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This study was undertaken with four purposes in mind:

(1) to describe the extent to which faculty members are now involved in decision-making in Texas junior colleges as reported by four reference groups: (a) board chairmen, (b) junior college presidents, (c) faculty association presidents, and (d) other faculty members;

(2) to describe the opinions of these groups relative to the extent to which faculty members should be involved in decision-making; (3) to describe the opinions of the four reference groups in regard to some characteristics of existing faculty organizations; and (4) to make recommendations for junior college faculty organization and participation in decision-making in Texas junior colleges.

Six questions were posed to aid in accomplishing the purposes:

1. To what extent does the faculty participate in decision-making in Texas junior colleges as reported by each of the four reference groups?
2. To what extent should the faculty participate in decision-making as reported by each of the four reference groups?

3. Does the size or organization of the junior college affect the extent to which the faculty is involved or should be involved in decision-making as reported by the four reference groups combined.

4. What types of professional organizations are most acceptable to the four reference groups?

5. What organizations do junior college faculty members presently join?

6. What percentage of junior college faculty members presently belong to local faculty organizations?

The study was conducted by the use of a questionnaire which was validated by leaders of AAUP, AAJC, NFA, TACT, and TJCTA. The questionnaire was sent to all of the fifty-three junior college governing board chairmen, junior college presidents, faculty association presidents, and 150 junior college faculty members. The responses were tabulated and displayed as mean responses or percentages in figures and tables.

The analysis of the responses to the questionnaire led to the following findings and conclusions:

1. Junior college presidents apparently thought that the faculty was more involved in decision-making than faculty members
thought the faculty was.

2. All reference groups apparently believed the faculty should have participated in decision-making more than it did but only to the extent of the faculty's making recommendations to the administration.

3. Local faculty organizations either did not include administrators or were dissatisfied with the inclusion of administrators.

4. A majority of faculty members apparently believed that administrators should be included in state and national faculty organizations.

5. All reference groups showed a strong preference for limiting membership in faculty organizations to junior college members.

6. Texas Junior College Teachers Association and American Association of Junior Colleges were the overwhelming choices of all reference groups as the organizations to represent faculty on the state and national levels respectively.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are many different professional organizations in the United States that represent junior college faculty members. Some of these organizations appear to operate more effectively than do others. Some are used as a ready source of committees for a variety of administrative purposes; others represent the faculty on matters of faculty welfare only.¹

A variety of professional organizations exists in Texas junior colleges. The Texas Junior College Teachers Association, a statewide organization, has made considerable progress in terms of membership since its organization in 1947 with 214 charter members. Its membership was reported to be 3044 in 1970.² Although the organization is large, other faculty organizations may be as influential in representing the junior college faculties in Texas.

¹"Four Associations Look to the Junior College Journal," Junior College Journal, XXXIX (December, 1968), 10-17.
The American Association of Junior Colleges, reported to be largely an administrator's organization, has membership on many campuses but does not appear to be accepted as a teacher's organization, as evidenced by the following statement: "Indeed, some faculty have not even heard of the association to say nothing of reading its publications." 3

Other organizations appear to be making an effort to enlist junior college faculty members. The NEA supported the organization of the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges in May, 1967. 4 This organization is reported in the 1969-70 NEA Handbook to have shown a large growth in membership, in the number of local chapters, and in the number of affiliated state associations. 5 The Texas Association of College Teachers has junior college members, as do the American Federation of Teachers and the American Association of University Professors. 6


6 "Four Associations Look to the Junior College," Junior College Journal, XXXIX (December, 1968), 10-17.
There does not appear to be a consistent trend toward faculty participation in decision-making in junior colleges, as the following indicates:

Collective negotiation in higher education—until recently nothing more than a subject for intellectual conjecture—is being acknowledged as an imminent fact of life by government officials, political leaders, and all sectors of the academic community, including boards of trustees, administrators, and faculty members.7

The above statement by Philip Encino, staff member of the NFA, has a different tone from that of the following statement by Mr. Richard Hixon, a director of the AFT. "Many junior college faculties can still be described as hotbeds of apathy while others teach in an atmosphere of terror."8

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to study faculty organization and participation in Texas Junior Colleges.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were (1) to describe the extent to which faculty members are now involved in decision-making, as


8"Four Associations Look to the Junior College," Junior College Journal, XXXIX (December, 1968), 12.
reported by four reference groups: (a) board chairmen, (b) junior college presidents, (c) junior college faculty association presidents, and (d) other faculty members; (2) to describe the opinions of these groups relative to the extent to which faculty members should be involved in decision-making; (3) to describe the opinions of the four reference groups in regard to some characteristics of existing faculty organizations; and (4) to make recommendations for junior college faculty organization and participation in decision-making in Texas junior colleges.

Questions to Be Answered

1. To what extent does the faculty participate in decision-making in Texas junior colleges, as reported by each of the four reference groups?

2. To what extent should the faculty participate in decision-making, as reported by each of the four reference groups?

3. Does the size or organization of the junior college affect the extent to which the faculty is involved or should be involved in decision-making, as reported by the four reference groups combined.

4. What types of professional organizations are most acceptable to the four reference groups?

5. What organizations do junior college faculty members presently join?
6. What percentage of junior college faculty members presently belong to local faculty organizations?

Background and Significance

"As troublesome as it sometimes is, most administrators would prefer to ride a spirited horse than to whip a dead one. The healthiest solution to the critical and delicate problem of power apportionment appears to lie in a condition in which there is a strong faculty and a strong administration."9 This statement by Stanley Honer is focused on the relationships that existed between faculty and administration. The fact that power apportionment was a critical concern is revealed by an appraisal of two situations in which the faculty-administration relationship resulted in conflict.

The Chicago city teachers' strikes in November, 1966, and January, 1967, were the largest faculty strikes in the history of American junior colleges. These strikes, according to Norman Swenson, President of the Cook County College Teachers Union, were the result of years of neglect on the part of the Chicago Board of Education. There was no faculty government for many years, and the faculty had had virtually no voice in the determination of their working

conditions. The resulting disruption was necessary to force the recognition of the elected bargaining agent of the faculty. 10

The other disruptive situation took place in California, where junior college teacher organizations competed for the support of faculty members. The three major associations included the California Teachers Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the California Junior College Faculty Association. The intense competition between these three organizations to enlist junior college faculty members forced all of them to take a more militant stand toward administrators than any of these organizations had taken before. The mood of California junior college teachers during the early 1960's led these organizations to believe that strong pressure for a larger faculty voice in junior college governance was necessary to obtain the support of faculty members for their organizations. 11

These two situations, the Chicago teachers' strike and the competition between California junior college teacher organizations, pointed out the need for a study of the opinions of groups in Texas which would be involved if similar situations arose in this state.


Evidence of some dissatisfaction already existed. The 1969 election of officers in the Texas Junior College Teachers Association brought out two conflicting groups. The ensuing confrontation resulted in the defeat of the administrator-approved slate of officers. This action testified to the eagerness of some junior college faculty members to participate in political activity.

James W. Tunnell, in a survey of 403 junior colleges, found that junior college administrators viewed the faculty as more involved in policy formulation than did the faculty members themselves. This factor could indicate that faculty members are not well informed as to the extent of faculty participation in decision-making, or it could indicate that administrators often think they are involving faculty in decisions in which the faculty does not regard its participation as having appreciable effect. Another view would indicate that administrators want faculty involved to a greater extent than it wants to participate. It was believed that this study, by including a group described as faculty association presidents, would present a

---

12 Interview with Dr. R.E. Smith, Secretary, Texas Junior College Teachers Association, May 16, 1970.

different view of faculty involvement in decision-making than that of similar studies which have not used this category.

This study was undertaken in the hope of describing adequately the present role of junior college faculty in decision-making in Texas, as viewed by board chairmen, junior college presidents, faculty association presidents, and faculty. This survey would also present the opinions of these groups in regard to the role faculty should assume in decision-making.

The final purpose was to make recommendations for organization and participation of faculty in decision-making in Texas junior colleges. The validity of this search is best indicated by this warning which appeared in the February, 1966, *Junior College Journal*:

"Once a faculty becomes involved in policy making it assumes a quasi-administrative role which cannot be abandoned simply because the faculty loses interest or wishes to direct its efforts to other problems. Power and responsibility cannot be separated without unfortunate consequences."\(^{14}\)

**Limitations**

The scope of this study was limited to professional faculty organizations that represent the total faculty in dealings with

---

\(^{14}\) Honer, "Faculty Power and Participation," p. 31.
administrations and legally-authorized state and local junior college
governing bodies in Texas. In addition, this study was limited to
full-time faculty members.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed in this study that the necessary data could
be obtained through the use of Questionnaires A and B, interviews,
current literature, and correspondence.

Definition of Terms

Faculty associations—professional organizations that
engage in political activity on behalf of junior college faculty
members in Texas. This definition excludes professional organizations that limit eligibility for membership to subject matter areas.

Small junior colleges—junior colleges with a reported
enrollment of 499 or less.

Medium junior colleges—junior colleges with a reported
enrollment of 500 to 1499.

Large junior colleges—junior colleges with a reported
enrollment of 1500 or more.
Procedures for Collecting Data

The data for questions one through six of the study were secured by the use of Questionnaire A and Survey Sheet B (see Appendix). Dr. R.E. Smith, treasurer of the Texas Junior College Teachers Association, was interviewed in collecting background information for the construction of Questionnaire A. Other studies used in the construction of Questionnaire A include the AAHE report of 1967, entitled Faculty Participation in Academic Governance; a report by Archie R. Dykes in 1968, Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making; and an AACTE report by Arnold E. Joyal in 1956, Faculty Participation in College Policy Formulation and Administration.

This instrument was validated by directors of the junior college departments of AAUP, NFA, AAJC, TJCTA, AFT, and TACT. They were asked to judge each item on Questionnaire A as either appropriate or inappropriate for the purposes of this study. The agreement of four of the six judges was used to determine the

15 American Association for Higher Education, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance (Washington, D.C., 1967).


17 Arnold E. Joyal, Faculty Participation in College Policy Formulation and Administration (New York, 1956).
appropriateness of each item and the completeness of the questionnaire. A sheet was provided for items that judges wished to add (see Appendix).

On February 2, 1971, rough drafts of Questionnaire A (see Appendix) were mailed to the following people, who were selected as judges to provide a panel for validation of the instrument: Mr. William E. Vincent, Associate Secretary, AAUP; Mr. Don Keck, NEA/NFA; Dr. Charles E. Chapman, President, AAJC; Mr. Bill Candler, President, TJCTA; Dr. Eleanor Duke, President, TACT; and Mr. Richard Hixon, Director, AFT.

Dr. Eleanor Duke, president of Texas Association of College Teachers, replied within two weeks. Four other replies were received after the follow-up letter was mailed on March 1, 1971. All replies received indicated that the questionnaire was valid and appropriate for use in this study. Replies were received from five of the six judges. The letter that was mailed to Mr. Richard Hixon of the American Federation of Teachers was returned unopened with the statement that the organization had moved and had left no forwarding address.

After the questionnaire was put in final form, it was mailed to all of the junior colleges in the State of Texas that were listed in
the *College Blue Book 1969/70*\(^\text{18}\) and *American Junior Colleges*, seventh edition.\(^\text{19}\) It was sent to the chairmen of the boards of trustees, the junior college presidents, the local faculty association presidents, and 150 junior college faculty members selected at random from the total Texas junior college faculty population.

Current college catalogs from all of the Texas junior colleges were used to obtain the names of faculty members. Each member was assigned a number. Numbers were drawn from a box, each number being replaced before selection of the next one.

Survey Sheet B was a survey of the memberships of state, national, and local faculty organizations. It was believed that this survey would indicate which organizations faculty members were presently joining. It was further believed that asking the local faculty association presidents to provide this information would increase the possibilities of receiving accurate information. Survey Sheet B was mailed to faculty association presidents only. This survey sheet was used to provide additional information on the responses that faculty members made to questions five through nine on Questionnaire A.


Procedures for Treating Data

A tabulating of the frequency of responses and a reporting of the mean responses of each group to each item on Questionnaire A were used to present the results of Questionnaire A. Question one of the study, "to what extent does the faculty participate in decision-making in Texas junior colleges, as reported by each of the reference groups?," is directly related to question one of Questionnaire A.

The frequency of responses from each group on each item of question one of Questionnaire A was tabulated. Values were then assigned to each degree of participation described on Questionnaire A: one for the least amount of participation, to five for the greatest amount of participation. The mean responses for the items in each category of participation were reported for each group and discussed in their relationships to the other groups. A variation of .5 in the value of the mean response to an item from one group to another or between actual and desired degrees of participation was arbitrarily determined to be significant for comment. The mean responses of each group on each item of question one were plotted on graphs (Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4).

Question two of the study, "to what extent should the faculty participate in decision-making, as reported by each of the four groups?," is directly related to question two of Questionnaire A.
The data obtained from this question were treated the same as were the data from question one. In addition, the mean responses of each group to each item of question two were compared to the mean responses obtained from question one to determine the variation between the extent to which faculty then participated in decision-making and the extent to which faculty should participate in decision-making, as viewed by each of the four groups. The reporting of mean responses was accomplished by the use of graphs (Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4).

Question three of the study, "does the size or organization of the junior college affect the extent to which the faculty is involved or should be involved in decision-making, as reported by each of the four reference groups as well as by the four groups as a whole?", required a reorganization of the data gathered for questions one and two. The data were arranged in three groups: colleges with 1 to 499 enrollment, colleges with 500 to 1499 enrollment, and colleges with 1500 or greater enrollment. The mean responses of all reference groups combined, arranged by size, were reported by means of graphs (Figures 7, 8, and 9) and are discussed using the procedures outlined for questions one and two.

The data were then reorganized into two groups: public and private respondents. The mean responses of all reference groups
combined were illustrated in Figures 5 and 6 and are discussed using the procedures outlined for questions one and two.

Question four of the study, "what types of professional organizations are most acceptable to each group, as well as to the four groups as a whole?", required treatment of the data gathered from questions three through nine of Questionnaire A. These data were assembled and the percentage of responses from each of the four reference groups, and from all reference groups combined, to questions three through nine were reported in Tables IV through IX. These responses are discussed in the text preceding the tables.

Questions five and six of the study were answered through the use of Survey Sheet B (Appendix). This sheet was sent to faculty association presidents in an effort to obtain an accurate percentage of the numbers of faculty members in local as well as state and national faculty organizations.

The responses received were totaled for each professional organization and computed as a percentage of the total number of faculty members represented by the responding colleges. This information is reported at the conclusion of Chapter III.

The final chapter of the study summarizes the findings and conclusions and makes recommendations for future organizational study.
CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

This study touches on many aspects of junior college concern and concentrates on the opinions of four groups who contribute to decision-making in the junior college. Three of these groups—faculty members, faculty association presidents, and junior college presidents—are paid employees of educational institutions. The other group, governing board chairmen, are unpaid representatives of the community. Although the study centers on the role of the faculty in decision-making in junior colleges, the characteristics of these groups have affected the outcomes of the study.

Directly Related Literature

Related studies of the characteristics of these groups have contributed to an understanding of the results. A study of Florida junior college trustees reveals remarkable unanimity in the opinions of this group and shows them generally highly supportive of

---

the junior college philosophy. Their reactions to faculty participation in decision-making are generally negative. The trustees express opposition to a statement that instructors should be able to speak freely and openly in the classroom and are strongly united in opposing collective bargaining by the faculty. They also express opposition to a faculty member's being on the governing board and feel that the college president should be the sole representative of the staff to the board.

The investigators in the Florida study express the opinion that the trustees had occasionally reacted emotionally to topics such as student unrest, faculty freedom, and collective bargaining. The Florida investigators advise administration to inform trustees on controversial issues in the absence of a crisis.

Other studies of trustees are related to universities and provide little information about junior college trustees. The four major studies in the area of university trustees are a study of 734 trustees from thirty universities by Beck,\(^2\) a statewide study of 1385 college and university trustees in New York,\(^3\) a survey of 306


\(^3\) *College and University Trustees and Trusteeship, A Report of the New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership* (James Perkins, Chairman) (New York, 1966).
trustees by Duster, 4 and a nationwide survey of 5180 trustees by the Educational Testing Service. 5

At a conference on university faculty-administration relationships, sponsored by the American Council on Education, Professor Loren C. Petry has reported faculty and administration to be remarkably homogeneous in character. "They are individualists; that is, they are nonconformists in small matters at least and frequently in larger ones. They are ambitious, dissatisfied, critical, and committed to education as a career. 6

This comment on the characteristics of paid professionals at the university level is supported by other studies and possibly may be applied to junior college faculty and administration as well. The degree of dissatisfaction of faculty members, however, apparently is


5 Rodney T. Hartnett, College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes (Princeton, 1969).

not related to the formal inclusion of faculty in policy decisions, according to Robert F. Boruch.\(^7\)

Boruch's study of campus unrest reveals that university faculty representatives were perceived to be sympathetic supporters of student protests at about half the institutions at which protests occurred during 1967-68. Protest incidents were correlated slightly with the existence of faculty committees for processing requests of the student government, but the protests apparently had no relationship to the formal inclusion of faculty in policy decisions.

The phrase, "perceived to be sympathetic supporters," opens the question of who does the perceiving. In Boruch's study, academic deans are the respondents to the survey, and their views may be considerably different from others at the same institutions.

James W. Tunnell, in his study of 403 junior colleges in the United States, supports the contention that viewpoints of groups at the same institutions may differ considerably. This study reveals that junior college faculty members view themselves as being less involved in policy formulation than junior college administrators view
the faculty. This divergent feeling is a consistent finding in much of the literature and is substantiated by the appeal for better communications systems. These systems have been often recommended as an element needed to improve faculty-administrator relationships.

Boruch complicates the situation somewhat in this statement:

> Although additional faculty involvement in administration may be desirable, faculty may not be prepared to expend the necessary time to become involved. A substantial body of evidence suggests that faculty members approve of their having a stronger voice in academic governance, but this approval is somewhat gratuitous in that they may have no real interest in participation.

Joyal reports that the degree of effectiveness of faculty participation in colleges and universities is viewed by administrators in a favorable light. Seventy-three per cent of those administrators responding view the faculty's participation as very effective or good. The main benefits cited are improvement of communications, broader administrative viewpoints, better judgments, capitalizing on faculty special attributes, development of a "we" attitude, and the training of potential administrators. The main disadvantages are

---

8 Tunnell, "Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation in the Public Junior College," p. 98.

9 Boruch, "The Faculty Role in Campus Unrest," p. 19.

10 Joyal, Faculty Participation in College Policy Formulation and Administration, pp. 23-25.
delays, time consumed, extra work for the faculty, lack of knowledge on the part of the faculty, and faculty turnover.

The nature of the participation which Joyal reports indicates that in approximately half of the institutions the faculty had a part in selecting the president, deans, division executives, and department executives. Almost 90 per cent of the institutions report that faculties were involved in the employment of new faculty members.

Other significant areas of faculty participation are salary determination, promotions, tenure, dismissals, teaching load, budget (60 to 70 per cent of institutions report faculty participation), committee assignments, college policies, building programs, rules, regulations, curricula, instructional facilities, and improvement of instruction (71-99 per cent of institutions report faculty participation). 11

The study that provides the greatest insight into the character of any of these groups is an analysis of junior college faculty by Roger H. Garrison. 12 He reports that the junior college faculty member is not at all certain of his professional identity. Many of the principles of professional associations that represent higher

11 ibid., p. 25.

12 Garrison, Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems.
education do not really seem to fit his situation. The emphasis in
the junior college is professed to be on teaching and the student-
centered attitude; the emphasis in the senior college and the univer-
sity has many diverse elements.

The typical faculty load in junior colleges is reported to be
fifteen credit hours. This load, together with the demands of indivi-
dual students for help during office hours, committee work, prepara-
tion, and grading, has caused many faculty members to identify
"lack of time" as their main professional problem. This universal
time problem is said to be "far too uniform and insistent to be dis-
missed as a complaint or as a distortion of reality."\(^{13}\)

Although this issue may not be confined to the junior college,
the faculty members of that study view themselves as being more
overworked, or at least in a much different position from that of
their university counterparts. This attitude carries over into a
definition of the role of the junior college faculty member in the
governing of the institution.

Although higher education in general is assumed to involve
faculty to a great extent in the governance of the institution, the
same is not true of the junior college. The guidelines that provide

\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 23.
for major participation by the faculty in the shaping of educational policies, the admission of students, selection and dismissal of academic personnel, and other academic affairs seem to be unimportant to many junior college teachers, as evidenced by the following statement:

However, in the view of many junior college teachers, most, if not all, of these guidelines are at best nearly irrelevant to the community college situation; or, at worst, possibly mischievous or detrimental to the effective operation of the institution. For example, they point out that the basic controlling policy of the community college has long since been established by agencies wholly outside faculty control; by state legislatures or local area boards, reflecting the will and intentions of the public at large. This overall policy is, of course, open-door admission for all students who have satisfactorily completed secondary school. It is this single policy that must inevitably be followed by the college.\textsuperscript{14}

The predominant view of the junior college faculty seems to say that they were most concerned with having a voice in how programs are created and offered—including content, methods of instruction, and materials for instruction. They are less concerned with traditional faculty prerogatives than in having a reasonable total environment in which to work, adequate pay, enough facilities and equipment, reasonable teaching loads, chances for professional

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 16.
growth, and an administrative setup responsive to their recommendations.

This report, however, does not rule out the possibility of increased teacher militancy as junior colleges grow in number and in size. As the instructor begins to be looked on as a "mere employee" with the restrictions imposed by increased rules and regulations, he may look to local, state, and national faculty associations for relief.

**Summary**

The findings and implications of the literature directly related to this study indicate that, although university faculties and junior college faculties are similar in some ways, the junior college faculty member views himself as being involved in situations that are different in many fundamental respects from those in the university. These basic differences require a lesser degree of participation on the part of junior college faculty members in the governance of their institutions.

The policies and statements of associations that propose to represent all faculties in higher education do not adequately represent junior college faculty members. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to say that associations such as AAUP propose principles that ask for too much participation and create uncomfortable positions that faculty members in junior colleges do not wish to assume.
Faculty members in many institutions of higher education participate in a broad range of decisions that affect the governance of the institutions. When this participation has been evaluated, administrators have viewed its effectiveness favorably.

The viewpoints of different groups in the same institutions in regard to a specific topic, such as the degree of participation of the faculty in decision-making, can differ widely. Faculty members often view themselves as being less involved in decision-making than junior college administrators view the faculty as being involved.

The degree of faculty dissatisfaction as evidenced by participation in student protests is not related to the extent of formal inclusion of faculty in policy decisions.

Faculty members and administrators have many of the same personality characteristics. Because many administrators have been recruited from the ranks of the faculty, this similarity seems to be an obvious conclusion, although it does seem that those characteristics would be typical of a particular segment of the faculty population.

Junior college trustees have been remarkably unanimous in their opinions and have been negative in their responses to statements of academic freedom and faculty participation in academic governance.
Indirectly Related Literature

Other literature, somewhat less related to this study than the foregoing, centers on two major subject areas: the "open-door" admissions policy that has been reported previously to have a pronounced effect on faculty participation, and studies of present faculty benefits in Texas.

The "open-door" admissions policy most common for public junior colleges throughout the country is stated by Clark as "Any two-year junior college shall admit any high school graduate and any other person over eighteen years of age who in his judgment is capable of profiting from the instruction offered."\(^{15}\) In addition, the open door is generally extended in junior colleges to allow the incoming student unrestricted choice in electing a field of study.\(^{16}\)

This one guiding policy of open-door admissions has had a pronounced effect on the scholastic ability level of the student body, the student loss level, and the existence and survival of programs of instruction.\(^{17}\)

\(^{15}\) Burton R. Clark, The Open Door College (New York, 1960), p. 44.
\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 45.
\(^{17}\) Ibid.
This analysis by Clark implied that there is only one open-door admissions policy. John Huther, in a study of 735 colleges listed in the 1969 Junior College Directory, describes four open admissions policies used in junior colleges that are different in the degree of openness. 18

These admissions policies and the percentages of junior college presidents who favor each policy are as follows: admit all whether high school graduates or not, 10 per cent; admit all who can profit from instruction whether high school graduates or not, 54 per cent; admit all with high school diplomas or the equivalent, 15 per cent; admit all with high school diplomas or the equivalent who can profit from instruction, 21 per cent. 19

These four open-door policies are amplified in the following statements. Bruton Clark describes the least selective policy: "In effect, the junior college expected to admit all applicants, without regard to ability, type of curriculum completed in high school, or any other aspect of background. It is to have an open door." 20


19 Ibid., p. 61.

20 Clark, The Open Door College, p. 45.
James Thornton declares a policy that is slightly selective:

"The basic admission policy of many community junior colleges is starkly simple: any high school graduate, or any person over eighteen years of age who seems capable of profiting by the instruction, is eligible for admission." 21

Another interpretation, by James Reynolds, is even more selective: "The junior college with an 'open door' policy sets an absolute minimum--graduation from high school--for admission." 22

The most selective policy is described by Thomas O'Connell:

"At Berkshire we don't have quite an 'open door' but we do admit any high school graduate who looks to us like a reasonably good bet to do the job in one program or another at our college." 23

These guiding policies of admission to the junior-college have had an effect on the extent to which the faculty can participate in decisions. The "open-door" policy also affects decisions made by anyone who has the power to make policy in the junior college.

Decisions involving academic standards, curriculum, program


development, selection of instructional and administrative staff, and even building programs must take the "open-door" policy into account. 24

Another set of factors that may have affected opinions surveyed in this study concerns the status of faculty fringe benefits and salaries in Texas junior colleges. The 1969-70 NEA Research Report of Faculty Salary Schedules in Community-Junior Colleges had reported the highest scheduled salary for a junior college instructor in Texas to be $14,800. The lowest maximum salary scheduled by a Texas junior college had been reported as $9,000. Junior colleges in twenty states had reported higher maximum scheduled salaries than the highest maximum scheduled Texas salary. Junior colleges in only five states had reported lower maximum scheduled salaries than the lowest maximum scheduled Texas salary. 25

Although the position of Texas regarding salaries paid to faculties in higher education had been viewed as relatively favorable in January, 1967, the fringe benefit situation had been considered less

---

24 Garrison, Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems.

than satisfactory. A state legislative committee appointed to study faculty compensation during 1966 had reported five major problems with fringe benefits and had assigned the following priorities to them:

1. an inadequate retirement plan
2. lack of a faculty developmental leave program
3. absence of a good group insurance plan
4. Need for college tuition waivers for faculty members and their families
5. restrictions on on-campus parking.

This legislative committee had proposed solutions for all of these problems but had omitted junior college faculty members from the faculty developmental leave program with this statement: "Due to the very nature of a faculty development leave, the Committee does not feel it would be practical or beneficial to institute such a program in the public junior college system and therefore has prepared legislation which would exclude such system from the faculty development leave program."

---

26 Education: The Texas Fringe, Report of the Committee on Faculty Fringe Benefits in State-Supported Colleges and Universities (Senator Andy Rogers, Chairman), Austin, Texas, January 9, 1967, p. 5.

27 Ibid., p. 9.
The retirement plan for Texas junior college teachers as well as for other Texas teachers has been improved since the Committee made its report, and, contrary to their recommendations, the authority for junior college districts to develop their own faculty leave programs has been granted by state law. Adoption of the Optional Retirement Plan in 1967 and subsequent revisions of the Texas Teachers Retirement Plan have improved the retirement situation. Improvements in the Texas Teachers Retirement Plan have raised the annual salary limit to $25,000 and have increased the retirement formula to 1.65 per cent for each year of creditable service. These are improvements recommended by the legislative Committee on Faculty Compensation and passed into law September 1, 1969.

CHAPTER III

THE SURVEY

Introduction

On March 29, 1971, Questionnaire A, under Cover Letter A (Appendix), was mailed to all junior college presidents and governing board chairmen and to 150 teachers selected at random from junior colleges in Texas. A list of junior colleges included in the survey is shown in the Appendix. An attempt was made to include all junior colleges in Texas, by using both The College Blue Book 1969-70, thirteenth edition, and American Junior Colleges, seventh edition, to compile a current list of junior colleges. Replies received indicated that the number of junior colleges in Texas fluctuates frequently with new colleges opening and others changing their status or closing.

Replies indicated that Lubbock Christian College ¹ and Southwestern Union College ² are now senior institutions.

¹ Cover letter returned April 7, 1971, with notation, from the president's office, Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock, Texas.

² Questionnaire returned April 6, 1971, with notation, from the president's office, Southwestern Union College, Keene, Texas.
Christopher College of Corpus Christi is no longer in existence. 3

A total of fifty-six colleges was surveyed, but the three cases described above reduced the total to fifty-three colleges that were eligible to be included in the study.

On April 10, 1971, Questionnaire A and Survey Sheet B, under Cover Letter B, were mailed to all faculty association presidents. A follow-up letter was mailed to all subjects who had not replied on April 17, 1971. Replies received are indicated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Possible Replies</th>
<th>Position of Respondent</th>
<th>Number of Replies</th>
<th>Percentage of Replies to Total Number Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Chairman of Governing Board</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>J.C. President</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Faculty Assn. President</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Letter returned April 16, 1971, with notation on the envelope that the college is no longer in existence from the post office.
The small number of replies received from chairmen of governing boards could probably best be explained by the following statements:

You are asking me to fill in something I feel I am not qualified to do. Too much of them involves faculty vs. administration or with administration and as a board member, I am not that clear on the degree. Our president should answer them. I will say this, our faculty has a big hand in our decisions. It is getting bigger—and frankly, I think too big!! Before long they won't need an administration or a board.  

As a matter of law, the trustees of a junior college have the ultimate responsibility of deciding the governance of an institution. This authority in most areas is delegated to administrative people. Some items, the faculty is more involved than others, but regardless of the degree of involvement, the final decision must be exercised by the trustees. Prior to that final decision in many instances the faculty recommendations carry more weight than in others. As I interpret your questionnaire, it does not permit such an alternative.  

The sizes and organizations of junior colleges in Texas were determined by the use of enrollment figures and statements from The College Blue Book 1969-70, thirteenth edition, and the 1970 Annual Report of the Coordinating Board--Texas College and University System. Only three separate governing structures

---

4 Questionnaire returned April 22, 1971, with notation.

5 Letter from Jenkins Garrett, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Tarrant County Junior College District, April 26, 1971.
were noted: private, public boards of trustees or regents, and public school systems.

A brief statement of the number, sizes, and organizations of junior colleges in Texas is necessary to provide a background for evaluating the responses.

There are forty-one public junior colleges in Texas. Two have enrollments less than 500; twenty have enrollments from 500 to 1499; nineteen have enrollments of 1500 or greater.

There are twelve private junior colleges in Texas: ten have enrollments of less than 500; two have enrollments between 500 and 1499; there are no private junior colleges in Texas with enrollments of 1500 or greater.

There are approximately 3064 full-time teachers in Texas junior colleges. Two hundred fifty-six teach in private junior colleges; the remainder, 2808, teach in public junior colleges.

Table II shows a detailed breakdown of the types of junior colleges in which teachers are distributed.

There is one junior college, Laredo Junior College, that is governed by a public board of education, and there is one

\[\text{6 Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System for the Fiscal Year 1970, Annual Report (Manuel DeBusk, Chairman), Austin, Texas, p. 23.}\]
**TABLE II**

NUMBERS OF TEACHERS BY TYPES OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution by Size and Organization</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Junior College, under 500</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Junior College, 500 to 1499</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Junior College, 1500 or over</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Junior College, under 500</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Junior College, 500 to 1499</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3064</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

junior college, Southwestern Christian College, still identified as a Negro institution. 7

The number of replies received are distributed as follows:

chairmen, governing boards: private 1, public 13; junior college presidents: private 8, public 33; faculty association presidents: private 4, public 31; faculty members: private 11, public 92.

A detailed breakdown of the number of replies received is described in Table III.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of Respondents</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 500</td>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Governing Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College President</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Association President</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A reporting of the mean responses of each group to each item of questions 1 and 2 is provided in graphic form in Figures 1 through 9. The horizontal scale of these figures was obtained by assigning values to the degrees of participation shown at the top of Questionnaire A: 1 for "faculty has no role," 2 for "faculty is not usually involved," 3 for "faculty recommends to administration--administration decides," 4 for "faculty usually decides," and 5 for "faculty decides always or almost always." A variation of .5 in the value of an item from one group to another or between present and
desired degrees of participation was arbitrarily determined to be significant for comment.

Participatory Patterns

Figure 1 illustrates the mean responses of governing board chairmen to questions one and two of Questionnaire A. The first ten items of this figure (down to salary), which deal with classroom or student-related activities, generally reveal greater participation than do the remaining items. This figure also seems to indicate that chairmen believe that the faculty participates about as much as it should on all items listed except "student welfare," "hospitalization insurance," "faculty grievances," and "transfers," where they believe the faculty should participate more than it does, and "retirement plan," where they believe the faculty should participate less than it does. The first ten items generally are grouped around the extent of participation "faculty recommends to administration." The remaining items lean more to the degree labeled "faculty is not usually involved."

Figure 2 describes the mean responses of junior college presidents to questions one and two of Questionnaire A. The lines describing the opinions of junior college presidents covering both the present and desired degrees of participation by faculty closely parallel the opinions of board chairmen, with two notable exceptions. Junior college presidents apparently do not think the faculty
Legend: indicates what this group thinks the present degree of faculty participation is.
_________ indicates degree of faculty participation this group thinks should exist.

Figure 1. Mean Responses of Governing Board Chairmen to Questions 1 and 2 of Questionnaire A.
Legend:  
- Indicates what this group thinks the present degree of faculty participation is.
- Indicates degree of faculty participation this group thinks should exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves of Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grievances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Mean Responses of Junior College Presidents to Questions 1 and 2 of Questionnaire A.
participates as much as board chairmen think the faculty participates on the items of "committee assignments" and "budget preparation."

Figure 3 describes the mean responses of faculty association presidents to questions one and two of Questionnaire A. This figure reveals three factors worthy of comment. First, this group consistently on all items views the present degree of faculty participation lower than do either board chairmen or junior college presidents. Second, the opinions of faculty association presidents and junior college presidents regarding the extent to which the faculty should participate are quite similar on all items. Third, this group apparently believes that there is a significant difference between the extent to which the faculty presently participates and the extent to which the faculty should participate on nearly all items.

Figure 4 describes the mean responses of faculty members to questions one and two of Questionnaire A. The opinions of this group apparently are similar to the opinions of faculty association presidents in regard to both actual and desired degrees of participation. The fluctuations of both the dashed lines and the solid lines on Figures 1 through 4 are very similar. However, the dashed line indicating the desired degree of participation by faculty moves progressively toward more participation, and the solid line indicating the present degree of participation by faculty
Figure 3. Mean Responses of Faculty Association Presidents to Questions 1 and 2 of Questionnaire A.
Figure 4. Mean Responses of Faculty Members to Questions 1 and 2 of Questionnaire A.
moves progressively toward less participation. This occurs on almost all items on these four figures from salary down. It does not occur on the first ten items, where all four groups generally seem to agree on the desired degrees of participation by faculty.

Figure 5 describes the mean responses of all respondents from public junior colleges. This figure reveals a pattern very similar to that of Figure 4, with the top half of the items viewed as presently being recommended by faculty to the administration and the bottom half as not usually involving the faculty in decision making. Probably the most noteworthy characteristic of this figure is the consistent difference between the present degree of faculty participation and the desired degree of faculty participation. On all but four of the twenty-six items of Figure 5, the difference is shown as significant (.5 or greater). This finding indicates that public respondents as a group believe that the faculty should be involved in decision making to a greater extent than it is and that it should do more than merely recommend to the administration in many decisions.

Figure 6 describes the mean responses of all respondents from private junior colleges. This finding shows quite a different picture from the figure describing the responses of public respondents. The present degree of participation of faculty is viewed by this group as being significantly higher on nearly all of the first ten items,
Legend:  
--- Indicates what this group thinks the present degree of faculty participation is.  
--- Indicates the degree of faculty participation that this group thinks should exist.

|                | Faculty Orientation | Professional Growth Policies | Curriculum | Calendar | Academic Standards | Student Activities | Student Welfare | Athletic Policies | Social Functions | Committee Assignments | Salary Schedule | Retirement Plan | Hospitalization Insurance | Tenure Policies | Sabbatical Leave Policies | Teacher Load | Leaves of Absence | Teacher Dismissal | Teacher Discipline | Faculty Grievances | Transfers | Promotions | Selection of Instructors | Selection of Administrators | Budget Preparation | Building Program |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
Figure 6. Mean Responses of All Respondents from Private Junior Colleges to Questions 1 and 2 of Questionnaire A.
relating to classroom or student-related activities. Private respondents view the present degree of faculty participation as significantly lower than do public respondents on nearly all of the remaining items, often considered administrative responsibilities.

This group apparently thinks that the present degree of faculty participation is sufficient for the first ten items but thinks that there should be more participation by faculty on the remaining items. The degree of faculty participation desired by this group, however, is significantly lower for nearly all of the administrative items than is the degree of participation desired by public respondents. Private respondents place the desired degree of participation close to the "faculty is not usually involved" mark; public respondents place the desired degree of participation nearly one full degree higher, at "faculty recommends to administration."

Figure 7 describes the mean responses of all respondents from large junior colleges. Figure 8 describes the mean responses of all respondents from medium-sized junior colleges, and Figure 9 describes the mean responses of all respondents from small junior colleges.

The lines describing the present and desired degrees of participation are similar on all three of these figures. Two comments seem appropriate for these three groups. Although there is no
Legend: _____ Indicates what this group thinks the present degree of faculty participation is.
        ______ Indicates the degree of faculty participation that this group thinks should exist.

Figure 7. Mean Responses of All Respondents from Large Junior Colleges to Questions 1 and 2 of Questionnaire A.
Legend: ______ Indicates what this group thinks the present degree of faculty participation is.
________ Indicates the degree of faculty participation that this group thinks should exist.

Figure 8. Mean Responses of All Respondents from Medium-Size Junior Colleges to Questions 1 and 2 of Questionnaire A.
Legend: _____ Indicates what this group thinks the present degree of faculty participation is. 

_____ Indicates the degree of faculty participation that this group thinks should exist.

Figure 9. Mean Responses of All Respondents from Small Junior Colleges to Questions 1 and 2 of Questionnaire A.
apparent trend involving the present degree of participation, small colleges have more instances of both high and low participation than do either medium or large junior colleges. In regard to the degree of participation the faculty should have, small and medium junior colleges are in close agreement; large junior college respondents apparently believe that the faculty should be more involved in decision-making than do either small or medium college respondents.

Table IV reports the percentage of responses to questions three and four of Questionnaire A. For example, the first figure in the upper left indicates that 28 per cent of all board of trustee chairmen apparently believe that the trend in Texas is toward more faculty participation and that they believe the trend is good. This table indicates that 62 per cent of all respondents apparently think the trend is toward more participation and that they think it is good. Board of trustee chairmen are the least favorable toward more faculty participation, and junior college presidents are the most favorable. An interesting percentage involves faculty association presidents. Thirty-four per cent of this group thinks the trend is toward about the same amount of participation, and 26 per cent of them think the trend is good. Both of these percentages are almost twice as great as the same response for any other group.
TABLE IV

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS THREE AND FOUR OF QUESTIONNAIRE A: "THE TREND IN TEXAS IS TOWARD MORE, ABOUT THE SAME, OR LESS FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING"; "I THINK IT IS GOOD; I AM INDIFFERENT TO IT; OR I THINK IT IS BAD."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend is Toward</th>
<th>I Think It Is Good</th>
<th>I Am Indifferent To It</th>
<th>I Think It Is Bad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toward More</td>
<td>28% Chairmen</td>
<td>14% Chairmen</td>
<td>23% Chairmen</td>
<td>65% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>77% JC Pres</td>
<td>4% JC Pres</td>
<td>0% JC Pres</td>
<td>81% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About More</td>
<td>52% FA Pres</td>
<td>8% FA Pres</td>
<td>3% FA Pres</td>
<td>63% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>64% Faculty</td>
<td>2% Faculty</td>
<td>3% Faculty</td>
<td>69% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>62% All Resp</td>
<td>4% All Resp</td>
<td>3% All Resp</td>
<td>69% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount More</td>
<td>14% Chairmen</td>
<td>7% Chairmen</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
<td>21% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount About</td>
<td>7% JC Pres</td>
<td>5% JC Pres</td>
<td>7% JC Pres</td>
<td>19% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>26% FA Pres</td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
<td>8% FA Pres</td>
<td>34% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount About the Same</td>
<td>4% Faculty</td>
<td>4% Faculty</td>
<td>10% Faculty</td>
<td>18% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount About the Same</td>
<td>10% All Resp</td>
<td>3% All Resp</td>
<td>9% All Resp</td>
<td>22% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less More</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0% JC Pres</td>
<td>0% JC Pres</td>
<td>0% JC Pres</td>
<td>0% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Less</td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>0% Faculty</td>
<td>0% Faculty</td>
<td>9% Faculty</td>
<td>9% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount About the Same</td>
<td>0% All Resp</td>
<td>0% All Resp</td>
<td>5% All Resp</td>
<td>5% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>14% Chairmen</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% FA Pres</td>
<td>4% FA Pres</td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% Faculty</td>
<td>5% All Resp</td>
<td></td>
<td>4% All Resp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Desired Characteristics of Professional Faculty Organizations

Table V reports the percentages of responses to question five of Questionnaire A. This table indicates that all groups favor local, state, and national faculty organizations with state organizations favored least. Board of trustee chairmen are the least favorable of all groups toward local, state, and national organizations but

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do You Favor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Faculty Organizations</td>
<td>50% Chairmen</td>
<td>36% Chairmen</td>
<td>14% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81% JC Pres</td>
<td>15% JC Pres</td>
<td>4% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% FA Pres</td>
<td>22% FA Pres</td>
<td>3% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81% Faculty</td>
<td>14% Faculty</td>
<td>5% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% All Resp</td>
<td>18% All Resp</td>
<td>7% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Faculty Organizations</td>
<td>58% Chairmen</td>
<td>21% Chairmen</td>
<td>21% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% JC Pres</td>
<td>8% JC Pres</td>
<td>2% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91% FA Pres</td>
<td>6% FA Pres</td>
<td>3% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91% Faculty</td>
<td>6% Faculty</td>
<td>3% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86% All Resp</td>
<td>8% All Resp</td>
<td>6% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Faculty Organizations</td>
<td>50% Chairmen</td>
<td>29% Chairmen</td>
<td>21% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56% JC Pres</td>
<td>36% JC Pres</td>
<td>8% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% FA Pres</td>
<td>22% FA Pres</td>
<td>3% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77% Faculty</td>
<td>17% Faculty</td>
<td>6% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67% All Resp</td>
<td>24% All Resp</td>
<td>9% All Resp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE V
RESPONSES TO QUESTION FIVE OF QUESTIONNAIRE A: "DO YOU FAVOR LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS?"
apparently like local organizations less than either state or national groups.

Junior college presidents apparently are in favor of local and state faculty organizations but are considerably cooler toward national faculty groups. Faculty association presidents and faculty members apparently favor all three levels but also are less in favor of national faculty organizations. One interesting figure indicates that 22 per cent of faculty association presidents do not favor local faculty groups. This compares to 14 per cent for other faculty members and to 15 per cent for junior college presidents.

Table VI reports the percentage of responses to question six of Questionnaire A. This table indicates some differences of opinion on whether local, state, and national faculty associations should include administrators. Trustee chairmen and junior college presidents apparently believe that local, state, and national faculty associations should include administrators above the position of division chairman. Faculty association presidents and faculty members apparently would include administrators in national and state associations but would not include them in local associations. Faculty members and faculty association presidents are less inclined than are the other chairmen and junior college presidents to include administrators in any group.
**TABLE VI**

RESPONSES TO QUESTION SIX OF QUESTIONNAIRE A: "WHICH GROUPS SHOULD INCLUDE ADMINISTRATORS: LOCAL, STATE, OR NATIONAL FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Should Include</th>
<th>Should Not Include</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Faculty Associations</td>
<td>64% Chairmen</td>
<td>14% Chairmen</td>
<td>22% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71% JC Pres</td>
<td>19% JC Pres</td>
<td>10% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37% FA Pres</td>
<td>55% FA Pres</td>
<td>8% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41% Faculty</td>
<td>56% Faculty</td>
<td>3% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48% All Resp</td>
<td>43% All Resp</td>
<td>9% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Faculty Associations</td>
<td>71% Chairmen</td>
<td>7% Chairmen</td>
<td>22% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82% JC Pres</td>
<td>10% JC Pres</td>
<td>8% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49% FA Pres</td>
<td>43% FA Pres</td>
<td>8% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57% Faculty</td>
<td>40% Faculty</td>
<td>3% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61% All Resp</td>
<td>31% All Resp</td>
<td>8% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Faculty Associations</td>
<td>71% Chairmen</td>
<td>7% Chairmen</td>
<td>22% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73% JC Pres</td>
<td>8% JC Pres</td>
<td>19% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61% FA Pres</td>
<td>31% FA Pres</td>
<td>8% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57% Faculty</td>
<td>38% Faculty</td>
<td>5% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61% All Resp</td>
<td>28% All Resp</td>
<td>11% All Resp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII reports the percentage of responses to question seven of Questionnaire A. This table indicates an overwhelming preference for limiting membership of state junior college faculty associations to junior colleges. All four groups show this preference, with only the faculty group showing any appreciable preference for any other type of organization. Thirty-two per cent of faculty members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Limited to Junior Colleges</td>
<td>85% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Limited to Junior and Senior Colleges</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Limited to Junior Colleges, Senior Colleges, and Lower Grades</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Limited to Junior Colleges and Lower Grades</td>
<td>0% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% All Resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Answer</td>
<td>15% Chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% JC Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% FA Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% All Resp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicate a preference for limiting membership in state junior college
faculty associations to junior and senior colleges. This group is
large enough to exert a strong influence on recommendations related
to this topic.

Opinions Regarding Existing Professional Faculty
Organizations

Table VIII reports the percentages of responses to ques-
tion eight of Questionnaire A. This table reveals a very strong
preference in all groups for the Texas Junior College Teachers Asso-
ciation as the organization to represent the faculty on the state level.
Percentages shown in the column marked "Other" include members
of those groups who did not respond as definitely as did those who
actually checked "Other" as a response. Therefore, the prefer-
ence for the Texas Junior College Teachers Association may actually
be even stronger than this table indicates.

Those organizations which have received the strongest nega-
tive response (picked as a last choice) are AFT, AAUP, NEA/
NFT, and TSTA, all with approximately the same percentage. It is /
interesting that more board chairmen and junior college presidents
give AAUP a negative response than they give to any other organiza-
tion. No board chairman or junior college president gives AAUP a
positive response (picked as first choice).
TABLE VIII

RESPONSES TO QUESTION EIGHT OF QUESTIONNAIRE A: "WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS WOULD YOU CHOOSE TO REPRESENT THE FACULTY ON THE STATE LEVEL? WHICH WOULD BE YOUR LAST CHOICE?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen to Represent on State Level</th>
<th>TACT</th>
<th>TJCTA</th>
<th>AFT</th>
<th>AAUP</th>
<th>NEA/NFA</th>
<th>TSTA</th>
<th>TCTA</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC Pres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Pres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Resp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC Pres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Pres</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Resp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IX reports the percentage of responses to question eight of Questionnaire A. This table reveals a very strong preference for American Association of Junior Colleges as the organization to represent the faculty on the national level. Percentages shown in the column marked "Other" include members of those groups who did not respond as definitely as did those who actually checked "Other" as a response. Therefore, the preference for AAJC may actually be even stronger than this table indicates.

### Table IX

**RESPONSES TO QUESTION NINE OF QUESTIONNAIRE A: "WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WOULD YOU CHOOSE TO REPRESENT THE FACULTY ON THE NATIONAL LEVEL?" "WHICH WOULD BE YOUR LAST CHOICE?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen to Represent on National Level</th>
<th>AAJC</th>
<th>AAUP</th>
<th>AFT</th>
<th>NEA/NFA</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC Pres</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Pres</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Resp</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC Pres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Pres</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Resp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The organization which receives the most negative responses (picked as last choice) is AFT. NFA and AAUP also receive strong negative response. AAUP receives the most negative responses from chairmen and junior college presidents, and AFT receives the most negative responses from faculty association presidents and faculty members.

The most notable response revealed by this table is the strong support of AAJC by faculty members. This organization is not a faculty organization and does not allow faculty to be voting members. This support could imply that faculty members in junior colleges are not aware of the purposes and membership requirements of the organizations that represent junior college members. It could also imply that junior college faculty members do not wish to be represented on the national level as a faculty group.

Percentages of Membership in Existing Professional Faculty Organizations

Only faculty association presidents were asked to respond to Survey Sheet B (see Appendix). Thirty-five faculty association presidents have responded. Thirty-one have actually filled out the survey sheet. Two have returned the Survey Sheet blank with no explanation. Two others have returned the survey sheet blank with an accompanying letter explaining that they are in the
process of organizing faculty associations and do not wish to respond at this time.

Replies have been tabulated from thirty-one colleges, which represent approximately 2008 of the state's 3064 junior college teachers. The following percentages are based on those replies.

Of the junior college faculty members in Texas who join professional faculty organizations other than their local junior college association, 3.5 per cent join NEA/NFA; 5 per cent join TACT; 70 per cent joint TJCTA; 9 per cent join AAUP; less than one per cent, or approximately .5 per cent, join AFT; 11 per cent join TSTA; and approximately one per cent join AAHE.

Of the 2008 faculty members represented by replies from the thirty-one colleges, 1087, or 55 per cent of all faculty members, belong to local professional faculty organizations.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Present Degree of Faculty Participation

The following are the apparent reactions of the four reference groups to question one of the study, "To what extent does the faculty participate in decision-making in Texas junior colleges?"

All four reference groups agree that the faculty is involved to a great extent (between "faculty recommends to administration" and "faculty usually decides") in matters of curriculum. All four groups agree that the faculty is involved to a lesser extent (between "faculty has no role" and "faculty is not usually involved") in the selection of administration.

Junior college presidents and governing board chairmen agree closely on all items regarding the present degree of participation by faculty. These two groups apparently believe that the faculty participates in decision-making to a greater extent than faculty association presidents and faculty members believe that the faculty participates. These two groups, faculty members and faculty association
presidents, agree closely on all items describing the present degree of participation by faculty.

The Degree to Which the Faculty Should Participate in Decision-Making

The following are the apparent reactions of the four reference groups to question two of the study, "To what extent should the faculty participate in decision-making?"

All groups except governing board chairmen believe the faculty should participate to a greater extent than it does presently. Governing board chairmen believe the extent to which the faculty participates is approximately the same as the extent to which the faculty should participate.

Faculty members, junior college presidents, and faculty association presidents agree closely on the degree to which the faculty should participate on most items. There are slight variations in these three groups, with faculty members believing in the most participation and junior college presidents believing in the least participation by faculty.

Effect of the Size and Organization of the Junior College on the Degree of Participation by Faculty in Decision-Making

The response to question three of the study, "Does the size or organization of the junior college affect the extent to which the
faculty is involved or should be involved in decision-making, as reported by the four reference groups?" are summarized below.

Respondents from private junior colleges view their faculties as being more involved in decision-making than do respondents from public junior colleges on the first nine items of Question one of Questionnaire A. These nine items deal with academic and professional responsibilities of faculty members. Private faculties are viewed as being less involved in decision-making than are public faculties on the last seventeen items, which deal with faculty benefits and welfare.

There is close agreement on the first nine items between private and public respondents on the extent to which the faculty should be involved in decision-making, but there is wider variation on the last seventeen items. Public respondents apparently believe that the faculty should be more involved in decision-making in areas of faculty benefits and welfare than private respondents believe the faculty should be.

The size of the junior college seems to have little effect on the present or desired degrees of participation, although the study shows the following variations. Small junior colleges have more instances of both high and low participation than do either medium or large junior colleges in regard to the present degree of participation.
Respondents from large colleges apparently believe that the faculty should be more involved in decision-making than do either small or medium colleges, although the variation is not significant for most items.

Desirable Characteristics of Professional Faculty Organizations as Viewed by the Four Reference Groups

The responses of the four reference groups to question four of the study, "What types of professional faculty organizations are most acceptable to the four reference groups?" are summarized below.

The prevailing opinion of all reference groups combined indicates that they believe the trend in Texas is toward more faculty participation in decision-making. The consensus is that such a development is good. Governing board chairmen believe that the trend is toward more participation but are split on whether or not they approve this trend.

All reference groups, other than the board chairmen, feel the trend is toward more participation by faculty and that the trend is good. All reference groups combined favor local, state, and national faculty associations, with state organizations favored most, local organizations next, and national organizations least.
Board chairmen are divided, with almost 60 per cent for and 40 per cent against local and national faculty organizations. They are a little more favorable toward state organizations. Junior college presidents favor local, state, and national organizations, with state organizations favored most, local organizations next, and national organizations least. Faculty association presidents favor local, state, and national faculty organizations, with state organizations favored most and local organizations favored least. Faculty members favor local, state, and national faculty organizations, with state organizations favored most and local and national organizations equally favored.

All reference groups combined are divided on whether or not to include administrators in local faculty organizations. The majority favors including administrators in state and national faculty organizations. Governing board chairmen favor including administrators in local, state, and national faculty organizations. Junior college presidents favor including administrators in local, state, and national faculty organizations. Faculty association presidents feel that local organizations should not include administrators, are split on state organizations including them, and think national organizations should include administrators. Faculty members feel that local organizations should not include administrators but are split with
approximately 60 per cent for and 40 per cent against state and national organizations including administrators.

All reference groups combined believe that limiting membership to junior colleges produces the most effective state organization, although approximately 20 per cent would like for senior colleges to be included.

Governing board chairmen, junior college presidents, and faculty association presidents are almost unanimously in favor of limiting membership to junior colleges. Approximately two-thirds of faculty members want to limit membership to junior colleges; the other third wants to include senior colleges.

All reference groups combined clearly identify TJCTA as their first choice to represent the faculty on the state level. NFA, AFT, TSTA, and AAUP in that order are identified as last choices, with NFA receiving the most last-choice responses. Governing board chairmen, junior college presidents, faculty association presidents, and faculty members as individual groups choose TJCTA as their first choice to represent the faculty on the state level. AAUP is last choice for board chairmen and junior college presidents. Faculty association presidents favor TSTA last, and faculty members divide their last-choice responses between AFT, NFA, and TSTA.
All reference groups combined favor AAJC as their first choice to represent the junior college on the national level. AAUP has the next largest number of first choice responses, although it is a weak second. AFT is the last choice of the combined groups.

All four reference groups, as individual groups, favor AAJC as their first choices to represent the faculty on the national level. Governing board chairmen and junior college presidents identify AAUP as their last choice. Faculty association presidents make AFT their last choice, and faculty members are divided, with AFT and NFA their last choices.

Conclusions

The analysis of the responses to Questionnaire A and Survey Sheet B discussed in Chapter III leads to an apparent justification of the following conclusions:

1. Either junior college presidents or faculty members, or both groups, hold an inaccurate view of the present extent of faculty participation in decision-making.

2. All reference groups will either support, or will not impede, greater participation by faculty in decision-making to the extent of the faculty's making recommendations to the administration. There seems to be little sentiment for a degree of participation greater than recommending to the administration.
3. Private junior college faculties are apparently more concerned with academic responsibilities than with matters of faculty benefits and welfare. Several further conclusions might be drawn from this hypothesis, none of which may be substantiated by any data gathered by this study.

4. Local faculty organizations either do not include administrators or have a majority of faculty members who are dissatisfied with the inclusion of administrators.

5. State and national faculty organizations may include administrators as members and still retain the favor of a majority of faculty members.

6. There will be a continuing need for state professional faculty organizations that limit their membership to junior colleges and for state professional faculty organizations that allow both junior college and senior college members. There is apparently little support for any other membership structure.

7. TJCTA and AAJC have something in common that has gained them strong support from all groups. TJCTA has very strong support as a state organization, and AAJC has very strong support as a national organization.

8. Either the purposes of AAJC are not fully understood by faculty members or junior college faculty members in Texas do not
wish to be represented as a distinct group on the national level.

AAJC does not allow faculty as voting members and is primarily an administrator's organization.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the data gathered by this study and the foregoing conclusions: Local faculty associations which promote greater faculty participation in decision-making and which include administrators as resource people should be developed in junior colleges in Texas. These organizations should include administrators as resource people in the planning stages of proposals for administrative action.

Local faculty organizations and junior college presidents should undertake programs to describe fully the role of faculty in decision-making in local colleges (see Figures 2 and 4). This information should be discussed openly with the total faculty, and the resulting participation throughout the school year should be described and evaluated in an attempt to present a more accurate view of faculty participation than the one expressed in the conclusions.

1 Garrison, Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, p. 31.
Each local faculty organization should appoint a faculty member to attend all meetings of the governing board to act as a resource person and to inform the faculty of board action. This procedure may be used to give faculty members greater insight into the policy-making process. It may also reduce the gap between the president's view and the faculty's view of its role in decision-making, described in Figures 2 and 4.

State junior college faculty organizations should continue to limit membership to junior colleges but should pursue an active program of participation with senior college organizations, such as TACT and AAUP.

All junior college faculties in Texas should organize and maintain an active chapter of TJCTA on their campuses. This chapter should include administrators in some active capacity but must be organized so that appeals to the state organization cannot be impeded by local administrators.

TJCTA and NFA, as the organizations most representative of junior college faculty in Texas and in the nation, should undertake a program to make junior college faculty members aware of

---

their purposes, activities, and membership requirements of all organizations that could be understood to represent junior college faculty.

TJCTA and NFA should undertake programs to inform governing boards of the purposes and activities of local, state, and national faculty organizations. The responses of governing board chairmen to this study indicate a lack of information on these subjects, probably because of the role the junior college president may often be asked to play (see Table I and the accompanying statements from trustee chairmen). The practice of using the junior college president as the sole representative of the institution to the governing board is probably a dubious one.

The questions raised by this study indicate that the following studies would be valuable to a deeper understanding of faculty participation in decision-making in Texas:

1. An analysis should be made of the characteristics of AAJC, TJCTA, NFA, AFT, TSTA, and AAUP that make them either acceptable or unacceptable to junior college presidents, faculty association presidents, and faculty members in Texas.

2. Reasons should be determined why local faculty association presidents are less in favor of local faculty associations than are either junior college presidents or faculty members.
3. A study should be undertaken to determine why a majority of junior college faculty members do not wish to include teachers from senior colleges or from lower grades in state faculty organizations.

4. A study should be made to determine the degree of influence the governing board has on the faculty's role in decision-making.

5. A study should be made to identify the reasons why faculty members do not wish to include administrators in local faculty organizations.
APPENDIX
Questionnaire A

FACULTY PARTICIPATION AND ORGANIZATION IN TEXAS JUNIOR COLLEGES

This questionnaire is designed to survey your impressions and opinions of faculty participation in decision making in Texas junior colleges. Please respond to each question with your impressions or opinions.

1. The chart below is a list of activities in junior colleges requiring decisions that may involve faculty participation. The scale at the top of the chart is graduated to indicate degrees of participation. To what extent does the faculty in your college participate in the following activities? Please mark the degree of participation with a triangle Δ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>FACULTY HAS NO RULE</th>
<th>FACULTY IS NOT USUALLY INVOLVED</th>
<th>FACULTY RECOMMENDS, ADMINISTRATION DECIDES</th>
<th>FACULTY USUALLY DECIDES</th>
<th>FACULTY DETERMINES ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves of Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grievances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please go through question 1 again and with a circle O indicate the degree of participation you believe the faculty should have in these activities.
3. The trend in Texas in regard to faculty participation in decision making is toward:
- [ ] more faculty participation
- [ ] about the same amount
- [ ] less faculty participation

4. How do you feel about this trend?
- [ ] I think it is good.
- [ ] I am indifferent to it.
- [ ] I think it is bad.

5. Do you favor:
- [ ] Local junior college faculty professional organizations?  [ ] yes  [ ] no
- [ ] State junior college faculty professional organizations?  [ ] yes  [ ] no
- [ ] National junior college faculty professional organizations?  [ ] yes  [ ] no

6. Which of these groups should include administrators? (higher than division chairman status.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Include</th>
<th>Should Not Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local faculty associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State faculty associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National faculty associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Which do you believe is the most effective state organization for a junior college faculty association?
- [ ] Membership limited to junior colleges
- [ ] Membership limited to junior and senior colleges
- [ ] Membership includes junior colleges, senior colleges, and lower grades.
- [ ] Membership includes junior colleges and lower grades

8. Which of the following organizations would you choose to represent the junior college faculty on the state level? (Indicate with a "1") Which organization would be your last choice? (Indicate with a "8")
- [ ] TACT
- [ ] AFT
- [ ] NEA/NFA
- [ ] TSTA
- [ ] TJCTA
- [ ] AAUP
- [ ] TSTA
- [ ] Other (Please specify)

9. Which of the following organizations would you choose to represent the junior college faculty on the national level? (Indicate with a "1") Which organization would be your last choice? (Indicate with a "5")
- [ ] AAJC
- [ ] AFT
- [ ] Other (Please specify)
- [ ] AAUP
- [ ] NEA/NFA

10. Which of the following most closely identifies the position you hold with the college?
- [ ] Chairman of the board of trustees
- [ ] Junior college president
- [ ] Faculty association president
- [ ] Faculty member
SURVEY SHEET B

Questionnaire

SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

Please check the organizations that are represented on your campus with the approximate membership.

☐ NEA/NFA  Number of members is _____.
☐ TACT  Number of members is _____.
☐ TJCTA  Number of members is _____.
☐ AAUP  Number of members is _____.
☐ AFT  Number of members is _____.
☐ TSTA  Number of members is _____.

Local Faculty Associations (Please identify if there are more than one).

☐ _________  Number of members is _____.
☐ _________  Number of members is _____.
☐ _________  Number of members is _____.
LIST OF COLLEGES INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY

Alvin Junior College
Amarillo College
Annunciation College
Bee County College
Blinn College
Brazosport Junior College
Butler College
Central Texas College
Christian College of the Southwest
Cisco Junior College
Clarendon College
College of the Mainland
Concordia Lutheran College
Cooke County Junior College
Del Mar College
Eastfield College
El Centro College
Frank Phillips College
Galveston Community College
Grayson County College
Henderson County Junior College
Hill Junior College
Howard County Junior College
Kilgore College
Laredo Junior College
Lee College
Lon Morris College
Navarro Junior College
Mary Allen College
McLennan Community College
Mountain View College
Odessa College
Panola College
Paris Junior College
Ranger Junior College
St. Phillips College
San Antonio College
San Jacinto College
Schreiner Institute
South Plains College
South Texas Junior College
Southwest Texas Junior College
Southwestern Assemblies of God College
Southwestern Christian College
Tarrant County Junior College
Temple Junior College
Texarkana College
Texas Southmost College
Tyler College
Victoria College
Weatherford College
Wharton County Junior College
The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study of faculty organization and participation in Texas junior colleges. It is being mailed to all junior college board of trustee chairmen, junior college presidents, faculty association presidents, and to selected faculty members in Texas. Your position in a Texas junior college system has identified you as one whose response is extremely important to the accuracy and completeness of this study.

My interest in this subject has been stimulated by my serving as president of the El Centro Faculty Association for the present year. The study will be used as part of a doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University.

The Questionnaire has been reviewed by TACT, TJCTA, and AAUP, each one of which has expressed interest in the results. At least one of these organizations is considering publishing the results of this study. Your responses will be included in an analysis of the results as a group only. Individual replies will be held in strict confidence.

Your participation is essential to this study and is earnestly solicited. Please complete both sides of the Questionnaire, and return it in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for participating.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Kirkpatrick
Department of Education

The enclosed Questionnaire and Survey Sheet are parts of a study of faculty organization and participation in Texas junior colleges. Your position as faculty association president has identified you as one whose response is extremely important to this study.

The Questionnaire has been reviewed by TACT, TJCTA, and AAUP, each one of which has expressed interest in its results. At least one of these organizations is considering publishing the results of the study. Your responses will be included in an analysis of the results as a group only. Individual replies will be held in strict confidence.

The second sheet is a survey of faculty membership in professional organizations and has been mailed to faculty association presidents only. The Questionnaire has been mailed to all junior college board of trustee chairmen, junior college presidents, faculty association presidents, and to selected faculty members in Texas.

My interest in this subject has been stimulated by my serving as president of the El Centro Faculty Association for the present year. The study will be used as part of a doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University.

Your participation is essential to this study and is earnestly solicited. Please complete both sides of the Questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for participating.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Kirkpatrick
Approximately three weeks ago, a questionnaire soliciting your opinions regarding faculty participation and organization in Texas junior college decision making was mailed to you. As of this date, your reply has not arrived. Your response is very important to the completeness and accuracy of this study and is earnestly sought.

Another copy of the questionnaire is included in this envelope for your convenience. Please complete both sides of the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. If you have already returned a completed copy of this questionnaire, please disregard this letter. Thank you for participating in this study.

Sincerely;

Mike Kirkpatrick
Dear Mr. Candler:

The enclosed Questionnaire is part of a doctoral study presently being conducted at North Texas State University. You and five other directors of junior college activities in professional faculty organizations have been nominated as judges to determine the validity of this Questionnaire.

We view your participation as essential to this study and hope that you will consider its results important to your organization. We ask your cooperation and will be grateful for it.

The study seeks to determine the extent to which faculty members presently participate and should participate in decision-making in Texas Junior Colleges, as reported by board of trustees chairmen, junior college presidents, faculty association presidents, and selected faculty members.

It will also seek to establish guidelines for the future development of faculty participation in decision-making in Texas Junior Colleges.

You are not asked to respond to the questions but to indicate whether you consider the items appropriate or inappropriate for this study. Please make a check mark in one of the shaded columns for each item on the questionnaire.

A sheet has been provided for any additional comments you wish to make regarding specific items. Please add items you believe are necessary to complete the survey. Any item that is added must be approved by four of the six judges; therefore, you may be asked to comment on any items that are added.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

James M. Kirkpatrick

Don W. Casey, Associate Professor
North Texas State University
Mr. Bill Candler, President  
Texas Junior College Teachers Association  
1300 San Pedro

Dear Mr. Candler:

On February 2, 1971, the enclosed letter and Questionnaire were mailed to you for your analysis of the Questionnaire as an instrument to determine the opinions of administrators, trustees, and faculty in regard to decision-making in Texas junior colleges.

Recognizing that your recent involvement in the TJCTA convention has taken a great deal of time, I felt that another copy of the Questionnaire would be appropriate at this time. I might add that you helped stimulate my interest in this subject. As president of the El Centro Faculty Association, I visited with you when you were on our campus. Our conversation lead me to make some assumptions that this Questionnaire may indicate are valid. I am eager to receive your reactions to this Questionnaire, but if you feel that you cannot participate, would you name someone else in TJCTA whom you consider an expert for the purposes outlined in the enclosed letter?

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,

Mike Kirkpatrick

Enclosures (2)
Questionnaire A

FACULTY PARTICIPATION AND ORGANIZATION IN
TEXAS JUNIOR COLLEGES

This questionnaire is designed to survey your impressions and opinions of faculty participation in decision making in Texas Junior Colleges. Please respond to each question with your impressions or opinions.

1. The chart below is a list of activities in junior colleges requiring decisions that may involve faculty participation. The scale at the top of the chart is graduated to indicate degrees of participation. To what extent does the faculty in your college participate in the following activities? Please mark the degree of participation with a triangle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Faculty has no role</th>
<th>Faculty is not usually involved</th>
<th>Faculty recommends to administration</th>
<th>Faculty usually decides</th>
<th>Faculty determines always or almost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth Policies and Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Faculty has no role</td>
<td>Faculty is not usually involved</td>
<td>Faculty recommends to administration</td>
<td>Faculty usually decides</td>
<td>Faculty determines always or almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization Insurance Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves of Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grievances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Instructional Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please go through question 1 again and with a circle o indicate the degree of participation you believe the faculty should have in these activities.

The trend in Texas in regard to faculty participation in decision making is toward:

☐ More faculty participation  ☐ About the same amount  ☐ Less faculty participation

How do you feel about this trend?

☐ I think it is good.  ☐ I am indifferent  ☐ I think it is bad.

Do you favor:

Local faculty professional organizations  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

State junior college faculty professional organizations  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

National junior college faculty professional organizations  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Which of these groups should include administrators? (Higher than division chairman status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should include</th>
<th>Should not include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local faculty association</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State faculty association</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National faculty association</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which do you believe is the most effective state organization for a junior college faculty association?

☐ Membership limited to junior colleges

☐ Membership includes junior and senior colleges

☐ Membership includes junior colleges, senior colleges, and lower grades

☐ Membership includes junior colleges and lower grades
Which of the following organizations would you choose to represent the junior college faculty on the state level? (Indicate with a "1".) Which organization would be your last choice? (Indicate with a "8".)

- TACT
- TJCTA
- AFT
- NEA/NFA
- AAUP
- TSTA
- Other (Please specify)

Which of the following organizations would you choose to represent the junior college faculty on the national level? (Indicate with a "1"). Which organization would be your last choice? (Indicate with a "5").

- AAJC
- AFT
- Other (Please specify)
- AAUP
- NEA/NFA

Which of the following most closely identifies the position you hold with the college?

- Chairman of the board of trustees
- Junior College president
- Faculty association president
- Faculty member (not an association officer)
JUDGE'S COMMENT SHEET FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

FACULTY PARTICIPATION AND ORGANIZATION IN TEXAS JUNIOR COLLEGES

This sheet is provided for any additional comments you may wish to make regarding the appropriateness of the items and the completeness of the Questionnaire. The numbers below correspond to the numbers of the items on the Questionnaire.

1. 

2. 

3. ____________________________________________

4. ____________________________________________

5. ____________________________________________

6. ____________________________________________

7. ____________________________________________

8. ____________________________________________

9. ____________________________________________

10. ____________________________________________

11. To which of the following organizations do you currently belong (mark with #1)? To which have you belonged in past (mark with #2)?

☐ TACT  ☐ AFT  ☐ NEA/NPA  ☐ TSTA  (Please
☐ TCCTA  ☐ AAUP  ☐ TSTA  ☐ other (Specify)
12. To which of the following national organizations do you currently belong? (mark with #1). To which of these national organizations have you belonged in past? (mark with #2).

☐ AAJC  ☐ AFT  ☐ Other (Please specify)
☐ AAUP  ☐ NEA/NFA

These last two questions would make questions #8 & #9 more significant. You also have an idea of how many "joiners" vs "non-joiners" you are dealing with in your study. Also, it reveals to which groups the different groups of individuals belong.

We in NFA have available a staff satisfaction survey that might be used by individual faculties and might give you a significant check on what you have here. The person to write to is

Dr. Zick
Director
NFA
1201 Sixteenth St., NW
Washington, DC 20036
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