This study describes perceptions of the president's role in organizational change in each of ten colleges in two metropolitan community college districts. The purposes included (1) tracing major administrative reorganizations from the fall of 1975 to the spring of 1985, (2) ascertaining perceptions of the reasons for those reorganizations, and (3) obtaining perceptions of the role of the president in those reorganizations.

Administrators in the two community college districts under study were surveyed to obtain the data. Chancellors, the chancellor emeritus of one district, and college presidents were interviewed to obtain one part of the data. College presidents, deans (vice presidents), and division chairs completed a questionnaire designed especially for this study. Response rate for the study was 73.3 per cent. A list of reorganizations, response frequencies, and percentages were gathered to show the administrative reorganizations which had occurred and the perceptions of each of the levels of administration under study about the president's role in those reorganizations. These are
presented in both table and narrative form. Information obtained from the personal interviews supported the data gathered from the survey and is presented in narrative form.

The findings show that administrative reorganization has occurred at each college included in the survey during the ten-year period under study, that perceptions of the reasons for those reorganizations are similar, and that perceptions of the president's role are relative to the administrative level of the respondent. Presidents identified thirty-one reorganizations, and deans (vice presidents) and division chairs identified seventy-eight. Organizational efficiency was the most frequently mentioned reason for reorganization by all three administrative levels surveyed. Open communication about the need and the reasons for change was determined to be essential if any reorganization is to be successful. The lack of structured evaluation was found to be a weakness in the procedures that had been followed in the past and is recommended as an important aspect of future reorganization.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The past ten years have seen many changes in the basic organization of both the academic and the student services areas of Texas metropolitan community colleges. Confronted with rising costs, decreasing or leveling budget funds, and increasing enrollments and demands for services, presidents have found it necessary to change organizational structure to keep their institutions at the educational forefront. Special pressure has been brought by state fiscal problems and by changing population demographics (10). Unique challenges are nothing new to college presidents. But the challenges brought on by all of these factors have sent many presidents to the drawing board to come up with new plans to accommodate the ever-changing educational scene.

Presidents have had to exercise special caution as they have both planned and implemented reorganization within their institutions. Even though the president is the head of the institution and has the authority to effect organizational changes, subordinates must be in agreement for the plan to work. Reorganization does affect all other levels of administration as well as faculty and support personnel. One writer predicted about the next ten years, "Working with
faculty committed to performing services for which there is no longer adequate demand may be the most difficult challenge that administrators will face . . ." (10).

Reorganization has been necessary because missions of the community college have not changed, and needs demanded by the public have not lessened. Writers have continued to stress the value of the community college in an ever-changing society. Community colleges are expected to "... become even more essential to the well-being of America in the late twentieth century than they have during the mid-twentieth century" (9).

New demands have continued while funds have decreased and regulations have increased. New fields have continued to open up, personnel have continued to need retraining, and new populations have needed to be served. In the latter part of the 1960's and the early part of the 1970's, presidents had budgets available to use in creating new programs, in adding personnel, and even in funding creative projects; however, they found these funds in jeopardy in the latter part of the 1970's. Even though the funds had not disappeared, insightful presidents and writers saw the problem of declining budgets looming (10).

Making internal organizational changes has become the most acceptable answer to meeting these problems. Many community colleges had been organized along traditional lines.

Almost from the beginning of the two-year college movement, presidents and chancellors emphasized a bureaucratic approach to leadership. Their organizational
charts emphasized the vertical dimension, communication flowed along formal authority lines, and informal communication networks were discouraged if they hampered the advance of the institution toward important goals (1). Presidents have changed this traditional structure by eliminating positions and combining responsibilities as attrition has taken place and by moving personnel into new areas of service, although this procedure has not always been met with enthusiasm.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is perceptions of the presidents' role in organizational change at each college in two Texas metropolitan community college districts.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To trace major changes in organizational structure from the fall of 1975 to the spring of 1985;
2. To ascertain perceptions of the reasons for those changes;
3. To determine the strategies utilized in effecting those changes;
4. To ascertain the college presidents' perceptions of their roles in the reorganization process;
5. To obtain perceptions of chancellors, deans (vice presidents), and division chairs about the presidents' roles in reorganization.
Research Questions

To meet these purposes, the following questions were asked of college administrators.

1. What major organizational changes have been made since the beginning of the fall semester 1975?

2. What were the perceptions of the reasons for those organizational changes?

3. What strategies were utilized in bringing about reorganization?

4. What was the president's perception of his/her role in reorganization?

5. What were the perceptions of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs of the president's role in reorganization?

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purposes of this study.

1. Organization is "... the process (or result) of arranging interdependent elements into a functional or logical whole" (4, p. 401).

2. Reorganization is "... a change in the internal organization of a school..." (4, p. 490).

3. Community college is "... an institution of higher learning... [that] may confer associate degrees, but does not grant the baccalaureate degree" (11, p. 16-1). It offers the first two years of university-parallel college courses,
training programs in vocational fields, and community services courses.

4. **College** is a campus site in a multicampus or multicollege community college district in "... an institution of higher education that grants degrees at the completion of courses of study.

5. **Chancellor** is the "...title of the head or president in some universities..." (5) or the chief administrator in a multicampus or multicollege community college district.

6. **President** is "...the highest [executive] officer of a... university..." (5) or a college.

7. **Dean (vice president)** is "...a member of a college or university administration..." (5) and is the second highest officer.

8. **Division chair** is an instructional leader who reports to the dean (vice president) at a college and supervises "... a subdivision of a college..." (5).

9. **Department chair** is an instructional leader who reports to a division chair at a college.

10. **Meaningful** means that a calculation falls within the top three responses on a Table.

**Significance of the Study**

Little has been published about the number of reorganizations that have taken place in community colleges during the past ten years, and this study provides a source of
information about those changes as well as rationale about why those changes have taken place. It will serve as a guide for chief educational officers and other administrators if they find it necessary to reorganize.

Even though there is a void in the literature about the subject, reorganization has taken place by necessity in many community colleges. The literature has concentrated on significant reasons that inevitably have led to reorganization, on leadership management, and on the general idea of change in community colleges.

McCabe said that reorganization has taken place for a variety of reasons, including the following: regulations from the federal government through federally funded programs, more control exercised at the state government level, more local board involvement in the governing process, and increasing pressures from faculty organizations (8).

Godbold discussed reasons for reorganization when he said, "Community Colleges face significant challenges posed by a period of financial austerity, educational cutbacks, and questioning of the fundamental missions of the colleges" (3). Reorganization has occurred to bring about financial savings, to eliminate ineffective personnel, to compensate for leveling enrollments or for larger enrollments, to set up special programs (e.g. cluster core colleges and basic studies programs), and to increase the efficiency in the operation of the college.
Seattle [Washington] Community College is one institution that found it had to undergo what was termed as "retrenchment" beginning in 1981. Before beginning the project, leaders undertook a thorough study of the college's missions and goals and did a comprehensive analysis of the metropolitan area and the student population. The economic crunch, declining enrollments, and a less-than-adequate tax base, all were mentioned as reasons for having to reorganize the college (2). In discussing the reorganization project, Casey said:

... the Seattle Community College District is presently engaged in this process, although not very many people who are engaged in the process fully comprehend its obvious eventualities. When the process is completed, I doubt that we will have a chancellor and three college presidents. Maintenance operations services will probably be centralized. Individual campuses will be far less comprehensive. Summer sessions and evening classes may be restricted to a single campus (2).

Oakton Community College in Des Plaines, Illinois, is another institution that had to make critical decisions about its future. Its leaders, too, conducted a study of the organizational structure to determine whether the college should retain its interdisciplinary program of learning clusters. The option was to change to a discipline-based curriculum (6). The outcome of the study was that the cluster system should be retained (7). Both of the examples above illustrate that administrators have been looking critically at their organizational structures as they have evaluated current problems and as they have anticipated problems they perceive to be imminent.
Limitations

This study has explored the problems and reorganizations that have taken place in two larger community colleges in the State of Texas from 1975 to 1985. Colleges from the districts in the Fort Worth/Dallas metropolitan area were utilized in this study: Tarrant County Junior College District (TCJCD) and Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD).

The three TCJCD campuses were Northeast Campus, Northwest Campus, and South Campus. The seven DCCCD colleges were Brookhaven, Cedar Valley, Eastfield, El Centro, North Lake, Mountain View, and Richland.

This study was limited to two metropolitan community college districts and to responses from two chancellors, one former chancellor, ten campus presidents, all deans (vice presidents), and all division chairs. It does not include responses from coordinators, directors, department chairs, or faculty members.

Respondents had been in their present positions for varying lengths of time, some for more than ten years and some for shorter periods. This time difference was not a consideration in this study.

All administrators completed the written questionnaire with the exception of the chancellors and former chancellor. This study was limited to what these administrators were willing to express on this questionnaire. Results of discussions with the chancellors, former chancellor, and
presidents were limited to what they were willing to express during the in-depth individualized interviews.

Information from these administrators was included because all levels of administration questioned were charged with planning and implementing change.

If it had not been possible to do research in either of the designated districts, other multicampus or multicollege districts from the state of Texas would have been substituted.

Basic Assumptions

For the purposes of this study, it was assumed

1. that the administrators interviewed were open and honest;
2. that the colleges chosen were representative of multicampus or multicollege metropolitan community colleges;
3. that reorganization had taken place in most of these colleges.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II contains a review of the literature that has been written about organization or reorganization, the president's role in change, leadership during the past ten years, the concept of change, and the functions of management.

Chapter III explains the procedures used in this study by describing the population questioned, the instrument used, the methods employed in obtaining the data, and the procedures used in analyzing the data.
Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data obtained during the research.

Chapter V includes a summary of the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations of this study.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON CAMPUS REORGANIZATION

Reasons for Reorganization

There is a bold newness upon us—calling forth new proposals, suggestions, and paradigms. In reading Toffler, Drucker, Levine, or Yankelovich, the message is the same: the immediate future is to be different in a more dramatic, pervasive manner than that of the 1960's and the 1970's. The many full-time jobs that form the constellation of a community college president—community activity, public policy, management, and educational leadership—require demonstration of mastery of detail and significant imagination, discipline, and concentration. The problems within colleges will not be unusual, will not always be soluble, and will breed new problems (8, p. 6).

When Eaton wrote these words in 1981, she was writing prophecy, the impact of which few people fully understood at the time. If she felt a "bold newness" in 1981, surely that same message has penetrated the consciousness of every community college president in 1984-1985 as pressures have demanded both boldness and newness in dealing with problems. These pressures have come primarily because of economic crunches and demands upon education at all levels for greater accountability in the use of the tax dollar. In fact, Reed said, "... two of the greatest challenges are in the areas of extending opportunities to more students and in implementing the concept of accountability" (24). The literature shows that these problems are not new for the 1980's, but they are more severe than they have ever been.
Although there has not been a great amount of literature written about the subject of college reorganization per se, there has been writing about change and about some of the reasons that have made college reorganization not only practical but necessary. The literature has gone in cycles. Beginning about the mid-1970's, there was a significant amount of writing about the community college president's role, about the kind of leadership the president would need to exert in the future, and about the problems the president could expect to face in the future. These topics began to crop up again in some publications in the early 1980's; and in 1984, there were several pieces of writing about these topics with the addition of discussions about the management functions of the president.

Some of the literature of the 1960's sounds as if it were written for the mid-1980's. In 1969, Cohen and Rouche said, If public community colleges are to be the major hope for the future of American higher education, and if universities are to be following the innovative developments of the two-year college in the next five years, new leadership must be developed—leadership that will provide the impetus for educational change resulting in improved practice (5, p. viii).

Six years later, Lerner hypothesized that college presidents are adopting a new role that he labeled as "merchant vendors." He described them as merchants who must go after more students to fill overbuilt and overexpanded campuses (15).

Rushing predicted in the mid-1970's, "After thirty years of steady, even spectacular growth, American higher education is entering a new era" (27, p. 1). This new era he
characterized as promising ". . . to be a period in which the pressures on leadership will be as great as those of the 1960's, albeit a different nature" (27, p. 1). He expressed the belief that community college presidents would spend a great deal of their time on legislative matters during the 1980's and 1990's. He said that administrators ". . . must take into consideration the possibility of leveling enrollments and major shifts in sources of students" as they plan for the future (27). He was indeed prophetic when he said, "Those in positions to know report that, over the next fifteen years, even community colleges in growing areas will face the necessity of reducing staff" (27, p. 24). He said, however, that this is not the only solution to critical problems in the community college. He cited such possibilities as increased productivity rather than cutting services to students and to the community as a solution to monetary problems.

Writing about the same time as Rushing, Glenny said he believed ". . . higher education . . . will require continuing and substantial adjustments during much of the remainder of this century" (10, p. 1). Such statements as this lend powerful credibility to such leaders as Ellison who advocated the development and implementation of long-term strategic planning for community colleges (9).

Other writers in the 1980's have added a dimension to what was written. It is not that they have changed in their basic understanding of what is happening to society or to education,
but that their prophecies appear more serious, more precise, or, at least, more immediate. Writers like McCabe and Skidmore have said it is time to evaluate the whole of societal environments so that future needs can be predicted and education planned to meet those needs. With the move away from an industrialized society and toward a communication society, they predicted several changes in the educational environment.

In the 1960's a number of community college leaders were starting fresh. They were a new group who were willing to reject much of traditional education. Now these leaders must reconsider the structure they so carefully built just a few years ago (17, p. 247).

They wrote that the community college would become increasingly important to society, praising it as the institution "... capable of salvaging opportunity for the largest numbers of Americans . . ." who have not prepared themselves to succeed in their chosen fields (17, p. 241). One prediction concerned a very important part of the community college curriculum: occupational programs. Because the 1980's have brought significant new demands on occupational programs, community colleges must organize to meet these demands (17, p. 239). Organizational structures will have to change in some cases.

McCabe wrote again in 1984, addressing specifically the kinds of changes that will confront leaders of educational institutions in the future. As with much of the other literature, he addressed some of the chief reasons for the problems facing educational leaders rather than discussing the result of these problems: reorganization of the system (16).
He pointed out that significant social changes have occurred since World War II: shift in population, economic difficulties, drop in the birth rate, and increase in the number of minorities. "... since as early as 1970, we have been in an unsettling transformation from an industrial to an information age economy" (16, p. 44). He said social programs of this nation have generally been considered as failures.

Yet the problems of urban areas and minority populations have not lessened. Rather, the changing requirements for literacy in an information age and the stress of the substantial transitions that society is undergoing have caused already severe problems to deepen. Any public institution, especially one as closely tied to the needs of society as the community college, will also find itself deeply immersed in transition. Thus the role of the community college leaders in the mid 1980's must be significantly different, both in scope and content, from what it was in the expansion years of the 1950's and 1960's (16, p. 44).

Naisbitt emphasized the transformation of this country from an industrialized to an information society. He said the transition actually began in 1956 and 1957. When the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957, that event marked "... the globalization of the information revolution" (23, p. 12). This is true, he said, not because of its contribution to the space age but because "... it introduced the era of global satellite communications" (23, pp. 11-25).

Another significant influence to which McCabe pointed was the increasing number of federal regulations that have affected community colleges and their students. He warned about more control by state government because of the number of programs being funded and the level of that funding.
The systemization of community colleges seems clearly evident in the development of new state boards with increased authority. California and Florida are good examples. In a recent article for the Orange County (California) Daily Pilot, Bernard Luskin (1984), president of Orange Coast Community College, identified a growing problem: 'Now community colleges are state-funded institutions, and with state funds has come a continuing blizzard of regulation and more centralization of power, exposing even stronger trends toward state control' (16, p. 47).

Other entities affecting the operation of the community college more than they had previously are local boards, agencies of federally funded programs, the Equal Employment Commission, and faculty organizations. A control that is not an entity but that has become an overpowering factor in some cases is the financial crunch of the mid-1980's, especially in the state of Texas. With threats of 27 per cent cuts in higher education in Texas, predictions and warnings of McCabe and other writers have suddenly become realities for presidents.

The influential Legislative Budget Board, searching for ways to give lawmakers a balanced budget, Wednesday recommended whacking state university budgets by an average of 27 per cent to help recoup a $900 million revenue shortfall (29, p. 1).

Such reports as this one caused understandable reaction from college administrators.

The President's Role

Recognition of increasing control of colleges and universities by state agencies prompted Anthony to emphasize the need for strengthening the college presidency. His plea was to make the presidency the seat of authority once again.
"Only when strong authority exists is there any possibility that proposed innovations will be debated, tested and implemented" (2, p. 15). He believed the president should "... act rather than react, stimulate rather than respond, anticipate rather than be surprised, deal with minor problems before they become major problems" (2, p. 15).

Anthony was not alone in his concerns. The need to strengthen leadership strategies was set forth by McClenney and Wygal. McClenney said,

... a community college president who is presently in touch with reality has been confronted with concerns about accountability, steady state conditions, retrenchment, consumerism, competition, loss of autonomy, government regulation, collective bargaining, attacks on traditional accreditation, court decisions, energy conservation, affirmative action, higher education spending, and faculty pessimism. The response to these realities has been to become "management conscious" and to seek ways to cope with an uncertain future now that enrollment has leveled off (18, p. 26).

McClenney stressed the importance of the five functions of management—planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling—for a college president desiring to be effective in fulfilling his responsibility as the chief administrator of his institution. McClenney said the president who is fulfilling his role as manager of his institution will be accountable for all areas of its operation. In listing these areas of accountability, McClenney included organizational structure, the area about which this study was conducted.

In a positive discussion of "The President as Manipulator," Wygal emphasized the president's role as the
supervising leader of the institution. He said the president should involve others by working through them to bring about change (32, pp. 7-8).

In her 1981 prophecies for the year 2000, Eaton emphasized that presidents of community colleges must retain the leadership role for the institution's work force while showing "sympathy, empathy, and responsiveness to students." She predicted organizational changes that would be needed to meet future demands. "Management and faculty will have reworked the organizational structure to provide integration of programming and the curriculum to reflect integration of teaching" (8, p. 9).

With the mixture of indicators for the future and realities of the day, McCabe's insightful analysis of institutional leaders is especially appropriate.

Of the many considerations affecting the way in which community college leaders must operate today, the most important is the ability to maintain a broad perspective on issues. The institution, its mission, its image, its priorities, its relationship to society, and its place in the larger educational system are all critical concerns. More than at any other time, the leaders must be an educational visionary and keep the focus directed on the essential purposes and value of the institution (16, p. 49).

The author stressed the importance of the college president's role as he deals with the problems of the day and keeps his institution at the educational forefront (16). Most of all, he said, the president must work with all of the entities involved to maintain his role as an educational leader.
Careful analysis like McCabe's is especially significant when one reads such literature as that which Alfred wrote about college presidents. He said the position of the chief executive officer of a community college is in crisis, not because of incompetence but because of the broadening number of influences on decisions by faculty that weaken the president's role (1, pp. 8-19). Cross agreed and said that if innovation is to come, it is the chief administrators who must set the climate and provide the support for change (7).

Both by his career and by his teaching of administrators of major community colleges across the nation, Colvert demonstrated his philosophy that the chief administrator is the key factor in any institution. Thus, the administrator must assume a most significant role for any changes within the institution (6).

Cohen viewed college administrators as more than just instructional administrators: they are also educational leaders. He said many institutional leaders do not live up to this responsibility (4).

To assure that this failure is prevented, Wattenbarger proposed an "... ongoing method of assessing the function and performance of the president..." He said this method will help to ensure that the president will retain his role as the key leader of the institution (31).

General agreement exists that the chief administrative officer is the leader of the institution and should exercise
himself in that role. To serve as the change agent for the institution is an important part of this role.

Leadership

Considering the importance that so many of the writers have placed upon the leadership role of the chief executive officer of an institution, many current writers have shown much concern about the concept of leadership and the characteristics of a good leader. LeCroy stressed that excellence in leadership does not just happen. The person who has become an effective leader has used experiences in his life as positive tools for his own development and training. The good leader allows himself to continue to learn and to grow. He must maintain openness and flexibility as he surrounds himself with effective individuals. Effective leaders realize they have not "arrived," but they are always in the state of "becoming." This posture allows them the flexibility of growth (14).

Those who are effective leaders in their institutions are those who have made preparation for that role, several of the writers emphasized. Rushing said the common element running through the idea of effective leadership is that "... effective leaders are those who organize to become so" (28, p. 43). Rouche pointed out some desirable attributes of an effective leader: high expectations and standards, behavior that models what is desired in others, consistency, and the self-confidence to recognize and to reward outstanding behavior and to discourage unproductive behavior (26, pp. 2-5). Good
leaders are individuals who take action if they are going to impact their organization (19). On the other hand, some writers warn against a chief administrator's taking too much action. One writer plainly warned against authoritarian leadership. He said it was one of the seven factors harmful to the effectiveness of an educational institution (31).

The Concept of Change in Higher Education

Change in any setting requires serious thought and detailed planning, but in the educational setting where faculties are aggressive and proactive many times, a chief administrator must be especially careful as he initiates change. The idea of change has always been a part of the educational scene in varying degrees, depending on the time and the financial circumstances. Griffith defined change as follows:

"The word change is used to mean an alteration in the structure of the organization, in any of its processes, or in its goals or purposes. The revision of a rule, the introduction of a new procedure, or the revision of the purposes or directions of the organization are all subsumed under the concept of change (11, p.428)."

In view of the educational climate evidenced by the information discussed elsewhere in this chapter, it must be concluded that change will be a major theme in higher education for many years to come. The conditions now present dictate that administrators be flexible and open to change. But the need for change will not stop when the present crises are met. Insightful administrators surely know that the changes of today must soon give way to the demands of tomorrow. Thus, if they
and their institutions are to survive, they must keep in place a sound structure for effective change.

The process of change is not new to this era and has been a subject of much study by chief administrators, especially in recent years. Although administrators are making changes to meet economic and legislative demands, they realize the necessity of not alienating faculty members and, consequently, losing their support. Methods of change, then, become extremely important. Washburn suggested four basic questions that can be useful as one contemplates the process of change: (a) What needs to change? (b) Who needs to change? (c) What are some of the reasons for resisting change? (d) How do we plan for change? (30). Miller suggested that the use of the scientific problem-solving technique can be helpful in producing effective change within an institution.

1. Defining the problem.
2. Listing the alternatives.
3. Weighing the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.
4. Making the decision.
5. Picking the right strategy for implementing the decision.
6. Implementing the decision.
7. Evaluating the whole process (20, p. 124).

This well-defined process has communication as its strong point. All involved parties are aware of what is ahead. They are aware of the alternatives, they are kept informed about procedures that are occurring, and they are given the opportunity to evaluate after the process has taken place.
The concept of change was considered so important by Clark and Guba that they developed a schema or a model in 1965. The four components of a modified version of their model are Research, Development, Diffusion, and Adoption (3). This model suggests the steps to be taken if one wants to initiate change effectively. The model has been explained as follows.

1. The first stage is research. The objective here is to learn enough to be able to understand the situation and propose a change. The first part of this project, both for the district committee and for each campus committee, involves getting background on the issues concerning common learning, general education, and the district—in effect, research.

2. Development is divided into invention and design. Invention involves formulating the changes; design is putting the changes into a form that will work in this setting.

3. Diffusion consists of dissemination and demonstration. Dissemination is the creation of awareness of the change. Demonstration involves giving the people affected by the change the chance to examine and assess it in order to convince them it will be useful.

4. Adoption, the final stage, has three parts: trial, installation, and institutionalization. Trial is a testing out of a change on a small scale. Installation is actually putting the change into full operation, and institutionalization means establishing the change as a permanent part of the organization (another pair of authors call this stage "routinization") (12, p. 93).

The four points in this model are broad and could be adapted to meet most situations. They outline the entire change process, but they do not necessarily have to be carried out in the order given. For example, the Diffusion step and Adoption step could go on simultaneously.

Even with the best-outlined of procedures, a chief administrator cannot expect that all changes will be accepted
without resistance. Washburn outlined seven reasons behind resistance to change.

1. The objectives of the change are not clear.
2. The people involved in the change are not involved in the planning process.
3. The rewards for changing are not seen as being adequate.
4. People are afraid of failure.
5. People do not trust the initiator of the change.
6. There are too many changes at one time.
7. People need to be dissatisfied to perceive the need for change (30).

Washburn said that usually people are not resisting a change as much as they are the procedures used to bring about the change. The chief administrator, then, becomes the agent for administering change effectively and must plan well and communicate thoroughly to prevent excessive resistance to needed changes.

The Functions of Management

Educational literature has been emphasizing the term "management" for the past several years as it has discussed the role and functions of a community college chief executive or administrative officer. This term has actually been adapted from the business world and has been used to give a more accurate description of what these officers do. The literature describes chief administrators as "managers," and it emphasizes their responsibilities in this role. Several writers have written about the specific functions of management in the educational setting.
Miller designated six functions that educational managers must perform: Leading, Evaluating and Controlling, Organizing, Planning, Staffing or Personnel, and Coordination. He emphasized that not only must the chief administrative officer be able to perform these functions, but that "... managers at all levels must perform these functions if they are to be effective and efficient in working with people." In his discussion of the first function, Leading, Miller said, "The manager must be able to initiate change" (21, pp. 115-116). The implication is that change must come as a result of leadership from the appropriate level in the administrative organization. When that change is to affect the entire institution, the appropriate level is the chief administrative officer.

Other writers have given a variety of terms to these functions, although the distinctions are really minute. One writer's list was Planning, Organizing, Executing, Controlling, and Evaluating (13, p. 3). Morrisey, a leading writer in this field of study, listed five functions: Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, and Controlling. He categorized these functions into the following twenty activities involved in the work of management:

**Function I Planning . . .**

1. Defining roles and missions. Determining the nature and scope of work to be performed.
3. Setting objectives. Determining results to be achieved.
5. Scheduling. Establishing time requirements for objectives and programs.
6. Budgeting. Determining and assigning the resources required to reach objectives.
7. Policy-making. Establishing rules, regulations, or predetermined decisions.
8. Establishing procedures. Determining consistent and systematic methods of handling work.

Function II Organizing . . .
9. Structuring. Grouping the work for effective and efficient production.
10. Integrating. Establishing conditions for effective teamwork among organizational units.

Function III Staffing . . .
11. Determining personnel needs. Analyzing the work for personnel capabilities required.
12. Selecting personnel. Identifying and appointing people to organizational positions.
13. Developing personnel. Providing opportunities for people to increase their capabilities in line with organizational needs.

Function IV Directing . . .
14. Assigning. Charging individual employees with job responsibilities or specific tasks to be performed.
15. Motivating. Influencing people to perform in a desired manner.
17. Coordinating. Achieving harmony of group effort toward the accomplishment of individual and group objectives.

Function V Controlling . . .
18. Establishing standards. Devising a gauge of successful performance in achieving objectives.

Each of the functions and activities identified here is performed by every professional manager at every level (22, pp. 7-8).

A careful study of these functions of management convincingly emphasizes the need for the educational leader to be the chief change agent of an institution.
Conclusion

The literature of the past decade that has been presented here has not dealt directly with reorganization of a college in that this subject has not been dealt with to any extent. The literature surveyed, however, does serve to point up causes of reorganization and problems that have made changes in the organizational structure necessary. The literature has emphasized the role of the president in carrying out whatever mission the community college has, including reorganization. Richardson emphasized the management function of the chief executive officers of an institution and said that it is they who must effect organizational improvements as they assess the need (25).
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Chapter III

PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

Introduction

The role of the chief administrator of an institution in effecting organizational changes was the thrust of the data collection in this study. The study was approached from four viewpoints: the chancellor's perception of the president's role in reorganization, the president's perception of the president's role, the deans' (vice presidents') perceptions of the president's role, and division chairs' perceptions of the president's role. This information could not be determined solely by analyzing an organization chart. Actual roles designated on an organization chart cannot always be followed, especially when change is being brought about. Perceptions of roles were the beliefs that the parties involved had about what had taken place.

Subjects for Interviews

This study included personal interviews with two chancellors, one former chancellor, and ten college presidents from two metropolitan community college districts in the state of Texas. Three of the presidents were from the Tarrant County Junior College District (TCJCD) in Fort Worth, Texas, and seven were from the Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD)
in Dallas, Texas. These districts were selected because they have been leaders of the community college movement during the past fifteen to twenty years not only in the state but in the nation. The dynamics in these colleges are thus representative of other community colleges with similar purposes and with similar community demands, financial constraints, and student populations.

Questionnaires were given to key administrators who work directly with the presidents interviewed. Those selected for this study were the deans (vice presidents) and division chairs at each college. These levels were selected because these personnel have the responsibility of administering reorganization and changes instituted by the chief administrator. They have been required to deal with other lower levels of administration and with faculty members as these changes have come about. Their perceptions were especially insightful on a very practical level. The length of time an administrator had been in a position was not be a factor in this study.

Design and Procedures

The TCJCD and DCCCD were selected as the two districts to be studied, and the following administrative levels were selected to be questioned: chancellor, president, dean (vice president), and division chair. Personal interviews were conducted with chancellors and presidents. The presidents also completed a questionnaire designed for this study. The same
questionnaire was used in gathering data from the deans (vice presidents) and division chairs. An interview schedule was used as a guide during the personal interviews with both the chancellors and the presidents.

The chancellor of each district was written a letter of explanation about the project and was sent a demographic data sheet and a copy of the questionnaire. Each chancellor was then interviewed for the purpose of providing further explanation about the project, obtaining a letter granting formal permission to proceed with the project within each district, and asking the chancellor to notify each president about the project. During the interview each chancellor was questioned about his perception of the president's role in the reorganization of colleges within his district.

At TCJCD, the letter of approval came directly from the chancellor. At DCCCD, the study was approved by the executive cabinet, and the letter of approval was sent by the chair of that cabinet.

As data collection began at each college, the presidents were sent a letter, explaining the project and asking for assistance in gathering the data; a demographic data sheet; and a copy of the questionnaire. Presidents were asked to completed the questionnaire and to return it to the researcher. This procedure was followed by a telephone call, requesting a specific time for an interview. Each interview took from thirty minutes to one hour. The interview schedule was used to guide the discussion. At the conclusion of each interview,
questionnaires and a cover letter of explanation were left with
the presidents for distribution to the deans (vice presidents)
and division chairs. Instructions indicated that the
questionnaires were to be returned to the president's office in
a sealed envelope to assure anonymity and that they would be
picked up at the president's office two weeks later. The
former chancellor of the DCCCD was interviewed at the end of
the study.

A 70 per cent return was expected from the interviews with
the chancellors and presidents, and a 65 per cent return was
expected from the deans (vice presidents) and division chairs.

Development of the Instrument

An instrument that allowed for open-ended responses and
measurable data was designed for use during this study. The
instrument was planned to gather personal and demographic data
about each of the officials (See Appendix A), to ascertain the
kinds of reorganization the college had undergone from the fall
of 1975 to the spring of 1985, to gather data about those
changes, and to determine perceptions about the president's
role in those changes (See Appendix B). The instrument
contained specific questions for continuity of data and
open-ended questions to allow for subjective responses. An
interview schedule (See Appendix C) containing open-ended
questions was designed to be used as a guide in interviewing
the chancellors, former chancellor, and presidents.
Validation of the Instrument

To validate the instrument, a panel of five administrative leaders in higher education (See Appendix E) were selected to analyze the questionnaire. If three of the five indicated the need for a change, the instrument was revised.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Data were kept in four separate categories for analysis: chancellors, presidents, deans (vice presidents), and division chairs. Information obtained during the interviews with the chancellors and former chancellor is presented in narrative form. Data from the questionnaires completed by the presidents was tabulated and then calculated by computer. Results are presented on Tables I through VIII and in the accompanying narrative. Information obtained during the personal interviews was presented with the narratives for the tables as it applied to them. Other information was presented in narrative form in a separate section. Data from the questionnaires completed by the deans (vice presidents) and division chairs was tabulated and then calculated by computer. Results from deans (vice presidents) are presented in Tables IX through XVI and in the accompanying narratives. Results from division chairs are presented in Tables XVII through XXIV and in accompanying narratives.

The descriptive method of educational research has been used in this study. "Descriptive studies are primarily concerned with finding out 'what is'" (2).
In status descriptive surveys investigators do not try to relate one variable to another. They merely search for accurate information about the characteristics of particular subjects, groups, institutions, or situations or about the frequency with which something occurs (4).

Those conducting descriptive research are concerned only with "... the collection, presentation, and description of numerical data" (3).

One of the techniques of descriptive research is the problem-solving method. The types of information gathered in problem solving are "... present conditions, ... what we may want, ... (and) how to get there" (1). Studies may utilize all three of these types or only one or two of them (1). This study has concentrated on a determination of present conditions, including an analysis of the processes used to get to this point.

Data was divided according to the four levels of administration: Chancellor's Perceptions, President's Perceptions, Deans' (Vice Presidents') Perceptions, and Division Chairs' Perceptions. Other data has been presented by narrative presentation.

Research Questions

1. What major organizational changes have been made since the beginning of the fall semester 1975?

2. What were the perceptions of the reasons for those organizational changes?

3. What strategies were utilized in bringing about reorganization?
4. What was the president's perception of his/her role in reorganization?

5. What were the perceptions of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs of the president's role in reorganization?

Data from Question 1 have been analyzed and presented in narrative form. Data from Questions 2 through 5 have been presented on frequency tables and discussed in narrative form. Information obtained during the personal interviews has been integrated into the data analysis as appropriate.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

This study was undertaken to determine the perceptions of the roles that community college presidents play when reorganization within the administrative structure takes place. Colleges used for collection of data were the Tarrant County Junior College District (TCJCD) in Fort Worth, Texas, and the Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD) in Dallas, Texas. Collection of data was limited to administrative changes from the division level through the president's level at each college. No attempt was made to study the district level or the department or curriculum levels.

The chancellor of each district was interviewed, and permission to conduct the studies was granted after the proper approval procedures were completed. At the end of the study, the former chancellor of the DCCCD was interviewed. The focus of the interviews was on the chancellors' overall views of reorganization within their districts and their views about why and how organizational changes should occur. Both chancellors and the former chancellor completed a demographic data sheet. (See Appendix A)

Ten presidents in the two districts were sent a questionnaire (See Appendix B) in which they were asked to analyze their perceptions of their roles in the changes in
organizational structure that their colleges had undergone in the past ten years. Personal interviews were then conducted with each president; and the identified changes were discussed in depth, using the interview schedule (See Appendix C) as a guide. There was a 100 per cent response to this part of the study.

Copies of the same questionnaire were then mailed to all deans (vice presidents) and division chairs who reported to these presidents. The 68.8 per cent who responded to the questionnaire identified their perceptions of the roles that their president had played in reorganization on their campuses during the past ten years.

Data obtained during the interviews and from the questionnaires are included in this chapter.

Interviews with Chancellors

The chancellor of the TCJCD (See Appendix D), the chancellor of the DCCCD (See Appendix D), and the former chancellor of the DCCCD (See Appendix D) were interviewed for this study.

The chancellor of the TCJCD has twenty-five years of experience as a chief executive officer of an educational institution and has been in this position at TCJCD for nineteen and one-half years. He was the founding chancellor of the district. He said that presidents in his district have been the chief change agents, and he believes that is the way it should be since they have the responsibility for the
organization of their colleges. "Presidents must have the freedom to organize," he said. "Each administrator has his own style, and he must be allowed to exercise that style." He said that consultation has gone on before reorganization has occurred at the colleges, but he has left ultimate decisions in the hands of the presidents. He has questioned some proposed changes and even occasionally disagreed with them, but he has never denied a request for change.

Most reorganizations at the colleges in the TCJCD have occurred at the time of a vacancy of a major administrative position. He said he believes in studying organizational structure at any time, but the prime time for reorganizing is at the time of a vacancy. He is generally satisfied with reorganizations that have occurred within the past ten years at all three colleges within his district. He indicated a continuing concern about some unnecessary administrative levels, but he believes that no college should operate too thin.

He said that major reasons for reorganizing are as follows:

1. To facilitate fulfilling the mission of the institution;
2. To obtain better efficiency—not just economical but also operational;
3. To achieve better use of funds available. He said reorganization can be justified on the basis of economics.
The present chancellor of the DCCCD has been in that position for the past five years, but he has been with the institution for sixteen years. When he became chancellor, he set up a council structure to give the presidents latitude to reorganize. Proposals for change are first taken to the vice chancellor of educational affairs who makes decisions for approval or disapproval for some changes. Where major reorganization is to take place, the vice chancellor of educational affairs takes them to the chancellor for input. Proposals are then taken before the Executive Cabinet, chaired by the vice chancellor of educational affairs and comprising the other vice chancellors and the college presidents. The Cabinet provides additional input for the president before a final decision is made. The chancellor retains final veto power on all campus reorganizations; but since he wants to encourage productivity and creativity, he "would have to have strong reasons to veto campus reorganization."

He said that ideas for change should come from any level, but that the president should have the final say about changes. He said that a number of reorganizations at colleges within the district were suggested by subordinates, but the president had still been the key figure in the final decision. He said he would think that presidents would encourage subordinates to suggest changes and that deans (vice presidents) would always be involved in the process. Division chairs should also be consulted in decisions that involve their areas, he said.
Principal reasons for reorganizing, according to this chancellor, should be as follows:

1. To achieve greater efficiency;
2. To demonstrate creativity (including the concept of testing a notion that something might work better);
3. To achieve newly constructed institutional goals;
4. To achieve greater productivity;
5. To work around the strengths and/or weaknesses of individuals.

He believes the reorganizations in the DCCCD have been efficient overall because he has not picked up dissonance from subordinates. He attributes much of the success of the reorganizations to the fact that he places trust in the administrators within the district.

The chancellor emeritus of the DCCCD was the founding chancellor of the district, having served in that position for fifteen years before his retirement. He has been chancellor emeritus for the past five years. He said organization is the method of carrying out goals and objectives, and it should provide a structure for people to do wonderful things that they could not do without them. Thus, he said, he believes in the ultrasimplistic approach. When he started the DCCCD, he made sure the presidents understood the major objectives, the resources, and the restraints; then he allowed them to organize their colleges according to their own plans. He told them he would watch them carefully, there would be communication among
the presidents at close intervals, and there would be charts showing what they were doing. This system worked well at first; but as the institution grew, it became necessary to standardize certain parts of the district. At first, there were no common titles and no common job specifications. "There was just continuous interchange among the presidents and lots of sharing," he said. "Change was simple and immediate. If it didn't work, it was stopped."

Given the same opportunity, the chancellor emeritus indicated he would follow the same plan; but it would be with the prior understanding that he would change it soon. He said he realizes that some fundamental principles must be followed in an organization, but he believes it is slavish to be tied to an organizational structure. "I have no qualms about violating organizational structure if there is a need," he said, "if there is especially good talent to be worked with, or if there is good reason."

One major administrative decision that he made during his tenure as chancellor affected the level with which this research was involved. The following district directive was issued: "Anyone who is more than three-fifths administrator will be classified as an administrator." The reason for this directive was that many faculty members were teaching one class and were on four-fifths release time as an administrator. The level primarily affected by this directive was the division chair level.
The chancellor emeritus said the ultimate test of whether reorganization should take place is whether a system is working and whether it is accomplishing what needs to be accomplished.

Identification of Organizational Changes

When presidents were mailed copies of the questionnaire, they were first asked to complete a demographic data sheet, identifying name, name of college, age range, sex, number of years in present position, total number of years at the institution, and total number of years as a college president. Age range of the presidents was from thirty-six through sixty-five years, and there were seven male and three female presidents. They had been in the position of president from one-half year to nineteen years, and they had been with their institutions from one-half year to nineteen years.

The presidents were asked to complete the first page of the questionnaire that asked whether there had been any major organizational changes at their colleges between September, 1975, and May, 1985, and in which year(s) those changes had occurred. They were asked to identify those changes and to complete a packet about each change. The ten presidents identified the following thirty-one major organizational changes that occurred during the time period under study:

1. Reorganized divisions;
2. Reduced number of divisions from seven to five;
3. Reduced number of divisions from nine to eight;
4. Reduced number of divisions from six to four;
5. Reduced number of divisions from six to five, and created an ITV division under the dean (vice president) of learning resources;

6. Reduced number of divisions from eight to seven;

7. Reduced number of divisions from four to three;

8. Reduced number of divisions from five to four;

9. Combined duties and responsibilities of the dean (vice president) of instruction and the dean (vice president) of student development services;

10. Shifted from four deans to three vice presidents and one dean. Changed division chairs from faculty to administrative status and combined math and science division;

11. Deleted title of department chair from administrative structure. Upgraded and expanded office of division chair and named coordinators to care for certain academic areas;

12. Eliminated dean (vice president) of instructional services;

13. Deleted programs;

14. Changed two deans (vice presidents) and realigned responsibilities;

15. Added a second dean (vice president) of instructional services to relieve heavy supervisory load;

16. Combined duties of dean (vice president) of instruction and dean (vice president) of student development services;

17. Divided a division;
18. Eliminated dean (vice president) of instructional services and director of counseling positions;

19. Eliminated director of placement and co-op;

20. Eliminated evening dean (vice president) position and gave responsibilities to division chairs;

21. Shifted all academic division chairs to report directly to dean (vice president) of instruction, shifted learning resources area to report to dean (vice president) of student development, and had associate dean (vice president) and dean (vice president) of career and continuing education report to president;

22. Reorganized four divisions, abolished basic studies division, and moved instructional television under instruction;

23. Made technical/occupational dean (vice president) head of continuing education;

24. Eliminated assistant to dean (vice president) of instruction;

25. Moved learning resources area from dean (vice president) of instruction to dean (vice president) of student development for reporting purposes;

26. Eliminated dean (vice president) of student development for two or three years and then reinstated it;

27. Eliminated number of faculty, staff, and administrative positions through attrition and consolidation of services without eliminating a specific service;

28. Eliminated position of associate dean (vice president) of student support services;
29. Eliminated technical/occupational dean's (vice president's) position;

30. Introduced and implemented Business Industry Training Center and began new technical programs;

31. Reduced faculty and staff.

Fifty-three (68.8 per cent) of the seventy-seven deans (vice presidents) and division chairs in the two districts responded to the questionnaire and identified seventy-eight reorganizations. This group was asked to follow the same procedure the presidents had followed: to complete a demographic data sheet, to identify the organizational changes that had taken place, and to complete a packet for each change.

The first forty-four changes listed below were identified by deans (vice presidents). Numbers forty-five through seventy-eight were identified by division chairs. The changes are as follows:

1. Reduced number of divisions from six to four;
2. Reduced number of divisions from four to three;
3. Combined dean (vice president) of instruction and dean (vice president) of student services positions;
4. Divided student development into counseling services and student services;
5. Reduced number of divisions from six to four and changed title of associate dean (vice president) of learning resources to dean (vice president) of instructional technology and had this person report to campus president instead of to a district official;
6. Reduced number of divisions from four to three;
7. Combined dean (vice president) of instruction and dean (vice president) of student development positions;
8. Eliminated positions because of budget cuts;
9. Restructured continuing education to report directly to president;
10. Reduced physical plant staff;
11. Reduced number of divisions from four to three and expanded role of technical/occupational dean (vice president) to include continuing education;
12. Divided instructional program into general education and vocational/technical education, with dean (vice president) of instruction responsible for the former and dean (vice president) of student development services responsible for the latter;
13. Clustered instructional programs under dean (vice president) of instruction and student services;
14. Moved security from dean (vice president) of business services to dean (vice president) of student development, and learning resources from dean (vice president) of instruction to dean (vice president) of student development;
15. Reorganized instructional divisions;
16. Reorganized instructional divisions;
17. Reorganized administrative responsibilities by moving learning resources to dean (vice president) of student development;
18. Created Adult Resource Center and moved it to joint supervision by dean (vice president) of instruction and dean (vice president) of student development;

19. Required health services and services to disabled students to report to both dean (vice president) of instruction and dean (vice president) of student development;

20. Reorganized counseling to include career services, reduced number of faculty positions, and increased number of staff positions;

21. Reorganized administrative structure collegewide, cutting number of divisions and a dean's (vice president's) position and downgrading one administrator's position;

22. Eliminated eleven full-time faculty positions;

23. Reduced number of divisions from six to five, eliminated administrative position, and consolidated technical/occupational programs, evening programs, and continuing education programs under one dean;

24. Realigned instructional divisions;

25. Restructured instructional divisions;

26. Changed learning resources from dean (vice president) of instruction to dean (vice president) of student development;

27. Created Business and Industry Training Center;

28. Added administrative assistant to president position;

29. Moved learning resources to student development;

30. Acquired director of counseling after not having one for five years;
31. Implemented Business and Industry Training Center;
32. Added new program;
33. Reduced number of divisions from five to four;
34. Changed structure of divisions and departments;
35. Deleted position of assistant dean (vice president) of students;
36. Removed financial aid from student development area;
37. Deleted position of director of placement;
38. Deleted position of educational advisor;
39. Reduced number of divisions from seven to five and eliminated two division chairs;
40. Eliminated position of dean (vice president) of instructional services;
41. Combined duties of technical/occupational dean (vice president) and continuing education dean (vice president) and created position of dean (vice president) of career and continuing education;
42. Changed division chairs from faculty to administrators;
43. Merged continuing education and career education under one dean (vice president);
44. Eliminated position of dean (vice president) of instructional services;
45. Reorganized divisions;
46. Changed position of dean (vice president);
47. Changed positions of dean (vice president) and president;
48. Placed technical/occupational dean (vice president) over continuing education and divided technical/occupational position;

49. Expanded number of divisions from two to four;

50. Eliminated department chairs and instituted title of program coordinators;

51. Reorganized instructional areas, with general education reporting to dean (vice president) of instruction and career education reporting to dean (vice president) of student development services;

52. Clustered all instructional programs under dean (vice president) of instruction and student development services;

53. Moved division chairs from faculty status to twelve-month administrators;

54. Reorganized divisions;

55. Made division chairs administrative positions rather than faculty positions;

56. Placed some academic-related areas under dean (vice president) of student services and required continuing education dean (vice president) to report to president;

57. Reorganized administrative staff collegewide;

58. Reorganized student development units;

59. Reduced budgets and reorganized counseling;

60. Added instructional division and realigned programs;

61. Reorganized administrative positions;

62. Changed structure of counseling division;
63. Reduced number of divisions and eliminated dean's (vice president's) position;
64. Reduced number of divisions by two;
65. Eliminated position of dean (vice president) of instructional services;
66. Reduced authority and responsibility of evening dean (vice president);
67. Restructured divisions;
68. Divided mathematics/science/technology division into mathematics/technology and science/technology divisions;
69. Realigned disciplines within divisions;
70. Realigned disciplines within divisions;
71. Reduced size of department;
72. Added division;
73. Reduced number of divisions;
74. Reduced number of divisions;
75. Changed classification of division chairs from faculty to administrator;
76. Eliminated developmental studies division and assigned a technical/occupational program to each remaining division except humanities;
77. Combined humanities with physical education and automotive;
78. Combined technical/occupational and continuing education positions under one dean and placed health center and counseling positions under one director.
Perceptions of Presidents of Their Role in Reorganization

The ten presidents involved in this study were asked to complete a packet for each reorganization they had identified on page one of the questionnaire. The first question dealt with their perceptions of the reasons that reorganization had taken place during the time period covered by this study. They selected responses from a list of eleven choices plus an "other" choice that had a blank for identifying other reasons they may have had for reorganizing. The eleven choices were budget cuts, enrollment decrease, elimination of ineffective personnel, recommendation from chancellor, board action, legislative action, influence from faculty, creative or innovative reasons, financial efficiency, organizational efficiency, and achievement of institutional goals. The presidents ranked these choices beginning with Number 1 as the primary reason for reorganization only as they applied to the reorganization under discussion. They were not asked to rank all items for every reorganization.

Table I presents the responses to this question. Of the thirty-one reorganizations identified, eleven (34.4 per cent) were ranked as having organizational efficiency as the primary reason. Budget cuts and achievement of institutional goals were both selected as the primary reason for reorganization, with each receiving four (12.5 per cent) responses. Financial efficiency and "other" were ranked as the primary reason for reorganization three (9.4 per cent) times each. Creative or
TABLE I
A BREAKDOWN OF REASONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION AS PLACED IN RANK ORDER BY PRESIDENTS OF COLLEGES IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Change</th>
<th>1 %</th>
<th>2 %</th>
<th>3 %</th>
<th>4 %</th>
<th>5 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Cuts</td>
<td>4  12.5</td>
<td>4  12.5</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Decrease</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Ineffective Personnel</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4  12.5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from Chancellor</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Action</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Action</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence from Faculty</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative or Innovative Reasons</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
<td>3  9.4</td>
<td>7  21.9</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Efficiency</td>
<td>3  9.4</td>
<td>3  9.4</td>
<td>4  12.5</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Efficiency</td>
<td>11 34.4</td>
<td>8  25.0</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
<td>3  9.4</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of Institutional Goals</td>
<td>4  12.5</td>
<td>3  9.4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3  9.4</td>
<td>2  6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3  9.4*</td>
<td>5  15.6**</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1  3.1***</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The ten presidents identified thirty-one changes, but thirty-two reasons for change are identified in Column 1 because one respondent named both budget cuts and enrollment decrease as Number 1. Some ranked only Column 1 since they were asked to rank only those items that were applicable.

*The three responses marked "other" in Column 1 are as follows:
1. Change in structure in the district office.
2. Personnel problems.
3. Improving organizational coherence and span of control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 %</th>
<th>7 %</th>
<th>8 %</th>
<th>9 %</th>
<th>10 %</th>
<th>11 %</th>
<th>12 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The five responses marked "other" in Column 2 follow:**
1. Upgrading of division chairs' responsibilities.
2. Conversations with chancellor.
4. Key administrator transferred to district office.
5. Enrollment increase.

***The one response marked in Column 4 was explained as enrollment increase.***
innovative reasons was ranked as the primary reason twice (6.2 per cent). Enrollment decrease, elimination of ineffective personnel, recommendation from chancellor, legislative action, and influence from faculty each was ranked as the primary reason once (3.2 per cent). Board action did not receive a response as the primary reason for reorganization.

Organizational efficiency also received the second highest number of responses. Eight (25.0 per cent) said this was the second most important reason for reorganizing. Creative or innovative reasons received the third highest number of responses. Seven (21.9 per cent) respondents said it was the third most important reason for reorganizing.

"Other" was given as a secondary reason for reorganizing by five (15.6 per cent) respondents. "Other" was also mentioned by one (3.1 per cent) respondent as the fourth most important reason for reorganizing. The explanations listed under "other" as the most important reason for reorganizing were change in structure in the district office, personnel problems, and improving organizational coherence and span of control. The five explanations named under "other" as the secondary reason for reorganizing were upgrading of division chairs' responsibilities, conversations with chancellor, personnel problems, key administrator transferred to district office, and enrollment increase. Enrollment increase was also named as the fourth most important reason under "other."
During the personal interviews with the presidents, they discussed fourteen reasons for reorganization, centering upon finances, better administrative balance, educational environment, and personnel. Some of the items mentioned were only to amplify what had been checked on the questionnaire, and some were new items. Financial efficiency was mentioned again as an important factor in reorganizing, but it was pointed out by one president that this is an unfortunate reason because it means they cannot experiment anymore. One president said he had reorganized to save funds. Three presidents mentioned better administrative balance as reasons for reorganization. These reasons were as follows: to keep the administrative level from being top heavy, to achieve a better balance among the divisions, and to achieve a better span of control.

The three presidents who mentioned the educational environment said they had reorganized to improve educational activities, to accomplish growth of instructional television, and to stay viable. One president said he had reorganized "in response to our need to stay viable with an incredibly volatile changing environment." Personnel problems were mentioned six times as reasons for reorganizing. These reasons were to make personnel moves necessary because of incompetence, to deal with personnel problems, to eliminate positions, to have a better working relationship and a smoother operation, to shape the organization around individual strengths, and to correct personnel problems. One president said, as an additional
point, that resignation of personnel is always a good time to reorganize.

Table II presents the data obtained when presidents were questioned about their perceptions of the use they made of the input from different administrative levels as they planned for reorganization. They ranked input from deans (vice presidents), recommendations of faculty committee, recommendations of faculty organization (or Senate), memorandum to faculty asking for input, no input requested, and "other," beginning with Number 1 as the highest ranking. Responses were decidedly directed to one item. Twenty-six (83.9 per cent) responses identified input from dean as the primary input utilized.

The second highest number of responses was given to "other" in Column 4. Four (12.9 per cent) respondents ranked "other" as the second most important input used. These were explained as conversations with the chancellor, open forums involving all staff (named twice), and people within the divisions. The primary column for "other" and the secondary column for recommendations of faculty committee each had three (9.7 per cent) responses. The three "other" responses were explained as observations and perceptions on organizational efficiency (named twice) and district decision. Two (6.5 per cent) responses indicated in Column 1 that no input had been requested.
# TABLE II

INPUT UTILIZED IN PLANNING FOR REORGANIZATION AS RANKED BY PRESIDENTS OF COLLEGES IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input from Deans (Vice Presidents)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations of Faculty Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations of Faculty Organization (or Senate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum to Faculty Asking for Input</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Input Requested</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The ten presidents identified thirty-one procedures. Only Column 1 indicates a ranking for each procedure since respondents were asked to rank only items that applied. Some ranked only Column 1.

*The three responses marked "other" are explained as follows:
1. Observations and perceptions on organizational efficiency (named twice).
2. District decision.

**The four responses marked "other" are explained as follows:
1. Conversations with the chancellor.
2. Open forums involving all staff (named twice).
3. People within the divisions.
During the personal interviews, presidents were asked about the kind of assistance they had received from other administrators in planning for reorganization. Responses to this question were consistent in every interview. All of the presidents said they involved other administrators at the appropriate levels. They consistently mentioned that deans (vice presidents) were involved in the planning process, and many of them mentioned involvement of the division chairs. Deans (vice presidents), division chairs, and other appropriate personnel were included in what was repeatedly described as "much discussion" at the planning stage. This information was consistent with responses to Question 2 on the questionnaire.

When presidents were asked whether the reorganization resulted in a change in staffing, they answered positively for twenty-nine (93.5 per cent) of the reorganizations. For only two (6.5 per cent) reorganizations was there no change in staffing. Those who responded "Yes" to this question were asked to indicate the number of staffing changes effected by the reorganization and to specify whether there was an increase or decrease in the number of faculty/staff positions, an increase or decrease in the number of administrative positions, and an increase or decrease in the number of divisions. Table III presents the data from these responses.

The most significant finding from these responses was that twenty-nine administrative positions had been eliminated. Eight faculty/staff positions had been eliminated, and there
TABLE III
NUMBER OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN STAFF POSITIONS AS A RESULT OF REORGANIZATION AS INDICATED BY PRESIDENTS IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Positions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Positions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was an overall decrease of nine divisions from the ten colleges surveyed. Seven faculty positions, one administrative position, and one division were cited as having been added.

Table IV presents the data for the responses to the question, "Did the reorganization result in a financial

TABLE IV
FINANCIAL SAVINGS AS A RESULT OF REORGANIZATION AS INDICATED BY PRESIDENTS IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the reorganization result in a financial savings?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Information Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The ten presidents generated thirty-one responses in assessing whether the reorganization resulted in a financial savings.
savings?" Twenty-four (77.4 per cent) of the reorganizations resulted in a financial savings, the presidents indicated. For six (19.3 per cent) was there no financial savings, and one (3.2 per cent) said the information was not available.

Table V presents the perceptions the presidents had about who had the greatest leadership role in the implementation of the reorganization. They were asked to rank the categories of president, deans (vice presidents), division chairs, department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans (Vice Presidents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Respondents were asked to rank only items that applied. Some ranked only Column 1. Thirty-three responses are indicated in Column 1 because two respondents ranked both the presidents and the deans (vice presidents) as Number 1.
chairs, and "other," beginning with Number 1 as the category with the most important leadership role.

Twenty-five (75.7 per cent) responses named the president as the one with the most important leadership role in the reorganizations. Seven (21.2 per cent) ranked the deans (vice presidents) as exercising the primary leadership role, and one (3.0 per cent) named the division chairs as the primary leaders. Department chairs and "other" received no responses in Column 1. The totals exceed the thirty-one reorganizations identified because two respondents ranked both the president and the deans (vice presidents) as primary leaders in reorganization.

During the personal interviews, presidents responded to the question about the implementation process in the same way they did about the planning process. All presidents said they had worked with the appropriate levels of personnel in implementing the reorganization. In most instances, this process included the deans (vice presidents) and sometimes the division chairs. For several of the reorganizations, presidents said all that was needed was to inform the personnel involved and to make an announcement to the college. One said that as soon as the change was approved by the chancellor, it was implemented immediately. One president said he/she met with the deans (vice presidents), made a commitment about the security of positions involved in the reorganization, and worked through the divisions to the faculty level.
Another president said he/she identified the problem and outlined the need for reorganization, received district approval, had a winddown of each program by eliminating personnel as attrition occurred or by moving them to other colleges in the district, and completed the students involved in the degree program. Another president did a survey of personnel about what needed to be done, distributed the results to appropriate personnel, had them prioritize these items at a retreat, had the president and the deans (vice presidents) respond to the list of priorities in the form of a proposal for change, had the personnel involved react to the proposal, consulted with the division chairs about the proposal, and announced what the changes were. This president said that further response was given to problems brought on by the reorganization by making additional adjustments as they were needed. Flexibility was the key concept.

Table VI presents the results of the presidents' being asked to rate their perceptions of their own roles in reorganization on a scale of one to five. A rating of one indicated the reorganization was a total presidential decision and a rating of five indicated the president had very little involvement in the reorganization. Six (19.3 per cent) responses indicated that the reorganization was a total presidential decision by selecting Number 1. Number 2 received fifteen (48.3 per cent) responses, indicating a majority of the presidents believed that a small amount of input was considered from other administrators before the president made the
decision about the reorganization. Nine (29.0 per cent) respondents selected Number 3 (equal input from president and others before decision), one (3.2 per cent) selected Number 4 (decision based primarily on input from others), and no one selected Number 5 (decision based almost totally on input from others).

TABLE VI
PRESIDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR OWN ROLES IN REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Involvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The ten presidents generated thirty-one responses in rating the role of the president in reorganization.

Table VII presents the data obtained when the presidents were asked to indicate their perceptions of how input from deans (vice presidents) and division chairs was used in the reorganization. This scale was from one to five, with one being much use of other input and five being no input from others (none on the questionnaire). Eighteen (58.0 per cent) respondents selected Number 1, indicating a strong feeling that presidents used much input from other administrators. Nine (29.0 per cent) selected Number 2 (moderate), and no one
selected Number 3. Number 4 (some) and Number 5 (none) ratings on the scale received two (6.5 per cent) responses each.

TABLE VII

PRESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE USE OF INPUT OF DEANS (VICE PRESIDENTS) AND DIVISION CHAIRS IN REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input from Other Administrators</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The ten presidents generated thirty-one responses in rating the use of input by deans (vice presidents) and division chairs in reorganization.

Table VIII presents the data obtained when presidents were questioned about methods of evaluating the effectiveness of the reorganization. They were instructed to check all of the methods that applied to the reorganization from the following list: oral feedback, memorandum requesting subjective feedback, questionnaire asking for specific feedback, no feedback requested, and "other." Since more than one method could be checked for any reorganization, the responses total more than thirty-one; consequently, no percentages were calculated. For twenty-three reorganizations, oral feedback was indicated as the most frequent method of determining effectiveness. Memorandum requesting subjective feedback received one response. Questionnaire asking for specific
feedback received two responses. No feedback was requested for three reorganizations. "Other" received the following ten responses: an open forum involving interested staff, feedback from the chancellor (mentioned twice), observation (mentioned three times), and observation of the effectiveness of the reorganization in meeting the goals of the college (mentioned three times). One said it was too early to evaluate.

**TABLE VIII**

**PRESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF METHODS OF EVALUATING EFFECTIVENESS OF REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Feedback</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum Requesting Subjective Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Asking for Specific Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback Requested</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The ten responses marked "other" were explained as follows:
1. An open forum involving interested staff.
2. Feedback from the chancellor (mentioned twice).
3. Observation (mentioned three times).
4. Observation of the effectiveness of the reorganization in meeting the goals of the college (mentioned three times).
5. Too early to evaluate.

**Interviews with Presidents**

When the presidents were interviewed, one of the purposes was to explore in detail some of the responses that they had given on the questionnaire. These discussions were guided by the questions on the interview schedule (See Appendix C), and the results of this part of the interview have been presented.
in narrative form following Tables I, II, and V earlier in this chapter. The other purpose of the personal interviews was to gain further insight into what the presidents believed should be reasons for reorganization in colleges.

The reason for reorganization identified almost one-third of the time by the presidents on the questionnaire was the same reason mentioned most frequently in the personal interviews as being the primary reason that reorganization should occur: organizational efficiency. Eight presidents specified this item as being the most important reason a college should be reorganized. One president went so far as to say that was the only legitimate reason. Two presidents said they did not mean primarily for financial savings when they said organizational efficiency, although they realized budgets always must be considered. They mentioned developing a more effective way to organize instruction, correcting the integrity of instructional units to be sure they hold together philosophically, and allowing for flexibility so the administration can be more responsive and not so bureaucratic as explanations for organizational efficiency.

To meet the goals of the institution was mentioned six times by the presidents as being an important reason that reorganization should occur. Increased effectiveness was mentioned by two of the presidents. One of these explained that he/she did not mean efficiency only. This president said organizational structures should be set up to help in getting
the job done in a better way. Budgetary considerations and reduction of span of control were mentioned twice as being reasons for reorganization.

When presidents were asked who should have the greatest input in reorganization, responses were again similar. Most presidents said everyone affected should have opportunities to provide input about the reorganization. One president said there should be mutual input, and discussion should be as broadly based as possible. One said if it is an upper administrative reorganization, the president should have the most input. Otherwise, input should come as close as possible from the level at which the change will occur but always in consultation with the president. One said the president should be sure appropriate personnel have an opportunity to participate in discussions so that the change will not appear to be arbitrary. Another said the president should scan the environment and plan change to keep the institution viable.

Responses to the question about the role the president should play in reorganization were unanimous. The president was described as the facilitator for all change and the primary change agent because he/she is the chief executive officer. One president said the president should explore and discuss but then must make the decision because he/she has the primary responsibility for initiating organizational change. Another president agreed with this point and said the president must have the greatest voice because of his/her accountability.
Another added that the president should consider the implications, fallout, and timing of the change. Still others repeated that the president should have the strongest voice in change, and that he/she should have strong support from the dean (vice president) level.

Perceptions of Deans (Vice Presidents) of the Role of the President in Reorganization

The fifty-three other administrators who responded to the questionnaire included twenty-three deans (vice presidents). Each was mailed a copy of the same questionnaire the presidents had received and was asked to return it within two weeks. The twenty-three deans (vice presidents) identified forty-four reorganizations that had taken place during the previous ten years and completed packets on each change. One dean's (vice president's) questionnaire was rejected because packets were not completed for the changes named. One response was not used because the respondent indicated a lack of information about the subject. Two changes, each with corresponding packets, were rejected from two other dean's (vice president's) questionnaires because they were not related to reorganization. Both involved personnel matters.

Deans (vice presidents) followed the same procedure as the presidents in ranking the eleven items plus "other" on Question 1 of the packets. Table IX presents the responses to this question. Of the forty-four reorganizations identified, twenty-three (52.3 per cent) were ranked as having
### TABLE IX

A BREAKDOWN OF REASONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION AS PLACED IN RANK ORDER BY DEANS (VICE PRESIDENTS) IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Change</th>
<th>1 %</th>
<th>2 %</th>
<th>3 %</th>
<th>4 %</th>
<th>5 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Cuts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Decrease</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Ineffective Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from Chancellor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Action</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Action</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence from Faculty</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative or Innovative Reasons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Efficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Efficiency</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of Institutional Goals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The twenty-three deans (vice presidents) identified forty-four reasons for change. Only Column 1 indicates a ranking for each change since respondents were asked to rank only items that applied. Some ranked only Column 1.

* Other* reasons identified in Column 1 were as follows:
1. To relieve the number of personnel reporting to the dean (vice president).
2. Dean (vice president) accepted another position out of the city.
3. New institutional initiative.
The "other" reason identified in Column 4 was that the dean (vice president) of instruction resigned.

Table X presents the results of the deans (vice presidents) being questioned about their perceptions of the president's use of input from different administrative and faculty levels in planning for reorganization. Twenty-seven (61.4 per cent)
organizational efficiency as the primary reason. The next highest rankings in Column 1 were budget cuts and financial efficiency, each receiving four (9.1 per cent) responses. Enrollment decrease, creative or innovative reasons, and "other" were ranked as the primary reason for reorganization three (6.8 per cent) times each. Achievement of institutional goals was ranked as the primary reason for reorganization twice (4.5 per cent), and elimination of ineffective personnel and recommendation from chancellor were ranked as the primary reason once (2.3 per cent) each. Board action, legislative action, and influence from faculty did not receive a response in Column 1.

Creative or innovative reasons received the second highest number of rankings. It was ranked as the second most important reason for reorganizing eleven (25.0 per cent) times. Organizational efficiency received the third highest number of responses. Ten (22.7 per cent) named this category as the second most important reason for reorganizing.

The three that identified "other" as the primary reason for reorganizing gave these reasons: relieved the number of personnel reporting to the dean (vice president) of instruction, new institutional initiative, and dean (vice president) of instruction accepted another position out of the city. "Other" was ranked one time as the fourth most important reason for reorganizing. The explanation was that the dean (vice president) of instruction resigned.
TABLE X

INPUT UTILIZED IN PLANNING FOR REORGANIZATION AS RANKED BY DEANS (VICE PRESIDENTS) IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input from Deans (Vice Presidents)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations of Faculty Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations of Faculty Organization (or Senate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum to Faculty Asking for Input</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Input Requested</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The twenty-three deans (vice presidents) identified forty-four procedures. Only Column 1 indicates a ranking for each procedure since respondents were asked to rank only items that applied. Some ranked only Column 1.

*The ten responses in Column 1 of "other" were as follows:
1. Presidential decision.
2. Mandate from chancellor.
3. Recommendation from president.
4. Discussion with president.
5. Discussion with president and director of counseling.
7. Selective input (mentioned three times).
8. "I don't know."

**The two responses in Column 2 of "other" were as follows:
1. Informal faculty input.
2. Presidential reorganization.
responses indicated the deans' (vice presidents') input was utilized the most. Ten (22.7 per cent) respondents ranked "other" as the primary input, and seven (15.9 per cent) ranked no input requested in Column 1. "Other" input included presidential decision, mandate from chancellor, recommendation to the president, discussion with the president, discussion with the president and director of counseling, suggestions of new structure by the chancellor, selective input (named three times), and "I don't know." "Other" was ranked as the second most important input used by two (4.5 per cent) respondents. These two were informal faculty input and presidential reorganization.

When deans (vice presidents) were asked whether the reorganizations resulted in a change in staffing, thirty-nine (88.6 per cent) answered positively and five (11.4 per cent) answered negatively. Table XI presents data on the kinds of changes in staffing that deans (vice presidents) indicated.

### TABLE XI

NUMBER OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN STAFF POSITIONS AS A RESULT OF REORGANIZATION AS INDICATED BY DEANS (VICE PRESIDENTS) IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Positions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Positions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They said twenty-one faculty positions, twenty-six administrative positions, and eighteen divisions were eliminated by the reorganizations. Six faculty positions, twelve administrative positions, and one division were added as a result of the reorganizations.

Table XII presents data for the responses about whether the reorganization resulted in financial savings. The deans' (vice presidents') perceptions were that twenty-three (52.3 per cent) of the changes resulted in financial savings for the college. Sixteen (36.4 per cent) indicated there was no financial savings. Five (11.4 per cent) said that information was not available to them.

### TABLE XII

**FINANCIAL SAVINGS AS A RESULT OF REORGANIZATION AS INDICATED BY DEANS (VICE PRESIDENTS) IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the reorganization result in a financial savings?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Information Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The twenty-three deans (vice presidents) generated forty-four responses in assessing whether the reorganization resulted in a financial savings.

Table XIII presents the perceptions of the deans (vice presidents) about the person with the most significant
leadership role in the implementation of the reorganization.
Twenty-six (57.8 per cent) said the president had the most
significant role. Fourteen (31.1 per cent) indicated the deans
(vice presidents) had the most significant role. Four (8.9 per
cent) said "other" had the most significant role, and one (2.2
per cent) said the division chairs did. Twenty-three (51.1 per
cent) said the deans (vice presidents) had the second most
significant role and ten (22.2 per cent) identified the
president as the second most significant leader. Seventeen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans (Vice Presidents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Respondents were asked to rank only items that applied.
Some ranked only Column 1. Forty-five responses are indicated
in Column 1 because one respondent ranked both deans (vice
presidents) and division chairs as Number 1.
(37.8 per cent) said the division chairs were the third most
important leaders in the implementation process.

The four who marked "other" as the most significant leader
identified the chancellor (two times), the district, and "do
not know." One (2.2 per cent) respondent identified "other" as
the second most significant leader and named the director of
counseling. Two (4.4 per cent) respondents selected "other" as
the fourth most significant reason and named the faculty and
counselors. One respondent selected "other" as the fifth most
significant leader and named the faculty.

Table XIV presents the results of the deans' (vice
presidents') being asked to give their perceptions of the
presidents' role in reorganization by choosing on a scale of
one to five with one being total presidential decision and five
being very little input by the president. Twenty-two (50.0 per
cent) selected Number 2 as their response, indicating their
perception that the president was the most influential person
in the reorganization but that he did not make the decision
without input from others. Eleven (25.0 per cent) selected
Number 1, indicating the reorganization was a total
presidential decision. One (2.3 per cent) said the decision
was based totally on input from others by selecting Number 5.
Seven (15.9 per cent) selected Number 3 (equal amount of input
before the decision was made), and two (4.5 per cent) selected
Number 4 (the decision was based primarily on input from
others). One (2.3 per cent) questionnaire had no response.
TABLE XIV
DEANS' (VICE PRESIDENTS') PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S ROLE IN REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Involvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR=No Response

NOTE: The twenty-three deans (vice presidents) generated forty-four responses in rating the role of the president in reorganization.

Table XV presents the deans' (vice presidents') perceptions about how their own input was utilized in the reorganization, with Number 1 indicating much use of their input.

TABLE XV
DEANS' (VICE PRESIDENTS') PERCEPTIONS OF THE USE OF INPUT OF DEANS (VICE PRESIDENTS) AND DIVISION CHAIRS IN REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input from Other Administrators</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR=No response

NOTE: The twenty-three deans (vice presidents) generated forty-four responses in rating the use of input by deans (vice presidents) and division chairs in reorganization.
input and Number 5 indicating no use of their input. Nineteen (43.2 per cent) indicated they felt much of their input was used, and eleven (25.0 per cent) marked Number 2, indicating a moderate amount of their input was used. These two categories accounted for more than two-thirds of the responses. Three (6.8 per cent) marked Number 3 (slight), and four (9.1 per cent) marked Number 4 (some). Six (13.6 per cent) marked Number 5, indicating their perception that no use was made of their input. One (2.3 per cent) gave no response.

Table XVI presents the results of the deans' (vice presidents') being asked about their perceptions of the type of feedback that was used in evaluating the reorganization. Thirty-one of the responses pointed to oral feedback being used, and sixteen responses indicated that no feedback was

**TABLE XVI**

DEANS' (VICE PRESIDENTS') PERCEPTIONS OF METHODS OF EVALUATING EFFECTIVENESS OF REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Feedback</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum Requesting Subjective Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Asking for Specific Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback Requested</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Respondents were asked to check all that applied; thus, no valid percentages could be calculated.

*The three responses for "other" were as follows:
1. Advisory committee.
2. Budget and enrollment data.
3. Discussion with counselors.
requested. Three said a memorandum requesting subjective feedback was sent out, and three indicated "other." "Other" responses were that feedback was given by an advisory committee, budget and enrollment data was used, and there was a discussion with the counselors. One questionnaire had no response to this question.

Perceptions of Division Chairs of the Role of the President in Reorganization

The thirty division chairs who responded followed the same procedure that other respondents did in completing the questionnaire. Seventeen division chairs identified thirty-four reorganizations that had taken place on their campuses and completed packets on each of them. Eight division chairs said no changes had taken place on their campuses, and two said they had not been on their campuses long enough to answer the questionnaire. Three questionnaires were rejected because they were completed incorrectly.

Table XVII presents the results of the division chairs' being asked to rank reasons for reorganization from the eleven items plus "other" listed in Question 1 of the packet. Sixteen (47.1 per cent) of the responses identified organizational efficiency as the primary reason for reorganizing. Budget cuts, elimination of ineffective personnel, and "other" each received five (14.7 per cent) responses as the primary reason for reorganizing. Recommendation from chancellor, creative or innovative reasons, and achievement of institutional goals each received one (2.9 per cent) response in the primary column.
### TABLE XVII

**A Breakdown of Reasons for Administrative Reorganization as Placed in Rank Order by Division Chairs in Two Texas Metropolitan Community College Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Change</th>
<th>1 %</th>
<th>2 %</th>
<th>3 %</th>
<th>4 %</th>
<th>5 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Cuts</td>
<td>5 14.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Decrease</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Ineffective Personnel</td>
<td>5 14.7</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from Chancellor</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Action</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Action</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence from Faculty</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>3 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative or Innovative Reasons</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>5 14.7</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Efficiency</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9 26.5</td>
<td>3 8.8</td>
<td>3 8.8</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Efficiency</td>
<td>16 47.1</td>
<td>6 17.6</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of Institutional Goals</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>5 14.7</td>
<td>3 8.8</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>a 14.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>b 5.9</td>
<td>c 2.9</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The thirty division chairs identified thirty-four reasons for change. Some ranked only Column 1.

a The five changes marked "other" in Column 1 were as follows:
1. Original dean (vice president) left to take another position.
2. "I was not in on the changes."
3. Personality and power play.
4. One dean (vice president) resigned, and the president wanted to eliminate competition between two nearly equal deans (vice presidents).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 %</th>
<th>7 %</th>
<th>8 %</th>
<th>9 %</th>
<th>10 %</th>
<th>11 %</th>
<th>12 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 d 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. "I don't know, but it was probably the request of a division chair for a full-time faculty assignment."

b The two changes marked "other" in Column 3 were as follows:
1. Alignment of programs that fed numbers of students into programs.
2. Enrollment increases and new programs.

c The change marked in Column 4 was resignation of administrative staff member.

d The change marked in Column 6 was that it was part of the district goal to have campuses very near the population.
Enrollment decrease, board action, legislative action, influence from faculty, and financial efficiency received no rankings as being the primary reason for reorganizing (Column 1). The second highest ranked category was financial efficiency in Column 2. It received nine (26.5 per cent) responses. Organizational efficiency was the third highest ranked category also in Column 2. It received six (17.6 per cent) responses.

The five responses indicated in Column 1 for "other" included these reasons: a dean (vice president) resigned to take another position, personality and power play, one dean resigned and the president wanted to eliminate competition between two nearly equal deans, no knowledge of the real reason but was probably the result of one division chair requesting full-time assignment, and "I was not in on the change."

"Other" was also ranked by two (5.9 per cent) respondents as the third most important reason for reorganization. The two explanations were the alignment of programs that fed numbers of students into programs and enrollment increases and new programs. One (2.9 per cent) respondent ranked "other" as the fourth reason for reorganization and explained that an administrative staff member resigned. "Other" was ranked as the sixth reason for reorganizing by one (2.9 per cent) respondent who gave the explanation that it was a part of the overall district goal to have the campuses very near the population.
Table XVIII presents the data obtained when division chairs were questioned about their perceptions of the use the presidents made of the input that came from different administrative levels as they planned for reorganization. They ranked input from deans (vice presidents) recommendations of faculty committee, recommendations of faculty organization (or Senate), memorandum to faculty asking for input, no input requested, and "other." Input from deans received the greatest number of responses in Column 1 with thirteen (38.2 per cent). "Other" received the second largest number of responses with eleven (32.4 per cent), and no input requested received the third largest number with nine (26.5 per cent) responses. Recommendations from faculty committee received one (2.9 per cent) response, and recommendations of faculty organization (or Senate) and memorandum to faculty asking for input received no responses in Column 1.

Explanations for "other" were as follows: not sure of initial planning, special task force, district committee formed, decision made by the president and staff, recommendation from campus selection committee, faculty met with the president to point out the problem and the president made the decision on how to reorganize, and five responses of "I don't know." "Other" received one (2.9 per cent) response in Column 2 with the explanation that the president appointed a new dean (vice president) and one (2.9 per cent) response under Column 4 with the explanation that much input was obtained before classes started.
## TABLE XVIII

INPUT UTILIZED IN PLANNING FOR REORGANIZATION AS RANKED BY DIVISION CHAIRS IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input from Deans (Vice Presidents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations of Faculty Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations of Faculty Organization (or Senate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum to Faculty Asking for Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Input Requested</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The thirty division chairs identified thirty-four procedures. Some ranked only Column 1.

*The eleven responses marked "other" in Column 1 were as follows:
1. Not sure of initial planning.
2. Special task force.
3. District committee formed.
4. Decision made by the president and staff.
5. Recommendation from campus selection committee.
6. Faculty met with the president to point out the problem and the president made the decision on how to reorganize.
7. "I don't know" (five responses).

**The one response marked "other" in Column 2 was that the president had appointed a new dean (vice president).

***The one response marked "other" in Column 4 was that much input was obtained before classes started.
When division chairs were asked whether reorganization resulted in a change in staffing, twenty-nine (85.3 per cent) responded positively and five (5.4 per cent) responded negatively. Table XIX presents the type and number of staffing changes that occurred. Those who responded positively to this question indicated there had been nine decreases in faculty positions, twenty-one decreases in administrative positions, and fifteen decreases in the number of divisions. They cited an increase of six faculty positions, fifteen administrative positions, and nine divisions.

**TABLE XIX**

NUMBER OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN STAFF POSITIONS AS A RESULT OF REORGANIZATION AS INDICATED BY DIVISION CHAIRS IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Positions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Positions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XX presents responses to the division chairs' being asked whether the reorganization resulted in financial savings. Fourteen (41.2 per cent) said it did, twelve (35.3 per cent) said it did not, and eight (23.5 per cent) said that information was not available to them.
TABLE XX

FINANCIAL SAVINGS AS A RESULT OF REORGANIZATION
AS INDICATED BY DIVISION CHAIRS IN TWO TEXAS
METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the reorganization result in a financial savings?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Information Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The thirty division chairs generated thirty-four responses in assessing whether the reorganization resulted in a financial savings.

Table XXI presents the data from the division chairs about the personnel who had the greatest leadership role in the implementation process for the reorganization. Twenty-one (60.0 per cent) respondents said the president was the most influential at this point in the reorganization. Seven (20.0 per cent) said the deans (vice presidents) had the primary leadership role, four (11.4 per cent) selected the division chairs as the primary leaders, and three (8.6 per cent) identified "other."

Deans (vice presidents) were selected by twenty-one (60.0 per cent) respondents as the second most important leaders at the implementation level. The three who selected "other" in Column 1 identified the chancellor twice and "I don't know" once. Two (5.7 per cent) who selected "other" in Column 4 cited the faculty twice as the leaders in implementing reorganization.
TABLE XXI
IDENTIFICATION OF LEADERSHIP ROLES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF REORGANIZATION AS RANKED BY DIVISION CHAIRS IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans (Vice Presidents)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>::</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>::</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Respondents were asked to rank only items that applied. Some ranked only Column 1. Thirty-five responses are indicated in Column 1 because one respondent ranked presidents and deans (vice presidents) both as Number 1, explaining that they had equal voice and influence.

*The three responses marked "other" in Column 1 were as follows:
1. The chancellor (twice).
2. "I don't know."

**The two responses marked "other" in Column 4 both identified the faculty as being leaders in the implementation process.

Table XXII presents the division chairs' perceptions of the degree of involvement that the president had in the reorganization by ranking from one to five, with one being total presidential decision. Ten (29.4 per cent) of the respondents said the reorganization was a total presidential decision. Thirteen (38.2 per cent) selected Number 2, indicating that it was slightly less than a total presidential decision.
decision. Five (14.7 per cent) respondents selected Number 3 (equal amount of input before decision), three (8.8 per cent) selected Number 4 (decision based primarily on input from others), and two (5.9 per cent) selected Number 5, indicating the reorganization was totally from other sources than the president. There was no response from one (2.9 per cent) respondent.

**TABLE XXII**

DIVISION CHAIRS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S ROLE IN REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Involvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR=No Response

NOTE: The thirty division chairs generated thirty-four responses in rating the role of the president in reorganization.

Table XXIII presents the division chairs' perceptions about the amount of input from other administrators, by selecting on a scale from one to five, with one being much use of input and five being none. Seven (20.6 per cent) respondents said there was much use of other input, and ten (29.4 per cent) said there was moderate use. Five (14.7 per cent) selected Number 3 (slight), nine (26.5 per cent) selected
Number 4 (some), and two (5.9 per cent) selected none. There was no response from one (2.9 per cent) respondent.

**TABLE XXIII**

DIVISION CHAIRS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE USE OF INPUT OF DEANS (VICE PRESIDENTS) AND DIVISION CHAIRS IN REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input from Other Administrators</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR=No response

**NOTE:** The thirty division chairs generated thirty-four responses in rating the use of input by deans (vice presidents) and division chairs in reorganization.

Table XXIV presents division chairs' perceptions of the type of evaluation that was used in determining the effectiveness of the reorganization. They could select from oral feedback, memorandum requesting subjective feedback, questionnaire asking for specific feedback, no feedback requested, and "other." No percentages are given since respondents were asked to check all that applied. Twenty said no feedback was requested, and thirteen said oral feedback was the method used. Memorandum requesting subjective feedback received three responses. Questionnaire asking for specific feedback and "other" received one response each. The response for "other" was explained as the person's not being involved. There was no response from one respondent.
TABLE XXIV

DIVISION CHAIRS' PERCEPTIONS OF METHODS OF EVALUATING EFFECTIVENESS OF REORGANIZATION IN TWO TEXAS METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Feedback</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum Requesting Subjective Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Asking for Specific Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback Requested</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Respondents were asked to check all that applied; thus, no valid percentages could be calculated.

*I was not involved.*

Research Questions

The research questions presented in Chapter I of this study were answered after compilation of data obtained from the questionnaire completed by presidents, deans (vice presidents), and division chairs. Respondents completed a packet of questions for every reorganization they identified. The first research question was, What major organizational changes have been made since the beginning of the fall semester 1975? Presidents identified thirty-one changes, deans (vice presidents) identified forty-four changes, and division chairs identified thirty-four changes. These are listed in the section entitled "Identification of Organizational Changes" earlier in this chapter. Related to this question were the data collected from responses to Questions 3 and 4 of the questionnaire. Question 3 asked whether the reorganization
resulted in a change in staffing. If the response were "Yes," respondents were asked to identify whether the staffing changes were an increase or decrease in the number of faculty/staff positions, administrative positions, or divisions. Data from responses to this question are presented on Tables III, XI, and XIX. No percentages could be calculated for this question because only totals were called for; however, all three groups had the largest number of staff changes under decrease in the number of administrative positions. Presidents said there had been a decrease of twenty-nine, deans (vice presidents) said there had been a decrease of twenty-six, and division chairs said there had been a decrease of twenty-one administrative positions. Question 4 of the questionnaire asked whether the reorganization resulted in a financial savings. Data from responses to this question are presented on Tables IV, XII, and XX. A majority of the presidents (77.4 per cent) and of the deans (vice presidents) (52.3 per cent) said the reorganizations resulted in financial savings. Division chairs' responses were more distributed: 41.2 per cent said "Yes," 35.3 per cent said "No," and 23.5 per cent said that information was not available to them.

The second research question was, What were the perceptions of the reasons for those organizational changes? Data used in answering this question came primarily from Question 1 of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to select from a list of twelve responses and to rank order those
that applied, beginning with Number 1 as the primary reason for reorganization. The twelfth item was "other," and respondents were asked to identify the specific item. Data from responses to this question are presented on Tables I, IX, and XVII. Organizational efficiency was selected by a meaningful number in all three groups as the primary reason for reorganization. Presidents said 34.4 per cent of the reorganizations were primarily the result of organizational efficiency, deans (vice presidents) said 52.3 per cent were for this reason, and division chairs said 47.1 per cent were for this reason. Rankings for the second most important reason for reorganizing were varied from the three groups of respondents. Presidents named the same reason they had as the primary reason when they said organizational efficiency was the second most important reason for 25.0 per cent of the reorganizations. Deans (vice presidents), however, said 25.0 per cent of the reorganizations were the result of creative or innovative reasons, making it their secondary reason. Division chairs said 26.5 per cent of the reorganizations were the result of financial efficiency, making it their secondary reason.

The third research question was, What strategies were utilized in bringing about reorganization? Question 2 on the questionnaire provided data for this question. This question asked the respondents to place in rank order the kinds of input that was used in planning for reorganization. The six-item list included input from deans (vice presidents) and division
chairs, recommendations of faculty committee, recommendations of faculty organization (or Senate), memorandum to faculty asking for input, no input requested, and "other" (with a blank for designating what other input had been used). Data from this question are presented on Tables II, X, and XVIII.

Presidents and deans (vice presidents) were closer in agreement than were division chairs in responses to this question. Presidents said that for an overwhelming 83.9 per cent of the reorganizations input from deans (vice presidents) was the primary source used in planning for reorganization. Deans (vice presidents) said that input from deans (vice presidents) was used for 61.4 per cent of the reorganizations. Division chairs agreed that input from deans (vice presidents) was the primary input used for 38.2 per cent of the reorganizations, but "other" and no input requested were also meaningful. "Other" (discussed with Table XVIII) was ranked by division chairs as the primary input used for 32.4 per cent, and no input requested was named for 26.5 per cent of the reorganizations.

The fourth research question was, What was the president's perception of his/her role in reorganization? Presidents' responses to Questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 on the questionnaire provided data for this question. Data are presented on Tables V, VI, VII, and VIII. In ranking those who had leadership roles in reorganization, presidents ranked themselves as by far the primary leader in the implementation process with a 75.7
per cent response. Asked to rate their role in the overall reorganization on a scale of one to five, almost half (48.6 per cent) selected two, indicating that the reorganization was almost totally a presidential decision. In a similar rating of how they used input from deans (vice presidents) and division chairs, a majority (58.1 per cent) of them selected one, indicating they made much use of that input. Asked how they evaluated the effectiveness of the reorganization, presidents said that oral feedback was the method used most often. It was mentioned twenty-three times. No percentages could be calculated since they were asked to check all responses that applied for every reorganization. "Other" (discussed with Table VIII) was selected ten times. No other responses were meaningful.

The fifth research question was, What were the perceptions of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs of the president's role in reorganization? Responses of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs to Questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 on the questionnaire provided data for this research question. Data from deans (vice presidents) are presented on Tables XIII, XIV, XV, and XVI; and data from division chairs are presented on Tables XXI, XXII, XXIII, and XXIV. When deans (vice presidents) ranked the leaders in the implementation process, the majority (57.8 per cent) showed their agreement with presidents that the presidents were the primary leaders. Division chairs were in agreement with a 60.0 per cent
There was agreement with the presidents when the deans (vice presidents) and division chairs rated their perceptions of the president's role in the overall reorganization on a scale of one to five. Number 2 (almost totally a presidential decision) was selected by 50.0 per cent of the deans (vice presidents) and by 38.2 per cent of the division chairs. In a similar rating of the perceptions of the use of input from other administrators, deans (vice presidents) agreed with the presidents when 43.2 per cent selected Number 1, indicating much use of other input. Perceptions from division chairs differed on this question because 29.4 per cent selected Number 2 (moderate use), and 26.5 per cent selected Number 4 (some use). Deans (vice presidents) were in agreement with presidents in selecting the method of evaluation used most often. Thirty-one responses indicated oral feedback as the primary method, but no feedback requested was selected sixteen times. Division chairs differed from the two other groups by selecting no feedback requested twenty times and oral feedback thirteen times.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, INFERENCES, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was concerned with describing perceptions of the president's role in organizational changes in two Texas metropolitan community college districts. The purposes included tracing major changes in organizational structure of the colleges from the fall of 1975 to the spring of 1985, ascertaining perceptions of the reasons for those changes, determining the strategies utilized in effecting those changes, ascertaining the presidents' perceptions of their own roles in the reorganization process, and obtaining perceptions of chancellors, deans (vice presidents), and division chairs about the president's role in reorganization.

These purposes were accomplished by obtaining perceptions about reorganization from chancellors, presidents, deans (vice presidents), and division chairs. Perceptions of the chancellor of the Tarrant County Junior College District (TCJCD), the chancellor of the Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD), and the chancellor emeritus of the DCCCD were obtained during personal interviews. Perceptions of the presidents were
obtained from their responses to the questionnaire designed for this study and from personal interviews, using the interview schedule as a guide (See Appendix C). Perceptions of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs were obtained from their responses to the same questionnaire that was completed by the presidents. There was a 100 per cent response rate from the three chancellors and the ten presidents. There was a 68.8 per cent response rate from the deans (vice presidents) and division chairs in the two districts since fifty-three of the seventy-seven administrators at these two levels responded. The overall response rate was 73.3 per cent.

Responses obtained during the interviews with the chancellors and the presidents were presented in narrative form in Chapter 4 of this study. Responses from presidents, deans (vice presidents), and division chairs about the kinds of reorganizations that had occurred during the ten-year period under study are presented in list form in Chapter 4. Descriptive statistics (i.e. response frequencies and percentages) were gathered from the questionnaires to show perceptions of the presidents, deans (vice presidents), and division chairs about these reorganizations. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings, to draw inferences and implications, and to make recommendations.

Findings

An analysis of the data accumulated in answering the
research questions of this study has been presented in Chapter IV. A summary of those findings is presented below.

Research Question 1. What major organizational changes have been made since the beginning of the fall semester 1975? The list of reorganizations identified by the presidents totaled thirty-one. Major items on this list included the restructuring of administrative responsibilities, reduction in the number of administrators, reduction in the number of divisions, and restructuring of divisions. In most reorganizations, there was a combining of duties and responsibilities to provide for greater efficiency. For all of the reorganizations identified by the presidents, there was a decrease of twenty-nine administrative positions. Only one resulted in an increase in the number of administrators: a second dean (vice president) of instruction was added to relieve a heavy supervisory load. More than three-fourths (77.4 per cent) of the presidents said the reorganizations resulted in financial savings for the college.

Deans (vice presidents) and division chairs identified a total of seventy-eight reorganizations that had occurred during the ten-year time period covered by this study. Forty-four of these were named by deans (vice presidents), and thirty-four were named by division chairs. Similar to the presidents' list, the major items named by these two groups had to do with the restructuring of administrative
responsibilities, reduction in the number of administrators, restructuring of divisions, reclassification of division chairs as administrators, and reduction in the number of divisions. Deans (vice presidents) said there was a decrease of twenty-six administrative positions and an increase of twelve positions at that level. Division chairs said there had been a decrease of twenty-one administrative positions and an increase of fifteen. No percentages could be calculated because only totals were asked for in response to this question. Almost one-half (46.7 per cent) of these two groups indicated that the reorganizations resulted in a financial savings.

Research Question 2. What were the perceptions of the reasons for those organizational changes? Respondents ranked twelve items, including an "other" category, in answering this question. All three groups ranked organizational efficiency as Number 1. Presidents ranked this reason both as Number 1 (34.4 per cent) and Number 2 (25.0 per cent). Data from the deans (vice presidents) showed 52.3 per cent ranking this item as Number 1 and from the division chairs 47.1 per cent. The second most important reason for reorganization as ranked by the deans (vice presidents) was creative or innovative reasons (25.0 per cent) and by division chairs, financial efficiency (26.5 per cent). The third most important reason as ranked by the presidents was creative or innovative reasons (21.9 per
cent); by deans, organizational efficiency (22.7 per cent); and by division chairs, organizational efficiency (17.6 per cent).

Even though financial efficiency was ranked at a meaningful level by only the division chairs, both it and budget cuts received a number of rankings by all three of the groups. In the discussion of the community college movement found in the literature, concerns about financial matters were mentioned frequently and were even specified as a reason for reorganization in higher education (6, 8, 9).

The needs that have demanded reorganization in the past are still present today. And it appears those needs may be intensified, especially in colleges located in states that depend upon oil as a source of educational revenue.

"Higher-education officials in oil-producing areas are bracing themselves for major cuts in state appropriations following recent sharp declines in petroleum prices," Jaschik said in a February, 1986, story in The Chronicle of Higher Education (4). He quoted Kenneth H. Ashworth, Texas Commissioner of Higher Education, as having "... called the recent price decline 'very bad news' that would have 'considerable impact' on higher education" (4). As a result of the crisis, State Comptroller Bob Bullock called "... top elected officials to a hurried summit on Thursday to discuss the evolving state fiscal crisis brought on by the severe drop in oil prices" (3).
When presidents were interviewed, they mentioned dealing with personnel problems as an additional reason for reorganizing. Six (60.0 per cent) of the presidents made a direct reference to personnel problems during the personal interviews. On the questionnaire, there was a category called elimination of ineffective personnel, but it did not receive enough responses to be meaningful.

Research Question 3. What strategies were utilized in bringing about reorganization? Respondents were asked to rank the kinds of input they had used in planning for reorganization. All three of the groups were in agreement in responding to this question in that they selected input from deans (vice presidents) as the primary source of assistance in planning. Presidents had the most decisive number of responses by indicating that for 83.9 per cent of the reorganizations they utilized input from deans (vice presidents) as the primary strategy at the planning stage. None of the other categories received enough responses to be meaningful. These data were supported in the personal interviews. All indicated that they had used the deans (vice presidents) in planning for reorganization.

Deans (vice presidents) gave a 61.4 per cent response to input from deans (vice presidents) and 22.7 per cent to "other." Division chairs selected input from deans (vice presidents) for 38.2 of the reorganizations, "other" for 32.4 per cent, and no input requested for 26.5 per cent.
Research Question 4. What was the president's perception of his/her role in reorganization? Four items on the questionnaire provided data for this research question. Presidents were asked to rank the leaders in the implementation of the reorganization, to rate their perceptions of their overall role, to rate their perceptions of the role of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs in the implementation process, and to check the evaluation process they used after reorganizing. Presidents ranked themselves as the primary leader for 75.7 per cent of the reorganizations. These perceptions are consistent with the literature that named the president as the primary leader of a college (2). Martorana said, "They have had to react quickly and effectively to changing economic, social, technical, and occupational conditions" (5). And these changing conditions have prompted the need for reorganization many times. In rating their role on a scale of one to five, presidents selected a two for 48.6 per cent of the reorganizations and a three for 29 per cent. A one was defined on the instrument as a total presidential decision. This rating was given to 19.3 per cent of the reorganizations. The two rating indicated it was almost a total presidential decision, and a three indicated the president played an important role but he shared his role in the reorganization with other administrative levels.
In rating the use of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs on a scale of one to five, the majority of the presidents indicated they made much use of input from these levels in implementing reorganization. One (much use) was selected for 58.0 per cent of the reorganizations, and two (moderate use) was selected for 29.0 per cent.

Presidents checked oral feedback twenty-three times, making it the most frequently mentioned category, when they evaluated the effectiveness of the reorganizations. No feedback requested received only three responses.

Research Question 5. What were the perceptions of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs of the president's role in reorganization? Data used in answering this question came from responses of deans (vice presidents) and division chairs to the same four questions that were used in answering Research Question 4. When deans (vice presidents) ranked their perceptions of who had the greatest leadership role in the implementation process, they indicated that for 57.8 per cent of the reorganizations the presidents were the primary leaders. Perceptions of division chairs were almost the same. They ranked the presidents as the primary leaders for 60.0 per cent of the reorganizations. In rating the president's role on a scale of one to five, deans (vice presidents) selected two (almost a total presidential decision) for 50.0 per cent of the reorganizations and one (total presidential decision) for
25.0 per cent. Division chairs selected two (almost a total presidential decision) for 38.2 per cent of the reorganizations and three (shared role) for 29.4 per cent.

More differences in perceptions become evident when observing how deans (vice presidents) and division chairs rated the use of their input by their presidents. This rating was on a scale of one to five. Deans (vice presidents) selected one for 43.2 per cent of the reorganizations, indicating their input was used much. They selected two for 25.0 per cent, indicating a moderate use of their input. Division chairs selected one for 20.6 per cent of the reorganizations, indicating their input was used much. This percentage is a contrast to the presidents' perceptions of 58.0 per cent. Division chairs selected two (moderate use) for 29.4 per cent. They selected four for 26.5 per cent of the reorganizations, showing their perception that their input was utilized only some of the time. This rating was next to none on the scale.

When deans (vice presidents) indicated the type of evaluation used in determining the effectiveness of reorganization, they selected oral feedback as their first choice, mentioning it thirty-one times. Division chairs selected no input requested twenty times, making it their first choice. They gave thirteen responses to oral feedback. Presidents and deans (vice presidents) were in agreement on this question, but division chairs perceived it
differently. No percentages could be calculated since respondents were asked to check all of the categories that applied to each reorganization.

Inferences

1. Reorganizations have occurred at community colleges during the period from the fall of 1975 through the spring of 1985.

2. Administrative level is not a factor in perceptions of whether reorganization has occurred since all three levels of administrators listed changes.

3. Administrative level is not a factor in perceptions of the kinds of reorganizations that have occurred since all three groups listed similar kinds of changes.

4. Administrative level is a factor in perceptions of whether there has been an increase or decrease in the number of administrative positions. The higher the level, the greater the perception that there has been a decrease. Similarly, the lower the level, the greater the perception there has been an increase.

5. Administrative level is a factor in perceptions of whether there has been a financial savings realized in the reorganization. Presidents said there was a financial savings for more than 25.0 per cent more reorganizations than deans (vice presidents) and division chairs did.

6. Administrative level is not a factor in perceptions of the reasons for reorganization. This inference is based on the fact that perceptions of all respondents were very
similar. They selected their most important responses from only three of the categories.

7. Since such a large percentage of the responses referred to the same reasons, it can be concluded that the college is not a factor in reasons for reorganization.

8. Financial matters have been a concern, but they will become an increasingly important concern for presidents and will be a major stimulant for future reorganization.

9. Based on findings in the interviews and in the literature, personnel or staffing is an important consideration in reorganization.

10. Presidents relied on deans (vice presidents) for assistance in making plans for reorganization.

11. Administrative level is a factor in perceptions of the kind of input that was used in planning for reorganization. The higher the administrative level, the greater the perception that the input of deans (vice presidents) was utilized at the planning level.

12. Presidents perceived themselves as being very strong leaders in their colleges.

13. Administrators in colleges understand the role of the president in reorganization.

14. Presidents perceived themselves as being in a close team relationship in implementing reorganization. They see themselves as the primary leaders but with strong support from other administrative levels. This inference is supported by the information gathered during the personal
interviews. The presidents consistently said they relied heavily on the deans (vice presidents), division chairs, and other appropriate levels in implementing reorganization. During the discussions, they placed heavy emphasis on involvement.

15. Presidents believe feedback is necessary following reorganization.

16. Presidents perceive that they do receive feedback from other administrators and faculty after reorganization has occurred.

17. Deans (vice presidents) and division chairs agree that presidents do have the primary role in implementing reorganization. They perceive that role, however, as being greater than the presidents themselves do. This inference is drawn because the greatest amount of data from the presidents came from the two and three ratings, but from deans (vice presidents) and division chairs, it came from the one and two ratings.

18. Administrative level is a factor in determining perceptions of the use of input by deans (vice presidents) and division chairs in the implementation process. The higher the administrative level, the greater the perception of the use of that input.

19. Deans (vice presidents) and division chairs do perceive there is a team effort in the implementation process, but they perceive the president to be a much
stronger leader in that process and to make use of less input from others than the presidents themselves do.

20. Deans (vice presidents) and division chairs perceive the need for feedback following reorganization.

21. Administrative level is a factor in perceptions of the type of feedback used in evaluating the effectiveness of reorganization. The lower the administrative level, the greater the perception that no feedback was requested.

A general conclusion from the data obtained both from the questionnaires and the personal interviews with the presidents is that the process of reorganization is a delicate one and that positive suggestions for effecting that process would be most welcome. One of the purposes of this research was to gather data to use in preparing a suggested guide for administrators when they find reorganization necessary. That plan is presented in Numbers one through four under Recommendations.

Implications

Responses to these research questions show that reorganization is not an idea whose time has come and gone, but that it is an integral part of the life of a college as it attempts to survive in a fast-changing world. Even though the literature did not support the idea, the data gathered in this study revealed that reorganization has taken place, even in the two, relatively new, dynamic community college districts used in this study. The
literature did have a great deal of information about subjects pertaining to reorganization, but little was written about reorganization itself. The general concept of change was a prominent topic in the literature as were the role of the president, leadership, and problems that presidents were currently dealing with.

Because of the void in the literature about the president's role in reorganization, this study was undertaken to describe that role. "The objective of educational research is to discover, reinforce, or refine knowledge. Research is carried out because we want to know something..." (1). This study broadens the base of knowledge about reorganization in colleges and provides a suggested plan for reorganizing, based on the data collected.

Since presidents have been identified as the primary leaders of a college, they must lead in reorganization as well as in other administrative functions. An application of the six functions of management as identified by Miller is appropriate when a president finds reorganization necessary. These functions are Leading, Evaluating and Controlling, Organizing, Planning, Staffing or Personnel, and Coordination (7). As the primary leader of the institution, the president provides a base upon which good organization can work and upon which effective reorganization can take place. When the organization is not working as effectively as it should be, the president should
set the stage for improvements to be made. As the data have shown, he/she does this by providing the leadership necessary for change to take place and also by having the flexibility to involve all appropriate levels of personnel. Presidents should not only identify areas in which reorganization is needed, but they should be open as both administrators and faculty suggest areas in which effective changes can be made.

After a need for reorganization has been identified, a president should establish an organized structure so that the process of change can begin. He/she should establish the appropriate conditions for teamwork among other administrators and faculty. This process can occur by utilizing a faculty organization, a committee structure that is already in place, or new committees. Following the establishment of the organizational framework, the president should allow the planning stage to be implemented. As the process continues, the president should fill a coordinating role. He/she should provide motivation, assistance in accomplishing objectives, and communication. As recommendations are made and decisions reached, the president should consider the impact of the decisions upon the staff of the institution, realizing the importance of the role that staffing has in the overall success of the institution. After the reorganization has been implemented, the president should provide a vehicle for immediate and long-range evaluation. This step can be a vital link in the
success of the process. It can make a difference in the acceptance or rejection of the change by other administrators and faculty, and it can make the difference in staff morale after reorganization has occurred. And, the matter should not be closed after the reorganization is over. If problems have been caused by the change, the president must be open to further change. In fact, there should be a built-in monitoring process so that feedback can be given at later times. The president should always be open to continuing informal feedback, and an opportunity for formal evaluation should be provided one year after the change has occurred. Involvement and communication are the keys to the success and acceptance of any reorganization.

Recommendations

Based on a review of the literature, interviews with the presidents and chancellors, impressions and perceptions gained through the questionnaire, the following recommendations are presented here for implementation and further study.

1. Presidents should communicate with all levels of administration and faculty when reorganization is imminent so that good administrative and faculty morale can be maintained and misunderstandings can be kept at a minimum.

2. Presidents should be sure that other administrators and faculty understand the reasons why reorganization is necessary. This communication will build trust, prevent
second guessing, and keep the lines of communication open.

3. Presidents should utilize all appropriate levels of administration and faculty in planning for and in implementing reorganization. The use of faculty organizations or faculty committees is recommended as a device for gathering data and making recommendations for reorganizations in which the faculty will be directly affected.

4. Presidents should coordinate the reorganization process and work toward harmony among all of the staff as reorganization is implemented.

5. Presidents would be well-advised to do more overt evaluation after every major reorganization. The recommendation is that a formal evaluation be conducted at the end of the semester in which the reorganization has occurred and another one year later. As an essential part of these evaluations, presidents should maintain the flexibility of being willing to make further adjustments if they will be of benefit to the college.

6. Presidents should recognize the importance of the role of other administrators and the faculty and should realize the psychological, emotional, and physical impact upon them when change occurs.

Following is a list of recommendations for further study.

1. This study was limited to the administrative levels
selected. Further insight could be gained by surveying all administrative levels and the faculty at colleges where major reorganizations have occurred within the past five years.

2. This study was also limited to the two community college districts designated. Future research should include a survey of at least the five largest community college districts in the state of Texas, using the same levels of administration as were used in this study. Further study would not need to include personal interviews with presidents. These interviews for this study served only to support data that was obtained from the questionnaires.

3. A case study of one college in each of the two districts used in this study would contribute depth and insight into the bank of information about reorganization and about the leadership style of presidents.

4. Future studies should cover a shorter period of time since personnel change frequently and since respondents are limited to what they can remember as they complete a questionnaire. An appropriate time period would be either three or five years.

5. A final recommendation based on the findings of this study and a review of the related literature is that reorganization will continue to be a way of life for community colleges. Thus, it will be appropriate for future
research to be conducted, investigating the many aspects of the process, broadening the base of literature that is now available, and providing further insight and guidance for administrators of the future.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET
For Deans (Vice Presidents) and Division Chairs

I. ____________________________ Name

II. Name of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tarrant County Junior College District</th>
<th>Dallas County Community College District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ Northeast Campus</td>
<td>___ Brookhaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Northwest Campus</td>
<td>___ Cedar Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ South Campus</td>
<td>___ Eastfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ El Centro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ North Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Richland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. ____________________________ Position

IV. _______ Number of years in present position.

V. _______ Total number of years at this institution.

VI. _______ Total number of years as a dean (vice president) or division chair.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Instructions:

1. Please answer the following questions according to the best information available, even if you were not in an administrative position at the time that reorganization occurred.

2. In designating changes, please list only those that occurred from the division level upward. This study is not concerned with curriculum changes.

II. Changes in Organizational Structure:

A. Did the organization of your college or campus undergo major changes from September 1975 to May 1985?

   yes  no

B. If yes, in which academic year(s) were those changes made?

   1975-76
   1976-77  1979-80  1982-83
   1977-78  1980-81  1983-84

C. Identify the changes below (add more numbers if needed). For each change that you list, please complete the appropriate packet enclosed in this envelope.

1. Change No. 1:

2. Change No. 2:

3. Change No. 3:
Instructions: Please indicate your responses to the questions in this packet for Change No. _.

1. What were the reasons for the reorganization (Please rank all items that apply in ascending order of importance beginning with 1.)?

   EXAMPLE: 1 = the most important reason
   2 = the second most important reason

   ____ Budget cuts
   ____ Enrollment decrease
   ____ Elimination of ineffective personnel
   ____ Recommendation from chancellor
   ____ Board action
   ____ Legislative action
   ____ Influence from faculty
   ____ Creative or innovative reasons
   ____ Financial efficiency
   ____ Organizational efficiency
   ____ Achievement of institutional goals
   ____ Other (Please identify)

2. What procedures were followed in planning for this reorganization (Please rank: 1, 2, 3, etc. according to Example in Question 1.)?

   ____ Input from deans (vice presidents) and division chairs
   ____ Recommendations of faculty committee
   ____ Recommendations of faculty organization (or Senate)
   ____ Memorandum to faculty asking for input
   ____ No input requested
   ____ Other (Explain)

3. Did the reorganization result in a change in staffing?

   ____ yes  ____ no

   If yes, what were the changes (Place a number in the blank indicating an increase or decrease in the number of staff positions affected by the reorganization and circle either Increase or Decrease)?

   ____ Increase/Decrease in number of faculty/staff positions
   ____ Increase/Decrease in number of administrative positions
   ____ Increase/Decrease in number of divisions
4. Did the reorganization result in a financial savings (Please check one)?
   ______ yes ______ no ______ Information not available

5. Who had a leadership role in the implementation of the reorganization (Please rank 1, 2, 3, etc. according to Example in Question 1.)?
   ______ President
   ______ Deans (Vice Presidents)
   ______ Division Chairs
   ______ Department Chairs (Where applicable)
   ______ Other

6. What is your perception of the president's role in this reorganization (Please circle one)?
   1 = Total presidential decision
   5 = The president had very little input in the reorganization
   1  2  3  4  5

7. What is your perception of how input from deans (vice presidents) and division chairs was used (Please circle one)?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Much Moderate Slight Some None

8. How did you evaluate the effectiveness of the reorganization (Check all which apply)?
   ______ Oral feedback
   ______ Memorandum requesting subjective feedback
   ______ Questionnaire asking for specific feedback
   ______ No feedback requested
   ______ Other

   Check if you would like to receive a copy of the results of this questionnaire.
APPENDIX C

Chancellors Interviewed:

Dr. Jan LeCroy, Chancellor
Dallas County Community College District
701 Elm
Dallas, Texas 75202

Dr. Joe B. Rushing, Chancellor
Tarrant County Junior College District
May Owen Center
1500 Houston Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Chancellor Emeritus Interviewed:

Dr. Bill Priest, Chancellor Emeritus
% President's Office
Richland College
12800 Abrams Road
Dallas, Texas 75243-2799
APPENDIX D

Sample of Letter to Chancellors

Dr. Joe B. Rushing, Chancellor
May Owen Center
1500 Houston Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Dear Dr. Rushing:

I am writing to ask your cooperation in the completion of the research for my doctoral dissertation on The President's Role in Reorganization in Two Texas Metropolitan Community Colleges. I am pursuing the doctorate at NTSU, and my major is higher education.

The plan is for me to interview you and the chancellor and former chancellor of the Dallas County Community College District, asking for your overall appraisal of the major campus reorganizations which have taken place during the past ten years. The study will be from the division level upward, but it will not include the district office.

With your approval, presidents on each campus in your district will then be interviewed. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire which will be used as a guide during the interviews.

At the conclusion of the interviews with the presidents, I will leave enough copies of the questionnaire and a cover letter for each dean and division chair to be completed within a two-week period.

I am asking for you to notify each of the campus presidents about the upcoming interview and of your approval of the project. I am also asking for you to send me a letter of acceptance of the project, and I will include that letter in the Appendix of the dissertation.

My committee has approved this study, and it can begin as soon as I receive your approval. Thank you very much for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Joe L. Norton
Director of Student Publications
APPENDIX E

Validation of the Instrument

To validate the instrument, the following panel of five administrative leaders in higher education were selected:

Dr. Ray Hawkins, President
Tyler Junior College
1400 E. Fifth St.
P.O. Box 9020
Tyler, Texas 75711

Dr. Bill Miller, Chairman
Division of Higher Education
North Texas State University
P.O. Box 13857
Denton, Texas 76203

Dr. Gale Neff
Director of Curriculum Development and Evaluation
Tarrant County Junior College District
May Owen Center
1500 Houston
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Dr. Jack Stone, Vice Chancellor of Educational Affairs
Dallas County Community College District
701 Elm
Dallas, Texas 75202-3299

Jimmie Styles, Vice Chancellor
In Charge of Research and Development
Tarrant County Junior College District
May Owen Center
1500 Houston
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
This letter is a request for your assistance in gathering data for my doctoral dissertation on The President's role in Reorganization in Two Texas Metropolitan Community Colleges. I am pursuing the doctorate at NTSU, and my major is higher education.

A number of colleges, not only in the metroplex but also across the nation, have reorganized during the past ten years. The purpose of this study will be to assess the role of the president in reorganization. The study will be from the division level upward, but it will not include the district office.

I have interviewed the chancellors of the Tarrant County Junior College District and the Dallas County Community College District. The chancellor of your district has approved the study; and my next step is to do the research on your campus with your approval.

Specifically, I am asking you to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me as soon as it is convenient for you. Pages 2 and 3 should be completed for each major reorganization which your campus has undergone during the past ten years. The next step will be for me to conduct a personal interview with you, and we will explore some of the items on the questionnaire in more depth.

At the conclusion of our interview, I will leave enough copies of the questionnaire and a cover letter for all administrators from the vice president level down to the division chair level to complete. I will pick these completed questionnaires up at your office at the end of two weeks.

I am hoping that you will see the positive benefits of this study and that it will not be an inconvenience to you.

I will call your office very soon to ask for an appointment. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Joe L. Norton
Director of Student Publications
Currently I am involved in a study of The President's Role in Reorganization in Two Texas Metropolitan Community Colleges, and I am hoping to have your assistance in gathering data. I am pursuing the doctorate at NTSU, and my major is higher education.

I have conducted interviews with the chancellors of Tarrant County Junior College District and Dallas County Community College District, and the president of your campus.

The study is concerned with major organizational changes, from the division level upward but not including the district office. The time period for the study is the past ten years.

It would be very helpful if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope to the president's office. Please complete one of the packets of the questionnaire for each major organizational change which has occurred during the past ten years. Additional copies of those pages are in your president's office, if needed.

My plan is to pick up the questionnaires from the president's office at the end of a two-week period. The information will not be seen by anyone except me, and it will be presented anonymously in the dissertation.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Joe L. Norton
Director of Student Publications
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