting to note that the college presidents and senate presidents evaluated the Senate activity identified by this item as more effective than the faculty did. The faculty response characterized the Senate as Not Effective (Table 31).

The item, Senate leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education (H5), revealed 75% of the college presidents' response to be concentrated in the Moderately Effective pattern (Table 31). The faculty response agreed but the senate presidents focused their evaluation in the Effective pattern (Table 31).

When responding to the active response of the statewide Academic Senate to changing needs of community college faculty (H6), the college presidents provided a reduced evaluation of Senate effectiveness. Seventy-five percent of their responses were centralized in the Not Effective pattern (Table 31). The "don't know" response climbed to 15% (Table 30).

The faculty respondents indicated a similar evaluation of effectiveness, while the senate presidents provided an evaluation of the Senate patterned as Effective (Table 31).

Seventy-five percent of the college presidents concentrated their responses to the effectiveness of the senate in strengthening local senates (H7) in the Not Effective pattern (Table 31). The "don't know" responses were a substantial 17% (Table 30). Both the faculty and senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Not Effective on this item, also (Table 31).

To summarize, the college presidents have patterned their evaluation of the Senate as Not Effective on most items (five out of seven) in this section. However, the college presidents, more than either the faculty or senate presidents' groups, thought the Senate effective in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern. To a lesser extent, the Senate was considered effective in demonstrating leadership in initiating policy relevant to community college faculties.

As was observed in the responses of the faculty and senate presidents, the college presidents indicated a critical response to the Senate effectiveness when activities concerned with communicating the Senate's activities to individuals and in strengthening local senates were considered.

The college presidents expressed a lack of knowledge about whether the Senate was effective in responding to recommendations and positions of the local senates.

The responses of the college presidents were similar to the faculty in indicating a reduced evaluation of Senate effectiveness when responding to the changing needs of community college faculties. Also, in its work to strengthen local academic senates, the Senate was viewed by all three groups as ineffective.

Effectiveness of Senate Representation (Section I).

This section of the questionnaire requested the college presidents to respond to the effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate in representing community college faculty concerning specific issues.

The college presidents' responses indicated interesting diversity not revealed in the other two groups. While the faculty (Moderately Effective) and senate presidents' (Effective) responses revealed a centralization of responses that remains the same for each item in the section but differs between the groups, the college presidents' responses revealed a different concentration for three of the four items in the section. Also, the "don't know" responses ranged from 20% to 26% (Table 32), which was considerably less than the faculty (48.1-41.9) and more than the senate presidents (9.5-20.3) (Tables 14 & 19).

Insert Table 32 about here

Concerning the establishment of Title V regulations for

Table 32

College Presidents' Response to Statements as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty

I. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing the community college faculty in:

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the system-wide grading policy minimum standards?	5.4	6.8	32.4	23.0	12.2	20.3	3.9
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?	9.3	16.0	28.0	14.7	9.3	22.7	2.6
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?	5.4	9.5	35.1	18.9	5.4	25.7	3.9
(4) accreditation?	16.2	18.9	33.8	6.8	1.4	23.0	3.9

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.
N of Population = 107; N of Respondents = 77; Percentage of Response = 72%.

the system-wide grading policy (I1), the college presidents concentrated 68% of their responses in the Effective pattern. This effectiveness evaluation was supported by the senate presidents, but was somewhat more positive than the faculty Moderately Effective evaluation (Table 33).

Insert Table 33 about here

College presidents' responses to the effectiveness of the Senate in representing faculties in the revision of the CSU general education requirements (I2) and the effectiveness of Senate representation of faculties concerning Title V regulations regarding the associate degree (I3) were focused in the Effective pattern. For item I2, 59% of the responses were found here and for item I3, 64% were observed (Table 33). Interestingly, this response agreed with the senate presidents' group and was a more positive evaluation of the Senate effectiveness concerning these items than that of the faculty's Moderately Effective pattern (Table 33).

Clearly, the college presidents evaluated the Senate as least effective when representing faculty concerning the issue of accreditation (I4). Sixty-nine percent of their responses were concentrated in the Not Effective pattern. Also, the largest percentage of "to a very small extent" responses for this section was present in this item (Table 32). The college presidents, in their effectiveness evaluation for the Senate, disagreed with the faculty group

Table 33

Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories
as to Academic Senate Representation of Faculty

I. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing community college faculty in:	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Group	Pattern Of Response
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the system-wide grading policy minimum standards?			38.6				F	ME
			65.8				SP	E
			67.6				CP	E
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?			39.7				F	ME
			67.6				SP	E
			58.7				CP	E
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?			34.8				F	ME
			69.6				SP	E
			63.5				CP	E
(4) accreditation?			36.4				F	ME
			78.3				SP	E
			68.9				CP	NE

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

Moderately Effective) and the senate presidents' (Effective) group. In fact, none of the three groups agreed with the others on this item (Table 33). Accreditation, as a Senate concern in which it represents faculty, is discussed in depth in Chapter VII.

In summary, the college and senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective and, therefore, disagreed with the faculty evaluation of the Senate as Moderately Effective in establishing the Title V regulations for the system-wide grading policy. The college presidents and senate presidents agreed in their evaluation of the Senate as Effective concerning the representation of the Senate in the revision of the CSU general education requirements. The faculty considered the Senate Moderately Effective.

The college presidents provided a strong negative statement by indicating their evaluation of the Senate as Not Effective when concerned with representing faculty about accreditation issues. None of the groups agreed on this item --senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective, while the faculty evaluated it as Moderately Effective.

Political Effectiveness of the Senate (Section J). This section of the questionnaire requested the college presidents to respond to the political effectiveness of the Academic Senate as it interacted with specific organizations in its environment.

Insert Table 34 about here

In response to the items, political effectiveness in representing faculty to the Legislature (J1), political effectiveness in representing faculty to CPEC (J2), political effectiveness in representing faculty to CSU (J3), and political effectiveness in representing faculty to UC (J4), the college presidents concentrated 76%, 78%, 63%, and 65% of their responses in the Not Effective pattern. The range of "don't know" response percentages for these items was (in order): 5.3; 13.2; 22.4; 23.6 (Table 34). When evaluating the Senate effectiveness on these items, the college presidents agreed with the evaluation of the faculty. However, both groups disagreed with the Effective (J1) and Moderately Effective (J2, J3, J4) evaluation of the senate presidents.

Insert Table 35 about here

The college presidents revealed a distinctly different evaluation of Senate effectiveness in their response to political effectiveness of the Senate in representing faculty to the Board of Governors (J5). The response indicated the college presidents consider the Senate to be more politically effective with the Board of Governors than with the other named organizations. Seventy-nine percent of the college presidents concentrated their responses in the Effective

Table 34

College Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate

J. In representing community college faculties, to what extent do you think the statewide Academic Senate is politically effective with:

	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Missing Data
(1) the legislature	21.1	22.4	32.9	13.2	5.3	5.3	1.3
(2) the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)	19.7	26.3	31.6	5.3	3.9	13.2	1.3
(3) California State Universities (CSU)	19.7	19.7	23.7	11.8	2.6	22.4	1.3
(4) University of California (UC)	23.7	18.4	22.4	10.5	1.3	23.7	1.3
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)	9.2	9.2	36.8	28.9	13.2	2.6	1.3

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

N of Population = 107; N of Respondents = 77; Percentage of Response = 72%.

Table 35

Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories
as to the Political Effectiveness of the Academic Senate

J. In representing community college faculties, to what extent do you think the statewide Academic Senate is politically effective with:	To A Very Small Extent	To A Small Extent	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent	To A Very Great Extent	Don't Know	Group	Pattern Of Response
(1) the legislature	-----	58.5 -----					F	NE
			-----	73.4 -----			SP	E
		-----	76.4 -----				CP	NE
(2) California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)	-----	49.2 -----					F	NE
			-----	75.4 -----			SP	ME
		-----	77.6 -----				CP	NE
(3) California State Universities	-----	51.5 -----					F	NE
			-----	78.0 -----			SP	ME
		-----	63.1 -----				CP	NE
(4) University of California (UC)	-----	51.8 -----					F	NE
			-----	66.9 -----			SP	ME
		-----	64.5 -----				CP	NE
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)	-----	51.2 -----					F	NE
			-----	75.0 -----			SP	E
			-----	78.9 -----			CP	E

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents.

Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

pattern (Table 35). Only 3% of the response was found in the "don't know" category, the lowest percentage for the entire section (Table 34). This evaluation was in agreement with the senate presidents and identified the Senate as Effective, while the faculty group evaluated the Senate as Not Effective (Table 35).

To summarize, this section, with one exception, revealed the most critical evaluation of the Senate effectiveness when all items in the section were considered. Contributing to this evaluation were the relatively low "don't know" percentages. The obvious exception was that both the college and senate presidents viewed the Senate as Effective in its representation of faculty to the Board of Governors.

There was an observable tendency of the college presidents to demonstrate agreement with the faculty group and for both faculty and college presidents' groups to disagree with the generally more effective evaluation provided by the senate presidents on these items.

Senate Overall Effectiveness--All Groups (Section K)

The final section of the questionnaires requested respondents to provide an overall evaluation of the effectiveness of the Academic Senate (Table 36).

Insert Table 36 about here

The faculty group was the most conservative in its

Table 36

Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Response to Statements as to the Overall Effectiveness of the Academic Senate

K. How do you evaluate the overall effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate? (Check one.)

- (1) Very effective ☐ ; (2) Effective ☐ ; (3) Somewhat effective ☐ ; (4) Not very effective ☐ ;
 (5) Ineffective ☐ ; (6) Don't know ☐.

	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Very Effective	Ineffective	Don't Know	Missing Data
Faculty	9.1	17.1	24.5	15.4	6.7	27.2	14.4
Senate Presidents	39.0	33.8	18.2	3.9	1.3	3.9	2.5
College Presidents	19.2	30.1	34.2	11.0	5.5	.0	5.2

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

overall evaluation. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents patterned their evaluation of the Senate's overall effectiveness as Moderately Effective (Table 37). Twenty-seven percent of the faculty chose "don't know" (Table 36).

Ninety-one percent of the senate presidents centralized their overall effectiveness evaluation in the Effective pattern (Table 37). The "don't know" response dropped to 4% (Table 37).

Insert Table 37 about here

Eighty-four percent of the college presidents agreed with the senate presidents and evaluated the Senate's overall effectiveness in the Effective pattern (Table 37). None of the college presidents selected "don't know" (Table 36).

The senate presidents and college presidents agreed in their overall evaluation of the Academic Senate as Effective. Both groups had small "don't know" responses. The faculty was more critical of the overall effectiveness of the Senate, as indicated by their Moderately Effective evaluation. Also, the faculty revealed a much higher "don't know" response percentage than the other groups (Table 36).

Summary Observations

The information contained in Figure 1 is provided as a means of summarizing the evaluation of effectiveness patterns for all groups on all 23 questionnaire items.

Table 37

Faculty, Senate Presidents and College Presidents' Focus of Response Among Categories and Evaluation Pattern as to the Overall Effectiveness of the Academic Senate

K. How do you evaluate the overall effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate? (Check one.)

- (1) Very effective ☐ ; (2) Effective ☐ ; (3) Somewhat effective ☐ ; (4) Not very effective ☐ ;
 (5) Ineffective ☐ ; (6) Don't know ☐ .

	Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Very Effective	Ineffective	Evaluation Pattern
Faculty		----- 57.0 -----				ME
Senate Presidents	----- 91.0 -----					E
College Presidents	----- 83.5 -----					E

Note: Percentages reported in response categories exclude missing data.

Evaluation Pattern: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective; E = Effective.

1. All groups evaluated the Senate as Moderately Effective when the Senate efforts to strengthen local senates (G2) was considered.
2. All groups evaluated the Senate as Effective in making recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California community colleges (G4).
3. All groups identified the Senate as Not Effective when evaluating the Senate's effectiveness in communicating its activities to individual faculty members (H1).
4. All groups indicated that the Senate was Not Effective in working to strengthen local senates (H7).
5. Excluding the previously identified items where all groups agreed, the faculty and senate presidents did not evaluate the Senate's effectiveness the same way on any of the remaining items.
6. The faculty and college presidents agreed on their evaluation of Senate effectiveness on 11 of the items (G3, G5, G6, G7; H3, H5, H6; J1, J2, J3, J4). Again, the four statements where all groups agreed were excluded.
7. The senate presidents and college presidents agreed in their evaluation of Senate effectiveness on five items (H4; I1, I2, I3; J5) when the items on which all groups agreed were excluded.
8. The faculty evaluated the Senate as Moderately Effective on a majority of the statements (12),

Not Effective on 9 statements and Effective on 1 item (G4). Also, the faculty's response to the overall effectiveness question (K) was Moderately Effective.

9. The senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective on 20 statements, Moderately Effective on 1 (G2), and Not Effective on 2 (H1, H7) statements. The senate presidents' response to the question of overall Senate effectiveness (K) was Effective.
10. The college presidents evaluated the Senate as Not Effective on 10 items, Moderately Effective on 6 items, and Effective on 7. The college presidents responded to the question concerning the overall effectiveness of the Senate (K) as Effective.
11. Finally, the senate presidents and faculty groups' overall evaluation of Senate effectiveness (K) was consistent with their evaluation of the individual statements. The college presidents did not demonstrate the same consistency, choosing instead to evaluate the Senate as Effective after, evaluating its effectiveness as Not Effective on 10 of the 23 statements.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Selected Comments - All Groups

Respondents to the questionnaires were provided with a

Figure 1

Summary of Patterns of Response for All Groups as to All Statements

G. Listed below are the purposes, aims and functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out each of the following:	GROUP		
	F	SP	CP
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.	ME	E	E
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.	ME	ME	ME
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.	ME	E	ME
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California Community Colleges.	E	E	E
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California Community Colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.	ME	E	ME
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California Community College faculties.	ME	E	ME
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California Community Colleges and their role in higher education.	ME	E	ME

H. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.	GROUP		
	F	SP	CP
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?	NE	NE	NE
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?	NC	E	NE
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent me on academic and professional matters.	NE	E	NE
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.	ME	E	E
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.	ME	E	ME
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.	NE	E	NE
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates.	NE	NE	NE

Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents.
 Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective;
 E = Effective; NC = No Concentration.

Figure 1--continued

Summary of Patterns of Response for All Groups as to All Statements

I. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing the community college faculty in:	GROUP		
	F	SP	CP
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the system-wide grading policy minimum standards?	ME	E	E
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?	ME	E	E
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?	ME	E	E
(4) accreditation:	ME	E	NE

J. In representing community college faculties, to what extent do you think the statewide Academic Senate is politically effective with:	GROUP		
	F	SP	CP
(1) the legislature	NE	E	NE
(2) California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)	NE	E	NE
(3) California State Universities (CSU)	NE	E	NE
(4) University of California (UC)	NE	E	NE
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)	NE	E	E

K. How do you evaluate the overall effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate?	GROUP		
	F	SP	CP
	ME	E	E

Group: F = Faculty; SP = Senate Presidents; CP = College Presidents.
Pattern of Response: NE = Not Effective; ME = Moderately Effective;
 E = Effective; NC = No Concentration.

space in which to write comments, if they wished, "about the effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate." Approximately one-third (101 of 348) of the faculty respondents, one-third (29 of 70) of the senate presidents and one-third (22 of 71) of the college presidents chose to write comments. The respondent statements which follow were selected because they seemed representative of the comments submitted for each group.

Faculty. Of the faculty commenting, over 40 of the comments pertain to not knowing about the statewide Senate, having no contact or communication with the Senate, a communications gap. One respondent wrote, "I know more about the effectiveness of the Academic Senate through my activities in CTA and news articles than from information from my local senate, so I really do not know how state and local senates interact." Another wrote, "The efforts of the Academic Senate should be published and mailed to all faculty members--." Yet another commented, "I do not believe the state Academic Senate is effective in communicating to the faculty; therefore, they may be more active than I know of." One commented, "What has the Academic Senate done for me today? How do they know what the faculty needs are? Do they help in my teaching role? Am I more effective because of the Academic Senate?" One individual voiced the opinion, "The Academic Senate has become too 'academic' and is overly concerned with entrance standards. Also, they seldom reflect

the concerns of vocational education." Finally, "I believe statewide effectiveness depends upon the strength of local leaders, and when effectiveness is less than desirable, it is due to those who are inexperienced and less professionally involved than they should be in the political arenas (local and state)."

Senate Presidents. In commenting on the statewide Senate's effectiveness, the senate presidents did not concentrate on communication to the same extent as the faculty. Several recognized the problem from the perspective of the president, who receives the communications from the Senate, "While I feel that the statewide Senate has been very effective, I also believe that greater effort should be made to communicate with faculties at the local level. The communication is left to the local senates and often, due to the time investment in local problems, the state business is overlooked." Another wrote, "Its greatest strength is its credibility with the State Legislature, and Board of Governors. Its greatest weakness is that it seems pretty out of touch with rank & file faculty members on individual campuses."

Two senate presidents expressed strong criticism of the Senate. The first one wrote: "ASCCC is effective but in my opinion it is wrong-headed--we are being dragged back to a junior college position." The second: "When I indicate that the ASCCC has been effective or that it has been instrumental

in policy formation or change or that it has been active in speaking out on academic matters, I don't mean that I believe it has been a positive influence or that it represents the views of a majority of CC faculty. The ASCCC leadership represents an elitist point of view which I believe is contrary to the best interest of students."

College Presidents. When commenting on the Senate's effectiveness, one college president thought, "The statewide Senate has appeared to represent too small a segment of CC faculty and has been dominated too long by the same leadership. I see some signs of changes and hope for better representation & involvement with local senates." Another commented, "Too much emphasis on academic areas as opposed to vocational." Yet another, "Lack of systematic data gathering from local faculty & therefore lack of representative vote." Finally, "They seem to be a strong voice before the BOG & Legislature. I don't see much aimed back towards campus activity."

Paradigm Analysis

The intent of the questionnaires was to provide the broadest picture of the Academic Senate effectiveness as seen by three primary but separate groups in the Senate's environment. In Chapter IV, the reader was provided with a series of three distinct but related paradigm, as well as the logic justifying their use in juxtaposing the various data in

meeting this study's general objectives of determining the effectiveness and impact of the Academic Senate for California community colleges. Contained in each paradigm are definitions of organizational effectiveness developed by recognized authorities, as well as characteristics which are attributable to the specific paradigm.

The format of the questionnaire grouped the statements in thematic sequence, asking for responses to statements about the Senate's purposes (G), activities (H), representation (I), political effectiveness (J), and overall effectiveness (K). The behavior of the Senate which the respondents evaluated in each section was juxtaposed against the individual paradigm in this section of the questionnaire analysis. Typically, the Senate behavior evaluated for effectiveness by the questionnaire statements in the purposes (G) and activities (H) sections are Paradigm A behaviors; Senate representation (I), Paradigm B; and the Senate's political effectiveness (J), Paradigm C. Information which was obtained through observation, archival research and interviews was integrated as part of the analysis.

Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions

Paradigm A behavior assumes that all organizational activity is based on a combination of values and objectives which are meaningful to the organization. Organizational activity is based on organizational choice and it can be used as a means for identifying the reason--goal, purpose,

objective--for the action. This behavior is most often observed through the actions of centralized leadership which explores and evaluates various options in light of the cost to the organization. Typically, as the cost increases for an alternative, the likelihood that it will be chosen as an activity decreases and vice versa.

There are several features which were observed from the response patterns to the statements concerning the purposes, aims and functions of the Senate which indicated the effectiveness of the organization when behaving in a Paradigm A manner.

The response pattern evaluation for all groups on all items contained in this section revealed either Moderately Effective or Effective evaluations of Senate effectiveness (Figure 1). Further, on two items, efforts at strengthening local academic senates (G2) and making recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California community colleges (G4), all three groups agreed the Senate was Effective. Concerning item G2, the Senate was viewed as Moderately Effective and G4 as Effective. On all of the remaining items, the faculty and college presidents agreed that the Senate was Moderately Effective while the senate presidents saw the organization as Effective.

The similarity of responses between the college presidents' group and the faculty group was noteworthy--especially when one realizes that neither group is in the Senate's direct communication line. Generally, college presidents

have the greatest access to all governance information, which may explain their relatively small "don't know" response. The senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective more often than the other groups on most items. Interestingly, the senate presidents reduced their evaluation of Senate effectiveness concerning its efforts at strengthening local senates and agreed with the faculty and college presidents' Moderately Effective rating. The faculty and college presidents increased their evaluation to Effective and were in agreement with the senate presidents, when responding to the Senate's effectiveness at making recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California community colleges.

These response patterns illustrated that the composite view of the Senate's effectiveness was concentrated and was similar within and among the groups surveyed. Coupled with the organizational structure of the Senate, which is representative and democratically constructed, and the shared images which the respondents have, a picture of the Paradigm A effectiveness characteristics of the Senate emerged.

The faculty group demonstrated a much higher "don't know" response to all items than either of the other groups, which may be explained by the fact that the Senate's leadership is centered in its elected Executive Committee. Structurally, the Senate, through the Executive Committee, interacts with faculty through their local senate president. The local president has the responsibility to distribute the information. Recall that the senate presidents evaluated the

Senate as more effective than either the faculty or the college presidents, and this was very likely the result of their increased information.

Given that the senate presidents received the most substantial amount of direct information, their reduced evaluation of the Senate's effectiveness when concerned with strengthening local senates was more meaningful. Clearly, the senate presidents, who have the most information, suggested that the centralized leadership re-evaluate their approach to meeting this purpose.

These response patterns indicated the groups' broad description of the Senate's Paradigm A behavior in which the organization's values and axioms were observed and the shared images of the respondents apparent. As one college president commented on the questionnaire, "The Senate very effectively represents the views of the leadership. My personal view is that the ASCCC has very effectively followed directions with which I strongly disagree." There is a high probability that both college and senate presidents, because of their roles and access to information, were in a position to observe the organization's behavior more directly than the faculty.

When juxtaposed against the organizational effectiveness definitions and characteristics of Paradigm A, which are based on evaluating the extent of goal/purpose attainment by an organization, the behavior of the statewide Academic Senate was judged effective by the respondents.

Effectiveness of Senate Activities

The next section of the questionnaires was concerned with the effectiveness of the Senate concerning specific activities. All groups evaluated the Senate as Not Effective when communicating to faculty members in strengthening local senates. Because the Executive Committee Minutes and Senate conference reports contain numerous references to the general topic of communication, the problems encountered by local senates and the inherent difficulty of trying to solve the problem, these responses reflected Paradigm A behavior, characterized by problem identification and evaluation by the centralized leadership, and were consistent with responses observed in the previous section.

In four interviews, this researcher delved into the communications problem. Specifically raised were questions concerning whether the Executive Committee Minutes or newsletters were ever mailed to a larger group than the senate presidents. Each time the respondents indicated that there was controversy within the Executive Committee about the pros and cons of these types of communication. Especially controversial was the mailing of the Minutes to any one other than the Executive Committee.

The Committee meets monthly during the academic year and the Minutes cannot be approved until the following month. The prevailing opinion has been that the Minutes should not be mailed until approved and, because the issues are controversial and complex, even the approved Minutes could be

misleading and misunderstood. Also, much of the information would be outdated by the time the Minutes were received. Mailing costs are very expensive. In the final analysis, Executive Committee Minutes were not considered effective as a general communication device and, as a result, they were circulated to the Committee only. However, the minority opinion was that the Minutes remain the organ that provides the most consistent and available source of information about the on-going Senate activities.

Most Academic Senate presidents have produced periodic newsletters in an attempt to alleviate the recognized problem but these were mailed to senate presidents only. Because of the expenses involved, there has been no large-scale mailing to the general membership about the Academic Senate activities. Senate presidents were encouraged to circulate the various publications.

Last spring, the Executive Committee received correspondence from a local senate representative, indicating the Committee should involve local senate presidents in the activities of the Executive Committee more directly. The Committee agreed with the letter and responded (Executive Committee Minutes, March, 1982) by setting aside a workshop day for senate presidents as part of the Fall 1982 Conference. Also, Executive Committee representatives, as reported in the same Minutes, were reminded strongly to more effectively represent their regions and build a solid base by calling the campuses they represent.

In these instances, the Senate demonstrated, through its centralized leadership, Paradigm A behavior. The activities resulted from organizational choice based on the purposes and objectives, were in response to identified problems, and were carefully evaluated prior to the decision.

The response patterns of the groups for the remaining items in this section of the questionnaire illustrated similarities to those observed in the previous section and continued to illustrate Paradigm A behavior. The faculty and college presidents' groups agreed that, when concerned with confidence and trust in the Academic Senate to represent community college faculties on academic and professional matters and the response of the Senate to changing needs of faculty, the Senate was Not Effective. The senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective on these two items.

When each of these items was juxtaposed against Paradigm A, the respondents of the respective groups viewed the Senate behavior as centrally controlled and two of the groups, faculty and college presidents, have a shared image of Senate effectiveness. The senate presidents' image of the organization, which differed from the other groups, was probably due to their presence in the direct communication path. Their view of the Senate was Effective and centrally controlled.

The response groups illustrated their divergence of opinion regarding the effectiveness of the Senate concerning Academic Senate responsiveness to recommendations made or positions taken by local senates. Common to all groups was a

high "don't know" response, with over 40% of the faculty and college presidents' responses in this category. For the faculty, the remaining responses were spread among the categories. The centralized organizational structure of the Senate has, to a certain extent, control over the information the respondents need to evaluate response items. Consistent with its Paradigm A behavior, the centralized leadership has chosen not to distribute information widely.

The college presidents and senate presidents shared an image of the Academic Senate as Effective in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern, but differed with the Moderately Effective image held by the faculty group.

When the responses to statements contained in this section were juxtaposed against the Paradigm A characteristics, the behavior of the Academic Senate was found to be less consistent than that of the previous section. The faculty and college presidents shared an image of the Senate's effectiveness as Not Effective on nearly half of the section's items. Yet, the senate presidents viewed the Senate as Effective on all but two items (H1, H7). Clearly, the respondents have identified problem areas for the Senate. The behavior concerning the specified activities must be identified as mixed in its effectiveness. These activities are logically tied to the purposes, aims and functions of the Senate. Because they are specific activities, the attention was more narrowly

focused and resulted in providing a more discriminating evaluation of Senate effectiveness.

Paradigm A defines organizational activity as based on organizational choices which are bound by organizational objectives. Effectiveness, then, is activity specific and, clearly, the Senate's effectiveness concerning some activities was found to be minimal. On other items, the Senate was identified as effective. The Paradigm's value in identifying the reason for some of the Senate's ineffectiveness was apparent in the discussion about communication.

Effectiveness of Senate Representation

When the respondents for all three groups were asked to respond to the extent of Senate effectiveness in representing community college faculty concerning specified issues, the faculty group demonstrated a gravitation to the middle, evaluating the Senate as Moderately Effective, and a strong "don't know" response. Not so with the two presidents' groups, who viewed the effectiveness of the Senate as Effective in all areas but one. This exception was seen in the college presidents' response to the accreditation item in which they provided a Not Effective rating of the Senate.

The issues listed--system-wide grading policy, California State Universities' general education requirements, associate degree regulations and accreditation--may appear to be without any unifying theme. However, they were thematically tied by virtue of the fact that they were issues in

the Senate's environment for which other agencies had final authority for resolution. The Senate's activities in representing faculty regarding these issues, all of which directly impact the community college faculties, demonstrated Paradigm B behavior of the Senate.

Paradigm B assumes that an organization consists of sub-units, each of which have existing goals, programs and rules by which they operate. The activity or output of the organization is directed by a coordinated leadership and is the result of established routines and loose coordination of the sub-units. Short-term activity is based on standard procedures, while long-term output is based on organizational goals and programs. The organization attempts to routinize its activity and to standardize interaction with its environment.

Paradigm B organizational effectiveness definitions incorporate the totality of the organization--acquisition and transformation of resources, outputs, feedback, and preservation of organizational integrity.

The following is offered to illustrate the Senate's Paradigm B behavior. The system-wide grading policy was the result of a statewide controversy concerning the quality of education in California and the specific attendant issues in higher education of poorly-prepared entering freshmen, less than minimal competency in basic skills in large numbers of students, reduction of entrance and exit requirements and grade inflation, to name but a few. The effects of the

massive changes in educational values and philosophy made during the 1960's and early 1970's prompted the controversy.

In 1977, stimulated by external influences and consistent with its aims and purposes, the Senate Executive Committee established the Academic Standards Committee (now the Educational Policies Committee) as a standing committee. This Committee developed and analyzed a questionnaire which was distributed to faculty throughout the community college system. In reporting the results to the Spring 1979 Senate Conference, the Committee provided the delegates with information about grading practices and academic quality which was previously unavailable. Leon Baradat, Chair of the Committee in 1977, felt that individuals and professional groups, previously unaware of the Academic Senate's existence, became very interested in the Senate and its activities as a result of this report. Undoubtedly, the quality of this effort was viewed as a demonstration of the seriousness with which the Senate was willing to attack the academic standards issues and more than one informant indicated it was directly related to the subsequent support for and recognition by the Board of Governors of the Senate as the statewide representative for community college faculty on all matters of academic and professional concern in 1979.

Paradigm B behavior identifies sub-units which have existing goals and programs. The Academic Standards Committee quickly became a vital sub-unit and utilized other sub-units, the local senates, to achieve its goals. Any analysis

of Paradigm B behavior is concerned with how the information is provided because the value of the Paradigm rests with identifying the routines that mediate organizational activity. In this instance, the Academic Standards Committee provided information to the leadership which was a reflection of fact, as well as the organization's goals.

Another indication of Paradigm B behavior was the establishment of routines, rules, standard operating procedures. The recognition of the Senate by the Chancellor's Office and Board of Governors simultaneously established procedures whereby the Senate representatives would meet regularly with the Chancellor; Senate officers would be included in the development of Board of Governors' agenda items; and, participation of the Senate in the appointment of faculty to Chancellor's task groups and committees was assured. Several years later, local senate presidents were included on the distribution list for the Chancellor's Office publications relating to academic and professional matters.

By 1980 the die was cast in the direction of a system-wide grading policy specifying minimum standards. There were many voices in the development of the final regulations. Clearly, the Senate participation on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee and the subsequent procedure requiring colleges to work through the local senates to establish the campus policy (district standards could be more stringent) were characteristic of Paradigm B. Another ingredient in the Paradigm B behavior pattern was the Senate's procedural

commitment to bringing as much information as feasible to the semi-annual conferences for debate and resolution development. The resolutions were subsequently used to establish direction for the organization by the Executive Committee, sub-committees and various other representatives. Also, local senates used the resolutions in similar ways. The long-term output of an organization is defined by the organizational goals in Paradigm B behavior. Coordinated by its leadership, subunits acted following prescribed procedures and routines. The organizational activity of the Senate led to the organizational output which took the form of implementation of statewide minimum grading standards in 1981-82.

The response patterns to questionnaire item I1, concerning grading standards, suggested that those who received the information (either from the Senate or other sources) and participated directly, i.e., senate presidents and college presidents, were very aware of the Senate's activities. Each group evaluated the Senate as Effective concerning this issue. The faculty viewed the Senate as Moderately Effective but many "didn't know" about the Senate's involvement in establishing the grading policy minimum standards.

Once the Senate was recognized as the statewide voice where academic and professional matters were concerned, it became routine, in typical Paradigm B fashion, for the Senate to participate with the other segments of education. The California State University and University of California Senates quickly recognized the status of the Senate and granted

Intersegmental Committee (representatives from CSU, UC, CC faculties) membership, as well as interaction with the presidents of UC and CSU senates, and other cooperative efforts became routine activities of the Senate. Also, participation with the State Board of Education Roundtable began.

The California State University system, in response to extensive criticism about the quality of their education, decided to do a thorough re-evaluation of their general education requirements. Besides providing parallel freshman and sophomore level coursework for transfer students, the community colleges had been granted, by the California State University system, the authority to certify when general education requirements were met by transferring students. In undertaking this re-evaluation, the California State University system, in effect, was questioning the quality of its academic program, as well as that of the community colleges.

Senate representatives met regularly with California State University senate representatives and others, and the two systems interacted regularly through the Chancellors' offices. Again, the regulations and reporting procedures were developed with full participation of the Academic Senate. Local senates were responsible for developing and implementing, in conjunction with administration and boards of trustees, the individual campus review and re-evaluation of the meaning of general education.

Once again, the Senate's Paradigm B behavior, as defined by its long-term goals, coordinated by its leadership,

operated in conjunction with its sub-units and used established procedures, was observed. The senate presidents and college presidents in their responses to the item (I2) considered the Senate Effective, while the faculty viewed the Senate as Moderately Effective.

On the heels of the California State University re-evaluation of their general education requirements, the Board of Governors, California Community Colleges, through the Chancellor, mandated a thorough review of the associate degree requirements. The pattern for the review was identified and the procedures outlined based on those used in previous issues. Certain minimum requirements were established by the Board but not without advice from many groups, including the statewide Academic Senate. Within the framework, individual district variations were appropriate. The Board and Chancellor, once again, worked in conjunction with Senate representatives (and others). The delegate assembly debated the issues, which were centered largely around the statewide associate degree requirements concerning competency in reading, writing and computation, since the new regulation required that competency be demonstrated by degree recipients. How it is demonstrated and other details of implementation were the prerogative of the district.

The Senate Conference resolutions demonstrated the broad involvement of the Senate in the associate degree issues. The process for arriving at these resolutions illustrated the Senate's Paradigm B commitment to using standard procedures

as the foundation for positions taken by sub-units and representatives of the organization. The issues surrounding the implementation of the associate degree minimum requirements continue to be debated on individual campuses through local senates, administrations and boards of trustees as this study is written. They must be in place for the 1983-84 school year.

The patterns of response to the questionnaire item I3 remain similar to the previous items: the faculty indicated the Senate to be Moderately Effective but largely without information about its involvement; the presidents' groups indicated an Effective evaluation of Senate activities and greater knowledge about the activities.

The final item of this section concerned the effectiveness of the Senate in representing faculty in issues surrounding accreditation. Accreditation, as a concern of the Academic Senate, is discussed thoroughly, in relation to the Paradigm and participant observation, in Chapter VII.

The issues selected for this portion of the questionnaire involved every campus in the system and were either resolved and being implemented as this study began or have not been resolved as it draws to closure. The process by which the issues have been debated and discussed, statewide, represented the culmination of many of the Senate's most basic efforts, which have been directed toward the routinization/acceptance of the Senate through legal justification and standard procedures as the faculty representative on matters

of academic and professional concern. Also, through the efforts of the Senate, which are largely unknown to most faculty, the routine involvement (often specified in Title V regulations) of local senates has been effected. A pattern, in the way the Academic Senate addressed issues, emerged and follows.

1. Issue is identified by one or more of the following:
Board of Governors; Chancellor; statewide Academic Senate; local senate; California State University; University of California; Public.
2. Referral to Committee: Chancellor's Advisory Committee; Intersegmental Committee; Roundtable; AS-CIO; Academic Senate Educational Policies Committee; Academic Senate Executive Committee; Internal Ad Hoc Committee.
3. Executive Committee debate/discussion.
4. Recommendation of Executive Committee to delegate assembly for approval/disapproval, unless time frame cannot be adjusted.
5. Resolutions from Conferences offer the foundation on which the Senate builds positions and alternative positions in representing faculty concerns.
6. Local senate activity related to discussion and/or implementation of alternatives.

There were many variations to the above steps and the steps may not always occur in the identified sequence. All of the standardized procedures and coordination of the

units were directed toward output-oriented behavior which indicated that the Senate spoke for and represented the faculty.

When the responses to this section were juxtaposed against Paradigm B, the Academic Senate's effectiveness was considered Moderately Effective. In actuality, the outputs have been effective, but the organizational routines which were responsible for the large "don't know" response from the faculty mediated their understanding of the Senate's effectiveness in representing them.

Political Effectiveness of the Senate

Paradigm C assumes that every organization is composed of many players who are involved in activity, resulting from the bargaining and negotiation which occurs along routinized pathways. Conflict and compromise are everyday occurrences. There are many actors involved in the organizational behavior and they have diverse interests and uneven influences. An integral part of the Paradigm is the recognition of power bases and of shared power bases.

Paradigm C behavior recognizes that individuals have goals, past positions, and priorities which may conflict with the organization's goals. Outcomes are often the result of confusion, compromise, and muddling of the individual actors. Organizational activity is not the result of unitary action taken by the whole organization.

Effectiveness definitions for Paradigm C incorporate the

notion of interdependence and the role of the individual in incorporating personal motives and goals with organizational goals.

The faculty and college presidents' responses to the political effectiveness of the Senate were very similar on all but one item. Both groups considered the Senate to be Not Effective on items J1-4. The college presidents, however, differed from the faculty but agreed with the senate presidents, and evaluated the Senate as politically Effective in interacting with the Board of Governors (J5). Perhaps this was attributable to the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of the routine procedures and coordinated efforts evaluated in the previous section. The senate presidents saw the Senate as Moderately Effective, politically, on all items except when interacting with the Legislature and Board of Governors, where they evaluated the Senate as Effective.

Paradigm C behavior prescribes that action results from the negotiation that occurs along routinized pathways--within and outside the organization. The items in this section requested the respondents to evaluate the political effectiveness, the Paradigm C behavior, of the Senate when it interacted with organizations in its environment. When the responses were juxtaposed against Paradigm C, the Senate's effectiveness was judged ineffective by the faculty, effective by the senate presidents and, not effective by the college presidents. However, the Paradigm addressed interdependence and individual behavior related to organizational

activity. The questionnaire statements concerned judgments about entire organizations. Since Paradigm C behavior is not the result of unitary action taken by the whole organization, the evaluation of the Academic Senate's political effectiveness was expanded by exploring the actors through interviews and participant observation.

That the Senate has been working in the Paradigm C mode with some degree of effectiveness may become more conclusive when the interviews and participant observation data are analyzed in later chapters. The issues identified in the previous section of the questionnaire illustrated the Senate's participation in issues largely generated by elements outside the organization and handled through joint committee interaction, in which various interest and representative groups participated. Since the Senate is collegial and advisory with final decision-making power resting in the arena of other groups, it was interesting to observe that Paradigm C behavior occurred simultaneously to A and B, in many instances. Certainly many Senate players were involved in the grading policy, general education, associate degree, and accreditation issues. Clearly, these individuals were often in situations where there were diverse interests and in which the players had unequal influence. Any one issue traced, as accreditation is in Chapter VII, will further illustrate the conflict and compromise present in everyday interaction.

CHAPTER VII

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

In March, 1982, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate was presented with an abstract of the proposal for this study and a letter requesting their support in the research. The formal request was carried by Leon Baradat, Chair of the Educational Policies Committee and member of the Executive Committee. Prior to the Committee meeting, Baradat had received and read the complete proposal and we had discussed thoroughly the objectives and methodology so that he would be prepared to answer questions about the proposed research.

It was my firm conviction that the success of this study would rest on the willingness of the Executive Committee to cooperate by: including me in their mailings; providing address labels of the local senate presidents for use with the questionnaire; allowing me to indicate in correspondence that they were knowledgeable about my project; providing access to the archives; and providing general access to information about the activities of the Senate. In short, I needed credentials to approach the membership and environment of the Senate.

The approved Executive Committee Minutes, March 26 and 27, 1982, indicate that "Baradat presented a research proposal by Gail Prentiss, Program Coordinator (Director) at

MiraCosta College and doctoral candidate in education at University of San Diego. She wishes to study the Senate, its goals and impact. It was agreed (MSC Conn/Baradat) with two abstentions that we cooperate with this study" (Note 8). There was some discussion as to whether the Senate was endorsing the proposal and some concern as to whether it was obligated to support the results.

Guba and Lincoln defined participant observation " . . . as a form of inquiry in which the inquirer--the observer--is playing two roles. First of all, of course, he is an observer; as such, he is responsible to persons outside the milieu being observed. But, he is also a genuine participant; that is, he is a member of the group, and he has a stake in the group's activity and the outcomes of that activity" (1981, p. 189).

As a participant observer, the methodology of choice for this research was described as " . . . based on the assumption that a researcher can enter a situation with the subjects knowing who he is and why he is there, and can establish with them a relationship characterized by trust and a free and open exchange of information" (Bogdan, 1971, p. 21). It was such an environment that I entered beginning in April, 1982.

Academic Senate Spring Conference-- April, 1982

"Building Excellence in Education," the theme of the Spring 1982 Conference, provided my initial opportunity to

observe the Academic Senate in action. This was the first face-to-face meeting with various members of the Senate Executive Committee since their discussion of my proposal and there were numerous positive comments about my project. Within moments of the normal "get acquainted" conference behavior, as we stood around the coffee pot, several delegates expressed curiosity about my project. By the close of the Conference two days later, numerous people had offered suggestions of people for me to interview and meetings I should consider attending.

One of the meetings which was suggested as having a high potential for being interesting to observe was the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges' semi-annual meeting, to be held in June, 1982. The proposed agenda for the meeting included a response to the Senate's request that it appoint faculty representatives to the Commission and that the number of faculty representatives to the Commission be increased to 40% of the Commission's total membership. Testimony from the Senate representatives would be presented at that meeting.

Bogdan (1972) described the role of the participant observer as one of seeing the world as the subjects see it; to understand the complexity of the setting (pp. 3-4). The observer at once acts as an insider to the issue, while describing the program to the outside without affecting the data. I decided that the accreditation issue provided substantial opportunity for development as a participant

observation theme for the study. In addition to being able to observe the Senate in action at meetings and hearings, publications, memos and interviews were available to provide a thorough analysis of this issue.

Foundations for the Issues

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) is the parent organization to several commissions. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) is the accrediting body which most affects the institutional lives of the California, Hawaiian and Pacific Basin (American Samoa, Guam, Micronesia) schools and colleges which include public and private institutions. The other two commissions of WASC are: Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities and Accrediting Commission for Secondary Schools.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges' Handbook of Accreditation and Policy Manual, 1981, defined accreditation as:

A voluntary process involving an association of schools and colleges to encourage high standards of education. Accreditation indicates that the accrediting commission judges that the institution, in a manner consistent with commission standards, offers its students, on a satisfactory level, the educational policies set forth in its objectives, and is likely to continue to do so.

Clearly, faculty participation in the process is of critical importance in defining institutional objectives, academic quality and educational opportunities for students. The Academic Senate's concern for increasing the faculty involvement in accreditation began in the fall of 1970 at the conference when the following resolution was passed.

The Academic Senate recommends that the Accrediting Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges give serious consideration to greater utilization of community college faculty as an integral part of the accreditation teams visiting all community colleges and that the nomination of these faculty members be made by the Academic Senate and/or local faculty senates and that representation be appropriate for programs within that college (Note 11).

The early concern centered around justifying and accomplishing the right of the Senate to provide the faculty names for appointment to faculty positions on the visiting teams and increasing the number of faculty members on each visiting team. In 1977, the Commission agreed to accept nominations for visiting teams from the Academic Senate. This procedure remains in place.

The Senate leadership turned its attention to increasing the number of faculty representation and to acquiring the right of appointing the faculty representatives to the Commission. Because the Commission only meets semi-annually and WASC meets yearly, any changes take a long time to effect.

The issue of faculty representation--numbers of and who appoints--was an active issue at the time I went to the Academic Senate Conference in Spring, 1982. It required much effort to "catch up" on the various steps occurring over many years which preceded the following account. To their credit, Senate representatives Conn, Bischof, Baradat, Hinkley, and others never lost patience with my questions or my presence.

Accreditation was one of many topics I discussed with Edith Conn during an interview session. What follows was her brief account of the most noteworthy events surrounding the Senate's activities as they related to accreditation.

Prentiss: In a nutshell, can you give me the background of the accreditation issues from the beginning?

Conn: Well, it all started at one of the very first Senate conferences in fall, 1970. There was a resolution passed; something to the effect that faculty should be more involved in accreditation and should serve on the accreditation teams appointed by the Senate. As far as I know, nothing happened at that point until Tyra (Duncan-Hall) got up at a meeting of the whole Senate in the spring of '76 and said, "Whatever happened to the resolution that we passed in 1970?" She said, "Why aren't we on those accreditation teams; why aren't we being appointed by the Senate to those teams?" I think that Walt McCallum was President then and somehow he started to pursue why faculty weren't on visitation teams. When I was President and he was Past President, I asked him

to continue and we had a difficult time just finding out where the Accrediting Commission Office was located.

We finally found the Office and it was hard to get any definite answer, but what we found out was that the meeting of the Commission was going to be in Hawaii and I said, "That's great. Go to Hawaii and ask them if the Senate can begin to appoint members to the teams." We had to build up the rationale and prepare a great deal of material justifying the Senate position. Walt McCallum went, in spite of the expense, and they said, yes, you can address us for five minutes; we're very busy and we usually don't take testimony. When you think about all those years the Accreditation Commission must have been meeting with nobody knowing what was going on--never again. He made the presentation and they accepted the idea that the Senate could make nominations to the teams. Then Walt didn't run again. He went off the Board and Lloyd DeGarmo took it up from there.

We decided to find out how the people got on the Commission. You wouldn't think things would be hard to find out, but it wasn't easy. That concern really didn't start in earnest until two or three years ago. We started going to their meetings, at least I started going to their meetings, and testified on other things. We were kind of side-tracked a little bit . . . let's see, it would have been the year Tyra (Duncan-Hall) was President, when they started re-writing the Accreditation Handbook. We really worked on that and practically rewrote it ourselves, especially that Standard 9

which has to do with governance. We wanted the Academic Senate written in there and that was a struggle. And we wanted faculty all through it. I met with Mary Amber and Val (Villa). We had an eight-hour lunch at the Hyatt in Los Angeles and just went through the proposals. We also had people testifying at various hearings on the Accreditation Handbook, but we worked very hard on that and did get faculty written in at various points. But most important was the section on Faculty Governance where it says, "The Faculty Senate shall be important . . ." It also includes Val's statement at the end, explaining the difference between the Senate and collective bargaining units. So, once having done that, which took about a year and a half, we went back to the issue of appointing people to the Commission itself and the first response we got from Swenson was, "Why don't you ask CCJCA (now CACC)?" So, in fact, we did ask them. Of course, they just laughed.

Prentiss: This is pre-Kellerman (Executive Director, CACC).

Conn: Yes. Kellerman just came on in '82. This would have been in Lloyd Messersmith's time. So, we had to ask the CCJCA, and we asked them, if we could make nominations through CCJCA but none of that worked out. A year ago, in the spring of 1981, John Petersen (Chair of the Commission) finally agreed with us that they should re-examine their appointment procedures and other aspects of membership. So, John made the motion that there be a committee to study the

appointing procedures. That's why I went to Hawaii to testify--because the committee made its report and the Senate didn't like it. That brings us to '82 and this past spring. It's interesting that one of the arguments we used to support why we should appoint people to the Commission was that we had been recognized in their Handbook which was, of course, an accomplishment in itself.

It should be noted that Conn's testimony (to which she referred in our interview) before the Accrediting Commission meeting in Hawaii in January, 1982, represented the Senate's response to the Ad Hoc Committee's proposed changes in Commission composition. At that time, the Ad Hoc Committee had recommended that nominations for ACCJC representatives should be gathered statewide but that a committee of the Commission make the appointments. Conn provided me with a copy of her prepared testimony in which she began by congratulating the Commission on appointing the Ad Hoc Committee to study its membership and appointment procedures and pointed out that many changes in community colleges have occurred since the Commission's procedures were adopted. One major change cited was the emergence of senates, coupled with the concept of collegiality and shared governance, in community colleges.

Next, Conn identified the Academic Senate's two major concerns with the proposal.

Our main concerns with the proposal of the Ad Hoc Committee are only two.

1. We feel there must be a definite commitment to

a specific number or percentage of faculty on the Commission. Significant faculty participation is required in self-study reports. A logical extension of this crucial faculty role at local colleges is having a significant number of faculty on the Accrediting Commission. On a Commission largely devoted to evaluation of educational excellence, it would seem appropriate to have faculty as key members. Senate appointments are now accepted by many state agencies, offices, and groups. Our proposal, that 40% of the Commission be faculty, appointed by the Academic Senate, was not only passed unanimously at our Fall Conference, but was also specifically supported by letters and wires to Dr. Swenson from college and district senates representing more than one-third of the colleges.

2. We are concerned about the credibility of a commission composed almost totally of self-appointed members as the proposal of the Ad Hoc Committee recommends. We know of no other state Commission that is self-appointed. We feel neither the goals of affirmative action nor those of geographic and institutional diversity can be fully met if the Ad Hoc Committee report is accepted. While I do not wish

to take the time now to discuss details of alternative proposals, I do suggest that the Commission direct the Ad Hoc Committee to hold open hearings at which various approaches to appointment and membership procedures may be discussed. I do want to mention, however, that we as a Senate have worked very cooperatively with Dr. Swenson in suggesting nominees for accrediting teams. We submit, after careful local screening, a group of names from whom Dr. Swenson selects those who meet the particular needs of the institutions to be accredited ...

Therefore, we urge the Commission to do the following.

1. Return the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Committee without endorsement.
2. Ask the Committee to hold open hearings to discuss alternative proposals for Commission membership and appointments. The Committee, before submitting the report before you, met only once in a non-publicized meeting. We suggest open hearings so that the Senate (and others) may discuss their views. On this crucial issue dialogue is essential; soliciting written comments alone is not enough.
3. Suggest that the Committee bring more than one proposal to the Commission for consideration in

June. We feel the Commission should have the opportunity to consider more than one plan.

4. Listen to the voice of the faculty of California Community Colleges . . . (Note 11).

As a result of this testimony, the Commission decided to distribute a copy of the testimony, as well as the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal to member institutions, and to hold open hearings concerning the Committee's report.

The Accrediting Commission held hearings on May 5 (northern California) and May 11 (southern California) for the purpose of gathering input on the issue of the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal. In preparation for those hearings, Conn reported to Senate delegates at the Spring Conference of 1982 and briefly outlined the policy the Senate wanted the Commission to adopt. The Senate proposal requested that 40% of the total Commission membership be composed of faculty members and that the Senate appoint the faculty representatives to the Commission. Following discussion on the proposal, Conn's report ended when she urged delegates to testify in support of the Senate position at the hearings.

A short time after the Spring Conference, I received correspondence from Conn, including the materials which provided substantive background information on the issue and a notice that the pre-hearing strategy caucus would take place about 12:45 p.m., May 11, 1982, in the student union at Santa Monica Community College. Conn indicated she would have

information from Norbert Bischof as to the outcome of the northern California hearing at that time.

Accrediting Commission Hearing--May 11, 1982

Pre-Hearing Caucus. Conn revealed at the caucus that the several administrators spoke against the Senate position and that some exploration of possible compromise positions occurred in dialogue among the Commissioners present and those testifying at the northern California hearing. The Senate representatives then decided who would make statements and in what order. Some discussion took place concerning the testimony to be given. All agreed that: They would not be drawn into a discussion about possible compromise positions; they would not participate in exchanges concerning what accreditation teams on individual campusus did or did not do; and, they identified two individuals, Executive Committee members Carmen Decker and Alfredo Mendoza, who would direct attention to the Commission's current method for selecting faculty representatives.

The group was very aware that the reason for these hearings was that Edith Conn's testimony at the previous Commission meeting in Hawaii raised the issue to the point that it could not be subordinated any longer. Leon Baradat reviewed the strategy and provided support for the Senate's position: collegiality; accreditation speaks to instruction which is what faculty know best; Senate is the recognized voice of community college faculty; and, CTA, AFT and FACCC all agree

with the Senate's position. Also, the Commission's Ad Hoc Committee proposal advocated that appointments to the Commission be made by the Commission--a very undemocratic process.

The Hearing. At least 10 colleges, some of which were represented by Senate members and some by administrators, were present at the Hearing. Also, a representative from FACCC was present.

The Commission members identified the ground rules for testimony which consisted, largely, of establishing the order in which testimony would be heard, which was alphabetical. The first three persons deferred their testimony to a later time which allowed Edith Conn to present the Senate's position. Her testimony included the points identified in the pre-caucus, plus a statement indicating that the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges was the last major body in California who's faculty representation was not appointed by a senate. The testimony following Conn's was given by a variety of individuals representing various aspects of the Senate viewpoint, as well as others who represented different points of view.

The opposition to the Senate position was offered by two administrators, the President of West Los Angeles College and the Vice President of Instruction at El Camino College. They indicated that when one group was responsible for appointing, there was no assurance that all points of view would be

represented; that the integrity of the Commission should be maintained; that the Commission was responsible to its member schools which are located not only in California but the Hawaiian Islands, Guam and the Pacific Islands. To change the composition of the Commission would affect the representation of other member groups, creating more and difficult problems.

Leon Baradat, in his role as Chair of the Senate's Educational Policies Committee, testified that the credibility of accreditation, in general, was under question by CPEC, the California Department of Public Instruction and the Legislature. He rebutted the opposition testimony concerning the hazards of one organization appointing representatives to the Commission by asking, "then why should CACC (formerly CCJCA) continue to appoint faculty representatives to the Commission?" He closed by indicating the Commission's Ad Hoc Committee proposal advocated appointments to the Commission by the Commissioners--and "only the Soviet Politburo operates that way."

Terry Maare, President of FACCC, indicated his organization supported the Academic Senate's position.

Post-Hearing Caucus. Testimony was exhausted approximately one hour after the Hearing began. Faculty representatives caucused in the faculty lounge of the college following the hearing. A complete de-briefing occurred and strategy for the June 14 meeting of the Commission was

developed. It was clear that the two Commissioners present had not understood the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal and that the Senate had not yet prepared a compromise position. Those present identified the Commissioners who should be lobbied before the June meeting in an attempt to gain Senate support. It was anticipated, based on the previous year's Commission hearing, that the agenda would be long and time short. The decision was made for Conn to notify Robert Swenson, Executive Director of the Accrediting Commission, that there would be individuals at the meetings who would want to be heard, and he would be notified of the Senate's position in a letter from Barbara Hinkley, Senate President.

Discussion turned to, "if all else fails, what is the Senate's new position?" The caucus became a brainstorming session with various possibilities being explored. The consensus was that the Senate had many options; that it was willing to listen to a compromise to the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal if one were offered. The most likely compromise was thought to be an offer to appoint some faculty members from a list supplied by the Senate but that the Commission would not likely change its constitution. A constitutional change would be required if the Senate proposal of 40% faculty composition of the Commission and the Senate as the appointing body were accepted. The strategy agreed upon was to wait and see how the meeting in June developed, but to recognize two points: the figure of 40% faculty representation would be

negotiable and the Senate right of appointment of faculty representatives would not.

The caucus disbanded about 4:30 p.m., with everyone agreeing they would try to get to San Francisco for the Commission meeting and "pack the room." Edith Conn would convey the sense of the hearing to the Executive Committee members who were not present.

Accrediting Commission Meeting--June 14, 1982

A telephone conversation with Edith Conn revealed that she had recently talked with Robert Swenson, Accrediting Commission Executive Director, to establish what time the issue of faculty membership on the Commission would be discussed and found out that it would be discussed at 9:00 a.m. as the first item on the agenda. Conn and Swenson agreed to a meeting about one week before the Commission meeting. The purpose, from Conn's point of view, was to articulate the Senate's position and perhaps offer some feasible alternatives to the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal.

Conn indicated there would be a Senate caucus in the Plaza Airport lobby at 8:15 a.m., June 14, and urged me to attend.

Pre-Meeting Caucus. About 10 Senate representatives began to gather and we moved into the coffee shop to review the morning's strategy. Conn provided an overview of the issues, reviewed what happened at the Hearings, and answered

questions. It was agreed that everyone should be prepared to speak but that Conn would introduce the Senate's concerns, followed by Hinkley and Bischof addressing more specific aspects of the issue.

Commission Meeting. The Commission conducted some routine business and by 9:20 a.m. was prepared to discuss the issue of proposed changes in Commission membership. The number of Senate representatives had increased to 29 and they represented colleges from all over California. The physical setting was that of a long, narrow meeting room in the hotel, furnished with a rectangular conference table around which the Commission sat. The chairs on which the Senate representatives were seated totally surrounded the Commission.

John Petersen, President of Cabrillo College and Chair of the Commission, reviewed the motions being proposed. Many letters had been received by the Commission between the time of the May hearings and the June 14 meeting. Letters from Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes of Los Angeles and Senators Gary Hart of Santa Barbara and Leroy Greene of Sacramento were read and acknowledged. The thrust of these letters was to stress the importance of faculty participation throughout accreditation and the important role played by the statewide Academic Senate in the process. Also, the legislators indicated that any Commission structure which would provide for Commission appointment of Commissioners without faculty involvement would be viewed unfavorably.

The Chair suggested that the agenda be interrupted briefly while he and Senate representatives discussed the procedures for taking testimony. It was agreed that the open discussion would be limited to 30 minutes.

Edith Conn made the opening statement, as had been planned in the caucus, followed by Barbara Hinkley (President), Palomar College, and Phil Hartley (Vice President), Chaffey College. Hinkley addressed the criticism of the Senate expressed by individual Commissioners during the hearings that it didn't represent vocational faculty. She provided a copy of the list of self-declared disciplines, provided by registrants to the Spring Conference, which indicated that many delegates were from vocational areas. Hartley addressed the importance of accreditation and indicated that the faculty supported accreditation. He indicated the Academic Senate wanted to increase faculty involvement in accreditation and that included faculty-appointed faculty representatives to the Commission. Further, he said the Senate was the vehicle for accomplishing this since it was the recognized representative of faculty on academic and professional matters and it was democratically constituted.

Jean Vincenzi (Saddleback College) emphasized the "rightness" of accreditation. The purity of the accrediting process was protected by the representatives of the Commission. She suggested that the Commission must fight the "old boys" syndrome and the tendency toward "you scratch my back

and I'll scratch yours." The purity of accreditation and rightness of the process must be protected.

Jack Stirton of CTA indicated support for the Senate's position and stated that accreditation was concerned with academic and professional matters. Therefore, CTA recognized and supported the Senate's position because it was in the scope of the defined role of the Senate and not an appropriate concern of collective bargaining.

At least nine other Senate representatives testified, each emphasizing a different point. When the allotted 30 minutes had elapsed, testimony was concluded, but those who had not testified were requested to give their name and school to be entered in the records.

The Chair of the Commission opened the discussion, indicating his support for the Senate position, but rhetorically questioned who the constituents of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges were. He pointed out that the Commission must insure the participation of all interested parties and the apparent domination by California community colleges had raised the concern of the private member institutions, as well as the institutions located in the other geographical locations. In closing, he indicated that the motion before the Commission would allow for an increase in faculty representation while addressing the concerns of the other institutional members.

Jack Hedges, a faculty representative to the Commission appointed by CACC (CCJCA), moved to amend the motion to

increase the Commission size to 19 members to allow for more faculty representation. The pro argument focused on the general agreement that there should be more faculty representation: the collegial model would be supported; the Senate as the group that represents faculty should appoint; other organizations were currently represented by Commissioners--CCJCA, CCCT. The con argument centered on the possibility that it would open the flood gates to other groups which would demand representation to the Commission; that the proposed change would raise the ire of member institutions; and, that California faculty would represent all other faculty.

Thomas W. Fryer, Jr., Chancellor of the Foothill-DeAnza Community College District and member of the Commission, spoke out sharply against the motion. He, too, indicated a desire to accommodate the position of the Academic Senate but he indicated his strong disapproval of the Senate's political references--i.e., Baradat's statement about the similarity of the Commission's proposal to the Soviet Politburo (Hinkley had quoted Baradat) and the use of the pressure of letters from legislators who today are friends but will be gone tomorrow. Fryer spoke directly to Hinkley, saying he had read all of the material she had sent but remained critical of the value of the Senate resolutions concerning accreditation and, in fact, most Senate resolutions because they did not discriminate between what are trivial and critical issues. He closed his opposition statement by indicating

that he did not like the motion under discussion but that he did not have an alternative solution. Fryer proposed that no action be taken, saying the Commission would be ill-advised to push for hasty solution that has far-reaching implications.

Discussion about the motion and its amendment continued. Gus Guichard, Vice Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the individual filling the only place on the Commission required in statute (Title V), expressed concern for the credibility of the Commission. He indicated that he didn't believe the legislative interest demonstrated by the letters was just a passing concern. There appeared to be abundant legislative interest. He indicated that he didn't sense an objection to broader faculty input but "how" was the question. Guichard suggested a process that would include drawing nominations from many groups and selecting faculty Commissioners from the list. Guichard indicated that the decision may have to be delayed.

Robert E. Swenson, Executive Director of the Commission, indicated that an increase in Commission size would cause an increase in expenses. He reminded the Commissioners that constitutional changes require a year to implement and that the Commission could continue to operate effectively for another year under the current constitution.

Fryer proposed the motion be tabled and that the Chair appoint another ad hoc committee to consider: role of other constituent groups (besides the Academic Senate); a specific

nominations procedure; a specific appointment procedure; proposed alternatives from which the Commission would choose; and, a specific number to be appointed.

The motion to table passed, and a motion to appoint a new committee was considered. Petersen summarized by saying he hoped all of the issues had surfaced. Clearly, he said, the question of the legitimacy of the Academic Senate had been laid to rest. The issues were the specified number or percentage of faculty members and the problem of how other constituent groups would be represented. He reminded those present that the Commission must be concerned about the public, private and Pacific Basin constituents, as well as the California community college faculties/institutions. Petersen indicated the charge to the committee would be: establish the number of appointments; identify the nominating authority; and, identify the constituent elements. He called for the question. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commissioners expressed their appreciation to the former Ad Hoc Committee and indicated a genuine concern about the issues raised by the Senate. They requested that the Senate not feel a need to reaffirm the credibility of the Senate. They indicated the Senate's apparent negative view of the Commission was understood and did not need to be restated. Edith Conn expressed the Senate's appreciation for the Commission's time and concern and offered the services of the Senate. A recess was called at 11:15 a.m.

Post-Meeting Caucus. By 11:20 a.m., a post-meeting caucus was in full swing downstairs in the hotel lobby. There were approximately 12 Senate representatives participating in the general discussion, and there was general agreement that the Senate should adopt a problem-solving posture at that point. The Commission had indicated some valid concerns, and requested that the previous position, stating 40% of the Commission be composed of faculty, be reconsidered.

One individual indicated that it was important to keep the issue alive and to expose whether the Commission's action was a delaying tactic or a genuine plan to solve the issues. The group decided to draft a letter to be presented to the Commission before it adjourned for the day. The major points of the letter included: recognition that the current process was not adequate and should not be used any longer than necessary; any appointments to the Commission should be specified as short-term, since the procedure is under review by an ad hoc committee; and request that Senate representatives meet with the Commission representatives to explore solutions to the issues. Conn and Herzstein polished and typed the letter; the hotel duplicated copies for all Commission members; and, the Commission allowed Conn the opportunity to present the letter after they returned from lunch. Later, it was learned by Senate representatives that several Commissioners were angry and considered the letter an affront.

The faculty group suggested some elements for

consideration as possible compromise positions of the Senate might include: nominating committee for Commission representatives; increased emphasis on the legislative support aspect; Senate willingness to meet with a sub-committee of the Commission; and, placing pressure on the Commission to bring the issue to the January, 1983 Commission meeting for resolution. The caucus adjourned at noon.

Accrediting Commission Sub-Committee Meeting--August 6, 1982

In a letter dated June 28, 1982 and addressed to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Edith Conn reported that Hinkley was working closely with the Senate accreditation committee to develop alternative positions and proposals to be considered by the Commission's Ad Hoc Committee. She reported, also, that the Ad Hoc Committee Chair, Tom Fryer, had contacted Hinkley to request that she submit names for delegates to attend the Commission's Ad Hoc Sub-Committee meeting in August. The Sub-Committee's charge was to prepare alternative models to be considered by the Ad Hoc Committee before its report to the Commission in January, 1983 (Note 9).

In an interview with Barbara Hinkley, Past President of the Academic Senate, which occurred on July 30, 1982, I asked if she thought the Commission would be able to meet the Senate's recommended deadline to resolve the issue of membership and appointment at their February meeting.

She said, yes, that it appeared that the Commission

intended to do that or they would not be calling a meeting of the Sub-Committee (of the Ad Hoc Committee) during the summer. She also said that when she talked with Fryer they were all relieved to realize that the Senate was willing to give up its position of 40% faculty membership on the Commission. Hinkley indicated that she wasn't sure the Commission really understood the Senate's position, in which the bottom line was that the Senate should appoint the faculty members to the Commission. The percentage of faculty representation was not as important as that point.

Information on the August 6 meeting was obtained from individuals who were present (Baradat and Hinkley), as well as from reports to the Academic Senate by Conn. The Sub-Committee meeting was attended by: Senate representatives Hinkley (President), Hartley (Vice President), Baradat (Educational Policies Chair); Kellerman, Executive Director, CACC; Swenson, Executive Director, Accrediting Commission; Petersen, the Commission Chair; Lee, faculty Commissioner; Enos, trustee Commissioner; Bates, Commissioner representing the public sector; Anderson, representing the senior schools Commission; and, Fryer and Wenrich (not on the Commission), Chief Executive Officers and Commissioners from community colleges.

Fryer chaired the meeting. Many alternatives were explored. The proposal which emerged from the Sub-Committee was to increase the size of the Commission to consist of 17 Commissioners: five members appointed from community

colleges; three appointed from the private sector; one from the senior commission; one from the high schools commission; one from the University of Hawaii; one from the Chancellor's Office (Title V requirement); one from private universities; and, maintain the four Commissioners appointed from California community college Chief Executive Officers.

The second aspect of the Sub-Committee's proposal was to establish a nominating committee which would nominate persons for all Commission vacancies. The membership proposed for the nominating committee was: two members from the Senate; two from the Chief Executive Officers; two from CCCT. Any two of the members of the nominating committee must be Commissioners.

The proposal was to be submitted to Chief Executive Officers in the fall, the Academic Senate in November and finally to the Accrediting Commission in January.

Baradat attended the Sub-Committee meeting and analyzed the proposals in a conversation the following day:

1. The Senate gave up its position requesting 40% faculty representation on the Commission and the request to appoint faculty directly to the Commission.
2. CACC lost its right of direct appointment of faculty representatives. The proposal excluded any group from having this exclusive right.
3. The Senate would gain a participatory role in appointing new commissioners as long as Senate

appointees to the nominating committee were not replaced by Commission appointees.

4. The faculty would be guaranteed five positions on the Commission, to be selected by a process that more likely will represent the Senate point of view.
5. The plan contained many loopholes. If it were implemented without "gamesmanship," it could be very effective. If the Commission demonstrated lack of integrity, the Senate had a natural fall-back position, in that both CPEC and the Legislature were investigating the accreditation process and had demonstrated a desire for increased faculty involvement in the process.

Academic Senate Fall Conference--November, 1982

Accreditation Break-Out Session. The special interest session was attended by about 25 delegates and began with the Chair providing an overview of the structure of accreditation in California and the role of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Delegates were provided with a review of the Senate's long-standing interest in the multiple issues of accreditation. These remarks led to a report of the proposal of the Sub-Committee of the Accrediting Commission which was then outlined for those present.

Conn related a conversation she had with Swenson, Executive Director of the Commission, several weeks after the

Sub-Committee met. At that time, she was told of the two new full-term appointments (replacements not additions) that had been made by CACC. Those Senate representatives attending the Commission Sub-Committee meeting in August (CACC representative was present) believed that an agreement had been reached with CACC that no new full-term appointments would be made since the appointing process was under review.

The Senate Executive Committee had informed the Commission that one of the two newly-appointed faculty members was not a classroom teacher and reminded them of their perceived agreement. Several times, Commissioners and Senate representatives met concerning the appointee, and agreed that there was a need for a common definition of what constitutes a faculty member. The Commission had reaffirmed the appropriateness of the new CACC appointees, indicating that both were considered faculty (as opposed to management or administrators) on their campuses and that CACC remained the appointing body until (and if) the changes occurred. Interestingly, Jack Hedges, the CACC appointee to the Commission who moved to amend the original Ad Hoc Committee's proposal to increase the number of faculty commissioners, was replaced by one of the new appointees even though it was announced at the June meeting that Hedges had one more year to his term.

The break-out session was designed to expose the issues contained in the Sub-Committee's proposals and to generate other resolutions for debate the next day. The delegates began to debate the proposal and it became clear to the

Executive Committee members present at the break-out session that the delegates did not unanimously support the Sub-Committee's proposal.

In an informal conversation with Norbert Bischof (Executive Committee member) following the break-out session, he elaborated on his reactions to the Accrediting Commission's proposal.

Bischof recognized the victory: five faculty as opposed to two; CACC (CCJCA) no longer would nominate commissioners; Senate was assured nomination rights within limits. But Bischof also was clear in his opposition to the appointment of two members nominated by CACC after the agreement which the Senate thought was in effect in which the Commission would make no new appointments. He opposed the Executive Committee's endorsement of the plan without qualification because he said the Senate should make its position clear and accepting the plan did not clearly indicate that the Senate remained committed to attaining its right to appoint Commissioners.

Bischof and Leon Baradat (member of the Commission Subcommittee) sparred in the resolution-writing break-out session. Baradat felt that the plan was a bitter pill but, nevertheless, CACC had the right to make the nominations. Also, that while the proposal did not offer great gains, it did not remove the option of future strategic moves. Bischof wanted it understood that he didn't oppose the proposal, but it wasn't good enough; the Senate shouldn't be satisfied;

and, the Senate should continue to work to achieve its right of appointment.

Senate Resolutions. Two resolutions were brought before the delegates concerning accreditation (Academic Senate Resolutions, Fall, 1982). The first was a resolution to support the Sub-Committee's proposal and, the second, a resolution reaffirming the Senate's position that it would recognize faculty representation only when the faculty were appointed by the Academic Senate, local senates or with their concurrence. The supporters of the second resolution stated in the floor debate that it was necessary to tell the Commission that if the Senate's much-compromised position was not appreciated and the Commission did not support the Sub-Committee's proposal, the issue of faculty representation on the Commission would continue to be sought using the alternatives which remained, such as seeking Legislative and CPEC support of the Senate's position.

The resolutions were introduced and debated extensively. There was a thorough exposure of the issues and pro and con arguments to the Sub-Committee's proposal. Both resolutions carried (Note 10, Book 2). These resolutions were somewhat paradoxical but they also reflected the delegates' recognition of the reality of the situation. In other words, they and the Senate leadership have a strong commitment to achieving what they understand to be the Senate's rightful role in

appointing faculty representatives to participate in community college governance.

The first resolution reflected that position. Numerous similar resolutions had passed in previous years. At the same time, the delegates realized that the Senate's position on appointments had not been totally compromised or negated by the Commission Sub-Committee's proposal, because the use of nominating committees is generally acceptable and the Senate would be appointing faculty representatives to the nominating committee. They chose to approve a proposal that offered less than the ideal, but more representation and thus influence in governance than they presently had.

Accrediting Commission Meeting--January 17, 1983

Under most circumstances, the flight from San Diego to San Francisco is so routine that it differs little from the normal drive to work. However, California's winter of 1983 will long be remembered. Upon my arrival at the terminal, the PSA departure information indicated that my flight was to be delayed. Generally, the weather wasn't too bad but San Francisco was fogged in with zero visibility. Since there was a scant hour between my flight's scheduled arrival in San Francisco and the start of the Commission meeting, this was an anxiety-producing delay. The Commission had informed the Senate that the discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee proposal would begin shortly after 9:00 a.m.

After delays on the ground, flying holding patterns in

the air and one aborted attempt at landing, the flight arrived an hour and a half late. Upon arrival at the meeting, it became clear that several Commissioners had arrived late for weather-related reasons, and that the agenda had been re-ordered so that the Ad Hoc Committee could present its report at a later time to the entire Commission.

Following lunch, a representative from CPEC provided the Commission with an update of their study of accreditation. Edith Conn was serving as the Senate's representative on the Technical Advisory Committee to CPEC and its report will be published by the fall of 1983.

At 1:45 p.m., the Commission was ready to address membership and appointment procedures. Fryer, as Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, reviewed the complex issues. He indicated that feelings ran deep and they complicated the solution; and, that accreditation was very important and for it to be successful and viable, all who are involved must have a stake or ownership in the process. He recognized that had probably not been the case.

Fryer outlined the Sub-Committee's recommendations:

1. The Commission would consist of 17 members.
2. Title V stipulates one Commissioner be appointed by the Chancellor's Office. A similar appointment for Hawaii was recommended.
3. Other members would include: at least five faculty appointments; three public members, one of whom has governing board experience; one from the schools'

commission; one from the senior commission; one representing the Pacific Basin institutions (Fryer's addendum to the Committee's recommendation); four appointed by Chief Executive Officers.

4. Create a nominating committee consisting of six members: two faculty; two administrators; two public; and, two from the Commission. The Academic Senate, Chief Executive Officers and Community College Trustees appoint from their segments; the Commission Chair would appoint two to the nominating committee, replacing segmental appointments.

Fryer then indicated that the plan was probably not the best of all possible alternatives but that it was the best that could be accomplished at this time. He believed that it would strengthen the accreditation process. With a motion and second to accept, discussion followed. Petersen established the procedure: discussion by the Commission; discussion by others present; discussion by the Commission; discussion of each item of the recommendations.

A lively debate followed in which all Commissioners participated, as well as the Senate representatives who were present. The debate lasted for two hours and 35 minutes. Two of the CEO's were on opposing sides; each of the faculty Commissioners took opposing positions. Each Commissioner expressed support and opposition for certain elements of the proposal and there were several attempts to modify it which died for lack of a second. One fundamental problem seemed to

be that there were actually more constituencies than were represented by those on the proposed nominating committee. Also, the Sub-Committee did not actually recommend the one commissioner from the Pacific Basin that Fryer included as an identified addenda. The overriding political consideration, he stated, was that the Commission must represent three states or territories to remain a Commission. The Pacific Basin colleges may choose to "take their marbles elsewhere" if they don't have representation.

Hinkley complimented Fryer on his ability to bring deep, complicated feelings to compromise. She indicated the recommendations were not perfect but they had Senate support and asked the Commission to support the proposal.

Dietz, the representative from the non-public colleges, spoke against the nominating committee. He believed that the Commission had been fair and just in their appointments. Buckley, one of the new CACC faculty appointees, supported Deitz's motion to have the Commission appoint the six members of the nominating committee and questioned whether the Senate represented the faculty. Fryer countered with the oft-repeated accusation that the Commission had become a self-perpetrating body and that the Commission could not afford to present that image to the outside world, especially to the Legislature. Motion by Deitz was defeated (4-6).

McCuen, a CEO, made a concerted attempt to postpone the vote to a later time. Fryer pressed him to commit and to avoid postponing the decision.

Each point in the recommendation was voted on separately. In some instances, minor alterations were made. Petersen called for a final vote on the entire recommendation. The motion passed--nine for, two against. The recommendation to be submitted to the yearly meeting of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in June, 1983, is provided below. Sections lined through or underlined indicated changes made during the discussion.

1. Commission consists of ~~at least~~ 17 members.
2. Chancellor for California Community Colleges and the President of the University of Hawaii shall each appoint one member.
3. The remaining members shall be appointed to overlapping three-year terms by a Nominating Committee:
 - a) at least five shall be faculty;
 - b) at least three of the appointments shall represent the public interest (at least one [with] community college governing board experience);
 - c) at least one of the appointments shall represent the independent institutions;
 - d) one shall be a member of the Pacific Basin;
 - e) one shall be a member of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges;
 - f) one shall be a member of the Accrediting Commission for Schools.
4. The Nominating Committee shall consist of six members:

- a) two faculty appointed by the Academic Senate;
- b) two administrators appointed by the Chief Executive Officers;
- c) two public appointed by the CECF;
- d) The Commission shall appoint two of these members from the Commission. The Academic Senate, the Chief Executive Officers and Community College Trustees, respectively, shall appoint the remaining faculty, administrative and public members;
- e) The Chair of the Commission shall appoint the Chair of the Nominating Committee from among the Committee's members.

Post-Meeting Caucus. There wasn't much time following the vote to caucus, as there were flights to catch and miles to be traveled before the fog settled in again. However, Hinkley, Duncan-Hall, Conn, and I gathered for a quick review and a few observations. A general consensus was that Fryer was masterful in his presentation, and eloquent in dissecting the recommendations and illustrating the compromise aspects of the proposal. Petersen ran a tight, effective meeting. Because the proposed changes require constitutional amendment, the Academic Senate becomes, if WASC accepts the proposal, an integral part of the Accrediting Commission procedures and, therefore, the WASC constitution. If accepted by WASC, the proposal procedure represents the culmination of 13 years of

work on the part of Edith Conn and many, many others on behalf of Senate involvement in accreditation.

The criticism of Dietz's proposal was extensive. Buckley, as a new appointee and the one appointee contested by the Senate, showed her position on the issue: she was supposed to be a faculty representative, yet she would not support what was clearly a compromise proposal. Resnick, the other new faculty appointee, took the position that the proposal was a compromise and should be given a try.

During our informal discussion, the Commission adjourned for dinner and Buckley came downstairs. Hinkley called to her and invited her to join us. The Senate members, led by Hinkley, very amiably and tactfully, but clearly, indicated why they had opposed her (Buckley's) appointment and that her motion did nothing to support the faculty she represented nor was it appreciated by the Academic Senate. Buckley indicated she understood their position but, under the rules just passed, she would never be appointed to the Commission and, therefore, she opposed the Senate.

As the remaining Commissioners passed through the lobby, the Senate representatives made a point of chatting with them whether they had supported or opposed the proposal, and then began dispersing throughout the State.

Update

In the Academic Senate Newsletter Journal (Edelstein, 1983), Laroche, Senate President 1982-83, announced a request

from the Accrediting Commission Chair to appoint two faculty members to the Commission's Nominating Committee. The final hurdle that remained was the ratification of the recommendation by the parent body, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its June, 1983, meeting.

Conn, in her update memo to the Executive Committee for its February, 1983, meeting, indicated that the recommendation of the Accrediting Commission for Schools and Colleges (AACJC) to WASC, "culminated 13 years of work on behalf of Senate involvement in accreditation." She urged the Senate to continue to work for: 1) more faculty on visiting teams; 2) Senate involvement in the appointment of faculty on those teams; 3) providing help to local senates in developing accreditation studies; and 4) timely publication of who is serving on visitation teams.

Analysis

The function of a participant observer is to understand that which is being studied as if one were an insider, while being able to describe that which is observed to the outsider. At the point that I began to develop the paradigm contained in Chapter IV, I understood the Senate as well as many insiders, but trying to describe what was occurring had been elusive.

Having just returned from the June, 1982, Accrediting Commission meeting, which was tension-filled and culminated in the tabling of the Ad Hoc recommendation and the creation

of a new committee, my observations began to jell with my rapidly accumulating information about the Senate. Clearly, the creation of a new Ad Hoc Committee by the Commission was a compromise, but one which led the Senate and Commission to new respect for each other and to a willingness to work together to solve the problem.

The opportunity to continue the observation process, as I simultaneously interviewed respondents and analyzed the survey instrument, provided for the "coming together" of ideas, as well as the substance for describing the Senate's behavior to others. At this juncture of the study, the development of the paradigm discussed in Chapter IV began. The continuous nature of the observation opportunities permitted preliminary testing of the paradigm.

The act of dissecting and juxtaposing the accreditation issues which I selected as the theme for the participant observation portion of this research was consistent with that procedure used for the interviews and survey. However, I view this portion of the data as the holistic illustration of the three paradigm as characteristic of Senate behavior being used simultaneously by the Senate to accomplish its goals and thus specifically identifying Senate effectiveness.

The definition of organizational effectiveness selected as the foundation for this research was that of Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957)--the extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without placing undo strain upon its members.

The justification for the selection of this definition over others was offered earlier, but essentially it rested with the definition's melding of the identification of specific resources and means with the organization's objectives, and the recognition that the organization members have limitations to the extent of their willingness to participate.

This is clearly a definition of effectiveness reflective of Paradigm A behavior. The Academic Senate, in 1970, set a goal, through its resolution asking the Commission to increase faculty membership on visiting teams and be the appointive body (Note 11), and it was able to accomplish this goal several years later. The issue more relevant to this study, that of increasing the faculty representation on the Accrediting Commission coupled with Senate appointive power, reflected another Senate goal. Both of these goals have their roots deep in the Senate's general purposes, aims and functions of representing faculty on academic and professional concerns. Accreditation is concerned with an educational institution's attainment and maintenance of academic quality. When coupled with the Senate's activities leading to increased faculty representation in what is clearly an instructional and, therefore, faculty concern, the accreditation issues are a cogent example of an organization participating in activities which reflect the purpose for its existence.

Because the interest in pursuing the issues of representation on visiting teams and on the Accrediting Commission did not die out over the 13-year period, it can be assumed

that these issues were shared concerns which were supported by the membership and guided by the centralized Senate leadership. Many of the key participants in the issues have changed but the cause was retained. There does not appear to be any evidence that the Senate's goals have strained the membership, as demonstrated by the desire of a wide variety of representatives to participate and support the Senate at the hearings and meetings of the Commission.

The principle on which analysis of Paradigm A behavior rests is that organizational activity is based on organizational choice which is bound by the objectives of the organization. The Paradigm provides the means of identifying the goal or objective for the action. Unquestionably, the Academic Senate's activities concerning accreditation have been based on choice. The Accreditation Commission had no reason to press for interaction and, in fact, may have had reasons to resist interaction. Clearly, the reasons for the Senate's action were to provide for faculty representation in what was an evaluation of academic quality and to become an integral part of a system that heretofore was difficult to penetrate. Achieving an additional power base for the organization was also recognized as a goal in conversations.

Analysis of the Senate's effectiveness, based on its Paradigm A behavior, begins with the recognition of the organization acting as a unit which explores its options and measures its alternatives on the basis of its goals and objectives. The Senate's 13-year history of resolutions,

reflected in the tenure of 13 presidents, is a clear indication of the unified action perpetuated by the accreditation issues. The evaluation of where the Senate was and where it ought to be was begun in 1970. At each step, the Senate had explored its options and it was successful in gaining representation of faculty on visiting teams and (probably) on the Commission. Certainly, the Senate has made progress on its way to achieving the organizational objectives, as illustrated by: the recognition of the Senate as the appointive body to the Commission for visiting team members; the increase in number of faculty appointed to each team; and, the likelihood that the Commission proposal to increase the number of faculty and the inclusion of the Senate on the nominating committee will be accepted by WASC in June, 1983.

Accreditation, as it currently exists, is performed by an independent body, the ACCJC, to which colleges voluntarily pay membership fees. As such, the Commission operates outside of the usual organizational structures of the community colleges. The Commission is not structurally bound to communicate with the statewide Academic Senate. But, the Academic Senate, in its commitment to academic quality and faculty representation/participation in a collegial atmosphere, began the process of achieving what the organization considered its right--though an unrecognized right, as far as the Commission was concerned. This was undertaken and continued as a consciously and constantly evaluated organizational choice which was related directly to the Academic Senate's

purposes, aims and functions. While these behavior patterns are characteristic of Paradigm A behavior, the ways--methods, processes, procedures--through which the organization operated are more characteristically identified by Paradigm B.

The Academic Senate as a whole, through its resolutions and the constancy and longevity of the accreditation issues, acted in a centralized Paradigm A fashion. But the presence and the importance of the Accreditation Committee throughout the 13-year period illustrated the effect of an organizational sub-unit. The basic assumption of Paradigm B is that an organization consists of sub-units, each with goals, programs and rules of operation. Information is provided by these sub-units and the output of organizational activity results from this information and the loose coordination of these sub-units. The numerous references in Executive Committee Minutes, Academic Senate conference reports, and the inclusion of specific break-out sessions at conferences concerning accreditation, which were discussed earlier, were evidence of the standardized procedures of the sub-unit and the Senate in operation.

From the beginning, the Senate representatives followed the appropriate course of action and the standard procedures --always working within the system. They requested permission to testify; clearly stated their opposition to support of the item under discussion; offered to meet and provide acceptable alternatives; reported back to the Senate membership; asked for direction and support; and then repeated the

process, armed with more alternatives, resolutions and a new basis for testimony.

The meetings, conversations and interviews in which I was a participant provided a clear illustration of this primary Paradigm B effectiveness criterion in action. The Senate goals (characteristic of Paradigm A behavior) defined the appropriate performance of the Senate representatives. For example:

1. Goal--Appoint faculty representatives to the Commission.
2. Behavior--Don't be drawn into diversionary conversations. Remind the Commission of the Title V legitimacy of the Senate as representative of the faculty, and the Chancellor's concurrence that the Senate appoint the faculty representatives to all committees.

The previously-cited examples of the sub-unit Accreditation Committee, providing information to the Executive Committee, to the membership and to the Commission, typify effective Paradigm B behavior. Clearly, the sub-unit Accreditation Committee, primarily through Edith Conn, provided the leadership/management with the information and alternatives necessary for effective decisions.

In Paradigm B behavior, one of the most clear examples of organizational effectiveness is the ability of an organization to acquire resources. Throughout the 13-year period, the Senate has made continuous progress in acquiring the

resource of greater faculty representation in the accreditation process.

The value of Paradigm B is in identifying the organizational routines which mediate the output. The observations provided the opportunity to juxtapose routines in use by the Senate representatives against the effectiveness criteria as a test of the organizational activity.

Over time, the Senate accreditation sub-unit demonstrated behavior associated with the accreditation issue which utilized standard routines directed toward the accomplishment of both short- and long-term output. For example, the act of sending Conn to Hawaii to the Commission meeting to testify about the Senate concerns for their Ad Hoc Committee proposal is standard procedure in the Senate's environment. Often, public testimony at open hearings provides the only means for an organization to make an impact. The use of this routine procedure mediated the short-term goal which was to block the passage of the proposal. The testimony was offered in conjunction with previous organizational activity--discussion, debate, resolutions--and was coordinated through the Executive Committee.

The long-term activity surrounding the accreditation issue was founded in the generalized goal, "achieve more faculty representation on visitation teams and the Commission with the Academic Senate as the appointing body." The sub-unit's continued and repetitive use of Senate procedure (gather information; report and discuss with Executive

Committee and delegates; generate delegate debate and resolutions; report to the Commission verbally and in writing) and Commission procedure (request time on their agenda; provide testimony; meet with the Executive Director) are standard operating procedures. Use of these procedures mediated the Senate's effectiveness in blocking two Commission proposals and accomplishing a Commission recommendation, which requires a Commission constitutional change, increases the number of faculty Commissioners, and includes Senate appointees to the Nominating Committee.

Paradigm C behavior identifies the pathways for producing action or accomplishing the desired end result. In Paradigm C behavior, effectiveness is considered a political activity. The organization's activity is the result of bargaining among groups and individuals. The Paradigm's greatest value rests with its display of the actors--participants in the organization's game.

Effectiveness in Paradigm C behavior is identified by the decisions which result from the compromise and negotiation between and among actors with dissimilar interests and uneven power. The decisions do not reflect singular organizational action. Organizational rules are often established by outside agencies. Time imperatives force actors to take stands and often there is not an objective focus on the issues.

As illustrated previously, the Accrediting Commission is an outside agency--an independent body with a well

established set of rules and practices which do not require interaction with the Academic Senate. However, a substantial part of the Senate's justification for its right of appointment request was based on the legislative (outside agency) mandate it had as the representative of community college faculty on academic and professional concerns. The Senate's use of the standard procedures characteristic of Paradigm B behavior created the situation which forced behavior by both groups to utilize the rules of outside agencies, a characteristic of Paradigm C behavior.

Certainly, Conn used her position as Chair of the Accreditation Committee to achieve what were her goals and the Senate's goals. Conn demonstrated substantial political acumen which overarched her leadership surrounding the issue. However, she and her Committee operated by the standardized procedures prescribed by both organizations and utilized them to gain inroads to the Commission. Clearly, the Senate wanted to routinize its interaction with the Commission, i.e., right to nominate and increase faculty representation through constitutional amendment, a characteristic of Paradigm B behavior.

The recommendation of the Sub-Committee of the Senate and Accrediting Commission was an outstanding example of the various actors representing dissimilar interests--faculty, trustees, Chief Executive Officers, public--and very uneven power bases arriving at a decision. The positions held by the actors largely defined their stands.

The concern for representation of the Pacific Basin members, expressed by one of the Chief Executive Officers, was founded in the recognition that if they chose to withdraw their membership, the Commission's survival would be at stake. The opposition to a nominating committee, expressed by the representative of the independent colleges (a designated seat), was largely one of power retention--centralized control of the Commission's membership by the Commission. The general unwillingness of the Commission to "give up" seats on the Commission, coupled with the number of constitutionally-designated seats, led to increasing the size of the Commission to accommodate the Senate, again an attempt to retain control. The Academic Senate's willingness to concede that its 40% faculty membership on the Commission could not be achieved, while expressing its acceptance of an increase of faculty representatives (two to five) and its participation on a nominating committee, was clearly an attempt to gain a power base.

The recommendation of the Sub-Committee of the Commission's Ad Hoc Committee was then taken to the Senate to be affirmed. It was not a singular activity of the organization but rather the work of three Senate representatives working with relevant others. It was not without controversy, as was seen in the review of the Senate break-out session. In Fryer's introductory remarks to the Commission at the January, 1983 Commission meeting, he clearly indicated that the recommendation was the best that could be accomplished at this

time and the ensuing discussion proved many Commissioners were not totally satisfied.

The unevenness of the power bases was obvious at the point of controversy over whether the two new CACC faculty representatives should have been appointed and the definition of faculty member. Power is partly structural and the structure provided CACC appointive power. The Commission had the power to reject the Senate's challenge in both instances. However, the Senate was not without power. The Commission responded to the letters they received from legislators at the June meeting, identifying their concerns about the relative lack of faculty participation in accreditation, by recognizing that there was a perception of the Commission as an exclusive, self-appointive body. Also, the actual physical set-up in which the Commission was actually surrounded by faculty representatives raised some humorous remarks about being surrounded, which indicated they felt some threat.

The controversy displayed the actors. Edith Conn has acted as the Senate spokesperson on accreditation for many years. She and the Commission and the Commission's Executive Director have become very familiar with the positions of the individual actors. At the point that the Ad Hoc Committee recommendation was presented in June, 1982, following the Hearings, it was clear that two of the Commissioners who were Chief Executive Officers were on opposite sides of the recommendation. This contributed to the tabling of the recommendation and the creation of the new committee with more

defined responsibilities. Senate representatives made a point of contacting--lobbying--members of the Commission, prior to the sub-committee meeting during the summer, to clarify their positions about accreditation. And always, Edith Conn monitored the Commission Office and reported back to Executive Committee and the Senate when possible. Between the June and January meetings, a greater depth of respect was generated for the general organizational positions, as well as the individual players on both sides.

The change in the Commission's makeup between the June, 1982 and January, 1983 meetings (three new appointees) and the absences (due to bad weather) added further complications to the situation in which the recommendation was discussed/negotiated. The discussion was probably longer than usual, simply because the players didn't have the background of testimony presented at the meeting in June, 1982.

Characteristic of Paradigm C behavior is Pfeffer's (1981) statement that effective organizations are those that perceive patterns of resource interdependence; correctly perceive the demands placed on them; and, respond to the demands made by the groups controlling the critical interdependence.

The Senate never lost sight of the fact that the Commission had something--control over accreditation--that it wanted to be part of. Also, it recognized that nothing required the Commission to increase faculty participation except the appropriateness of the request and environmental pressures. At the same time, the Commission recognized that

its image was tarnished by the expressed beliefs that it consisted of "old boys" and was self-appointing. Also, it recognized that legislative interest had increased and CPEC was preparing a report about accreditation. The existence of this situation provided a readiness on the part of the actors to solve the problem.

Organizational goals and their accomplishment are a critical part of any discussion about organizational effectiveness. Any definition of organizational effectiveness, according to Steers (1977), rests with how successful an organization is in attaining its goals, but it is best achieved by finding ways for members to integrate personal motives and goals with organizational objectives. Clearly, the Senate representatives who have been and continue to be active in the accreditation issues have successfully found the solution to integrating their motives with the organization's goals.

Viewed holistically, as one example of the Senate in action over a period of time, the behavior exhibited was characteristic of all three paradigm. At times, the behavior was characteristic of a single paradigm but, more often, elements of more than one paradigm were observed simultaneously. When the effectiveness characteristics of each Paradigm were juxtaposed against the activities/behavior of the Senate, the Academic Senate was clearly Effective. The length of time taken to accomplish these goals was not a consideration of effectiveness. The Senate had defined its goals, evaluated

its options and acted as a centralized body (Paradigm A), while using its sub-unit Accreditation Committee to gather and disseminate information, manipulate the process, and use standard operating procedures to create the situation (Paradigm B) which identified the actors, their power bases and the action pathways which culminated in a compromise, negotiated by a small group of representatives of various constituent groups (Paradigm C).

From a participant observer's view, Paradigm A effectiveness behavior was most apparent in the Senate representatives' tenacious and repeated direct statements of its goals. The Senate was viewed as an organization with a strong goal focus. Paradigm B effectiveness was most obviously observed when the goal-focused statements were coordinated by the Senate and used in mediating the standard procedures and rules to routinize its behavior and interact with its environment --the Accrediting Commission, initially through repeated testimony, communication and forced interaction. Later, the Senate achieved proposed structural interaction. When the tough decisions were being made in the complex negotiations between the Senate and the Commission, Paradigm C behavior was most apparent. As the elements in the controversy came together, the parties were able to hammer out a compromise which they could live with. The players had to be well versed in their respective "bottom lines." This included recognition of the actors' individual stakes and stands in the issues, as well as those of the organization. The Senate

had two major bottom lines: one, to increase the number of faculty on the Commission; and, second, to be the appointive body for faculty representatives to the Commission. In one sense, the compromise accomplished both, but not to the extent the Senate had hoped. While none of the participants in the Sub-Committee compromise really liked the proposal, all were willing to implement it--a critical consideration in Paradigm C behavior.

My activities as a participant observer of the Academic Senate illustrated that, to be effective, an organization through its members must demonstrate behavioral characteristics of all three paradigm and it must be done at opportune moments. This movement among the paradigm effectiveness characteristics may be demonstrated in one sentence or occur over time. Indeed, organizational effectiveness was observed as situational and directly related to the primary organizational actors, in regard to the theme, accreditation, for the participant observation portion of the data.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Background

The purpose of this research was to study the organizational effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The organization was founded in 1968 and is the legally-defined representative voice for the approximate 15,000 California community college faculty members on matters of academic and professional concern.

The emergence of the statewide Academic Senate to the position as the dominant voice in this arena was related directly to a series of internal and external forces which were exerted on the educational system. An important aspect of the Senate's history and development was a series of legislative actions which occurred over a period of time. These actions separated the junior colleges from the unified school districts; established local senates; created the California Community College system; legalized collective bargaining; provided recognition of the Senate in Title V of the California Administrative Code and, most recently, partial funding for the Academic Senate.

The Academic Senate is a voluntary, collegial organization composed of all professionals who are teaching faculty in the public community colleges of California. Because

membership is a function of being a faculty member, the Senate composition is very diverse and heterogeneous. The individual colleges affiliate with, and contribute fees to, the organization, and the Legislature provides some financial support in a manner similar to that of the statewide senates of the UC and CSU systems.

The Senate is structured democratically with an elected Executive Committee. The individual colleges are represented by their local senate president and one delegate. The organization convenes semi-annual conferences during which organizational positions are proposed and debated from the floor with only the official delegates eligible to vote. These positions become the foundation for statewide Academic Senate activities. The leadership/management of the Academic Senate consists of an elected Executive Committee which meets monthly during the academic year and is responsible for the on-going organizational activities and for communicating with local senates.

The review of the literature revealed no studies of a voluntary, professional, collegial organization with a research design similar to this study. Several studies about local academic senates were located but no previous study of a statewide Academic Senate was identified. Additionally, no studies comparing the organizational characteristics of the Academic Senate (or other senates) with organizational theory were found.

The literature revealed considerable discussion and

disagreement among the researchers concerning the definition of organizational effectiveness, how to assess organizational effectiveness, and whether organizational structure was related to organizational effectiveness. But, when the various schools of thought were analyzed, it appeared that every definition of organizational effectiveness included consideration for the goals/objectives of the organization and the extent to which the stated goals were achieved. The definition of effectiveness selected for this study emphasized organizational goal attainment while specifying the importance of the membership.

Generally, there was agreement that assessing effectiveness included measuring the degree to which organizational goals were achieved and whether groups and individuals supported or withheld support from the organization, based largely on whether their interests were served. Also, assessment was considered very difficult at best because organizations withhold needed information from those who question in order to maintain control. Organizational structure was shown to be highly interrelated with the environment in which it operated. Clearly, there are different structure requirements placed on organizations whose environment is non-profit, public service, from those whose environment is product-oriented and profit-making. For all organizations, incorporating the external forces in the internal structure led to a greater commitment by all members of the organization. Organizational structure was identified as nothing

more than the way in which human resources are organized and directed toward goal achievement.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has identified itself as an organization structured as a collegial body whose existence was founded in the concept of shared governance in higher education. Its unique role in shared governance was placed in the representation of community college faculty on all matters of academic and professional concern. Collegiality, as an organizational and conceptual frame, is steeped in academic tradition and is an early form of democracy. Collegiality was discussed extensively in the review, with and without specific application to the academic setting, and was characterized as an organizational structure in which: The members have access to each other because the layers of structure are minimal; cooperation is encouraged and decisions are affirmed by the plurality or majority; authority is limited, power is separated and responsibility divided; provision is made for discussions illuminating differing points of view which facilitate compromise.

In a collegial organization, questions about policy or program are encouraged by a wide range of organizational members while hierarchy and bureaucratic behavior are avoided. The importance of the members, their interactions and the interrelationship of personal and organizational goals is stressed. Many networks are present within the collegial

organization involving peers, coalitions, interest groups and cliques, all of which may be fluid in their membership.

In addition to being collegial, the Senate was identified as a voluntary organization since it has formal structure and its membership is open to all who share the profession of community college teaching, have common interests, and participate in the decisions. Characteristics of voluntary organizations, such as the Senate, were identified as including ensuring government by consent of the membership and authority delegated through the elected leadership.

Recent research has identified the political model of organizational behavior which includes elements from various earlier organizational models. Originally, the impetus for the model's description was identified with the desire of researchers to understand how decisions were made and where power rested. When viewed from the political model perspective, organizational actors are seen bargaining, participating in coalitions, having personal and structural power bases and personal goals to be met. Cooperative efforts based on power distribution are common: bargaining is a means by which exchange with the environment is developed; co-optation is used to absorb adverse elements within the organization; and, coalitions where two or more organizations define and join in a common purpose are common.

The similarities in the characteristics of the collegial and political/strategic models are quite apparent.

Conduct of the Study

This study incorporated a research design characteristic of naturalistic inquiry. Naturalistic research assumes that reality is multiple, divergent and interrelated. Since the focus for this research was the organizational effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges whose purpose, structure and complex environment separated it from established effectiveness theory, naturalistic research provided the means for discovery of interrelationships not present in the theoretical literature.

Naturalistic inquiry generates data which is, for the most part, qualitative and is, therefore, subject to criticism by the advocates of quantitative scientific methodology. The literature of naturalistic inquiry revealed numerous references to the on-going debate and the relative merits of each methodological position. Central to the debate was the reliance of naturalistic research on the researcher as the data-gathering instrument and the subsequent questions raised, concerning researcher bias and its effect on the reliability and credibility of the research.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) described the value of the researcher in the role of instrument as centered in the uniquely human qualities possessed by the instrument. These qualities include " . . . the capacity to be responsive, to be flexible, to see social organizations as components, to rely on both propositional and tacit knowledge, and to search for that which is expert, which is atypical, idiosyncratic,

unique, singular, or uncharacteristic of the mainstream" (p. 151). The research setting in naturalistic research is a naturally occurring event, program, relationship, interaction, which has no bounds predetermined by the researcher. No attempt is made to manipulate the setting, but reality is re-created by the inquirer as an understanding of the environment is sought.

Recognizing that the credibility of naturalistic research rests with the inquirer, numerous activities were undertaken in advance of this research to increase those skills--observing, analyzing, categorizing, listening--which are the foundation of the reliability and credibility of the inquirer. However, the truth value of this study lies in the research design which incorporated structural corroboration and a strategy of multiple triangulation. "Structural corroboration is a process of gathering data or information and using it to establish links that eventually create a whole that is supported by the bits of evidence that constitute it" (Eisner, 1979, p. 215). As the information was gathered from the multiple data sources, pieces of information were used to validate each other and to identify convergence of the data toward the whole, while continually testing the data in the Academic Senate's environment.

The dominant technique used in support of structural corroboration was triangulation, the basic feature of which is the combination of two or more forms of different research strategies. Included in this study were interview, survey,

participant observation and archival research methods. The data provided for methodological triangulation, a complex process in which each method was played against the other so as to maximize the validity of the effort (Denzin, 1973, p. 304).

"Assessment . . . is an emergent process, contingent on the investigator, the research setting, and the investigator's theoretical perspective" (Denzin, 1978, p. 304).

Combined in this research were multiple observations, sources of data, methodologies, as well as multiple theoretical perspectives of organizational effectiveness. The triangulation resulted in the emergence of the three organizational effectiveness paradigm, developed as a perspective for data analysis, and in the presence of information about Senate effectiveness, which was consistent in data generated by the multiple methodologies in use. Through investigator training, structural corroboration, and use of triangulation strategy, the research design controlled for intrinsic bias.

Data for the evaluation of the organizational effectiveness of the statewide Academic Senate were collected between March, 1982, and February, 1983. The specific objectives for this investigation were: (1) To describe the historical development of the Senate; (2) To determine the effectiveness of the methods by which the Academic Senate provides for community college faculty to participate in academic and professional governance; (3) To determine the effectiveness of the Academic Senate as understood by the membership and others

with whom it interacts, in meeting the purpose and goals which the organization and relevant others have established for it; and, (4) To interpret the impact of the Academic Senate on its environment. The general purpose was to provide a composite description of the Senate.

The investigation was conducted in four major segments, each overlapping the others to some extent, as follows:

1. Participant Observation. The Senate's involvement in the issues surrounding accreditation was identified as having been present consistently throughout its 13-year history. The opportunity to observe the Senate actively pursuing its goals resulted in the selection of accreditation as the theme for the participant observation portion of the study. Between April, 1982, and February, 1983, a variety of meetings were held concerning accreditation, which the researcher attended as a participant observer. The issues under discussion were the method of appointment of Commissioners to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) and the number of faculty appointed to the Commission. Data for this portion of the study are reported in Chapter VII.
2. Questionnaires. The survey instrument was distributed to three identified groups--faculty (751); senate presidents (109); college presidents (107);-- in October, 1982. Forty-six percent of the faculty

group responded and 70% of the senate and college presidents' groups responded. A follow-up questionnaire was sent to non-respondents in November, 1982.

The questionnaire was concerned with establishing the effectiveness of the Academic Senate as understood by these groups. The questionnaire was divided into seven sections: demographic; purposes, aims and functions of the Senate based on its Bylaws; effectiveness of the Senate concerning specified activities; effectiveness of the Senate in representing faculty members concerning specific issues; political effectiveness of the Senate; overall evaluation of Senate effectiveness; written comments. Descriptive statistical procedures were used and analyzed using the SPSS program and run on an HP-3000 mainframe. The data obtained from the questionnaire respondents were based on a six-item, Likert-type scale which requested the respondents to evaluate the extent of Senate effectiveness. Concentrations of response were identified for each item for each group and translated into evaluation response patterns labeled Not Effective, Moderately Effective, Effective. Data for this portion of the study are reported in Chapter VI.

3. Interviews. A series of 12 elite and numerous informal interviews was conducted between July 30,

1982 and February, 1983. The majority of elite interviews were taped and professionally transcribed before being analyzed. Those selected for interview represented both the internal and external environments of the Academic Senate. The analysis of the interviews was performed by grouping and discussing the responses using the same section headings used for the questionnaires. The data were collapsed so as to identify the Senate's effectiveness as viewed by those who participated. More specifically, the selected interview statements were analyzed using the paradigm behavior characteristics developed in Chapter IV. Next, the statements were evaluated for their strength as indicators of effectiveness, based on the paradigm effectiveness criteria, and were rated Not Effective, Moderately Effective, Effective. Data for this portion of the study are reported in Chapter V.

4. Archival Research. The majority of the Senate archives are located in Ventura, California, at the home of Edith Conn. She provided access to them, as well as advice about the most important documents. Also, Leon Baradat provided access to his extensive personal archives. Patrick McCallum, Executive Director of FACCC, provided access to the FACCC archives. Information gathered from these sources

has been included throughout the reporting of the data.

5. Paradigm Development. Three paradigm were developed as a perspective for data analysis which would allow the researcher to focus and integrate the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the data collected by juxtaposing the results against this common base. These paradigm are conceptually discrete but empirically related. Each paradigm was outlined and includes a statement about the assumption on which the paradigm is founded, organizational effectiveness definitions, principle on which the paradigm is based and organizational characteristics which are used for the analysis of effectiveness for the paradigm. Following are the principles on which each of the paradigm is based.

Paradigm A--Prototype Model. Organizational activity is based on organizational choice, bounded by organizational objectives. The value of this Paradigm as a means of analysis rests on identifying the reason (goal/objective) for the action.

Paradigm B--Modus Operandi Model. Organizational action is based on output determined by subunit goals, programs and standardized procedures. The value of this Paradigm rests with identifying organizational routines that mediate the outputs.

Paradigm C--Strategic Model. Organizational

activity is the result of bargaining among groups and individuals. The value of this Paradigm rests with its displaying of the actors, participants and players in the organization's goals.

The paradigm were developed to frame the data and provide the composite picture of Senate effectiveness sought by the objectives of this study. They are discussed in Chapter IV.

Findings

Naturalistic inquiry encourages the researcher to allow the sum and substance of that which is being studied to emerge through the use of a variety of methodologies. This form of inquiry is designed to study organizational behavior within the natural environment as the organization interacts with other organisms in its environment. The focus of naturalistic inquiry is on interactivity--multiple interactions and realities--and on understanding a particular event, situation or organization. There were no hypotheses established to accept or refute and no truly similar studies to use for guidance. These findings are the results of that which emerged from the inquiry.

The findings are presented so as to relate them to each of the four stated objectives of this study.

To Describe the Historical Development of the Academic Senate
for California Community Colleges

Though the first junior/community college in California was established in 1907, it was not until the early 1960's that faculties began to agitate for a place in the governance process. By 1963, Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 48 (ACR 48) was passed, which granted junior/community college faculties the legal right to participate in policy formation on academic and professional matters through the establishment of academic senates on each campus. Within five years, faculty participation in governance had been established statewide.

By 1968, the need for a statewide voice to represent faculty on matters of academic and professional concern was present and the constitution-writing conferences of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges were held. A constitution which, if ratified, would unite the local senates was written and sent to all senates. Ratification was completed by Spring, 1969, and the leadership began the long process of seeking legal jurisdiction to represent all community college faculty on academic and professional matters. The founders of the Academic Senate received seed money and support from other professional organizations who saw a need which was apparent and not in conflict with their organization.

Collective bargaining and the conflicts between local senates, the Academic Senate and bargaining units, as well as

other organizations, were apparent during this time. A series of legal and philosophical statements delineated the appropriate spheres of influence and serious conflicts between the senates, and CB units began to disappear and were replaced by cooperative efforts.

There was growing concern, statewide, for the apparent decline of academic standards, poor preparation of entering college students and grade inflation. The Senate created a standing committee on academic standards (now Educational Policies Committee) and researched the academic standards and grading practices throughout the community colleges (1977). This project compiled information previously unavailable and received the attention of legislators, the Chancellor's Office and the CSU and UC Academic Senates. Concerns for the decline in educational quality were present in public outcry and at all levels of education and government.

The results of the research gained publicity for the Senate and it was viewed as a statement indicative of the seriousness of the Senate in representing community college faculty while addressing academic and professional issues.

In 1979, the Academic Senate was recognized in Title V as the representative of community college faculty on academic and professional matters. This provided further legitimization of the organization, including: direct access to the Board of Governors; justification for legislative funding through Chancellor's budget; membership on Chancellor's

advisory committees; more substantive access to the CSU and UC Senates and to CPEC.

The Senate's recent history is rich with indications of its collegial activities. The work of the Intersegmental Committee, composed of members from the CSU, UC and statewide Senates, has produced a monumental joint statement on what competency levels in the basic skills are appropriate for high school graduates planning to enter college and what constitutes college-level freshman coursework in writing/reading and mathematics. The combined efforts of AS-CIO to promote generalized acceptance of specified minimum competency standards throughout the California community colleges has been surprisingly successful. There are few precedents for faculty (AS) and administrators (CIO) working in a collegial manner statewide.

Further, the Senate representatives provided input to the committees and directly to the Board of Governors, as the statewide minimum grading policy, the course classification system and the associate degree review were developed and implemented. In each case, the involvement of the local senates, at the request of the Academic Senate, was required by the actual legislation or the Chancellor's directive to the colleges.

The Senate activities regarding accreditation, their concerns for more faculty representation with the Senate as the appointing body, have been carefully documented elsewhere in this study. It is noteworthy that the Accrediting

Commission is an independent agency operating outside the Senate's more routinized channels of communication. The compromise hammered out between the Senate and the Commission was not what either group wanted, but it does constitute an increase in faculty representation on the Commission, as the Senate representatives on the Nominating Committee now sit with status equal to the other elements.

In summary, this is but a brief overview of the findings as they relate to the historical development of the Academic Senate. The Senate's history has been relatively short--15 years--and influenced by a variety of legislative and cultural/social events which occurred in higher education. These events, coupled with the broad economical picture of the State of California, fed the momentum which carried the organization into a position of dominance as the voice of the 15,000 community college faculty on matters of academic and professional concern.

To Determine the Effectiveness of the Methods By Which the Academic Senate Provides for Community College Faculty to Participate in Academic Governance

In summarizing the findings, as they relate to this objective, the questionnaire and interview responses for the sections on Senate activities, representation and political effectiveness were considered the methods by which the Senate provided opportunities for faculty to participate in governance. Also, the participant observation issue--

accreditation--was discussed as the holistic statement about the effectiveness of the Senate's methods. The findings revealed that Senate effectiveness was illustrated as faculty were observed participating in academic governance.

Since the inception of the organization, there has been a demonstrable increase in acquisition of Senate resources by and through which faculty members participate in academic governance. The acquisition of these resources has provided the foundation for participation in governance. For example, legal recognition of the Senate in Title V, as the representative of community college faculty concerning academic and professional matters, has provided the Senate direct access to the Board of Governors' agenda. In accomplishing this, the Senate has provided its members with a primary-level participative voice which is exercised through faculty representatives. This recognition was followed quickly by the recommendation of support for the Senate and direct implementation efforts of Chancellor Craig, continued by Chancellor Hayward, and was visible through: the faculty members (Senate-appointed faculty representatives) serving on Chancellor's advisory committees; the local senate presidents' placement on Chancellor's Office mail distribution lists; and, the frequent interaction between Chancellor's Office staff and Senate officers and representatives, indicated by interview respondents.

Additionally, the acquisition of state funds to supplement fees contributed by local senates to provide for

visibility and active representation of faculty, along with the increased number of faculty members on accreditation teams and the requirement specified in Title V (local senates participate in every aspect of the campuses' review of courses, as required by the highly controversial course classification system) were but a few of the examples of the Academic Senate effectively working to provide for faculty participation in academic governance.

Interviews--Senate Activities. There was a general indication among those interviewed that the Academic Senate was Effective when a variety of its activities, such as conferences, forums, committee participation testimony, were observed. Generally, those interviewed indicated that the Senate had remained organizationally independent and that its activities reflected its goal focus. Most observed activities were reflective of Paradigm B behavior characteristics, though effectiveness behavior indicators characteristic of all three paradigm were observed occurring singularly and/or simultaneously.

Questionnaires--Senate Activities. Concerning the specified activities, there was agreement of the faculty and college presidents' groups that the Senate was Not Effective on four characteristics: communication; confidence and trust; response to changing needs; strengthening local senates. The senate presidents thought the Academic Senate to

be Effective on five characteristics: responsive to local senates; confidence and trust; speaking out; demonstrates leadership; responsiveness to changing needs. All three groups agreed that the Senate was Not Effective when communication and strengthening local senates were evaluated. The college presidents and senate presidents thought the Senate Effective in speaking out on matters of professional concern, while the faculty considered it Moderately Effective. The faculty and college presidents agreed that the Senate was Moderately Effective in demonstrating leadership in initiating policy.

The divergence among the groups in their evaluation was explained by several factors. The Academic Senate communicated about its activities through local senate presidents, who then communicated with their faculties. They have the most direct knowledge about the Senate and generally evaluated the Senate as more effective than did the other groups. Neither the faculty group nor the college presidents' group was in the direct communication path of the Senate, which may, in part, explain the large "don't know" faculty response and their evaluation of the Senate as less effective than the senate presidents' evaluation.

Knowledge about the Senate appears to be of primary importance in evaluating its effectiveness since local senate presidents are full-time faculty members (as are the faculty respondents), serving a leadership role for a specified length of time, and they differ from the faculty group only

because they are in this role. Generally, college presidents have the greatest access to all governance information, which may explain their relatively small "don't know" response. Whether the college presidents would evaluate Senate effectiveness differently if they were in the direct communication path was not apparent by this data analysis.

The questionnaire items in this section reflected characteristics of Paradigm A behavior. The response patterns of all groups indicated that they obviously shared an image, a primary characteristic of Paradigm A behavior, of the Senate. This was illustrated by the agreement within each group in their evaluation of the effectiveness of Senate activities. When the behavior of the Senate was juxtaposed against the organizational effectiveness definitions and characteristics of Paradigm A, the behavior of the statewide Academic Senate was identified as mixed in its effectiveness.

Comparison of Interview and Questionnaire Responses.

The questionnaire respondents showed divergence in their evaluation of the Effectiveness of Senate Activities section. Generally, the senate presidents viewed the Senate as Effective, while the faculty and college presidents evaluated the Senate activities as Moderately Effective. Interview respondents judged the Senate Effective.

The questionnaire items for this section were considered characteristic of Paradigm A. The interview respondents indicated a dominance of Paradigm B effectiveness

characteristics. This discrepancy and the Effective evaluation of the interview respondents to this section were interpreted as a reflection of the respondents' opportunity to explain their responses, as well as their more intimate knowledge of the Senate. While organizational activities are closely related to goals, they often reflect procedural (Paradigm B) behaviors.

Interviews--Senate Representation. Responses from those interviewed, concerning the effectiveness of the Senate in representing community college faculty, indicated it was at least Moderately Effective. The effectiveness behavior characteristics were more uniformly spread among the paradigm than previously observed. Again, the characteristics were observed occurring singly and/or simultaneously. Thus, the study suggests that the Senate's efforts in representing community college faculty were goal-founded, procedurally responsive, and flavored with political interaction.

Questionnaire--Senate Representation. The faculty group evaluated the Senate as Moderately Effective on all items; the senate presidents as Effective. The college presidents were in agreement with the senate presidents on all items except accreditation, on which they evaluated the Senate as Not Effective.

The response items reflected Paradigm B effectiveness characteristics for all items. It appeared that the

relatively high "don't know" response percentages were related directly to organizational routines which prescribed indirect communication paths and mediated the membership's understanding of the Senate's effectiveness in representing community college faculty. When the responses to this section were juxtaposed against Paradigm B definitions and characteristics, the Academic Senate was Moderately Effective in representing faculty.

Comparison of Interview and Questionnaire Responses.

Respondents to the section on Effectiveness of Senate Representation revealed substantial agreement among questionnaire groups and those interviewed. The senate presidents and those interviewed evaluated the Senate as Effective while the college presidents and faculty thought the Senate Moderately Effective.

The questionnaire items reflected Paradigm B effectiveness characteristics. The interview responses identified behavior and effectiveness characteristics which were more uniformly spread among all paradigm. The opportunity to expand one's response, thus increasing its complexity, was provided as the probable explanation for the presence of other paradigm characteristics. It appeared that organizational efforts to represent faculty were goal founded, procedurally responsive, and indicative of political interaction.

Interviews--Political Effectiveness. Those interviewed

identified the Senate as Effective when the responses were juxtaposed against behavior characteristics of Paradigm C. Statements reflecting Paradigm A and B behavior characteristics indicated the Senate was Effective when these behaviors were considered. The effectiveness behavior characteristics of all three paradigm were observed occurring independently and/or simultaneously.

Some who were interviewed expressed concern about whether the Senate should be politically active. The basis of their concern was two-fold: The Senate is funded from public sources and should be non-partisan; much of its success is due to its purist, focused image. To be politically active could dilute this image.

Questionnaires--Political Effectiveness. The faculty respondents to the questionnaire viewed the Senate as Not Effective when representing faculty to the Legislature, CPEC, UC, CSU, and BoG. The college presidents were in agreement with the faculty concerning all items except the Senate's political effectiveness with BoG, in which case they thought the Senate Effective. The senate presidents viewed the Academic Senate as Effective when representing faculty to the Legislature and BoG, and Moderately Effective on all other items.

In this section, respondents were requested to evaluate Senate behavior as it interacted with organizations in its environment. When the responses were juxtaposed against

Paradigm C definitions and effectiveness characteristics, the Senate's effectiveness was judged Not Effective by faculty, Effective by senate presidents and Not Effective by college presidents.

An explanation for the critical evaluation of Senate effectiveness by those questionnaire respondents was offered when the effectiveness behavior characteristics were juxtaposed against the paradigm. This explanation indicated that the questionnaire requested responses about political effectiveness with groups and Paradigm C behavior evaluates behavior based on individuals--conflict, compromise, and power bases that do not necessarily reflect unitary group behavior. Also, a large "don't know" response was present for faculty questionnaire respondents.

Comparison of Interview and Questionnaire Responses.

Responses to the Political Effectiveness of the Senate section revealed that the faculty and college presidents' groups thought the Senate was Not Effective. Local senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective. Those interviewed provided an Effective evaluation. This nearly diametrical evaluation of the Senate's political effectiveness was interpreted as caused by the fact that the questionnaire items requested respondents to evaluate organizations, rather than individual actors, and political effectiveness is more appropriately evaluated by viewing groups and individuals

representing organizations, rather than the unitary action of the organization.

All questionnaire items were considered characteristic of Paradigm C behavior. Also, the interview responses indicated a predominance of Paradigm C effectiveness behavior.

Participant Observation. The observations of the Senate in the various activities surrounding accreditation provided the holistic example of the Academic Senate representatives, demonstrating a variety of methods in which faculty participated in governance. The behavior characteristics of all paradigm were observed occurring simultaneously as the Senate sought to achieve its goals.

During the period of time encompassed by the observation of this study, the Academic Senate and the Accrediting Commission developed an increasing respect and concern for the relative merits of the other organization's position. This led to a commitment by both groups to mutually and agreeably solve the issue at hand. Clearly, there were external and internal pressures affecting both groups (CPEC study, legislators' letters, power bases, image as self-appointed body) present, along with a well-grounded philosophical statement justifying the Senate's position, and all of these added to the motivation of both parties to resolve the problem.

When the activities, actions, and results of the Senate's interactions with the Commission were juxtaposed against the effectiveness characteristics of Paradigm A, B,

and C, the Senate was identified as Effective. The length of time taken to accomplish resolution of the issue was not a consideration of effectiveness. The Senate had defined its goals, evaluated its options, and acted as a centralized body (Paradigm A), while using its sub-unit Accreditation Committee to gather and disseminate information. The process was manipulated and standard operating procedures were used to create the situation (Paradigm B) which identified the actors, their power bases, and the action pathways which culminated in a compromise negotiated by a small group of representatives of various constituent groups (Paradigm C).

The proposed solution included: (1) The establishment of a nominating committee to include two faculty members who would be nominated to the committee by the Academic Senate; this committee would nominate all Commission vacancies. (2) A guarantee of five faculty Commissioner seats. (3) Removal of CACC as an appointive agency. Both groups compromised extensively on their original positions and neither group was totally satisfied with the end result. The Academic Senate ratified the proposal at its 1982 Fall Conference; the Commission at its January, 1983, meeting. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges must approve the proposal at the June, 1983, meeting. Apparently, the Commission (ACCJC) expected approval by WASC, as it took steps to establish the nominating committee and requested appointments to the committee from Jonnah Laroche, Senate President, in advance of the Commission meeting.

To Determine the Effectiveness of the Academic Senate as Understood by the Membership and Others With Whom It Interacts in Meeting the Purpose and Goals Which the Organization and Relevant Others Have Established For It

Interviews--Purposes, Aims, Functions. Most of the response statements reflected Paradigm A behavior characteristics and there was general agreement among those interviewed, based on the strength of their statements and juxtaposed against the paradigm effectiveness criteria, that the Academic Senate behavior, relative to carrying out its purposes, aims and functions, was Effective. Statements indicating Paradigm B and C behaviors were observed, and revealed that Senate behavior was at least Moderately Effective when juxtaposed against those effectiveness characteristics.

Questionnaires--Purposes, Aims, Functions. The faculty and college presidents' groups indicated strong agreement that the Senate was Moderately Effective in: developing policies of statewide concern; assuming delegated responsibilities; providing communication among local senates; and, initiating relevant policy positions. The senate presidents and college presidents viewed the Senate as Effective in representing community college faculties. The senate presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective on all items. The three groups agreed on a Moderately Effective response

pattern when the Senate purpose of strengthening local senates was considered. All three groups viewed the Senate as Effective when making recommendations on statewide matters.

The questionnaire items for this section represented Paradigm A behavior characteristics. When the effectiveness characteristics were juxtaposed against the response patterns, the Academic Senate was viewed as at least Moderately Effective in accomplishing its purposes, aims, functions.

Comparison of Interview and Questionnaire Findings. The findings for the Senate Purposes, Aims, Functions section for those interviewed and the senate presidents' questionnaire respondents were strikingly similar in their Effective evaluation of the Senate in accomplishing its aims and purposes. The college presidents and faculty groups evaluated the Senate as at least Moderately Effective in carrying out its purposes, aims, functions.

When the responses for the questionnaires were juxtaposed against Paradigm A behavior characteristics of effectiveness, the Senate was judged Moderately Effective. Using a similar analysis procedure, the interview respondents characterized the Senate behavior as Effective when juxtaposed against Paradigm A characteristics. However, interview respondents also characterized certain Senate behaviors as reflective of Paradigm B and C. In these instances, the Senate was thought to be at least Moderately Effective.

To Interpret the Impact of the Academic Senate On Its Environment.

Impact simply means the effect of one thing upon another. The Senate's environment was outlined in Chapter II and can be described as diverse and heterogeneous. The effect of the Senate on its environment may be best understood by considering the documented chain of events centering around the Senate's behavior relative to accreditation. Clearly, the Senate was interacting with its environment, and vice versa, throughout the 13-year period. The results of this study indicate that both the Accrediting Commission and the Senate benefited from the controversy. The Commission's public image was improved, as both individual legislators and CPEC had publicly indicated support for greater faculty involvement in accreditation and disagreement with any practice which would allow the Commission to appoint its own Commissioners. The Senate provided one more opportunity for faculty to participate in academic governance (accreditation) at a high level to a greater extent than ever before.

Elements of the environment of the Senate and the Commission are in a state of flux regarding accreditation. The long-term efforts of the Senate representatives forced the issue of faculty representation--numbers and appointment power. In so doing, the Commission and the Senate were in a position to seek a solution. The resulting compromise required amendments to the Commission's constitution which will likely be approved in June, 1983. This represents a

substantial effect or impact on the Commission's environment, as every organization guards its constitution from outside influences.

The issue has had great impact on the Senate because it concentrated much organizational time and energy in the effort to achieve more input/influence to the whole accreditation process. Since the increase in number of faculty Commissioners will not occur until after June, 1983, the impact of the changes is unknown.

Two elements of the accreditation process which the Senate was able to accomplish earlier were the Commission's acceptance of the need for more faculty members on visitation teams (names are provided by the Academic Senate), and the revision of the guidelines for the self-study used by all institutions being accredited. Senate representatives participated in revising the handbook and were responsible for writing into the handbook specific ways in which local senates/presidents should be involved in governance. Ultimately, each college will be affected by these two changes as they go through accreditation. Clearly, more faculty have been and will continue to be able to participate in visitations.

Another activity in which the Senate was a primary participant, which had great impact on its environment, was the specification in Title V that the local senates participate in the review and revision of the Associate Degree requirements. The Senate recommended such specification and the

Board of Governors approved. Each college and every student in a degree program was directly or indirectly impacted.

The explanations of the findings discussed as they pertain to the study's four objectives, provided an interpretation of the composite impact of the Academic Senate on its environment. The organization has demonstrated its influence, understanding, and use of various kinds of effectiveness behavior and leadership in interacting with its environment. In short, the findings indicate the Senate has impacted its environment extensively and the environment has responded to its impact.

Senate Overall Effectiveness--All Groups

The evaluation of overall Academic Senate effectiveness provided by the faculty group was Moderately Effective. The senate and college presidents evaluated the Senate as Effective. Interview respondents were not requested to provide an overall evaluation of Senate effectiveness.

Conclusions

The Paradigm

Throughout the year-long process of data gathering and analysis, the pieces of the complex organizational picture of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges began to take form and shape. With data gathering and analysis completed and the study's written form nearly finalized, the various elements present in the Senate's environment were

defined and analyzed. But, it was also clear that the Senate's real world, that is, its environment, was very complex, filled with interactions, interrelationships and multiple realities. The composite picture may be likened to a photograph taken with a powerful telephoto lens where some images have distinct form, while others are fuzzy and ill-defined.

The paradigm were developed as a means of explaining and portraying the Academic Senate's reality, so as to contribute to the composite picture of the Senate's organizational effectiveness. The effectiveness definitions, methods of assessing organizational effectiveness reviewed in the literature, and observable Senate behaviors logically fit into three paradigm which were determined to be appropriate for this study.

Paradigm A reflects the roots and self-image of an organization; the reason for the organization's existence. It describes effective behavior as largely goal-oriented and centrally controlled. Paradigm B reflects an organization's process orientation. Effective behavior was identified as the result of loose coordination of sub-units and characterized by attempts to routinize activity and standardize environmental interactions. Standard operating procedures are very important. Paradigm C reflects the importance of the many players involved in strategic and political activity. Organizational effectiveness hinges on the recognition that the individual is very important and that organizational

goals must dovetail with the needs and wants of the membership.

While these paradigm are conceptually discrete, they are empirically related. It is possible that there are other paradigm and in differing numbers which describe the Senate's reality. These paradigm reflected what the researcher considered the most salient behavior characteristics of the participants in higher education and those Senate characteristics which were observed. Their application to a situation was based on observation, interpretation, intuition, as well as that which was quantifiable. They are fuzzy and paradoxical, at times, but that is a common occurrence in the real world and the paradigm do frame the Senate's reality and this researcher's interpretation of it.

The stimulus for the actual development of these paradigm occurred during the participant observation phase of the data collection. Senate representatives were observed taking strong positions based on stated organizational goals while, almost simultaneously, bargaining and compromising to achieve their goals. Often, though, the effectiveness behavior characteristics of a single paradigm were present. Observation indicated they were effective. There was no organizational effectiveness model located in the literature which described the organizational behavior being observed. The paradigm provided the frame for the composite picture of the Senate and exemplified the definition of paradigm--a scheme for

understanding and explaining certain elements of reality (Ferguson, 1980, p. 26).

Description of the Academic Senate

Based on the findings of this study, the following images--some well-defined, some more translucent--are offered as a composite picture of the Academic Senate.

The organization was goal-focused, choosing to take an active interest in selected issues which are most germane to the academic and professional concerns of community college faculty. It was centrally led by an elected Executive Committee. Its organizational structure has had the flexibility to accommodate changing levels of interests/needs that the members exhibit in their participation, while allowing it to respond to external and internal pressures as they occur.

The Senate has been successful in accomplishing its goals and it has exhibited a steady increase in the quality and quantity of spheres of influence. Also, its activities were consistently well-attended by its membership and other representatives of various elements of its external environment. But, too little concrete support for local senates was provided by the Academic Senate. While there were definite pockets, statewide, of strong local senates, the generalized concern expressed by interview respondents was for the lack of uniform strength of the local senates and the resultant neutralizing impact on the Senate's effectiveness.

Questionnaire respondents were critical of the

effectiveness of the Senate's efforts at strengthening local senates. Some respondents wrote cogent comments to this effect on their questionnaires. There was too much distance in the communication between the local senates (faculty members) and the Academic Senate. The much-diluted or non-existent communication which does occur left the membership with extensive lack of knowledge about the Senate. The high "don't know" percentages of response from the faculty group illustrated this. Interview respondents expressed concern that the membership did not know about this effective organization even under the most ideal of circumstances.

The behavior exhibited by the Senate demonstrated the appropriateness of selecting the Tannenbaum and Georgopoulos definition of effectiveness for this study, as it recognizes the Senate's environment, its goal direction and accomplishments, while highlighting the specific importance of the membership. This was illustrated by the fact that collegiality, the core of the Academic Senate's self image and behavior characteristics, recognizes the importance of the needs of the individual participant in the effectiveness of the whole organization. The extent to which the Senate and its representatives have become collegial and the relationship of collegiality to their political or strategic behavior was exemplified by the display of the events surrounding the accreditation issue. This issue, as well as the associate degree and general education requirements review, illustrated the effectiveness of the Senate in these specific situations.

The Senate activities, reviewed in depth, relating to accreditation, demonstrated the vital importance of the individual actors who championed a cause for the sake of the greater good--organizational goals--and, in return, their individual needs (undefined by the study) were met. These same activities demonstrated, also, the effectiveness of the sub-units (accreditation committee, Educational Policies Committee) as they worked toward and successfully accomplished the committee's and organization's goals over long periods of time. But, in each instance, the purpose for the committee's existence and activities rested with the reason the Senate exists--to represent faculty on academic and professional matters.

The data analysis revealed that the Senate was viewed as least effective by the faculty and college presidents' groups and most consistently effective by senate presidents and those interviewed. At first glance, it might seem that the faculty and senate presidents should be more in agreement, since senate presidents are full-time faculty members, and that there was no obvious connection between those interviewed and the senate presidents. Access to information and being in the communication path was identified as the common thread between senate presidents and those interviewed. For both groups, access to the Senate representatives and communiques was direct. Knowledge about the organization directly affected the response to inquiry about the Academic Senate's organizational effectiveness.

Clearly, the Senate has successfully fostered the process and procedural aspects of involvement of the local senates in governance. A primary factor in this involvement was the Senate's efforts, which resulted in an agreement with BoG and the Chancellor's Office that local senate presidents be added to the distribution lists where information about academic and professional matters is disseminated and thus be included in the same communication link as the college chief instruction officer and chief executive officers. In the case of the associate degree review, Title V of the Administrative Code specifies the local senates' involvement in the review.

When the effectiveness behavior characteristics of the paradigm were juxtaposed against Academic Senate behavior, it was clear that the Senate had demonstrated effectiveness behavior characteristics of all three paradigm. Also, it had moved among and between the paradigm effectively, as was most clearly observed in the interview responses and accreditation participant observation situation, but illustrated in many other situations, too. The Senate representatives utilized a variety of effectiveness behavior patterns and demonstrated numerous effectiveness characteristics. The paradigm provided a means for framing the reality of their behavior.

Throughout their book, In Search of Excellence (1982), Peters and Waterman, Jr. emphasized that excellent companies respect their employees and place great value on their individual worth. As a voluntary organization, the effectiveness

of the Academic Senate rests on its individual members and their degree of commitment and participation. The Peters and Waterman, Jr. study, as well as this research, further confirmed the wisdom of the Tannenbaum and Georgopoulos (1957) definition of organizational effectiveness because it specifically identified and set apart the importance of the individual to organizational effectiveness.

The intent is to indicate that the statewide Academic Senate, a non-profit, voluntary, professional, collegial organization which was identified as an effective organization by questionnaire respondents, interview respondents and participant observation evaluation, may possess the same characteristics, labeled slightly differently, as are found in the excellent companies. Further, it would appear that excellent companies possess the effectiveness behavior characteristics identified in the three paradigm, and that these characteristics may be generalizable to both profit and service oriented organizations when studies with qualitative research designs are considered.

The flexible organization structures and strong social networks which encourage lateral, as well as vertical, communication and abundant opportunity for interaction found in Peters and Waterman, Jr.'s excellent companies, Naisbitt's (Megatrends, 1982) participatory decision-making involving people whose lives are affected by the decisions, and the Academic Senate's commitment to collegiality and democratic structure have striking similarities. The very foundation of

collegiality is in colleagues questioning, participating in decisions and sharing in the governance process.

There are similarities between the Peters and Waterman, Jr.'s (1982) loose-tight characteristics, Naisbitt's (1982) view of the future, and certain of the effectiveness characteristics described by the paradigm. Consider, for example, a comparison of Peters and Waterman, Jr.'s "tight" characteristic present in excellent companies, identified as rigidly shared values and firm central direction which provides the framework about what counts, Naisbitt's identification of an institution's defined purpose that is right, its strategic shared vision which provides the image of what is desired, as well as the focus to achieve it, and Paradigm A effectiveness characteristics in which goals are defined and lead to goal attainment. Additionally, a Paradigm A description of an organization reveals a centrally-directed organization with large patterns of activity and members who share an image of the organization and its purposes. Virtually all respondents to the questionnaires and those interviewed shared the image of the Academic Senate as having a clearly defined purpose, firm, centralized direction, and as effective in accomplishing its goals.

As a classic example of Naisbitt's "change occurs when there is a confluence of both changing values and economic necessity, not before" (p. 183), one could cite Proposition 13 (1978), the tax reform initiative (change in values), which was followed by difficult economic times (economic

necessity) so apparent during the period of this study with both factors overarched by the poor academic preparation of college students.

The institutions of higher education have been forced into serious and prolonged questioning of the purpose they serve and numerous substantive changes have occurred. The statewide Academic Senate participated fully in activities which led to: uniform grading policy; associate degree general education requirements review; AS-CIO and Intersegmental Committee recommendations for uniform minimum competency requirements in the basic skills; and, changes in the Accrediting Commission membership and appointment procedures. The impact of the changes has been or will be felt on each community college campus. It is noteworthy that these activities and resultant changes were concentrated in the academic years 1980-81, 81-82, 82-83 (the period of greatest economic crisis). Concurrently, the Senate has taken strong positions, similar to those identified by Naisbitt, in support of the concept of lifelong education and in recognition of the critical importance of generalist education. Naisbitt's view of the future indicates a combination of lifelong learning and generalist education, providing the tools which people will use in meeting the future.

The Academic Senate's Problem Areas

The statewide Academic Senate had four major problems related to organizational effectiveness. The first problem

was concerned with communication. The members surveyed were not knowledgeable about the Senate's activities. Effectiveness cannot be judged by those who lack knowledge. The senate presidents received direct communications from the Academic Senate. Those senate presidents who responded to the survey (70%) indicated a much smaller "don't know" response than the faculty. The elite interview respondents were selected because of their interaction with the Senate and expertise about its activities. Both the senate presidents and those interviewed were very positive in their evaluation of the effectiveness of the Senate. The interview respondents had communicated directly with the organizational actors (as had the senate presidents) and understood the Senate, if only in a specific area of concern.

Further, this has been an on-going problem and the problem rests with the Senate's acceptance that it was communicating with the membership in the manner it should as a democratically-structured microcosm of representative government. The pattern was for the Senate officers to communicate with the local senates, through the presidents, who then communicate to their faculties. If this were multiplied 107 times, most faculty members of the community colleges in California would be well informed about the Academic Senate activities. Clearly, this has not been happening and the communication structure has not been effective. Comments which were received from senate presidents as part of their survey response indicated their concurrence and highlighted

the seriousness of the problem. The Senate must undertake a major overhaul of its communication network with its members.

The Senate's second major problem pertained to local senates. These senates need to develop more uniform strength, statewide, in order to implement or maintain the substantive gains in participatory governance, accomplished by the efforts of the Academic Senate. Jean B. Trapnell, one of the interview respondents, indicated she thought it "was going to be more and more important that the local senates be empowered to carry out . . . what the statewide Senate now has to gain for them at the state level." Patrick M. Callan, another interview respondent, stated his concern for the uneven strength of the local senates statewide. The results of the questionnaire responses of all three groups indicated their agreement that local senates needed to be strengthened through the active support of the Academic Senate.

There were strong local senates. The legislative statutes and procedural agreements which support strong senates apply to all local senates. Why, then, were there such differences? As indicated previously, the Academic Senate and its external supporters have accomplished many avenues for use by all local senates in participative governance. But, there were distinct differences in strength, the causes of which were not, in the opinion of this researcher, fully understood.

On several occasions, the Senate has surveyed the local

senates requesting very important data, such as: the amount of assigned time for the president; amount of financial support; and, amount of clerical support. This data has been used effectively by local senates to gain resources on individual campuses. It is true that the strong senates likely have more local support. The question is, how did they achieve it? It is likely to be true that there are strong local senates with relatively little quantifiable support. If this is the case, how and under what circumstances does this occur? Is there such a thing as ambience, perhaps of a collegial nature, which differentiates the strong senate? Is local strength related to role modeling in some identifiable way, that is, having the opportunity to observe or experience the methods and skills necessary to interact with the membership, CEO's and Board members effectively? If tradition is an identifiable factor, what contributes to it? Who are or have been the local senate leaders in strong senates? Do they have common characteristics?

It appears that some local senates have been labeled "strong," using somewhat obscure criteria, but have not been well-defined and described in such a way as to provide useable information to other senates. The Academic Senate should not and cannot afford to reduce its efforts at the statewide level. However, the organization should provide active support for local senates on local campuses, which is unique to their needs. To begin to do this, the Senate must gather more concrete data on what characterizes strong local

senates and then go about the process of strength-building with all the local senates. Strong senates can become stronger, also.

Third, the Senate needs to actively consider its role as a political force (Paradigm C). The questionnaire raised the issue of whether the Senate was politically effective when its interactions with specified organizations in its environment were concerned. There was general agreement by those interviewed, as well as the senate and college presidents' groups, that the Academic Senate was politically effective in interacting with the Board of Governors for California Community Colleges and, to a lesser extent, with the other identified organizations. It appears that this was an accurate evaluation of the Senate's political effectiveness. Contributing to the Senate's more effective interaction with the Board is that its representatives attend all meetings and have the legal right to submit agenda items and address the Board directly. Also, the Board has indicated its approval of the focused efforts of the Senate to address critical academic and professional issues. Access to the Board, which provides the opportunity for repeated interactions over time by individuals where bargaining and compromises can occur, probably accounts for the Senate's increased political effectiveness with that group.

Access to CPEC has been more difficult for the Senate to achieve, though the interactions have become more frequent.

The Commission often includes the Senate representatives in appropriate advisory groups and committee structures.

The Senate position and representatives working on accreditation issues attracted the favorable eye of several key legislators. This was exemplified by their willingness to write letters to the Accrediting Commission, confirming their support for the Senate's position to increase the faculty participation/representation on the Commission, and their disapproval of the Commission's proposal to self-appoint commissioners. Also, the Legislature increased the Senate's funding because they supported the Senate's issue-driven efforts and were encouraging the organization to extend their activities. Again, this kind of effectiveness was related to Senate representatives interacting with legislators in providing testimony at committee hearings and in the hallways of Sacramento.

A substantive issue was raised by several of those interviewed who questioned whether the Academic Senate should be politically effective. Several expressed the view that the effectiveness of the Senate was based on its apolitical, purist goals and its focused effort to achieve these goals. To become politically effective, the Senate might have to compromise its image and effectiveness.

Political effectiveness has many meanings and there was no question that some believed political activity of any sort blatantly unprofessional. In their view, it is not possible to participate in political activity without tarnishing the

organization or individual's image. Throughout this study, the participants have indicated that the Senate's image was very pure--goal-focused and directed toward issues concerning academic and professional matters--while characterizing Senate behavior as akin to political (Paradigm C). A primary example was the observation of Senate behavior surrounding the accreditation issue, which identified Senate representatives using political strategies in combination with purist strategies over an extended period of time. Clearly, the Senate has been effective in combining what appears to some to be paradoxical characteristics--political and purist--and the question seems moot.

A fourth problem was identified by several who were interviewed and was expressed as a concern for whether the Senate will be able to maintain or increase its effectiveness without some direct, formalized method or program for assuring the perpetuation of quality leadership. One suggestion was for the Senate to develop an internship-like program for use in training and exposure of members to the various roles played by the organizational actors. Another was for the Senate to provide leadership workshops for local senates. Those interviewed attributed much of the Senate's effectiveness to the individual Senate representatives with whom they had interacted.

Unquestionably, the future effectiveness of the Senate, as a voluntary organization, rests with its ability to replace its leadership on a regular and reasonably predictable

basis. The potential pool from which to draw was large-- 15,000 or so. But participation is also voluntary and incentives to participate are relatively obscure or non-existent for the vast majority of those individuals. Additionally, the Senate leadership representatives interact with individuals and organizations in highly-charged arenas, far removed from the college classroom. In fact, there was little reason to assume that the professional preparation or skills required of an effective teacher are those most desired of the Senate leadership.

Because of the Senate's representative structure, local senate delegates and presidents were the individuals who composed the greatest portion of the leadership pool; the training for potential leaders occurred in the local senates. The potential pool was affected by numerous factors. Currently, those who remain in the eligible pool either self-select and place their name in nomination or are tapped by present leadership, based on their observations. Once elected or appointed, the individual begins the undefined learning/training process. Some individuals have not taken their role seriously. Others exemplify nearly total dedication to their role. The latter were the individuals those interviewed characterized as the Senate leadership.

As the role of the Senate leader becomes more visible, demanding skills and talents more common to publicly elected officials and less familiar to the activities of the local senate, the pool of potential leaders will become even

smaller. Those who remain may not necessarily possess the desirable skills. Instead, they may just be persistent or be motivated by personal needs to a greater extent than the others.

The need for a leadership development plan and training activities, prior to running for office or being appointed to committees, was not measured by this study and there was no indication that leadership problems existed as this was written. The fear was for the future. This may be a "sleeping" need for the Senate. In other words, by the time the need is recognized, the leadership pool may have been drained. Interview respondent Gus Guichard's advice to the Senate was to plan for the future by developing a series of formalized experiences for potential Senate leaders to participate in prior to being elected or appointed. This suggestion should be explored thoroughly by the Senate. Its future rests on the consistency of the leadership.

Recommendations

The organizational effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been well documented by the findings of this study. As with any individual organization, weaknesses in the Senate have been present and deserve the attention of the Senate.

Organizational Effectiveness Definition

The review of the literature provided numerous

definitions of organizational effectiveness. Most often they were cumbersome, requiring an understanding of the author's research and an interpretation of the jargon of organizational behavior. The Tannenbaum and Georgopoulos (1957) definition was selected because it minimized the jargon and included the organization membership as a unique consideration, rather than a generalized organizational resource. The conclusions of this study indicated that the definition was appropriate. It was clear, however, that elements of organizational effectiveness emerged which deserved more distinct emphasis in the definition. These elements may have been present in some or all of the definitions in the review but were obscured by their author's terminology.

The following definition of organizational effectiveness is recommended for study. An organization is effective when: it is goal-focused; it understands and accommodates paradox; it is highly participatory; and, all who belong have a stake in its present and future. This definition lacks a statement about resource acquisition, but goal statements and focus actually address resource acquisition and, to the extent they are accomplished, resources are acquired. This definition is universal and appears applicable to the study of organizations as widely divergent as coalitions and multi-national corporations.

Research Design and Methodology

The research design and methodology were selected

because they offered support for the comprehensive nature of the purpose and objectives of this research, and the means to provide for understanding the complexity of the Academic Senate's environment. The results and conclusions of the research justified the importance of undertaking the comprehensive design as it exposed the differing viewpoints of those individuals and groups in the Senate's environment.

The two major groups in the internal environment, faculty and senate presidents, disagreed on many points concerning the Senate's effectiveness. The interview respondents consisted of more members of the external environment and they tended to view Senate effectiveness similarly to the local senate presidents' group. The college presidents were very important to local senates but, as a group, they were external to the Academic Senate. Yet, their responses to the evaluation of Senate effectiveness were more similar to those of the faculty group. Using the thematic approach to participant observation served to isolate one situation/issue and view it comprehensively while integrating virtually all elements of the Senate's internal and external environment.

A less comprehensive research design would have cloaked the differences, provided an incomplete and less accurate understanding of the Senate's effectiveness, and provided distinctly different conclusions. As a result, a personal leaning toward effectiveness studies with multiple data collection methodologies, which began to develop during the

literature review, was confirmed through use of this study's triangulation strategy and structural corroboration.

The three paradigm which were developed as a means of integrating the analysis of the various types of data appear to be generalizable and, therefore, applicable to future organizational effectiveness studies.

The research findings identified four major problems: Communication with community college faculty members; Need to strengthen local senates; Role as a political force; Future leadership development. Four recommendations follow.

Communication with Community College Faculty Members

Communication problems were not unique to the Academic Senate and it appeared that there may be many aspects of this problem which need scrutinizing. In democratically structured representative organizations, the elected leaders communicate through representatives (senate presidents), elected or appointed, to the people or members of the organization (community college faculty). The Senate, through the President or Executive Committee, has operated this way for many years and the Executive Committee, senate presidents, and faculty have expressed dissatisfaction because it has not worked. Since it was clear that the faculty did not know and understand this organization, the Academic Senate should consider the following:

Establish a small group of faculty members (10-15) who have expertise in communication methods and techniques,

as well as knowledge about organizations. Charge this group with studying the problem and suggesting solutions.

Need to Strengthen Local Senates

The expressed and recognized need to strengthen the local senates by all who participated in this study was the second major problem the Academic Senate should tackle. Some local senates appeared to be strong and vital, but others were not. The Senate has done a number of surveys of local senates requesting information about various demographic characteristics. However, questions, such as the following, have not been asked by the Senate in the frame of any research it has conducted:

"What are the characteristics of a strong local senate?"

"Where are the strong local senates located?"

"How do strong local senates communicate?"

"How do strong local senates differ from the weak ones?"

In order for the Academic Senate to work to strengthen local senates, a description of the characteristics of strong local senates must be identified.

The Executive Committee should:

1. Consider establishing a small team of faculty members with research expertise to study strengths, weaknesses, and needs of local senates.
2. Consider establishing a list of individuals from all over the State who have demonstrated success with

their local senates to act as "contacts" and troubleshooters, for local senate presidents to communicate with when an outside, objective opinion on how to expedite local activity is needed.

3. Consider encouraging Executive Committee representatives to visit campuses and/or communicate by telephone with local senate presidents regularly about what they are doing; what the Executive Committee needs to know; and, what the Senate is doing.

Role as a Political Force

Some of those who were interviewed raised interesting concerns as to whether the Senate should be politically effective while indicating that it had been. Others were not troubled by this concern and the Senate was identified as politically effective. Political activity was one of the realities of the Senate's environment.

The Executive Committee should undertake a thorough review of the Senate's political behavior. The behaviors characteristic of political effectiveness need to be analyzed as they relate to collegiality and accepted or rejected as appropriate for use by the Senate when future strategies are developed. The question of establishing a permanent office and increasing Senate visibility in Sacramento were inter-related with this issue.

Future Leadership Development

Clearly, the respondents to this study identified the importance of the organization's members in its effectiveness. Most people who come in contact with an organization do so through the visibility of its officers and representatives, and the concern for the perpetuation of the quality leadership which has been expressed was perhaps a valid one.

The Executive Committee should undertake, as a project, the consideration of problems inherent in perpetuating quality leadership. The past methods have been effective, but there were indications (Peters and Waterman, Jr., 1982; Naisbitt, 1982) that leaders and expectations of leadership were changing. The suggestions offered by those interviewed should be carefully considered, along with an interdisciplinary, philosophical/theoretical exploration of leadership.

Recommendations for Future Research

The scholarly works cited throughout the review of literature concerned with organizational effectiveness did not identify one best organizational structure nor did one best way to assess organizational effectiveness emerge. This dissertation serves to contribute in a small way to the overall body of knowledge about organizations and organizational effectiveness because no similar study of the organizational effectiveness of a statewide academic senate existed. The value of its contribution to that body of knowledge can only

be determined by the critical review of others and time. However, it has served to enlighten the researcher and lead to recommendations which should be considered for future study.

1. An obvious need for further study was outlined in the earlier recommendation concerning local senates. Clearly, the Academic Senate will maintain, increase or decrease in its effectiveness, based on the continued support of the local senates. The discrepancy in effectiveness of the local senates is of concern. A research project, patterned closely after this dissertation and testing the paradigm developed for this study, would provide a clear understanding of local senate effectiveness and be an appropriate companion study to this one.
2. Replicability and generalizability of research has been a traditional means of indicating the appropriateness of the methodology and confirming the credibility of the research. Therefore, a study, replicating this design and concentrating on the applicability of the paradigm to the effectiveness of a non-voluntary public service organization, is recommended. Similarly, a study concentrating on a profit-making, non-voluntary organization is suggested.
3. The questionnaires generated a wealth of data which begs to be analyzed, to determine whether there are

indications of the interactions among items which deserve further investigation relative to the Academic Senate's organizational effectiveness.

Final Observations

As this study drew to a close, it became obvious that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been an effective organization. The 15 years encompassed by its existence have been some of the most exciting and anxious years in the history of higher education in California.

Sense of timing--being in the right place at the right time--is an incredibly nebulous and difficult concept to explain. To a large extent, it is intuitive but it is based on the ability to accumulate, categorize, analyze and combine related and seemingly unrelated information, and then make decisions. In the case of the Academic Senate, numerous incidents were mentioned during this research which occurred somewhat unexpectedly, but the Senate was either prepared to handle them or to rise to the occasion. As an example, the fledgling Senate was confronted with the turmoil of collective bargaining and the diversity which accompanied it. Leadership in both camps was taxed. Yet, the Senate quickly decided to separate the issues, focus on the need for both kinds of groups, and ultimately to cooperate when appropriate. Many predicted the death of local senates and the statewide Senate but it did not happen.

When generalized growth and access and the local

communities were supporting and demanding courses which were the antithesis of traditional college coursework, the Senate was advocating academic quality and standards and not many were listening. When the tide began to turn in 1978 and was sucking the life out of the community colleges shortly after, the Senate had information, representation and a publicly-stated collegial philosophy. The organization was called upon to participate and make recommendations in the decisions that culminated in the retrenching of the 80's.

The academic years 1979-80, 80-81 and 81-82 were tumultuous ones throughout the State. During that period, the Senate elected a political scientist and a sociologist as president. Both were well-schooled in human interaction; both were experienced Senate representatives. Was it timing, organizational insight or luck? Their leadership was effective. Were there others, potentially just as effective, who were not leading?

Sense of timing was not a factor evaluated by this research, but more than one individual suggested that it was the most appropriate reason for an action being taken at the time it occurred.

Focus, tenacious at times, on academic issues, adequate process and standard operating procedures, and a political/strategic expertise, labeled collegiality, have characterized the Senate's behavior over the years. But, it was during the last three years that these combined and interacting

characteristics have been most visible and the most effectively demonstrated.

The Board of Governors and the Legislature have made public statements, to all who would listen, that they were not interested in having individual districts and/or special interest groups addressing them, requesting solutions for problems which are rightfully settled locally. Both groups have publicly indicated their support for the efforts of the Senate because, in their view, it has consistently addressed statewide issues focusing on academic quality.

Those who characterized the Senate as effective sometimes criticized the issues it has supported, indicating that they were often counter to local control and destructive to the unique identity of an individual college. As yet, the Board of Governors has not clearly defined the issues which are local, but it has indicated an intent to accomplish that very difficult task. Underlying this controversy is the fact that local districts have almost no control over their income. Since the passage of Proposition 13, the State controls the purse strings which, when coupled with the existence of the California community college system, is the basis for Senate activity, which tacitly considers the issue of local control moot.

At the same time, the Board of Governors has clearly indicated that it does not propose to remove all local identity and control. The more reinforcement it provides for the Academic Senate and local senates, especially with repeated

inclusion of these organizations in Title V sections, the more important local senates will become in the governance process.

As the coordinating commission for higher education in California, CPEC evaluates and recommends to the Legislature. CPEC has indicated that it considered the work of the Inter-segmental Committee to be of primary significance and an example of collegiality in action. Again, the activity undertaken at the State level is extremely significant, but implementation occurs at the local level and that was identified as the rightful domain of the local senate.

As an organization, the Senate was not without its critics, both internally and externally, nor was it devoid of all problems. It has been very consistent in its positions, and its representatives have frequently been faced with adversity and uneven odds. Some of its leaders have been inept and some excellent--but, in toto, they have been effective. Timing is not just luck. The Senate had prepared itself well for the participatory role in shared governance and was ready when the time was right. Without question, it has incorporated the external environment in its internal environment and the impact has been reciprocal.

Earlier, a definition of organizational effectiveness was proposed for future study in which an organization was effective when: it is goal-focused; it understands and accommodates paradox; it is highly participatory; and, all who belong have a stake in its present and future. The four

major concerns, addressed as recommendations, are germane to the last two points of this definition, are manageable and largely interrelated problems. An enthusiastic and creative approach to these topics will lead to continued or increased organizational effectiveness.

The Academic Senate should be congratulated for its proven ability to maintain clarity of purpose and goal-focused behavior. It has managed the paradox and conflict in its environment well. As a generalized statement, these characteristics may reflect the most important and generalizable behaviors for the Senate to demonstrate if it is to continue to be a strong, effective organization.

APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

1. Tell me about the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. How did it get to be the way it is? (Anything else?)
2. In what specific ways (capacities) have you participated in the Academic Senate? How about currently? How many years?
3. What do other professional organizations, groups think of the Academic Senate? Has this always been true? If not, can you identify turning points?
4. What lines of communication are set up between the Academic Senate and major educational organizations?
5. Does the organization make use of available information? Why/Why not?
6. What is the purpose of the organization, in your opinion?
7. How strong is the Academic Senate?
8. What do you consider the goals of the Academic Senate?
9. Should any of these goals be eliminated? Added to? Give examples.
10. Which outside groups does the Academic Senate listen to?
11. What do you think will be the most important activities to the Academic Senate five years from now?
12. What future do you see for the Academic Senate? Why?
13. What do you think community college faculty in California see as the Academic Senate's major function?
14. How old is the Academic Senate? Why was it founded? Was there a special need? What was it?
15. How much has the Academic Senate changed in the past five years?
16. How would you rate the Academic Senate compared with other similar organizations?
17. Do you think the Chancellor's Office is supportive of the Academic Senate? In what specific ways?
18. What is the relationship of the Academic Senate and the California Postsecondary Education Commission?
19. From your perspective, what do you think is the most important function of the Academic Senate? Least important?
20. Do you think that the existence of collective bargaining units and academic senates on individual campuses is mutually advantageous? Why?
21. What organizational characteristics do effective organizations possess?
22. What is it about this organization that makes a difference in terms of its effectiveness?
23. What would have to change in order to make the Academic Senate more effective?

APPENDIX B

Survey Questionnaire

October 11, 1982

Dear Colleague,

MiraCosta College

One Bernard Drive Oceanside, CA 92054 Telephone (619) 437-1000

This questionnaire is concerned with investigating the organizational effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The survey represents one of several data collection techniques that I will be using in the development of my doctoral dissertation and will take about fifteen minutes for you to complete. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate is knowledgeable about and supportive of this research.

The Academic Senate is your statewide representative in all matters of academic and professional concern. Your responses to this survey are vital to my research and in providing substantive information which the statewide Academic Senate may use in accomplishing its major goal — that of representing you the community college instructor.

Throughout the questionnaire, the Academic Senate for California Colleges is referred to as the statewide Academic Senate. References to local senates should be interpreted to include faculty councils or equivalent organizations.

Please complete the questionnaire, fold, staple closed, and return to me by October 29. Your response will remain confidential. A copy of the survey results will be made available to every community college through the local academic senate president. Many thanks for your early response.

Sincerely,

Gail Prentiss

Not printed or mailed at taxpayer expense.

Serving the communities of Cardiff, Carlsbad, Del Mar, Encinitas, Leucadia, Oceanside, Olivenhain, Rancho Santa Fe, San Luis Rey and Solana Beach

Directions: This questionnaire is concerned with the effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.
Please check the appropriate box. The questionnaire will take about fifteen minutes to complete.

- A. Sex (1) M ☐ (2) F ☐
- B. In what area was your principal teaching assignment in 1981-82?
(1) Social and Behavioral Sciences ☐ (2) Natural Sciences ☐
(3) Physical Sciences including Math ☐ (4) Humanities ☐ (5) Health and Physical Education ☐ (6) Business and Vocational ☐ (7) Basic Skills (remedial) ☐
- C. Number of years of full-time teaching taught in a community college:
(1) 0-5 ☐ (2) 6-10 ☐ (3) 11-15 ☐ (4) 16 or more ☐
- D. Size of your full-time teaching faculty:
(1) Less than 50 ☐ (2) 51-100 ☐ (3) 101-200 ☐ 201-300 ☐
(5) More than 300 ☐
- E. Have you ever held office in your local academic senate?
(1) Yes ☐ (2) No ☐
- F. Have you ever attended a state conference or area meeting of the statewide Academic Senate?
(1) Yes ☐ (2) No ☐

	to a very small extent	to a small extent	to some extent	to a great extent	to a very great extent	don't know
G. Listed below are the purposes, aims and functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out each of the following:						
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.						
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.						
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.						
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California community colleges.						
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California community colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.						
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California community college faculties.						
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California community colleges and their role in higher education.						
H. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.						
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?						
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?						
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent me on academic and professional matters.						
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.						
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.						
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.						
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates						
I. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing the community college faculty in:						
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the systemwide grading policy minimum standards?						
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?						
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?						
(4) accreditation?						
J. In representing community college faculties, to what extent do you think the statewide Academic Senate is politically effective with:						
(1) the legislature						
(2) California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)						
(3) California State Universities (CSU)						
(4) University of California (UC)						
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)						
K. How do you evaluate the overall effectiveness of statewide Academic Senate? (check one)						
(1) Very effective ☐ (2) Effective ☐ (3) Somewhat effective ☐ (4) Not very effective ☐ (5) Ineffective ☐ (6) Don't know ☐						

IF YOU WISH TO COMMENT ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE, PLEASE DO SO BELOW OR ENCLOSE ADDITIONAL SHEET.

THANK YOU. Please fold and staple closed so that my address appears on the front.

October 11, 1982

MiraCosta College
 One Bernard Drive, Oceanside, CA 92054 Tel.: (619) 757-2121

Dear President,

This questionnaire represents one of several data collection methods which I am using, as a doctoral candidate at the University of San Diego, in the development of my dissertation. My study is concerned with researching the organizational effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate is knowledgeable about and supportive of my research.

The questionnaire will take less than fifteen minutes of your time and your response will remain confidential. I believe this study to be of value to all community college educators and sincerely appreciate your time and early response. Throughout the questionnaire, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is referred to as the statewide Academic Senate. References to local senates should be interpreted to include faculty councils or equivalent organizations.

Please complete the questionnaire, fold, staple closed, and return to me by October 29. A copy of the survey results will be made available to every community college in the state through the local academic senate president. Many thanks for your response.

Sincerely,

Gail Prentiss
 Program Director, Instruction

Not printed or mailed at taxpayer expense.

Serving the communities of Cardiff, Carlsbad, Del Mar, Encinitas, Leucadia, Oceanside, Olivenhain, Rancho Santa Fe, San Luis Rey and Solana Beach

Directions: This questionnaire is concerned with the effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Please check the appropriate box. The questionnaire will take about fifteen minutes to complete.

- A. Sex: (1) M ☐ (2) F ☐
- B. Number of years as a community college president:
(1) 0-5 ☐ (2) 6-10 ☐ (3) 11-15 ☐ (4) 16 or more ☐
- C. Number of years of full-time teaching in a community college:
(1) 0-5 ☐ (2) 6-10 ☐ (3) 11-15 ☐ (4) 16 or more ☐
- D. Size of your full-time teaching faculty:
(1) Less than 50 ☐ (2) 51-100 ☐ (3) 101-200 ☐ (4) 201-300 ☐
(5) More than 300 ☐
- E. What was your principal teaching area?
(1) Social and Behavioral Sciences ☐ (2) Natural Sciences ☐
(3) Physical Sciences including Math ☐ (4) Humanities ☐ (5) Health and Physical Education ☐ (6) Business and Vocational ☐ (7) Basic Skills (remedial) ☐ (8) Other (please specify) ☐
- F. Have you ever held office in a local academic senate?
(1) Yes ☐ (2) No ☐
- G. Have you ever attended a state conference or area meeting of the statewide Academic Senate? (1) Yes ☐ (2) No ☐

	to a very small extent	to a small extent	to some extent	to a great extent	to a very great extent	don't know
H. Listed below are the purposes, aims and functions of the statewide Academic Senate as described in the bylaws. To what extent do you believe the Academic Senate has been effective in carrying out each of the following:						
(1) to represent the California Community College faculties and thereby ensure a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of statewide policies on academic and professional matters.						
(2) to strengthen local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in the California Community Colleges.						
(3) to develop policies and promote the implementation of policies on matters of statewide concern.						
(4) to make recommendations on statewide matters affecting the California community colleges.						
(5) to assume responsibilities and perform functions as may be delegated to it by the local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations of California community colleges and by the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges.						
(6) to provide statewide communication between local academic senates or other equivalent faculty organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of California community college faculties.						
(7) to initiate policy positions relevant to California community colleges and their role in higher education.						
I. Listed below are questions and statements about some of the many activities of the statewide Academic Senate. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in fostering these activities.						
(1) How effective has the statewide Academic Senate been in communicating its activities to individual faculty members?						
(2) How responsive has the statewide Academic Senate been to recommendations made or positions taken by local academic senates?						
(3) I have confidence and trust in the statewide Academic Senate to represent community college faculties on academic and professional matters.						
(4) The statewide Academic Senate is active in speaking out on matters of academic and professional concern.						
(5) The statewide Academic Senate demonstrates leadership in initiating policy statements relevant to the role of community college faculties in higher education.						
(6) The statewide Academic Senate responds actively to the changing needs of community college faculties.						
(7) The statewide Academic Senate has worked effectively to strengthen local senates.						
J. To what extent has the statewide Academic Senate been effective in representing the community college faculty in:						
(1) the establishment of Title V regulations for the systemwide grading policy minimum standards?						
(2) the California State Universities revision of their general education requirements?						
(3) the Title V regulations regarding the associate degree?						
(4) accreditation?						
K. In representing community college faculties, to what extent do you think the statewide Academic Senate is politically effective with:						
(1) the legislature						
(2) California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)						
(3) California State Universities (CSU)						
(4) University of California (UC)						
(5) Board of Governors (BOG, CCC)						
L. How do you evaluate the overall effectiveness of statewide Academic Senate? (check one)						
(1) Very effective ☐ (2) Effective ☐ (3) Somewhat effective ☐ (4) Not very effective ☐ (5) Ineffective ☐ (6) Don't know ☐						

IF YOU WISH TO COMMENT ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE, PLEASE DO SO BELOW OR ENCLOSE ADDITIONAL SHEET.

THANK YOU. Please fold and staple closed so that my address appears on the front.

APPENDIX C

Colleges Included in the Sample

Allan Hancock	Long Beach City
Antelope Valley	Los Angeles Harbor
Barstow	Los Angeles Mission
Cerritos	Los Angeles Trade Tech
Chabot	Los Medanos
Chaffey	Mendocino
Citrus	Merced
College of Alameda	Merritt
College of Marin	Monterey Peninsula
College of the Redwoods	Mt. San Antonio
College of the Sequoias	Mt. San Jacinto
Contra Costa	Orange Coast
Crafton Hills	Palo Verde
Cuyamaca	Pasadena City
Diablo Valley	Palomar
East Los Angeles	Rio Hondo
Evergreen Valley	Sacramento City
Feather River	San Diego City
Foothill	San Diego Mesa
Fresno City	San Jose City
Fullerton	Shasta
Gavilan	Skyline
Golden West	Southwestern
Grossmont	Taft
Kings River	West Valley
Lake Tahoe	Yuba
Laney	

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Standiford, E., Hooper, G., Bischof, N., & Phillips, V. Conference of Academic Senates of California Community Colleges. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, May 24, 1968.
2. Meier, H. A. Report to Academic Senate Council. Oceanside, CA: MiraCosta College, May 3, 1968.
3. ASCCC Fall Conference Minutes, Los Angeles, CA, November 1980.
4. Baradat, L. P. Address to Fall Conference, Collegiality and Academic Senates. Los Angeles, CA, Fall 1980.
5. Rationale for the inclusion of ASCCC in Title V. Academic Senate Archives. No date or author provided.
6. Bischof, Norbert. Senate workshop address, the Academic Senate Fall Conference. Los Angeles, 1980.
7. Prentiss, G. Observation notes of the Chancellor's Report delivered by Gus Guichard, Executive Vice Chancellor, at the Academic Senate Conference, San Francisco, Spring 1982.
8. Approved Executive Committee Minutes, Julie Hatoff, Secretary, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, March 26-27, 1982.

9. Memo to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges from Edith Conn, Accreditation Chair, reporting on meeting of the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, San Francisco, June 15, 1982.
10. Prentiss, G. Observation notes concerning accreditation. Books 1, 2, 3. 1982-1983.
11. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Resolutions. 1970.
12. Conn, Edith. The testimony of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges given by Edith Conn before the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. January 19, 1982.

REFERENCES

- Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The role of academic senates in California community colleges: A position paper. Sacramento, California, 1980. (Mimeographed)
- Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Handbook of accreditation and policy manual. Aptos, CA, 1981.
- Allison, G. T. Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- Bachrach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. Power and politics in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Backstrom, C. H., & Hursh-César, G. Survey research (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons, 1981.
- Bandley, M. K. Relationships of faculty senates (councils) to the administrative staff, presidents and/or superintendents, and board of trustees in sixty-eight California junior colleges as reported by the presidents or vice presidents. Stockton, CA: San Joaquin Delta College, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 013 640)

- Bentley, N. E. The role of faculty in community college policy making. 1966. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 014 268)
- Blankenship, R. L. Organizational careers: An interactionist perspective. In R. L. Blankenship (Ed.), Colleagues in organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1977.
- Blankenship, R. L. (Ed.). Colleagues in organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1977.
- Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. Formal organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Bogdan, R. Participant observation in organizational settings. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1972.
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. J. Introduction to qualitative research methods: A phenomenological approach to the social sciences. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1975.
- Boghe, J. P. The community college. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. E. Educational research, an introduction (3rd ed.). New York: Longman, 1979.
- Brydon, C. W. Control and coordination of California community colleges: As perceived by administrators, trustees and academic senate presidents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.

- Brydon, C. W. Academic senates and the Winton Act. Published for distribution by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 1971.
- Bucher, R. Faculty politics and power. In R. L. Blankenship (Ed.), Colleagues in organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1977.
- Bucher, R., & Stelling, J. Characteristics of professional organizations. In R. L. Blankenship (Ed.), Colleagues in organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1977.
- Bylsma, D., & Blackburn, R. T. Changes in faculty governance and faculty welfare: Some empirical consequences of collective negotiations. 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 058 882)
- California Community Colleges Directory 1981-1982. Sacramento, CA: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. Postsecondary education in California 1981 information digest. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1981.
- Campbell, J. P. Contributions research can make in understanding organizational effectiveness. In S. L. Spray (Ed.), Organizational effectiveness: Theory-research-utilization. Kent State University Press, 1976.

- Campbell, J. P. On the nature of organizational effectiveness. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings & Associates, New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Campbell, J. P., Bownas, D. A., Peterson, N. G., & Dunnette, M. D. The measurement of organizational effectiveness: A review of relevant research and opinion. Contract N00022-73-C-0023 San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, April, 1974.
- Capper, M. R., & Gaddy, D. Faculty participation in junior college governance. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 027 886)
- Carey, R. F. Empirical vs. naturalistic research? Reading research quarterly, 1980, 15 (3), 412-415.
- Case, C. H. Faculty participation in the governance of junior colleges: A study of academic senates in California public junior colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.
- Case, C. H. Establishing academic senates in California community colleges. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, 1971.
- Chapin, F. S., & Tsouderos, J. E. Formalization observed in ten voluntary organizations: Concepts, morphology, process. Social Forces, 1955, 33, 306-309.

- Clark, B. R., & Youn, T. I. K. Academic power in the United States: comparative historic and structural perspectives. Washington, D. C., 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED127 853)
- Clark, E. C., McMahan, E. M., & Hyde, M. Communicating in the oral history interview: Investigating problems of interpreting oral data. Minneapolis, MN: 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 085)
- Cooke, R. A., & Cardoze, S. D. Formal participation and control in community colleges. New York: 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 140 898)
- Cummings, L. L. Emergence of the instrumental organization. In P. S. Goodman, & J. M. Pennings & Associates, New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Cutler, W. W., III. Oral history - its nature and uses for educational history. History of education quarterly, Summer 1971, 11, 184-194.
- Davis, C., Back, K., & MacLean, K. Oral history. Chicago: American Library Association, 1977.
- Denzin, Norman. The research act. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Douglas, J. M. The impact of collective bargaining on governance. New York: University of New York. PERS Information Bulletin, Vol. 2, No. 1, January-February, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 171 223)

- Douglas, M. A study of the role and responsibilities of the academic senate and the California Teachers Association bargaining unit in educational matters. Los Angeles, CA: Pepperdine University, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 186 066)
- Dressel, P. Administrative leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Edelstein, M. (Ed.). Academic Senate for California Community Colleges newsletter. San Marcos: Palomar College, Number 5, March, 1983.
- Eisner, E. W. The educational imagination. New York: Macmillan, 1979.
- Evan, W. M. Dimensions of participation in voluntary associations. Social Forces, 1957, 36, 148-153.
- Evan, W. M. Organizational theory and organizational effectiveness: An exploratory analysis. In S. L. Spray (Ed.), Organizational effectiveness: Theory-research-utilization. Kent State University Press, 1976.
- Faulkner, R. R. Improvising on a triad. In J. Van Maanen, J. M. Dabbs, Jr., & R. R. Faulkner, Varieties of qualitative research (5). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1982.
- Ferguson, M. The aquarian conspiracy. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, Inc., 1980.

- Garlock, J. Collective bargaining; attitudes of college presidents compared with presidents of academic senates. Torrance, CA: El Camino College, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 116 730)
- Georgopoulos, B., & Tannenbaum, A. A study of organizational effectiveness. American Sociological Review, 1957, 20, 534-540.
- Goodman, P. S., & Pennings, J. M. New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Grant, W. Unprecedented state colleges' plea. San Francisco Chronicle, June 15, 1982, p. 2.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Hegland, S. ASCCC role. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Newsletter, Fall, 1970, 1, 3.
- Hillway, T. The American two year college. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersema, W., & Jurs, S. G. Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1979.
- Hodgkinson, H. L. The campus senate: Experiment in democracy. Berkeley: University of California Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 138 149)
- Juric, G. Financially speaking. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Newsletter, Fall, 1970, 1, 3.

- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. The social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1966.
- Lammers, C. J., & Hickson, D. J. Methodological convergences? In C. J. Lammers & D. J. Hickson (Eds.), Organizations alike and unlike. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Lawler, E., III, Nadler, D. A., & Cammann, C. Organizational assessment. New York: John Wiley, 1980.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. Organization and environment. Boston: Harvard University, 1967.
- Levinson, H. Organizational diagnosis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Lorsch, J. W., & Morse, J. J. Organizations and their members: A contingency approach. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1958.
- McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. Issues in participant observation: A text and reader. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- McClelland, D. C. The achieving society. New York: Irvington Publishers, 1976.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structures as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 1977, 83, 340-363.
- Meyer, M. W., & Associates. Environments and organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

- Miskel, C. Simple linear and curvilinear relationships of leader style and school climate to principal effectiveness. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 105 597)
- Monroe, C. R. Profile of the community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Mott, P. E. The characteristics of effective organizations. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Myers, V. Toward a synthesis of ethnographic and survey methods. Human organization, Fall, 1977, 36 (3), 244-251.
- Naisbitt, J. Megatrends. New York: Warner Books, 1982.
- Patton, M. Q. Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980.
- Pennings, J. M., & Goodman, P. S. Toward a workable framework. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings & Associates, New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Perrow, C. Organizational analysis: A sociological view. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1970.
- Perrow, C. Three types of effectiveness studies. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings & Associates, New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Pfeffer, J. Power in organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing, 1981.

Pfeffer, J. Usefulness of the concept. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings & Associates, New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Phillips, B. S. Social research (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan, 1976.

Porter, A. D. Faculty senates in California community colleges: Five years of operation. Los Angeles, CA: 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 036 285)

Price, J. L. Organizational effectiveness. Sociological Quarterly, 1972, 13, 3-16.

Ratsoy, E. W., et al. Organizational effectiveness in the education practicum program 1977-1978. Edmonton, Canada: Alberta University, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 224)

Richardson, R. C., Jr., & Others. Governance for the two-year college. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 146 985)

Richmond, S. B. Statistical Analysis (2nd ed.). New York: Ronald Press, 1964.

Riess, L. C. Faculty governance in turmoil -- who speaks for the junior college professor. Long Beach, CA: 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 017 250)

- Riess, L. C. Institutional attitudes relating to faculty participation in California community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973. (University Microfilms No. 71-687)
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. The bases and use of power in organizational decision making: The case of a university. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, 19, 453-473.
- Scott, W. Organizations: Rational, natural and open systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981.
- Seashore, S. E. An elastic and expandable viewpoint. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings & Associates, New perspectives on organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Shavelson, R. J. Introduction to statistical reasoning and procedures for the design and analysis of research in the behavioral sciences. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles, 1977.
- Smith, W. P., Jr. Rights and responsibilities of California community college academic senates; an historical and legal analysis. Sacramento, CA: 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 076 183)
- Spray, S. L. (Ed.). Organizational effectiveness: Theory-research-utilization. Kent State University, 1976.

- Steers, R. M. Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear, 1977.
- Steers, R. M. Problems in the measurement of organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1975, 20, 546-558.
- Steers, R. M. When is an organization effective. Organizational Dynamics, 1976, 5 (2), 50-63.
- Stewart, J. H. Factors accounting for goal effectiveness: A longitudinal study. In S. L. Spray (Ed.), Organizational effectiveness: Theory-research-utilization. Kent State University Press, 1976.
- Stokle, J. G. Non-participating governance as an influence on faculty senate militancy. 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 103 044)
- Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. Asking questions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Tannenbaum, A. S. Control in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Tannenbaum, A. S., & Cooke, R. A. Organizational control: A review of studies employing the control graph method. In C. J. Lammers & D. J. Hickson (Eds.), Organizations alike and unlike. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Taylor, J. C., & Bowers, D. G. Survey of organizations. Ann Arbor, MI: Malloy Lithographing, Inc., 1972.
- Thompson, J. D. Organizations in action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

- Thompson, J. D., & McEwen, W. J. Organizational goals and environment. American Sociological Review, 1958, 23, 23-30.
- Thornton, J. W. The community junior college. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Tikunoff, W. J., & Ward, B. A. Conducting naturalistic research on teaching. In D. Zigarmi and A. Lindquist (Eds.), Education and urban society (Vol. 12 Number 3). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, May, 1980.
- Tuckman, B. W. Conducting educational research (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1978.
- Vroom, V. H. (Ed.). Methods of organizational research. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967.
- Weber, M. [The theory of social and economic organization] (A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons, Ed. and trans.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Weisbrod, M. R. Organizational diagnosis: A workbook of theory and practice. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- Williamson, J. B., Karp, D. A., Dalphin, J. R., & Gray, P. S. The research craft (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown, 1982.
- Wright, S. J. Faculty participation in academic governance - report of the AAHE task force on faculty representation and academic negotiations, campus governance program. Washington, D. C., 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 018 218)

Yuchtman, E., & Seashore, S. E. A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 891-903.

Zoglin, M. Power and politics in the community college. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications, Dept. Z, P.O. Drawer 1627-A, 1976.