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"The community college as an institution is one of the most important innovations in the history of higher education. . . . The driving premise of the community college--higher education for everyone--is a pivotal educational innovation not just for America, but for the world" (O'Banion, 1989, p. 1). The 85 year growth of this innovation resulted in more than 1,200 community colleges (Deegan, 1989). "The period from the late 1950s to the mid-1970s was a period of special growth when bigger was often equated with better. Colleges grew in size; some community college districts became 'multicampus', and organizational units within colleges became larger" (p. 200).

The formation of multicampuses was seen as a way to "maintain quality with diversity, individualization in spite of numbers, and close community identity within an expanding administrative structure" (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969, p.1). Concern was expressed as to how this could be accomplished.

As multiunit community college systems developed, "there was little focus on changing existing concepts of administration and governance, based primarily on experience with single-unit institutions" (Richardson, 1973, p. 141). The reason this occurred was "the ideal type is the single-unit institution" (p. 141). This philosophy was the basis for the assumption that the effectiveness of the
multiunit community college would be enhanced as the units within the system "approach the degree of autonomy afforded the free-standing institution" (p. 141).

At a meeting of the Commission on Administration of the American Association of Junior Colleges in Boston in 1968, commission members expressed their concerns and questions facing administrators of multiunit community junior colleges. The problems identified at that time were "the concept of autonomy for individual campuses, of centralized and decentralized functions and services, and the general organizational structure for multi-unit operations" (Jones, 1968, p. 5). The issue underlying all the problems identified was the "matter of the philosophy for organization and administration" (p. 5) of multiunit community junior colleges. Traditionally colleges and universities had been autonomous, discrete units, but the commission recognized that the multiunit organization was challenging that idea.

Wynn (1973) recognized the need to study the administration of multicampus two-year colleges because the growth of them "had been so rapid that documentation has fallen behind. Current practices have been largely communicated by word-of-mouth on an informal basis. It is generally recognized that there is great diversity in styles of organization and administration" (p. 10-11). Multiunit districts "often evolved without any clear guidelines and without a philosophical basis for management of this new institutional structure" (Wattenbarger, 1977, p. 9).
The issue of autonomy in multiunit community college systems was directly related to the organization and administration of the system, which had not been simple or easily clarified. Monroe (1972) described it in this way: "the problem is not so much how to expand the curriculum and the faculty, or how to build more buildings, but how to allocate to each operating unit, or campus, a reasonable amount of power and autonomy" (p. 397).

Buckner's (1975) study, which investigated the role of the chief executive officer in two different multiunit community colleges, concluded "the role of the executive administrative officials at both the institution and district levels must be clarified" (p. 3). A concern identified by Lombardi (1964) in establishing multicampus districts concentrated on the framework of administration for the district. Two options were available. Each campus would be part of a junior college with a president, a dean of instruction, and a dean of admissions or each campus would have its own independent administrators with a large degree of autonomy.

Individuals who studied the multiunit community college development concluded it was difficult to assess or be informed about the administration and leadership of the units within multiunit community colleges because they had received little attention in the literature. Buckner (1975) recommended "studies are needed to examine the role and interrelationships of campus and unit college chief executive positions. The role of the individual unit chief executive officer is in need of clarification" (p. 168). Jensen's (1965a)
study of ten multicampus community college districts found two dominant concerns emerging: achieving greater campus autonomy and achieving more status for campus administrators.

Powell (1983) discovered that the lack of information about campus chief executive officers has implications for the identification, recruitment, selection, and retention of that group of college administrators. In addition, that same lack of information resulted in inconsistent perceptions by governing boards, coordinating councils, legislators, the academic community, students, and the community-at-large.

The need for having a better understanding about the administration of units within a multiunit district was more clearly recognized after hearing the following statement made by one of the administrators interviewed for this study. He said:

There is no doubt in anyone's mind it is much more difficult to work in a multicollege district. It is much more difficult to be president in a multicollege district. I think if you can be a president in a multicollege environment, you can be a president anywhere.

Statement of the Problem

Studies examining the administration of the individual units within a multiunit system are limited. The early development of multiunit institutions, the issue of centralization vs. decentralization, and the administration of multiunit systems were discussed in previous studies (Buckner, 1975; Chang, 1978; Jenkens & Rossmeier,
1974: Jensen, 1965a, 1965b, 1984; Jensen, Kintzer, & Hansen, 1969; Jones, 1968; Lee & Bowen, 1975; Miller & Norton, 1987; VanTrease, 1972; Wattenbarger, 1977; Wilch, 1986; Wynn, 1973), but none examined the chief administrative position of a unit within a multiunit organization. Unit administrators were involved in previous multiunit community college studies but their participation contributed to gathering information about their perceptions of the chief district administrator's role and the relationships between the district and unit administrator. Those studies were conducted to better understand the chief district administrator's role in a multiunit district, not the chief unit administrator's role. Very little descriptive data about the chief campus administrator were available.

A need existed for an increased understanding of the role and responsibilities of the unit administrator as that individual was important to the total operation of the multiunit community college district. The role and function of the unit administrator was a factor in the degree of autonomy and control each unit had within a system and was a factor that was not consistent among multiunit systems. Understanding the role of the unit administrator involved an examination of both the management and administrative responsibilities.

A void in the literature regarding self-perceptions of multiunit community college administrators strengthened the need for researching the chief unit administrator's role. Other research that focused on community college administration studied the president or
chief executive officer's position, or the academic dean/dean of instruction, or the dean of student services, or dean of vocational/occupational education, but none examined the unit administrator within a multiunit community college. The position of the chief unit administrator within a multiunit community college district was unique as compared to other administrative positions.

There was a need to become better informed about multiunit community college districts. "Multi-campus two-year institutions have had and show every sign of continuing to have sustained growth as the needs of society which conceived them show no signs of diminishing" (Wynn, 1973, p. 3). Having a better understanding of the organization and administration of units within multiunit community college systems can contribute to the viability and success of the multiunit district itself.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators within multiunit community college districts. The process involved determining what the roles and responsibilities of the chief unit administrators in multiunit districts were, collecting information about the perceptions the administrators had toward their roles, and making comparisons in the roles and responsibilities of the unit administrators included in the study. In the course of the study, the following questions were addressed:
1. What was the profile of individuals who hold positions as chief unit administrators within a multiunit community college district?

2. What roles and responsibilities were ascribed to the chief unit administrator?

3. From the chief unit administrator's perspective, what was the relationship between the chief unit administrator and central office?

4. What was the relationship between the chief unit administrators within a multiunit community college district?

5. What management functions were performed by the chief unit administrator within a multiunit community college district?

The goals of the study were accomplished by completing a literature review about multiunit community colleges, conducting personal interviews with chief unit administrators in multiunit community college districts, seeking responses by chief unit administrators to a questionnaire, and reviewing documents, as job descriptions, organizational charts, and college catalogs of those multiunit community college districts included in the study.

Significance of the Study

A scarcity of research exists specifically regarding the role of the chief unit administrator within multiunit community colleges. The
numbers of chief unit administrators increased significantly in the past 30 years because the number of multiunit districts increased.

Knowing more about the individuals presently serving in those positions would aid in identifying the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators in multiunit districts. Having that information could provide new perspectives to individuals presently in chief unit administrator positions. An increased understanding and awareness of the position would assist in the preparation and selection of leaders for those positions. The information could be used to assess the skills and knowledge required for a chief unit administrator.

A study as this could improve relationships between unit administrators and central office, faculty, students, and the community because more would be understood about the position. The information could also be used by the board of directors of multiunit community college districts to have knowledge of the position and its responsibilities.

Ultimately having the information would result in a clarification of the responsibilities of the chief unit administrator and an improved understanding about the interrelationships involving the chief unit administrator in a multiunit district.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions will clarify the terms used in this study:
**Administration:** The process of "managing the details of executive affairs" (Mackenzie, 1969, p. 87).

**Administrator:** "One who (a) directs the activities of other persons and (b) undertakes the responsibility for achieving certain objectives through these efforts" (Katz, 1975, p. 20).

**Autonomy:** The prerogative of the units within a multiunit district to promote their own institutional style.

**Central office:** The location of the chief district administrator and staff who work with the campus administrators. The central office is also called the district office.

**Centralization:** "The clustering of decision-making responsibilities at a certain level within the organization" (LaHay, 1985, p.5).

**Chief unit administrator:** The position held by the top administrator of a single campus, college, or branch within a multiunit community college district. Common titles for this position include dean, president, director, or vice president.

**Community college:** A two-year institution of higher education offering programs in general education, vocational/technical education, transfer education, developmental education, and community education.

**Decentralization:** "The dispersal of decision-making responsibilities to various levels within the organization" (LaHay, 1985, p.6).

**Management:** The process of "achieving objectives through others" (Mackenzie, 1969, p. 80).
Multicampus community college district: A district operating two or more campuses within its district where the central office is strong and a minimum amount of local authority is available to the campus.

Multicommunity college district: A district which operates two or more individual comprehensive colleges within its district where maximum local authority is given to the individual college with coordinated services provided by a central office.

Multiunit chief district administrator: The principal administrative officer of a multiunit community college district responsible for the direction of all operations. The title associated with this office is chancellor, president, superintendent, or provost.

Multiunit community college district: A community or technical college district operating two or more sites within its service area under one governing board and administered by a central or district office. Each site has a separate chief unit administrator. This does not include statewide systems or university operated systems.

Unit: The campus, college, or branch that is one part of a multiunit community college district.

Limitations of the Study

Consideration of the following limitations is recommended in making interpretations and conclusions from the study:

1. The investigation of chief unit administrative roles was limited to three multiunit community college districts.
2. The data collection was limited to an examination of institution documents, responses to a questionnaire, and responses to a structured personal interview.

3. The study participants were limited to those individuals presently serving as chief unit administrators in the three multiunit community college districts studied.

4. All generalizations drawn applied only to the chief unit administrators in the three districts studied, and any inferences drawn to other chief unit administrators in other multiunit districts were speculative.

5. The campus administrator response questionnaire and the structured interview guide were of no tested validity.

6. The study was limited by the researcher's analysis and the presentation of the analysis of data.

7. Although measures were taken to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of those interviewed for the study, some respondents may have chosen to describe only the positive aspects of issues and concerns rather than the negative aspects.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study:

1. That the chief unit administrators selected for the study would complete the data collection instrument and personal interview and supply the researcher with requested documents.
2. That it is possible to describe the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators in multiunit community college districts.

3. That Mackenzie's (1969) management model can be used to describe and analyze the responsibilities of the chief unit administrators.

4. That the spring of 1991 was an appropriate time to conduct the data collection for this study.

5. That the researcher would be able to draw conclusions from the study findings.

Summary

The goals of this study were to identify the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators within multiunit community college districts. Chapter 2 describes the literature review used by the researcher to prepare for the study. The methodology for the study is discussed in Chapter 3, followed by the report of the study findings in Chapter 4. The last chapter discusses the conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Because this research project focused on the role of unit administrators in multiunit community college districts, background information on multiunit organizations and administration was a prerequisite. The review of literature included four general topics associated with multiunit community college districts.

The first topic discussed the history and development of multiunit community college districts. It included a discussion about the four developmental stages (Jones, 1968) of organization and structure of multiunit districts, justifications and reasons for establishing multiunit districts, categories of multiunit organizations, and criticisms expressed about multiunit districts.

The second section was devoted to a summary of research studies involving multiunit institutions beginning with Arthur Jensen's first study of multiunit junior colleges conducted in 1963. This was followed by the section that debated the issue of centralization vs. decentralization, a topic that appeared frequently in the literature discussing multiunit districts. Attention was given to clarifying terms associated with centralization and decentralization, describing trends regarding degrees of centralized and decentralized authority, and exploring the factors that influenced centralization and
decentralization. This section concluded with a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of each.

The last section of Chapter II presented an overview of administration and management as they relate to educational institutions. It discussed management processes and characteristics and examined the administration of multiunit organizations.

Development of Multiunit Community Colleges

An important segment of the system of higher education and post-secondary education in the United States was the multiunit community college districts. It was, however, a part that had less attention in the literature, particularly in reference to discussing the growth and development of junior colleges and community colleges (Diener, 1986; Starrak & Hughes, 1954; Zwerling, 1976).

In 1989 there was a total of 1,273 public and private community colleges in the United States (Mahoney, 1990) enrolling more than 5.5 million students or approximately 40 percent of all undergraduate students. Dale Parnell, as President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, supported the significance of community and junior colleges by reporting 53 percent of all entering college freshmen were enrolled in state public and private community colleges.

An examination of those statistics revealed there were 117 multiunit community college districts in 1989 composed of 392 campuses and 25 central office locations. More than one fourth or 27
percent of students attending community colleges were attending a campus of a multiunit district (Mahoney, 1990).

The growth of multiunit community colleges was most significant in the last thirty years. As of 1964 there were 10 multiunit community colleges districts (Cohen & Brawer, 1989; Jensen, 1984; Kintzer, 1980; Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969) with 34 campuses (Jensen, 1984) in the United States. In 1967 there were 31 multiunit districts followed by an additional nine districts the following year, or a total of 40. By 1980, the number of multiunit districts had grown to 66, with 208 campuses in twenty-two states (Kintzer, 1980). In 1983, Jensen (1984) noted there were 100 districts operating two or more campuses, with a total of 361 campuses.

Arthur M. Jensen (1965a, 1984) traced the growth of multiunit community colleges through two of his studies, the first in 1963, followed by the second one in 1983. He concluded the growth was due "to the movement to provide an increased quality and quantity of higher education" (1984, p. 5).

The first multicampus operation was established in Chicago in 1934, prior to World War II (Jensen, 1965; Kintzer, 1980; Rossmeier, 1976) followed by Los Angeles starting a multiunit community college district in 1945 by adding a second campus to its already existing Los Angeles Junior College (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969). Other multiunit districts developed in urban areas, particularly in Miami, New York, and Dallas.
In Jensen's 1963 (1965a) study of 10 multicampus districts, he concluded multicampus junior college districts formed in communities that had rapidly growing populations, large and varied industrial concerns, large business and distributing centers, and aggressive community groups backing the district, as chambers of commerce, labor, and advisory committees. He also determined some of the multiunit districts started as a district with two or more campuses; others started with one campus and added others.

Some multiunit districts were planned from the onset to have more than one campus. St. Louis County Junior College District and Tarrant County Junior College were examples. The St. Louis District was initially established as a multicampus district by a vote of its citizens in 1965. A $47.2 million dollar bond issue was passed to begin the construction of its three campuses, of which two would be located in St. Louis County and the third in the city of St. Louis (Cosand, 1966). Voters of Tarrant County, Texas, authorized a multicampus junior college district in 1965 with the intent to establish three campuses serving a population of 650,000. The three comprehensive campuses were opened within a period of six years from 1967 to 1973. Later a fourth operating unit, the community campus which conducted non-credit programming and all off-campus instruction in both credit and non-credit, was established (Rushing, 1980).

The Dallas Community College was founded in 1966 and began with a downtown campus in 1967. Three suburban campuses were
opened in the early to mid 70s and the final three suburban campuses opened in the late 1970s (LeCroy & Shaw, 1982).

The growth of the multicampus college district in Chicago began with three campuses in 1934, one campus in the north part of the city, another in the central part, and the third in the southern area of the city. By 1962 the district was composed of eight campuses as four more campuses were added throughout the city between 1956-1958, and the eighth was added by establishing a campus in the Loop. The primary reason for having eight campuses was to provide better accessibility to all residents in the city (Jones, 1968). This philosophy was recently reinforced by the Chancellor of the City Colleges of Chicago, Nelvia M. Brady, when she said: "We have here an institution that can address educational needs for almost any adult in this city. That's a tremendous challenge and a tremendous opportunity to make a difference" (Leatherman, 1990, p. A3).

Milton Jones (1968), through his study, supported the finding that there was a trend toward multiunit junior college systems in America, especially in the urban metropolitan areas. This movement reinforced the national trend of working "toward universal higher education opportunities for at least the two years beyond high school" (p. 57-58). In reviewing the early development of multiunit junior colleges, Jones identified three primary factors present: size of student population, accessibility to students, and economy and efficiency. Two of the factors reinforced Jensen's (1965a, 1965b) findings. Keeping class size small so students would be treated as individuals and not numbers
was the reason for considering the size of the student population as one of the factors. Jensen (1965a) determined a 3,500 to 4,500 student enrollment was considered maximum, while others had established 2,500 to 3,500 as an optimum. When the student numbers grew beyond that point, a community college should go multicampus.

One of the contributors to substantial increases in student enrollments was the rapid growth in urban areas. This growth was due to the shift in population from rural to urban because of the growth in industry and mechanized farming; the selective population migrations, as foreign born and low income rural, that increased the need for public educational services in the large cities; the increase in college age population because of high birthrates during the postwar years; changes in technology causing changes in the employment market; and the increased acceptance of the role of open door junior colleges in the world of higher education (Erickson, 1964). In essence, the urban community colleges were faced with the challenge of providing social unity and social mobility to their constituencies (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969).

The explanation for the continued growth in enrollments in the urban community colleges in the early 1970s was attributed by Buckner (1975) to:

> the overall size, multiplicity of educational needs within an area, employment and general economic conditions, and the geographic expansiveness of many metropolitan areas . . . campus or institution in order to meet increasing demands for educational services (p. 2).
Jones (1968) concluded multicampus institutions were formed in urban areas initially as a way to respond to the complexity of an urban setting.

Jensen (1965b) recommended junior colleges must accept more responsibility for bringing at least two years of college experience within the economic and geographic reach of growing numbers of students. This was accomplished by adding campuses to form a multicampus district. Multiunit districts typically resulted "when a college opened a branch campus that eventually grew to a size that warranted an independent administration" (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 96).

A primary factor contributing to the growth of community colleges in general and their innovative activities in the 1960s was "access" (O'Banion, 1989). "The goal of the community college during the 1960s was to expand so that community colleges would be located within commuting distance of a majority of the citizens in most states" (p. 7). To do this colleges developed outreach centers, and in some instances, additional campuses, as a way of serving students. The development of multiunit community colleges in rural areas represented that approach.

The small multicampus colleges serving non-urbanized regions were described as a "college with widely separated small units in a big but sparsely populated geographic area . . . is large geographically in order to encompass a population (and assessed valuation) great enough to render the operation of a college economically feasible" (Upton,
The district size was usually too large to permit a single location or campus to be placed within a reasonable commuting distance of all residents in the service region. Because rural areas lacked population and financial support to establish several independent colleges in their area, the establishment of a multiunit college district was encouraged. This was exemplified by legislation passed in Florida which approved two or more contiguous counties combining for the purpose of supporting public junior colleges under a single administrative board (Jones, 1968).

If there were not enough students to operate an efficient college in a rural area, the community colleges were forced to consolidate by action of state legislatures. In those situations a consolidated community college district could find it necessary to operate off-campus centers as extension centers in the outlying areas of the district (Monroe, 1972).

Improving economy and efficiency was the third factor suggested by Jones (1968) influencing the development of multiunit institutions. He concluded many of the supportive services needed by a college could be accomplished by a single agency for several campuses more efficiently than having several doing the same task. This did not require, however, that all functions be housed centrally or controlled centrally. Other considerations that influenced the size of an institution were the ability to finance, the availability of land, the geographic size of the district, the community support for a program on
multiple campuses, and the future fluctuations of populations feeding into the community college (Marsee, 1966).

Information about the development of multiunit community college institutions was sketchy and those who studied their development expressed concerns. "However multicampus districts come into existence, the fact that they will multiply greatly in the future seems inescapable" (Monroe, 1972, p. 397).

Developmental stages

How multicampus organizations were formed and structured was influenced by legal and historical factors. As numbers of multicampus junior colleges increased, considerable attention was directed to the basic questions of organization and control. The ideal organizational pattern for one multicampus organization was not necessarily ideal for another. It was discovered "that different organizational patterns may be needed at the various stages of growth and development of the multicampus complex" (Masico, 1966, p.23).

Jones (1968) identified a four-model or four-level developmental sequence of multiunit organizations. His models were based on a continuum, using degrees of centralized and decentralized authority. The first stage or level one consisted of a college first developing an off-campus center and was called the one college-branch centers model. Then as the center grew, it began functioning as a separate campus, which was level two or the one college, multi-campus model. As the single campus developed its own administrative organization
and assumed more separate functions and services, it became somewhat autonomous and tended to de-emphasize the one-college aspect. This stage was level three and was called the multi-campus district model. The final level was attained when the campus became stronger and more self-supporting, an indication that it was now part of a multi-college district and was described as the multi-college district model.

Researching each of the four stages added clarity to the developmental stages of multiunit districts. The One College-Branch Centers Model was described "as one college in a central location, with leadership and services provided from a central office on main campus" (Jones, 1968, p.27). Examples of this model included junior colleges operating with technical centers, continuing education centers, or special divisions or programs operating in off-campus locations. Extension centers in businesses and local high schools also exemplified this model. Branch centers were supervised by second or third level administrators and had the main purpose of providing "specific courses and certain programs which will be more accessible to students in an area some distance from the main campus of an institution" (p. 28). This model was used to form a new unit within a multiunit district for the purpose of trying something new, or "an innovative program that would attract a new group of students" (Taylor, 1898, p. 14). For example, on the Yorba Linda campus, a new education center utilizing an instructional schedule based on a five week block was developed to compete with proprietary schools.
The second model, The One College, Multi-Campus Model, emphasized "the college, with its multiple campuses, is a single institutional entity" (Jones, 1968, p. 28). This model was "best visualized by assuming one large junior divided into parts, two or more, and located at separate places . . . campuses are identical twins under central control" (p. 29). There was a high degree of uniformity among all campuses, which required close articulation, coordination, and cooperation. Differences among campuses were due to various circumstances as location and student characteristics, but all campuses continued to operate under the same general administrative policies.

The Multi-Campus District Model was more district oriented and gave each campus more autonomy or decentralized authority as compared to the one-college, multi-campus model. This model consisted of a district office and two or more campus organizations which could be identical in structure. It was structured to allow "maximum coordination and cooperation among all units in the organization with a minimum of control" (Jones, 1968, p. 30). In the relationship between district office and campus, "each campus is a cooperating, autonomous unit" (p. 30) and had a chief administrator, its own budget, and developed its own identity as a reflection of its students, community, and administration.

The fourth model, the Multi-College District Model, was at the far end of the continuum. "This model visualized the colleges as separate, autonomous institutions, loosely coordinated within a district
framework" (Jones, 1968, p. 31). Each college had its own head who functioned the same as if the president of a single institution not part of a district. The fourth model was the rapidly emerging concept of multiunit organizations and suggested "as the units of a multi-unit institution grow and develop, they also increase in autonomy" (p. 32).

There was a wide range of examples in each model and an overlapping of models, especially between the one-college, multi-campus model and the multi-campus, district model. Presidents of multi-campus districts described their districts as having one college with more than one campus and tried to operate them with stronger central control and allowed less autonomy in campus operations. Overlapping consisted of multicampus districts having two or more autonomous campuses plus some centers or branches.

Jones (1968) described support for his four-level model by suggesting that when a college first started and was small, strong centralized control was needed to provide more leadership and services. As a multiunit organization grew to a multi-college district, less control and more autonomy was needed, which resulted in fewer services being provided centrally.

Multi-campus organizations should be constantly evolving from strong central control when units are small and weak to much autonomy as the units demonstrate their ability. The final evolvement may see the central office providing primarily leadership with some services which are more economically operated centrally (p. 35).

Jensen (1965b) concluded that of the three factors that affected relationships between individual campuses and central office, one of
them involved the state or phase of developmental cycle in which the district found itself.

Multicampus junior college districts are here to stay, and even though there are problems, the numbers of such districts will increase. As they progress through their developmental cycle, the campuses will tend to become more independent, and the majority of multicampus districts will eventually become multicollege districts (p. 13).

Jensen's (1984) follow-up study validated his 1963 findings regarding the influence the stage or phase of development cycle of the multiunit organization. He stated:

that more of the differences between districts were caused by the stage of their development than by which philosophical group they were in. The older the district was, the more independence and freedom each of the campuses had, regardless of the district's stated philosophy or type of control (p. 14).

**Justifications for multiunit districts**

The reason for establishing multiunit districts was "similar to the cluster college concept and is a strategy for survival or a strategy for expansion of a strategy for the reform of education" (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969, p. 16). Wattenbarger (1977) identified two forces instrumental in the development of multiunit structures: "the need to extend educational services to all persons within a defined geographical area, and the pressure to develop a single point of management responsibility for colleges and/or universities with similar roles" (p. 9).
After Jensen (1965a) visited ten multicampus districts and reviewed their histories, he established the following justifications for their formation:

1. To compensate for district geographical size which prohibited one campus from servicing the district adequately.

2. To equalize educational opportunities through making the college accessible to the residents of the district.

3. To meet the differing educational needs of the various communities within the district.

4. To accommodate applicants after the only campus had reached its maximum growth.

5. To keep each campus to a reasonable and functional size (pp. 55-57).

In forming a multiunit organization, "the dispersion of units throughout a diversified metropolitan or rural area is in lieu of dividing the area into several tax bases, each supporting a separate community college" (Rossmeier, 1976, p. 79). The units resulted in being smaller than a single-unit community college, but had access to the resources of a large metropolitan or rural area which helped eliminate duplication of human resources, facilities, equipment, and programs because all units coordinated and planned their efforts.

Other reasons for the establishment of multiunit districts were identified in the literature. Multicampus colleges formed if the original campus had no room to expand and they wanted to maintain optimum enrollments, such as in urban areas. A desire for prestige was
another reason. "The pattern of multiple campuses may impress people as a status symbol, a sign of a far-flung empire" (Sammartino, 1964, p. 503). This was especially true in the founding of some of the church-related schools.

Multiunit districts proved to be effective in serving particular groups, as minorities within an urban district, along with enhancing their responsiveness to diverse, fluctuating needs of different populations of students.

The evidence of neighborhood attendance is revealed where the community college has several campuses in the same city: At East Los Angeles College in the mid-1980s, 65 percent of the students were Hispanic; at Los Angeles Southwest College, 87 percent were Black; and at Los Angeles Pierce College, 75 percent were white (Cohen, 1989, p. 25).

Some multiunit institutions formed because it was a way to prevent or minimize unhealthy competition among campuses. More specifically, it reduced political battling between campuses in the state capital (Munitz, 1981). Small campuses in themselves were not large enough nor had enough political clout to be effective at lobbying (Whiting, 1982).

Multiunit districts provided a means for a four year institution to assure a supply of juniors and seniors if some of their branches were two year institutions. In addition, some leaders of community colleges found it exciting to start a new campus and were eager for the experience (Sammartino, 1964).
As the result of forming multiunit districts, other advantages for that organization emerged that were not originally incentives for establishing the district. Multiunit community college districts increased diversity of learning alternatives and made education more accessible through the dispersion of facilities (Rossmeier, 1976). They permitted effective financing and financial flexibility to cope with temporary pressure points in campus development and permitted economy of a large size operation, but yet were able to respond to local needs. Because of its size, the college's efforts to attract top talent for administrative positions were enhanced. In a multiunit district, there was less chance of unnecessary duplication of specialized occupational programs, or of equipment, faculty, and facilities, but more opportunity to give students greater choices (Chang, 1978). In addition, the establishment of multiunit districts helped overcome transportation limitations for its constituencies by having campuses more accessible to them (Block, 1970).

Categories of multi-unit organizations

"The patterns of multi-unit organizations in community junior college districts are fairly varied, and make classifications difficult" (Block, 1970, p. 24). There were no set formulas and the pattern that resulted was usually a product of the board of trustees for the particular district.

Various authors have classified multiunit organizations differently based on varied criteria. Creswell, Roskins, and Henry
(1985) studied the literature and identified four organizational and administrative characteristics that were used to differentiate multicampus systems in both junior and senior level higher education institutions:

1. the control of the system, either public or private
2. the jurisdiction of the board, either statewide or less-than-statewide in scope
3. the comparability of the campuses within the system, either homogeneous or heterogeneous
4. the administrative structure of the system, either a "flagship" or a separate central office structure (p. 30)

Wynn (1973) categorized multiunit two-year colleges primarily using two criteria: the degree of centralization or decentralization and whether the campus was part of a college/university operated system or part of a community junior college. The development of junior colleges in the early 1960s was challenged by a debate on how needs for educating the first two years of college could best be met, "whether or not junior colleges should serve this function by branch campuses or should the university develop two-year programs as branches in urban areas" (Jones, 1968, p. 14). As a result of this debate, some states administered the junior college system as branches of the universities.

The issue of autonomy was one of the factors used to describe Rushing's (1970) three forms of multiunit colleges. One form consisted of several autonomous colleges under one board whereby each college
operated independently of the others. Another form was organized by function with individual schools specializing in certain programs, especially in areas of vocational training. Each school existed as part of a system serving a district. His third form was described as a single college operating two or more campuses. Each campus was usually a comprehensive junior college offering both academic and occupational programs.

Jensen's 1963 (1965b) study of ten multiunit junior colleges concluded districts were organized into two patterns, as legal institutions and as legal districts. The legal institutions operated with a strong central office, and each campus or branch was considered a part of a single institution. Those institutions were classified as multi-branch and multi-program organizations. The legal districts operated multicollages with maximum autonomy for each, which meant each campus was allowed to be a college with freedom to develop and offer the education programs most suited to the students and community within the state laws and governing board regulations.

Although Jones (1968) established the four models of multiunit organizations and differentiated among them based on the stage of development of the organization, his criteria for his models were found in some of the other patterns for multiunit organizations. The commonalities related particularly to the issue of central control vs. individual campus autonomy and to the structure of the organization as being multicollege or multicampus. Multicollege was considered synonymous with maximum local autonomy while multicampus was
synonymous with minimum local authority (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969).

Two methods for achieving comprehensiveness as a community college organizational goal was used by Grede (1970) in identifying two patterns of multiunit organizations. "Collective comprehensiveness" was especially suited to urban/metro areas and consisted of having units developed as centers for specialized occupational/technical programs that were not necessarily offered in other units in the college. This approach to organizing an institution used a career orientation and stressed career objectives rather than vague educational objectives. The entire service area was considered as the units were developed. "Unitary comprehensiveness" meant the units were positioned in distinct subservice areas, and each unit was expected to develop a full range of transfer, occupational, technical, and developmental programs to serve its constituency. This allowed units to have increased autonomy.

Three patterns of multicampus expansion were found by Lander (1977) when studying the structure of Arizona community college districts, and all were based on the concept of going from a single to multicampus form of organization. Districts were formed due to an expansion from one all-purpose campus to adding two or more campuses throughout the community, or to an extension of college services to rural areas of a county, or to an extension of residential campuses into urban centers.
The flagship model (Creswell, Roskins, & Henry, 1985) originated through a process of natural growth by adding new units, called centers, branches, and satellites to a single institution until the units became complete campuses nurtured by the flagship campus. This model allowed the original campus or the flagship campus to maintain its status and power within a multiunit system. This model was also exemplified by a differentiation of functions among the campuses within the system.

The philosophy of a district toward its community college was an influential factor in the types of multiunit community colleges that resulted. The early guidelines for multiunit organizations (Review of Multi-Unit, 1976) implied multicampus and multicollege districts represented different philosophical commitments, different value systems, or different administrative philosophies, all which contributed to controversy. Jefferson (1986) suggested that priorities for multi-site institutions provided the framework for the development of site or campus plans.

Jensen's (1984) study in 1983 validated his 1963 findings that "two very important factors seemed to shape the district concept of organization" (p. 20). One of the factors was the philosophy of the district toward its community college district organization. The philosophy made reference to being a college with multicampuses or a district operating two or more colleges. The other factor was the stage or phase of development cycle in which the district was. Both of
these factors were found to influence the administrative policies and practices in the district and/or its campuses.

Jensen (1984) discovered the majority of chief campus administrators had the desire to be an individual college, rather than having each campus as a part of a single legal institution. Jenkins and Rossmeier (1974) concluded that the goal in organizing multisite community college systems was "maximum utilization of size and resources of the whole system while it simultaneously strives to provide each of the multiple units enough autonomy so that they can realize the advantages of a smaller, single-unit college" (p.13).

According to Coultas (1964), a key in multiunit districts was a "broad understanding throughout the district and a sense of working together toward common goals" (p.16). The ultimate goal in establishing a multiunit district was "to enable the establishment of junior colleges which are large enough to maintain a comprehensive program but which operate not only close to, but with, the people of an area" (Williams, 1961, p. 307).

Criticisms of multiunit community college districts

The creation of multiunit districts was not without criticism and problems. The basis of most of the criticism was: "The creation of a multiunit system establishes interdependencies: few actions by one unit do not affect other units" (Richardson, 1973, p. 143). Sensitivity to the values of individual campuses (Lee & Bowen, 1980) must be prevalent or a dysfunctional competition or "sibling rivalry" (Fryer,
1989, p. 24) among the units/campuses in the district resulted. If there was a lack of conformity in addressing problems and concerns on individual campuses, the district faced additional challenges. The ownership of the concern, whether it be district or campus, needed to be addressed. There was the possibility that an insensitivity to a particular service area within a district could develop. Too, the size and complexity of the institution often interfered with readiness to change and innovation.

Administratively multiunit districts created challenges and complexities in administrative relationships to which single institution districts were immune. In multicampus districts, "the district organization represents increasing numbers of administrators who must be reported to, communicated with and satisfied before problems can be solved, and the business of instruction carried on" (Sherman, 1984, pp. 31-32). Central office personnel tended to become too directive in some multiunit districts or a "we-they" problem existed between the campuses and central services. One usual criticism was the failure to have mechanisms in place that allowed the "campuses and their constituencies to be heard at the systemwide level" (College-wide governance, 1976, p. 28). Some districts were challenged by the difficulty of interfacing campus governance with college-wide governance and in having units develop an allegiance to the district as a whole. The possibility of operating costs being greater, especially during the first few years as a multiunit district, created funding concerns. Having adequate sources of funding and
equitable distribution of funds for each campus, in some situations, was the basis for additional criticism, especially if one unit felt slighted in acquiring new equipment and facilities.

Criticisms arose in reference to the students attending multiunit districts. Possible social stigmas were promoted on campuses within a multiunit district if one of the campuses became oriented toward vocational or "blue collar" programs and another campus was known only for its college transfer programs (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969). If the range of student abilities and achievements widened because of "selected population migrations" (p. 7), there was a likelihood that it would be more difficult for an institution to respond to the interests and capabilities of its constituency (Rossmeier, 1976). This supported the criticism of a multiunit district exhibiting depersonalization, and units avoiding responsibility and less program flexibility (Chang, 1978). There was the possibility of a self-segregation problem existing due to a self-separation of certain minority groups on the campuses within a multiunit district. Another concern existed in some districts regarding the difficulty in putting articulation agreements in place between district units and between the district and other institutions.

A unique concern of multicampus districts was to have branch centers an integral part of their community and to have the community identify with the institution. Although they were located in the city, the branch centers did not necessarily identify as being part of it. "They may be as isolated in spirit as they would be physically if they
were standing miles outside of town" (Cohen & Roueche, 1969, p. 25). It was important as a part of the mission to have community college leaders "who will translate community needs into curricular plans" (p. 25) and who will develop and maintain a community leadership role.

Administrators of multiunit districts that covered a large geographical area had difficulty coping with the distances between campuses; this usually prevented faculty from serving more than one campus. In large districts the probability of additional problems with program development and selection existed because of the fairness involved in limiting programs that were either expensive or had low enrollments or both to particular campuses.

Multiunit districts in urban areas were challenged in keeping each campus a functional and manageable size because of numbers of students. In addition, if each campus functioned as a comprehensive unit, it was likely that a problem of role definition and competition (Grede, 1970) would exist.

Studies Involving Multiunit Community Colleges

A chronological review of the studies involving multiunit community colleges began with Arthur Jensen (1965a), who was involved in some of the first studies examining multicampus junior colleges. In 1963 he conducted case studies of ten multicampus districts in six states for the purpose of investigating the administration of them. His study was initiated because there was a present and projected increase in numbers of multicampus institutions,
and as a result, there was a need to establish sound administrative principles and procedures for them. Through his research, he identified reasons and justifications for establishing multicampus junior colleges, types of organizational patterns, and administrative policies and procedures.

Jensen (1965a) classified multicampus districts into three categories: multicollege, multibranch, and multiprogram and concluded multiprogram and multibranch organizations had intermediary administration between campus administration and the chief district executive; multicollege organizations had no intermediary administration and were preferred because of the autonomy they represented.

As a part of his study Jensen (1965a) analyzed the distribution of administrative functions in six different areas: curriculum and instruction, student personnel services, staff personnel, plant/facilities, finance, and community services. In addition to the analysis of functions, Jensen also researched the philosophy of the districts toward college freedom and autonomy. The consensus was each college should have the freedom, subject to state laws and the governing board rules and regulations, to develop and offer the educational programs most suited to the interests and attitudes of the students and to the needs of the community.

Specific recommendations of Jensen's (1965a) study were

1. That each campus be allowed as great a degree of autonomy as the district can provide.
2. That unified multicampus districts consider the possibility of becoming independent districts.

3. That central office be located off any and all campuses and if possible, in center of district.

4. That no one at the central office, other than the chief administrator for the district, be at a level higher than the chief campus administrator.

5. That at least two administrative positions besides that of chief administrator, director of business and director of instruction be established at central office, the level of such positions same as or lower than that of chief campus administrator (p. 163).

With special emphasis on urban community colleges that had developed into multicampus organizations, Jensen (1965b) identified two factors that affected relationships between individual campuses and central office through his interviews with chief district administrators and chief campus administrators. The first one addressed the pattern of control in which the district operated, either as independent junior colleges or as part of a unified school district. The other factor was the philosophy of the district toward its community college organization, either as a legal institution with one college with multibranches/programs or a legal district with multicolleges. He also discovered when central offices were located on one of the individual campuses, the arrangement "gives use to dissention, jealousies, and divergent loyalties . . . the campus with the central office comes to be considered the 'main' campus and the 'favored' one" (p. 9).
Milton Jones (1968) studied the organization of multiunit community junior colleges by investigating existing models of multiunit organizations and characteristics of their operations. Issues of central control vs. individual campus autonomy and centralized or decentralized services were also researched. He identified three common elements that existed in all multiunit operations: each multiunit operation had a single administrative officer called chancellor, president, or superintendent who was responsible for whatever structure or model of multiunit organization emerged; each multiunit organization had a single governing board responsible for each college, center, or campus in the organization; and each organization placed fiscal authority at the central office.

Jensen, along with F. C. Kintzer and J. S. Hansen (1969), conducted a study of all known multi-institution junior college districts, excluding both state and university-operated systems. The purpose of the study was to gather information about 45 multi-institution districts by analyzing the district administrative organizational trends to clarify relationships between the district office and colleges. Chief campus administrators and chief district administrators responded to questionnaires addressing 40 areas and functions. The findings concluded that of the functions studied, more were college functions than district and very few were shared between the two.

Another finding of the study (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969) made reference to the organization of the multiunit institutions and concluded there was no universally best organizational scheme for
multiunit districts. There was consensus that categorizing administrative functions for central office was necessary. The three researchers recommended that the central office be located away from all campuses and that no one at central office, other than the chief district administrator, be at a level higher than the chief campus administrator. In addition, the concern of "what is community" or the relationship of the community to the individual campus within multi-institution junior college districts was discussed.

A 1972 dissertation reported the results of research conducted by D. VanTrease who studied the understanding of authority relationships between chief district administrators and chief campus administrators in 45 multicampus junior college systems. This was accomplished by analyzing the perceptions of how nine different functions were accomplished or performed in multicollege systems. The nine function areas were textbook selection, recruitment of new staff members, in-service training, physical facility planning, budget preparation, public information services, student personnel services, curriculum development, and community service development. VanTrease determined the degree of delegated authority perceived by the chief district administrator differed significantly from that perceived by the chief campus administrators, especially in the public information services function and budget preparation function. There was general accord in perception in only two function areas, that of central office participation in textbook selection and in-service training.
For his research John T. Wynn (1973) modified the questionnaire developed by Kintzer, Jensen, and Hansen ((1969) and used it to determine the current placement of management authority and responsibility of multicampus two-year institutions. The objective of his study was to view "on a centralization/decentralization continuum, the current placement of the authority and responsibility exercised by multi-campus, campus chief executives" (Wynn, 1973, p. 3-4). The study compared the placement of authority and responsibility of community junior colleges to that of college and university affiliated institutions. The questionnaire was answered by chief administrators of individual campuses within multicampus districts and responses were based on their perceptions of the placement of authority and responsibility in 21 different functions/activities. As a result of his study, Wynn concluded there was a trend toward more functions being placed at the campus level than any other level of placement (district or shared). This justified his prediction that campuses were attaining more autonomy.

Twelve urban multiunit community college systems were the subject of a study conducted by John A. Jenkins and Joseph G. Rossmeier (1974) through the Center for the Study of Higher Education. Their focus analyzed the patterns of centralization and decentralization of multiunit institutions and of individual campuses/colleges within the institutions in five general function areas: professional personnel management, student personnel
management, budgetary management, program development, and community services management.

The Carnegie Council of Policy Studies in Higher Education published a report prepared by E. C. Lee and F. M. Bowen (1975) that discussed the management of nine multicampus systems. The nine systems were first studied in 1971 with a follow-up conducted four years later. The concerns identified in the study examined enrollment management, budgeting, planning, program development, and faculty retrenchment. The researchers concluded there was little a system could do about internal imbalances of enrollments by campuses and/or programs. Attracting students was enhanced if multicampus systems encouraged the qualities of diversity, specialization, and cooperation within a system. Flexibility in academic budgeting was exemplified by allowing one campus within a system to fund and staff programs differently from other campuses, provided they were consistent with the accountability of using public funds. Program development and planning both stressed the need for considering student opportunities and programs at other campuses within a system to avoid as much duplication as possible. They also concluded that intercampus transfers of faculty should be encouraged if retrenchment was needed.

Richard G. Buckner, Jr. (1975) conducted his study by using Miami Dade, a multicampus community college, and Dallas County Community College District, a multi-institution district, for the purpose of investigating the role of the chief executive officer in each of the two districts and their functional relationships to individual campus chief
administrative officers. Through the use of a questionnaire, structured interviews, and a review of district documents, information was gathered about the importance of six different administrative functions, including planning, finance, legitimization, external relations, educational leadership, and evaluation. In both of the districts studied, planning and finance were perceived as the most important administrative functions of the chief executive officer, with evaluation being the least important.

Buckner (1975) concluded large urban multiunit community college districts tended to become similar in style and method of operation due to the similarity of their environments, not necessarily because of their formal organizational patterns. Because no successful and acceptable organizational pattern seemed to exist, multiunit organizational schemes needed to be designed to fit one's own situation. He also determined that the district chief executive officer tended to be more involved with matters external to the operation of the district rather than the day-to-day operations. This was especially true regarding relations with the board, interactions with community influencers, and overall planning for the district.

A 1976 report (Review of Multi-Unit) described the guidelines for developing a multiunit district's central organization and the experiences some community colleges had as they expanded into multiunit community college districts. Numbers of central office staff in relation to student enrollments and the type of multiunit institution (multicampus vs. multicollage) were assessed. Another report
(College-Wide, 1976) studied the governance systems of six urban multicampus community colleges and as a result, proposed and adopted a participatory governance system for Cuyohoga Community College.

Patterns of centralization and decentralization in 15 multicampus districts were used by Chang (1978) as the basis for suggesting a plan for the reorganization of the administrative structure of Denver Community College. Eleven management functions were identified as being central office responsibilities and eight management functions were verified as being individual unit or campus responsibilities.

The results of Arthur M. Jensen's (1984) follow-up study included data from 14 districts in five different states. He used the research format and interview questions from his 1963 study for the purpose of gaining insight into major administrative policies and practices at both the central office and individual campus levels. An additional purpose was to determine if his conclusions and recommendations from his 1963 study continued to be valid. His 1983 study validated his findings from his earlier study, which concluded the philosophy of the district toward its community college district organization and the stage of the developmental cycle were the most important factors in shaping the district concept of organization and division of responsibilities between central office and campus. From his first study Jensen secured very little information about organizing and administering multiunit junior colleges; in 1983 he determined that the problems of
running a complex multicampus community college system had not been resolved.

Jensen (1984) attributed the fast growth of community colleges in the 20 years between his two studies "to the movement to provide an increased quality and quantity of higher education" (p. 5). He concluded that multiunit districts were here to stay and would serve larger geographical areas. From his 1983 study, he discovered that although there was diversity in the administrative practices among the fourteen districts studied, all "supported the objectives and program characteristics of community colleges" (p. 21). Recognizing the significance of multiunit community college districts and their place in serving their constituencies, Jensen also suggested that the caliber of leadership of multiunit districts was extremely important.

Four general groupings of administrative functions in multiunit institutions were the basis for Kintzer's (1984) study. Each of the practices were assessed by whose responsibility (central office or campus) it was or should be in each of four function areas: initiating or planning, coordinating or supervising, evaluating or auditing, and changing or redirecting.

Leroy A. Wilch (1986) involved the multiunit community college districts in Nebraska to study the perceived leadership role and function of community college presidents and campus directors. In addition, he wanted to identify those factors which influenced administrative leadership role behavior and job satisfaction. He concluded:
There are phenomenon described as leadership role and function present among administrators . . . The leadership role of the population surveyed are people and problem centered . . . The administrative function of the population surveyed is operational in nature and includes: fiscal management, long range planning, and allocation of resources (p. 79).

Two Texas community college systems were used to study the role of administration in the administrative reorganization in the two community college districts and the reasons the reorganization was done. Both central office and campus administrators were included in the study (Miller & Norton, 1987) which determined the president was primarily responsible "for initiating and carrying through the reorganization process" (p. 92), but sensitivity was needed in "securing the involvement of those who are to be affected" (p. 92).

This researcher, in reviewing the studies involving multiunit community colleges, concluded Arthur Jensen's work was influential in establishing a knowledge base about the organization and structure of multiunit systems. His findings were referenced in the majority of studies addressing the issues and concerns of multiunit districts.

Centralization Vs. Decentralization

As found in the previous section of this chapter, many of the studies involving multiunit institutions included in some manner attention to the issue of centralized vs. decentralized control within a multiunit system (Buckner, 1975; Chang, 1978; Jenkins & Rossmeier, 1974; Jensen, 1965a, 1965b, 1984; Jones, 1968; Kintzer, 1984; Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969; Rushing, 1980; VanTrease, 1972;
Wattenbarger, 1977; Wynn, 1973). Generally, the issue was studied by first identifying certain functions that were typical within a college operation. The placement of those functions, either as a primary activity of the central office, or as a primary responsibility of the campus, or as shared responsibility between both, was then analyzed. The logical and efficient distribution of functions was also researched (Jensen, 1965a).

Centralization and decentralization described differences in "allocation of control and authority over decisions made within multiunit college systems" (Jenkins & Rossmeier, 1974, p. 3). In addition, they represented styles of leadership and administrative responsibility (Chang, 1978). Centralization was characterized by a greater amount of decision making at the district level and was a style of management when "decisions, control of resources, methods of implementation and accountability, are the responsibility of a core administrative staff" (p.19).

Decentralization entailed more decision making within separate units and was the management style used when "these same functions are dispersed through several layers of management within an institution and responsibility for outcomes are placed with those people closest to the action" (p. 19). The end product of decentralization was campus autonomy or the freedom for each campus to develop and offer the educational programs most suited to the students and community within the state laws and governing board regulations (Jensen, 1965b). Issues regarding the relationships
between the campuses and central administration affected the degree of autonomy of individual campuses due to the "freedom of action, conformity to uniform practices, assignment and transfer of personnel" (Lombardi, 1964, p. 7).

The literature, in some instances, referenced centralization and standardization synonymously. In those examples, there was more emphasis placed on institutionalizing or committing to procedures most of the activities of the college (Wygal, 1985).

Centralization/decentralization trends

Besides examining particular functions within multiunit districts, the studies also tried to determine if there were trends within multiunit institutions that exemplified districts were becoming more centralized or campuses were becoming more autonomous. For example, Rushing (1980) discovered in the 12 year span he examined with regard to the management of a multicampus, there had been no significant move toward greater centralized control. This was a carry-over from the previous years when campuses desired greater autonomy. Rushing realized, in some instances, the central staff had become more involved, but in a coordinating role.

Jensen (1965b) identified a trend toward the multicollege plan with an implication that administrators, faculty, and students on individual campuses favored the move toward an increase in local autonomy. The opinions of central office staff in that study did not totally agree with his findings.
Wynn (1973) confirmed a trend toward more functions being placed at the campus level than any other level of placement (district or shared). He also determined there were few changes suggested which implied there was a "general satisfaction with current placement of authority and responsibility" (p. 73). If changes took place, more of the changes were at the campus level than at the district or shared level.

According to Kintzer (1984) the trend in the 1960s and early 1970s inferred "many multiunit colleges and universities achieved a high degree of decentralization" (p. 7). He surmised the move toward decentralization was continuing. When the multiunit institutions were faced with issues of organizational size and complexity, "dispersion of responsibility became the desirable end, rather than a technique to help produce efficiency and effectiveness" (p. 7). Many of the system-wide responsibilities, as planning, budget preparation and analysis, public information, the procurement and distribution of services had lost central office control and were now approached as a coordinating or supervising level of activity. That type of activity reinforced the direction that was appealing to districts and colleges alike; "organizational effectiveness, rather than the extension of power, ought to be the important goal" (p. 29).

In the late 1970s, Kintzer (1980) concluded there was a change in the trend and reported a move toward greater centralization and control at the district because of "collective bargaining and tighter state surveillance, budget and enrollment conditions" (p. 13). Districts were using centralization as a method of controlling costs and
preventing an overlap of services, in addition to preventing the loss of power.

In his review of four studies that had researched decision-making processes in multiunit community colleges, Wattenbarger (1977) concluded that the aftermath of having a requirement for an increase in central coordination was a corresponding decrease in unit autonomy. He also determined "no existing structure is universally successful and acceptable" (p. 13).

Wygal (1985) supported Kintzer's (1980) findings and also reported a trend toward increased centralization.

During the late 1970s and into the 1980s, noticeable changes began to take place . . . in other multi unit districts across the country. A trend toward more standardization of offerings and services began to take shape. One could identify this standardization trend with a move toward more centralization" (Wygal, 1985, p. 64).

Chang (1978) recognized a growing trend toward "the adoption of multi-campus community colleges with organizational structures which represent a synthesis of both the centralized and decentralized modes of administration" (p. 38). Richardson (1973) concluded that during the growth of multiunit systems, forces encouraged decentralization and campus autonomy as a means to allow growth to occur without having the entire system become paralyzed.

Jensen (1984), in his later study, determined multiunit districts were moving toward the multicampus operation which encouraged greater participation of individual employees in the decision-making process. This was accomplished by using campus and district-wide
committees. This trend reinforced the findings of his 1963 study when he recommended that each campus be allowed as great a degree of autonomy as the district could legally provide. From his perspective, it was important that those making the decisions should be the ones who had the facts and would be implementing them.

Other factors influencing centralization/decentralization

Jensen (1965a) viewed the issue of autonomy from a different perspective by relating it to the age and geographic location of each campus. He concluded the older the district was, the more independence and freedom each of the campuses had; the further a campus was from the central office, the more emphatic was the support for local autonomy. Another factor presented by Jensen (1965b) that influenced the degree of autonomy and freedom was personnel. If the campus had new administration, central office tended to exercise more control over the campus. As the administration gained confidence and experience, central office was more inclined to relax its control.

Buckner (1975) discerned through his study of two multiunit community college districts that "the degree of centralization was a result of factors such as community power structure, personal leadership style of the chief executive office of the district, and the stage of development of the districts studied" (p. 166). Multiunit districts practicing participatory management reflected a decentralized organization. With that type of management, more
functions were given to individual colleges, thereby reducing the number of administrators in district office (Kintzer, 1980).

Another factor that influenced the degree of autonomy of campuses was the organizational structure of the multiunit district. Two options existed with regard to structure, a district as one college with multicampuses or a district with multicolleges. If the district were described as a legal institution with each campus or branch considered a division of a single college, the district was more centralized. If the district operated as a multicollege district, there was more autonomy for each college (Jensen, 1965a, 1965b). This, however, was not true in the study conducted by Buckner (1975). He concluded that as the complexity of an organization or operation increased, the need for greater coordination existed. "Urban multi-unit community college districts tend to require increasingly more central coordination, not increasingly more individual unit autonomy" (p. 165). Wattenbarger's (1977) findings, with reference to organizational structure, were similar to Jensen's (1965a, 1965b). The progression through the stages of development from a branch campus to a multicampus to a multicollege was associated with a continual increase toward greater autonomy. "The more independent and autonomous each college becomes, the more mature the structure is considered to be" (Wattenbarger, 1977, p. 9). He inferred that the progression to a state of autonomy may not be as real and definite as some had thought because there were only a few management studies that had been reported.
According to Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen (1969), in appropriate situations, it appeared multi institution junior college districts had more going for them than against them, but they did present special administrative problems. They recommended that "the multi institution junior college district can best be met by an organizational system that provides a great deal of institutional autonomy" (p. 35), but the district that was able to balance the pattern of central and individual institutional strength was best. This philosophy was illustrated by a statement made with reference to the St. Louis multicampus district: "We are attempting at all times and in all instances to foster local autonomy within a district framework of policy and procedure based upon leadership and service rather than rigid control" (Cosand, 1966, p. 12).

Kintzer (1984) provided another viewpoint about the issue of centralization and autonomy. From his perspective, the most important factor was the amount of perceived influence or authority individuals had throughout the organization or "the critical level of balance where campus individuality and district leadership are both maintained" (p. 36). Organizational effectiveness was more affected by the use of human talent, rather than an equitable pattern of responsibility and authority distribution between central office and each campus. The "problems presumably become more complex and issues more intense as a result of too much centralized authority or too much decentralized responsibility" (p. 5).
Environmental factors also played a role in evaluating the degree of autonomy possessed by individual units within a multiunit district. "The environment within which multiunit districts operate has changed considerably over the past decade" (Wygal, 1985, p. 65), and these changes encouraged more centralization and standardization within multiunit community college districts. The indicators in the changing environment were

1. "Greater demands by external authorities" as legislative bodies and coordinating bodies requiring more reports and greater standardization of reports.

2. "Increased control of resource allocation" by policy makers as a response to enrollment pattern shifts, more requirements for accountability, and generally less and more restricted funding.

3. "Intensified interest in planning" systems that require more standardization in approach and development.

4. "Increased pressure from clients for consistent services from campus to campus" as student services and program offerings.

5. "Greater demand from college employees for consistent treatment throughout the workplaces of the district", as work schedules and working conditions (p. 65).

Another environmental factor involved the name assigned to a multiunit district and how name changes within multiunit districts were used to reflect a change toward more centralization. For example, in 1977 the governing board of St. Louis Community College District approved a recommendation by the chancellor to change the names of the three colleges that comprised the district from Florissant
Valley College, Forest Park College, and Meramec College to St. Louis Community College at Florissant, St. Louis Community College at Forest Park, and St. Louis Community College at Meramec. The changes were made for the purpose of making the district more of a single institution (Wygal, 1985).

The process of decision making was prevalent in discussions about centralization and decentralization. According to Jenkins and Rossmeier (1974), the real issue concerning centralized vs. decentralized patterns of decision making should focus more on organizational levels within units rather than the units and district office. From their perspective the goal was "maximum utilization of size and resources of the whole system while it simultaneously strives to provide each of the multiple units enough autonomy so that they can realize the advantages of a smaller, single-unit college" (p. 3).

Wattenbarger (1977) concluded the role of decision making correlated to the particular management functions assumed by central office and to those assumed by the campus. If functions as budget making, purchasing, and long range planning were centralized, central office was more involved in the primary decision making affecting those functions. Campus administration exercised their decision making in the areas that were their responsibilities.

Faculty members and administrators included in the study by Jenkins & Rossmeier (1974) proposed that for an effective organization, participation in decision making should be maximized for staff members at all levels, regardless of the nature of the hierarchy.
They also described the role of district offices as a coordinating one rather than a controlling one. A similar view was expressed by Richardson (1973) when he suggested that shared decision making should exist in any type of governance structure and should not be dependent upon campus autonomy, but on the commitment by management.

LaHay's (1985) opinion regarding centralized decision making referred to the vague patterns for decision making in multiunit community colleges. More specifically, "the controversy surrounding centralization of decision-making stems from the redistribution of power among different levels in the organization" (p. 17).

Other views in the literature described the complexity of the centralization/decentralization issue. "In a system that emphasizes interdependencies . . . accountability is a two-way street. No function or operation is the exclusive property of either campus or system. Some areas are designated for campus leadership and initiative, others for primary responsibility to the system" (Richardson, 1973, p. 145). In some multiunit districts, autonomy was expected in areas where there were no well defined institutional guidelines or programs, as in curriculum development, marketing, and student orientation (Jefferson, 1986). Although units desired autonomy, leaders in multiunit districts realized that some areas required uniformity among the units in the district (Block, 1970).

The literature discussed many factors that influenced the centralization/decentralization issue in multiunit districts. Using the
areas of responsibilities assigned to central offices and campuses was one way to assess the degree of campus autonomy and/or the degree of district centralization.

**Campus and central office functions**

Many of the studies that focused on defining the areas of responsibilities for campuses and central offices had similar results. Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen (1969) used 40 functions in their study. In their analysis they concluded more of the functions were college functions, rather than district. They identified college responsibilities as personnel matters, course content and organization, textbook and library book selection, student personnel services, and accreditation. District responsibilities were auxiliary services involving money, administrative data processing, purchasing, warehousing and supplies, research and planning, and finance/accounting. Shared responsibilities between the college and district were curricular matters and publicity.

In looking at 18 different functions, Chang (1978) identified eleven functions that clearly indicated a centralized pattern or a function of the district office. Those functions were institutional research, automated data processing/administration, statistical services, internal auditing, legal services, personnel/records, salary administration, district publicity, college-wide plant management, purchasing, and warehousing. Eight of the functions were a responsibility of a campus and included financial aid/counseling, financial aid/awards, student library services, local plant maintenance
and operation, counseling and testing, student activities, health services, and instructional services.

Jensen's 1963 study (1965a) established that the district office determined policies and procedures for forming curriculum objectives, conducted planning, controlled employment practices, and handled business affairs. Individual units were responsible for student personnel services and community services.

Additional centralized functions identified by Rushing (1980) included admissions and records, food service and bookstores, a central cataloguing process for the library, and a common curriculum with one catalog containing uniform course descriptions and course objectives. The instructional program was a campus-based responsibility which allowed more latitude with departments for teaching strategies, textbook selection, and evaluation of instruction.

Staff development was usually a function of the campus. The direction of staff development activities was established by the campus or unit leadership so that it was suited to each unit's needs (LeCroy, 1972). According to Elsner (1981), faculty development programs in multicollege districts were often the best when they were "probably highly decentralized, and even undermanaged, as far as the intrusion of administration is concerned" (p. 6). Coordinating the district priorities with faculty development activities that provided opportunities for creativity was a challenge for management.

An important factor in defining the limitations of a campus or unit within a multiunit district was the philosophy of the central
office toward the role of each unit. Barry Munitz (1981) in his "Memo to a Multicampus Trustee" suggested "each component must strive to be excellent in its own assigned role and scope." Walter Coultas (1964) as assistant superintendent of the Los Angeles City School Districts, which included seven community junior colleges, described the district's philosophy. Each college was to "operate under a policy of maximum autonomy for the individual college and its president. . . . Each is charged with the responsibility of meeting the needs of its own student population and the geographical area in which it is located" (p. 14).

Unit autonomy was encouraged when a campus or branch specialized in certain occupational programs, "since potential competition among colleges for programs, funds, faculty, students, and unique identity would probably be much less than under the present unit comprehensive approach" (Grede, 1970, p. 189).

Although a degree of uniformity in identifying particular functions was absent, Kintzer, Jensen, and Hansen, (1969) recommended central office assume responsibilities for functions, particularly fiscal and property management. Other functions for central offices were district film library, district print shop, video-production studio (Rushing, 1980), and central maintenance office overseeing standardization of light fixtures, plumbing hardware, and climate control equipment (Rushing, 1970).

Jenkins and Rossmeier (1974) concluded the district office was more concerned with coordinating rather than controlling various units
within the system. Even when services as fiscal affairs, management information, program planning and coordination, and personnel administration were centralized, those "need not be accompanied by a centralization in the decision-making process" (Richardson, 1973, p. 146). If the role of campuses was defined, task forces, committees, and coordinating groups "can arrange for persons to be involved in making the decisions that affect them" (p. 146).

Kintzer (1980) described central office functions as a manager of delivery systems and instructional resources. From his perspective, "business management and public information have always been district responsibilities because the district administration is the legal fiscal authority" (p. 15). Other district office functions usually included the control of computer and data processing which could lead to centralized admission and records. The services specifically for students, as counseling, advising, placement, and health were largely college or campus responsibilities.

The degree of authority required to assume the responsibilities of a function and how that authority was perceived were issues presented in Buckner's (1975) study. With reference to the Dallas County Community College District, one of the study's samples, he concluded the district organizational structure was perceived as centralized in policy formation and somewhat more decentralized in the implementation and administration of district policy. Perceptions contributed an extra factor in describing central office and campus
functions and another issue in the centralization/decentralization debate.

Advantages and disadvantages of centralization/decentralization

Multiunit districts that had a high degree of central office control or centralized administration were characterized as operating with maximum efficiency, maximum economy, maximum uniformity, responsiveness, and impartiality regarding the treatment of all units within the district (Jenkins & Rossmeier, 1974; Kintzer, 1984; Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969; Whiting, 1982). The responsiveness existed because strong district administration perceived overall needs and immediately authorized action. The economy resulted because there was an expectation there would be fewer administrators, less duplication of facilities and equipment, and improved coordination of program planning. In addition, "multi-institution districts can often function more efficiently than can two or more smaller districts serving the same area" (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969, p. 34).

Other merits of centralized institutions as identified by Chang (1978) included the following:

1. Eliminates the duplication of functions as purchasing, data processing, facilities planning, personnel, publicity, research, finance, physical plant, and contracting.

2. Standardizes recruiting, fringe benefits and payroll, and affirmative action procedures.

4. Fosters equal treatment of all elements, resulting in a high degree of consistency in support services, personnel, salaries, promotions, grievances, and resource allocations.

5. Minimizes rivalry and competition between campuses.

6. Enhances recruitment campaigns, publicity, grantmanship, community service, and coordination with programs.

7. Facilitates educational program coordination and staff development.

8. Provides for more flexible manpower utilization, as faculty mobility among units.

9. Facilitates more direct communication process to one key administrator rather than several separate administrators resulting in institutional objectives being more clearly delegated, defined, and directed.

10. Provides more specialized resources and personnel.

11. Achieves uniformity which benefits students because of academic standards, transfer of credits, uniform course numbering and titles, admission policies, certification of occupational competencies, financial aid assistance, and record maintenance.

12. Encourages resource sharing and exchange of ideas among staff.

13. Eases and speeds community contacts and lessens chance of conflicting information from different campuses.

14. Expedites communication between campus and outside agencies, as federal and state.

15. Provides greater opportunity to hire higher level and more specialized personnel.
16. Emphasizes educational services of college rather than emphasis on individual campus prestige.

17. Makes better use of industry representatives' time on vocational advisory committees as the committee is formed for each vocational field rather than each area on each campus.

The centralized approach "assures uniformity and fairness in application of college policy, both for students and employees . . . the one-college posture gives added support and protection to departments and individual faculty members when they are subjected to external pressures" (Rushing, 1980, p. 20). Because the number of people interpreting policies in a centralized system was less, the district had more uniformity in policy application. Centralization also made it possible for an organization to make abrupt or rapid changes in the over-all operation. Due to the fact that all information was collected at a central point, the central office could facilitate the use of information in making comparisons and decisions. (Wynn, 1972).

There were disadvantages to having a centralized multiunit system. A centralized multicampus system could result in a "dissipation of staff time in meeting bureaucratic requirements and satisfying what, at times, becomes procedural mystique and overkill" (Whiting, 1982, p. 31). Central administrative units that were heavily centralized tended to have less appreciation for problems and needs of individual units (Kintzer, 1984).

An increase in centralization often resulted from lean economic periods or other crisis situations and led to more formalization and
specialization of the units. "Over-centralization clearly reduces the influence of constituent members of the organization, both internal and external, and perhaps even more dangerous to institutional vitality, their sense of responsibility" (Kintzer, 1984, p. 6). It could also interfere with academic concerns that were better handled by individual units.

Centralization risked depersonalization, avoidance of responsibility, and lower morale (Kintzer, 1984; Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969). The possibility of over-reacting or under-reacting to situations that developed on individual campuses existed in a centralized system. This was especially a concern with regard to the administration of the budget because it was difficult to weigh all factors from a distance and judge the seriousness (Wynn, 1972).

There were many advantages to having a decentralized multiunit district. Decentralization of central administration enhanced flexibility, curtailed bureaucracy, provided for a more creative work environment, and improved responsiveness of units to local needs (Chang, 1978; Jenkins & Rossmeier, 1974).

When unit administration had the authority to respond to the particular needs of staff and community, the unit's flexibility and responsiveness was evident (Rossmeier, 1976). Decentralization facilitated decision making by unit staff because they were more sensitive to issues at hand. As a result, the wide-spread decision making encouraged an efficient and creative work environment, but required unit personnel to be accountable for their decisions (Munitz,
1981). Overall results were usually better because those most directly involved were responsible for the decisions and outcomes (Chang, 1978; Wynn, 1972). In addition, campus level decisions were made in a more timely manner because fewer administrators were involved. Efficiency of decisions was also attributed to working with more manageable size groups (Chang, 1978). "Decentralization of the decision-making process through delegation of system responsibilities to campuses wherever possible is one way to preserve flexibility without destroying system integrity and economical operation" (Richardson, 1973, p. 143).

When individual units had the freedom to develop and offer the educational programs most suited to the interests and attitudes of the students and community, the unit experienced an increase in student and teacher morale (Jensen, 1965a). Program relevancy and creativity were additional benefits (Kintzer, 1984; Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969). A decentralized structure fixed responsibility at a lower structural level, fostered the development of leadership among campus administrators (Chang, 1978), and encouraged more people to be involved (Wynn, 1972).

Disadvantages and concerns regarding a decentralized system within a multiunit district existed. "Campus bureaucracies are likely to expand as more activities requiring college management are decentralized to the campuses" (Kintzer, 1984, p. 29) and campus leaders need to accept that responsibility. "In an interdependent system, autonomy is an illusion and may be costly when it results in
unnecessary duplication of administrative staff, proliferation of programs and facilities, and competition" (Richardson, 1973, p. 146). What resulted were "systemic imbalances that draw heavily on human resources for system maintenance, leaving fewer resources for goal achievement" (p. 146).

Too much decentralization or too much concern for individual units led to institutional fragmentation. In a worse case scenario, "attention to the overall goals of the multiunit community college district is submerged under a welter of concerns expressed by individual campuses and departments within campuses . . . reduces the role of the chief executive from leadership to mediator or caretaker" (Kintzer, 1984, p. 6). Maximum campus control "can result in inefficient handling of matters of district-wide concern, intercollege competition undesirable in nature or extent, and communication problems" (Kintzer, Jensen, & Hansen, 1969, p. 34).

The philosophy regarding decentralization created concerns. "Complete autonomy, like complete freedom, exists only in theory" (Richardson, 1973, p. 143). There was a tendency with decentralization that the more one had, the more one desired.

The best of both conditions had a balance between centralization and campus authority. A model suggested for multicampus systems to achieve that balance was suggested by Lee and Bowen (1980). For their model it was important to have

1. an awareness that most decisions most of the time were better made at the campus level.
2. an awareness that some decisions must be made by central office and the governing board.

3. the best possible information about programs and needs to make good decisions at both campus and systemwide levels.

4. the flexibility to employ budgetary resources among campuses and at the campus level, among programs.

5. equitable procedures to deal with personnel retrenchment and intercampus mobility of faculty.

6. systemwide academic programs which attracted faculty and students beyond the limitations of single campus.

7. systemwide capacity for self-analysis, evaluation, and change.

8. a philosophy that encouraged campus administrators, faculty, and students to seek solutions on their own campuses but within the system as a whole.

The issue of centralized/decentralized distributional authority and how it was perceived by faculty and administration was found to be an influential factor regarding administrator effectiveness. Jenkins and Rossmeier (1974) concluded as a result of their research that when participation in decision making was maximized for all staff at all levels, the organization was more effective, regardless of the nature of the hierarchy.

Administration of Post-Secondary Institutions

Before the topic of administration can proceed, attention was given to the terminology often associated with administration, such as
governance, leadership, and management. Governance was an all inclusive, comprehensive term that described "all aspects of the control and direction of the college" (Monroe, 1972, p. 303) including the state statutes, local boards of directors, the administration, and sometimes faculty and student body. It included those who made policies and those who executed and administered them. Although basic policies were made in the state legislatures and by local boards, administrators at the local level made lesser decisions important in the operation of the organization. Governance was the term used "to include the total structure through which the various constituencies of the institution collaborate in the development and refinement of specific policies and programs that enable the institution to move closer to achievement of its goals" (Wolotkiewicz, 1980, p. 173).

The differences among leadership, administration, and management varied according to the author being quoted. Mackenzie (1969) described leadership and administration as functions of management. Management was considered to be the broadest term and involved how people and processes were organized to get things done. It was "a descriptor of goal-directed human affairs . . . involves the organization and conduct of human affairs toward the accomplishment of a particular goal" (Park, 1980, p. 73). Rausch's (1980) opinion was managers needed to be good leaders and "must be good planners, good organizers, and competent decision makers" (p. 26).

Wolotkiewicz (1980) described leadership and administration as being synonymous. "Leadership is an organized arrangement for linking
governance and management - for linking decision making and work performance" (p. 172). In addition, "the true educational leader provides ideas and direction while aiming for simplicity, efficiency, and coherence" (p. 22). Wolotkiewicz described a leader as one who was able to mediate conflict, establish a climate for achieving established objectives, and acquire support for the mission, programs, and procedures for the institution.

The feelings of academicians toward management as a term, tended to be negative because they associated management with capitalistic business and industry operations. It was "viewed as a narrow, technical function consisting principally of adding figures, maintaining buildings, and mowing lawns" (Park, 1980, p. 73). Another opinion suggested "a successful academic administrator needs some of the same proficiencies as the business administrator, particularly in the areas of finance, personnel, policy implementation, and planning" (Wolotkiewicz, 1980, p. 40). Because academic leaders perform management functions, "it is important that academic leaders . . . will be significantly more effective if they gain greater acquaintance with management functions" (Rausch, 1980, p. 2).

The process of administration tended to be bureaucratic in nature because "administration implies the orderly distribution and implementation of resources and policies that have already been determined" (Park, 1980, p. 72). It was operational in nature (Wilch, 1986) and involved the execution and application of the policies and decisions of a community college board (Monroe, 1972). This required
the administration to "have a working understanding of what the role of the college is" (Gleazer, 1968, p. 109).

Wolotkiewicz (1980) described a relationship between managers and administrators. "The college administrator must be a manager in the very broadest terms by providing dynamic leadership in initiating and bringing about change . . . responsible for routine decision making and operations while following predetermined policies, procedures, and regulations" (p. 36).

According to Park (1980), the term, "leadership" was ambiguous. It could "mean anything from supervision to inspiration - its focus is on the individual rather than institution, and for this reason, it lacks the critical dimension of organizational effect" (p. 72). Wilch (1986) suggested, as a result of his study involving the leadership of Nebraska multiunit community colleges, that "the leadership role of the population surveyed are people and problem centered . . . includes assessing community needs, staff relations, and program development activities (p. 79).

Wolotkiewicz (1980) explained the major responsibility of educational leadership as "establishing some vehicle for a continuous review and revision of the statement of the direction for that institution's efforts towards self-renewal and keeping abreast of the changing needs of its constituency" (p. 15). Martha Brunson (1980) described leaders as "renaissance persons . . . individuals who though specialized are also versatile enough to assume leadership in areas of knowledge broader than their own" (p. 2). The primary function of an
academic leader from her perspective was being able "to see that faculty work in a setting that will give them the best chance to carry out their professional trust" (p. 2). This involved "creating an atmosphere that will allow us and our faculty to practice our profession well" (p. 4) and establishing "an environment that will influence the quality of life for our faculty, our students, and ourselves" (p. 8). In addition, an effective leader would desire to make an impact both on the campus and beyond.

Management Characteristics

There was "little agreement among executives or educators on what makes a good administrator" (Katz, 1975, p. 19) or where a person acquired the skills for leadership and management. Was a person born with certain leadership characteristics, or were they developed through experience and training were questions being asked.

To identify desirable administrative and management skills, Katz (1975) studied good administrators and analyzed the skills they used. "A skill implies an ability which can be developed, not necessarily inborn, and which is manifested in performance, not merely in potential" (p. 20).

Katz (1975) concluded that effective administrators at all levels within an organization required some competence in each of three basic skills: technical, human, and conceptual. It was his opinion that each of the three skills could be developed through training and experience. The technical skills primarily involved working with things, processes,
or physical objects and required an understanding of and proficiency in a specific kind of activity. Those skills were used particularly when dealing with limited physical and financial resources. The basis of human skills was the ability to work with people. Acquiring those skills involved developing sensitivity and the ability to work effectively as a group member and team leader. Conceptual skills represented the ability to visualize the organization as a whole, and the various relationships within the organization. Creativity was required to look at an organization and its parts in a conceptual manner. "'Conceptual skills' is the unifying, coordinating ingredient of the administrative process. . . . the coordinating and integrating all the activities and interests of the organization toward a common objective" (p. 25). They were used particularly in dealing with external demands.

Rausch (1980) used the Linking Elements Concept as a practical approach to the management of an educational institution. The concept was "based on the fundamental truth that an organizational unit will achieve the highest level of performance that its environment permits if the manager can bring a high level of alignment between the needs of the unit and the characteristics and needs of the people in it" (p. 27). The skills a manager needed to accomplish this were the linking elements. The assumptions central to this management theory were the actions of managers are shaped by three primary influences, the environment, the people who report to the manager, and the manager's personal characteristics; a person cannot motivate others, but can only
create an environment in which others can find motivation; decision making and communication are required for all managerial activities; and success is determined by "the extent to which unit needs are aligned with the needs and characteristics of people in that unit" (p. 8).

The Linking Elements Concept (Rausch, 1980) also gave recommendations for what an organization needed to perform at a high level. The organization required control, direction, and coordination which was accomplished through goals and standards. For high level performance, organization members were required to have technical competence and morale which "depends on the satisfaction that people get from their work" (p. 28).

Another view with reference to administration in an academic environment was expressed by McIntosh and Maier (1976): "Certain general skills and aptitudes are essential in any top administrative position" (p. 87). This was true if the organization was in a period of growth, or in a period of decline, or in a steady state. They defined the baseline skills for administration as integrity, courage, intelligence, energy, and ambition. Other skills as the ability to empathize, scholarly competence, organizational ability, administrative skills, interpersonal skills, emotional stability, vision, fiscal ability, fiscal sense, creativity, and ability to make appropriate value judgments were also important. Making appropriate value judgments required that "emphasis needs to be placed on identifying the right thing to do, and not merely the right manner of doing it" (p. 90). The special attributes of courage, resourcefulness, and independence were especially
important during periods of retrenchment and decline in educational environments.

Although Peters and Waterman's *In Search of Excellence* (1982) described eight attributes that characterized excellent companies, Richardson (1984) applied the attributes to the administration of community colleges. The eight attributes of successful companies were "a bias for action" or a responsiveness to problems in a timely manner; "close to the customer" or a responsiveness to customer's needs; "autonomy and entrepreneurship" which fostered leaders and innovations throughout an organization; "productivity through people" by respecting all individuals in the organization; "hands-on, value driven" or the organization's philosophy/mission was the most important factor in what it achieved; "stick to the knitting" or do what you know best; "simple form, lean staff" exemplified by a lean top administrative staff; and "simultaneous loose-tight properties" or being both centralized and decentralized and giving responsibility to operating levels (Peters & Waterman, 1982, pp. 13-16). Richardson (1984), in applying the attributes, focused on human motivation and recommended that administration needed to value faculty, staff, and students for their role and contributions to the organization. "Positive reinforcement is more effective than negative sanctions. Institutional policies and procedures should permit staff to think of themselves as achievers. . . . Each professional needs to feel a sense of purpose in what he or she is doing within the context of the organization" (p. 26).
Eight general characteristics of effective management in educational institutions were discussed by Dabney Park, Jr. (1980): open communication, teamwork, participation in decision making, encouragement of initiative, mutual support, high standards, use of objectives, and performance evaluation. This author was advocating that group members be listened to, be given opportunities to work together and give input with regard to decisions that needed to be made, and be given flexibility in how they accomplished their tasks. Other responsibilities of management were to encourage and support the work of others and to require their help in developing standards and goals. Timely feedback and reactions to work performance by management served as a coaching and training function in helping others to improve.

Luther Gulick in 1937 described the work of a chief executive by using a made-up word, "POSDCORB." Each letter represented the functional elements of the work of a chief executive: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. Planning involved goal setting and the methods for accomplishing them; organizing was "the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined, and coordinated for the defined objective" (p. 13); staffing entailed the entire personnel function, including hiring, training, and evaluating; directing included making decisions and the following through to check that the decisions were carried out; coordinating referred to "the all important duty of interrelating the various parts of the work" (p. 13); reporting was
"keeping those to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on" (p. 13); and budgeting involved fiscal planning, accounting, and control.

Gulick (1937) discussed administration in particular:

Administration has to do with getting things done with the accomplishment of defined objectives. The science of administration is thus the system of knowledge whereby men may understand relationships, predict results, and influence outcomes in any situation where men are organized at work together for a common purpose (p. 191).

Some of Gulick's (1937) management functions were used by Wolotkiewicz (1980) in describing the responsibilities of a college administrator. More specifically, the administrator's role involved numerous activities that included organizing, planning, directing, coordinating, and evaluating. The administrator was responsible for providing broad general direction to the organization by having clear specified objectives, making available and managing human and material resources so they would be effectively applied toward accomplishing the goals and objectives of the institution, making decisions, and helping others make decisions.

The Mackenzie (1969) model was similar to Gulick's in utilizing functions to describe management, but his model reduced the number of functions to five: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling. The functions were described as being sequential and cyclical. They were illustrated as a complete circle divided into pie-shaped wedges representing each of the five functions. At the center of the management process were the three components of every
organization, identified as ideas, things, and people. Ideas required conceptual thinking, things required administration, and people required leadership. In addition to the five management functions, Mackenzie identified three functions, analyzing problems, making decisions, and communicating, as "'general' or 'continuous' functions because they occur throughout the management process rather than in any particular sequence," (p. 87) and they permeated the entire work process. Analyzing problems involved gathering facts, ascertaining causes, and developing alternate solutions. Making decisions required that conclusions and judgments were made, and communicating was done to ensure understanding.

This researcher utilized Mackenzie's (1969) model in analyzing the role of the chief unit administrator within multiunit community college districts. Special attention was given to the five functions of the management process. The planning function which was used to predetermine a course of action involved the following activities:

- forecast: establish where present course will lead
- set objectives: determine desired end results
- develop strategies: decide how and when to achieve goals
- program: establish priority, sequence and timing of steps
- budget: allocate resources
- set procedures: standardize methods
- develop policies: make standing decisions on important recurring matter (p. 84)
The organizing function involved more of the administrative aspect. This function arranged and related work for effective accomplishment of objectives and included the following activities:

- establish organization structure: draw up organization chart
- delineate relationships: define liaison lines to facilitate coordination
- create position descriptions: define scope, relationships, responsibilities, and authority
- establish position qualifications: define qualifications for persons in each position (Mackenzie, 1969, p. 81)

The staffing function involved choosing competent people for positions in the organization. Staffing was completed by these specific activities:

- select: recruit qualified people for each position
- orient: familiarize new people with the situation
- train: make proficient by instruction and practice
- develop: help develop knowledge, attitudes, and skills (Mackenzie, 1969, pp. 81-82)

The directing function focused on bringing about purposeful action toward desired objectives and included these activities:

- delegate: assign responsibilities and account for results
- motivate: persuade, inspire to take desired action
- coordinate: relate efforts in most effective combination
- manage differences: encourage independent thought and resolve conflict

- manage change: stimulate creativity and innovation in achieving goals (Mackenzie, 1969, p. 82)

The controlling function ensured progress toward objectives according to the plan and consisted of five activities:

- establish reporting system: determine what critical data are needed, how and when

- develop performance standards: set conditions that will exist when key duties are well done

- measure results: ascertain extent of deviation from goals and standards

- take corrective action: adjust plans, counsel to attain standards, replan and repeat cycle

- reward: praise, renumeration and discipline (Mackenzie, 1969, p. 85)

A manager's interest in any one of the five functions depended "on a variety of factors . . . including his position and the stage of completion of the projects he is most concerned with. He must at all times sense the pulse of his organization" (Mackenzie, 1969, p. 86).

Administration of Multiunit Districts

There were two aspects to the administration of multiunit community college districts. One involved the administration of the entire district and the other involved the administration of each unit within the district. The two administrative aspects of multiunit systems contributed to a unique situation because "the structure has
created particular challenges to the relationship between system and campus administrators" (Munitz, 1981, p. 20).

The administration of multiunit community college districts was described as being unique, frustrating, and challenging. This was due to primarily the organization and operation of multicollege districts (Erickson, 1964; Jones, 1968; Lee & Bowen, 1980; Tyler, 1965). A similar view was expressed by Wygal and Owen (1975), "A multicampus college experiences special problems and tensions as a consequence of its size, complexity, and the distances separating its units" (p. 27).

Administrators who have had experience in multiunit districts admitted there was a challenge in deciding how to share power between the central administration and the local units (Monroe, 1972). An opinion expressed by Wattenbarger (1977) revealed that "good community college management has been generally assumed to be synonymous with campus (or college) autonomy and bad management with system controls" (pp. 9-10). According to Erickson (1964), "the goal of the administrative organization ... is to foster the creativity and flexibility of each campus, establishing unity in the multi-campus college without rigid conformity" (p. 19). Monroe (1972) also supported the perception that the management of a multiunit district was not simple.

The problem is not so much how to expand the curriculum and the faculty, or how to build more buildings, but how to allocate to each operating unit, or campus, a reasonable amount of power and autonomy. ... The question of how to
Lee & Bowen (1975) suggested that multicampus systems must exemplify creative use of "the unique organizational structure of multicampus administration, which combines coordination and governance" (p. 226). The reference to coordination implied continuing the campus autonomy or its own institutional style. The governance factor implied "that the central administration has direct operational responsibility and is accountable to the state for the sum of activity across campuses" (p. 226).

Organizing for administration or "how best to develop an organizational structure which will provide unity of purpose, coordination of effort, and efficiency of operation" (Jones, 1968, p. 41) was a problem faced by multiunit districts. Three approaches were used by Jones in describing administrative structures of multiunit districts. The pyramid approach was typical of institutions with greater centralized authority and involved a flow of authority from the top administrator in the central office to the administrators in charge of the branch centers or campuses. The yoke approach reflected "the idea of partial decentralization of authority which permits more autonomy in the branch operation" (p. 43). The yoke structure represented the campus administrator who developed his/her own pyramid structure to describe lines of authority from the campus administrator throughout the campus structure. The circle approach was used to describe district operations of the more autonomous multi-college district model. . . . The college is a circle within a circle and each campus is a circle of its own service area.
The campus circles go together to make up a larger circle which represents the district as one sees the total college (p. 44).

In this model the district office focused on leadership and service rather than rigid control. The circle emphasized the supporting functions of the administrative structure.

Jones (1968) discovered that administrative councils composed of the chief district administrator and the administrative heads of the various units within the district were often used in the multiunit districts. Their purpose was to develop administrative procedures and recommend policy matters. Even with administrative councils in place, confusion among line and staff functions often resulted.

In a study of the development of Arizona multiunit community college districts, Lander (1977) observed that another layer of administrators was added when multiunit districts were formed. The layer was between the first line administrators at each college and the district's chief administrator. The outcome of this administrative structure was the administrative functions of each layer increased in complexity, particularly in relation to communication patterns, delegation of responsibilities, and the centralization of authority.

Jensen (1984) made reference to three principles that should govern a multicampus district. The three principles were identified by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, who in 1963 was director of the Junior College Leadership Program and Professor of Higher Education at U.C.L.A. The principles were

1. Efficiency to avoid needless and costly duplication
2. Consistency of policy and practice

3. Initiative (freedom) on individual campuses (p. 40)

The board within a multiunit district could reduce conflict between the system and campus administrators if both were given greater areas of discretion. To alleviate some of the issues that led to conflict, "the most logical response is a candid and early conversation among system administration, campus administration, and board about their governance expectations" (Munitz, 1981, p. 23).

The administration of multiunit community college districts was addressed by Wattenbarger (1977) by studying one of the primary functions of administration, the decision making process. Administration should have a clear understanding of responsibilities, roles, and authority before problems appear. This involved having policies that established responsibility and authority in the governance structure and clarifying relationships between individuals and units.

Kermit C. Morrissey (1967) suggested that multiunit community college districts should not follow the pattern used by regional universities with branches. Because the branch does not initiate anything without the approval from a center of authority who is far removed from local needs, the administrative structure in university systems was not recommended. The university's philosophy contradicted the community college mission of being responsive to local needs.

Although Charles R. Monroe (1972) was not discussing multiunit community college districts in particular, he made suggestions about
administration that were applicable to the multiunit district. "The administration of the community college, like the administration of any public body, is not an end in itself. Its value is to be measured by the degree to which the college is enabled to function more efficiently and harmoniously" (p. 309). He described the primary function of administration as a general management function of coordinating and balancing the diverse activities of the college. The administration, in essence, became the college's balance wheel by encouraging harmonious efforts and exercising its chief control through the allocation of funds. Administration also had the responsibility for leadership and "giving impetus to reform and change" (p. 310). Other administrative functions included helping students and faculty understand and accept regulations and policies; counseling or comforting by listening to concerns of faculty, students, and staff; serving as a "shock-absorber or scapegoat for the college when it comes under attack from critics and enemies" (Wolotkiewicz, 1980, p. 312); and promoting positive public relations. A weakness of community colleges identified by Monroe (1972) was to imitate other community colleges in their administrative structure and organization. Each college should develop its own structure to fit its needs, including details as administrative titles, numbers of administrators, and division of responsibilities.

The views of Wolotkiewicz (1980) about the administration in community colleges can be applied to multiunit districts. Community colleges were organizations, and organizations consisted "of people, procedures, and resources which function as a unit . . . to accomplish
specific goals" (p. 16). The effectiveness and success of the organization depended on how well it succeeded in accomplishing its goals. This required interactions between and among the leaders and members in the organization and was based on a climate of trust and cooperation so both personal and institutional goals were accomplished.

In a paper presented at the annual convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the Chancellor of Dallas County Community College District identified the leadership skills needed to guide community colleges through the coming decades. The most important skills were ability to plan strategically for long term benefits and goals; the ability to evaluate programs and personnel as a continuous process; the art of collaborative decision making because most things were too complex for one individual to be the sole criterion for decision making; an increased understanding and knowledge by administrators of the entire operations of their institutions; and the ability to build a long term interest in the institution by realizing the individual needs and needs of the organization were synonymous (LeCroy & Shaw, 1982).

Following the principles of good administration were helpful when establishing the administrative structure of a multicampus district. These included streamlining the numbers of administrators, clearly identifying in written form the responsibilities of each administrative job, having free and open communication, and regulating the span of control of an administrator so that the numbers did not
"exceed the number which allows close working relationships between the supervisor and supervised" (Monroe, 1972, p. 313). Another principle recommended there was a "need for a decentralized control on the part of the top supervising administrators" (p. 313) so individuals had the freedom to work in their own manner.

In his study of community colleges Gleazer (1968) suggested several factors contributed to the development of the concepts of administration used in community colleges. Some of the factors were applicable to the multiunit community college districts. For example, when community colleges were first established, they had no traditions or established leadership structures. The role definitions of administrators did not happen quickly and were based on the perceptions individuals had of the jobs to be done. This was also true of the multiunit districts. Their administrative structures tried to address the concerns of a large complex organization, which described the multiunit district. The relation of individual freedom and institutional necessities continued to be a factor in how multiunit districts were structured and managed (Morrissey, 1967).

The administration of a multiunit district was described by several as being complex and challenging. Suggestions from the literature described how the administration processes could be accomplished and maximized at both the unit and district levels to accomplish the goals of the district.
Summary

The "Review of Literature" included four general areas about multiunit community college districts. The growth and development of multiunit districts was discussed first. This was followed by a description of studies researching multiunit community college districts. The areas of centralization/decentralization and administration were described in the final sections of the chapter.

Tracing the growth and development of multiunit community college districts in the United States began with statistical data that reflected how quickly they developed. The description of the developmental stages for multiunit districts provided a basis for exploring why and how districts were established and for classifying them into categories. Problems in establishing and operating multiunit districts along with criticisms about them concluded the first section of the chapter.

Studies involving multiunit districts began with the research conducted by Arthur Jensen (1965a) and Milton Jones (1968). They studied the organization and structure of multiunit districts and the distribution of responsibilities among district units and central office. Other studies that followed researched authority relationships within multiunit districts, patterns of centralization and decentralization, and administrative practices and procedures.

The issue of centralization/decentralization was addressed by reviewing the trends and levels of decision making, control, and authority over the different functions within multiunit districts.
Factors, as personnel, organizational structures, and environmental details influenced the degree of centralization of district functions and the degree of decentralization or campus autonomy. Because there were advantages and disadvantages of being centralized or decentralized, a model was presented that illustrated how balance between centralization and campus autonomy could be achieved.

The final section of the chapter discussed the administration of multiunit community college districts. The terms, leadership, management, administration, and governance were defined and clarified. Several management models, including MacKenzie's (1969) model which used the five functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling, were discussed. Suggestions for the administration of multiunit districts concluded the chapter.

Based on this review, it was evident that Jensen (1965a, 1965b, 1969, 1984) and Kintzer (1969, 1980, 1984) completed extensive research involving the development, organization, and administration of multiunit community college districts.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Description of Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators within multiunit community college districts. Qualitative research methods were used to conduct the study. The Mackenzie (1969) model of management provided the basis for analyzing the responsibilities with reference to five management functions: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling. In addition, the study also included data about the perceptions chief unit administrators had toward their roles.

Data were collected by interviewing the chief unit administrators in three multiunit community college districts in three different states, which included Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri. Additional data were obtained from a questionnaire completed by each administrator, the chief unit administrators' job descriptions, and organizational charts from each district. Catalogs from each college/district were reviewed to provide background and historical information.

The data were used to answer the five research questions identified by the researcher:

1. What was the profile of individuals who hold positions as chief unit administrators within a multiunit community college district?

2. What roles and responsibilities were ascribed to the chief unit administrator?
3. From the chief unit administrator's perspective, what was the relationship between the chief unit administrator and central office?

4. What was the relationship between the chief unit administrators within a multiunit community college district?

5. What management functions were performed by the chief unit administrator within a multiunit community college district?

Descriptive Survey

A qualitative research approach was used for this study and data were collected by using several methods or method triangulation. A qualitative approach was effective to use when a method was needed to define important variables and increase an understanding of the variables involved. Qualitative research was also helpful in studying organizational structures within educational environments and in acquiring a better understanding of a phenomena that was new or not previously studied (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Data collection for this study used method triangulation which meant that more than one method was used to collect the data. "The use of triangulation helps to demonstrate validity and open up new perspectives about the topic under investigation" (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 397). Data were collected from questionnaires completed by chief unit administrators, interviews with the chief unit administrators, and
document analysis of job descriptions, organizational charts, and college catalogs.

In addition, this study was described as a descriptive survey because it generated "knowledge by studying conditions as they currently exist" (Hopkins & Antes, 1990, p. 238). Survey research usually included "questionnaires and interviews in order to determine the opinions, attitudes, preferences, and perceptions of persons of interest to the researcher" (Borg, 1981, p. 130).

Sample for Study

The researcher used the 1990 Statistical Yearbook of Community, Technical, and Junior Colleges to identify the multiunit community college districts in the United States, from which a sample of three was selected. Criteria for selecting the three districts for the study were based on geographic location, size of district, and the governance of the district. Because the districts needed to be within a reasonable travel distance of the researcher's home, the researcher selected one district in each of three states, Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri. The districts selected were not part of a state or university system and were governed by elected boards of directors. The three districts varied in size. One of them was a small rural district, another a mid-size urban district, and the third was a large metro district.

The researcher used the multiunit district in which she was employed to conduct a pilot test of the questionnaire and interview. The pilot test data were not included in the study results and
conclusions. The pilot test provided the researcher an opportunity to review questions for applicability, practice interviewing skills, and judge how long the face-to-face interview would take.

Description of Sample

Three multiunit community college districts served as the sample for this study. To maintain anonymity of the districts and colleges involved, each of the districts, for the purpose of describing data and information, was assigned a number, representing System 1, System 2 and System 3. System 1 was located in Iowa; System 2, in Nebraska and System 3, in Missouri. Each campus/college within each district was then assigned a letter - A, B, and C. Each of the districts included in the study had three colleges/campuses. A brief description of the history and background of the three districts and their campuses/colleges is presented.

The Iowa multiunit community college district

The multiunit community college district in Iowa, selected for this study, was established as a multicollege community college district in 1966 as the result of 1965 legislation passed by the Iowa General Assembly which permitted the organization of area colleges as area community colleges. The district consisted of three colleges located in four counties, plus parts of two other counties and was under the direction of a nine-member board of directors and a chancellor of the district. The chief administrator of each college carried the title of president/vice chancellor; the title of president
represented their role in their colleges and the title of vice chancellor represented the role they had involving district-wide responsibilities. The district administrative offices were centrally located in a downtown area in a separate location from the three colleges.

The college (College 1-A) in this district that was closest to the central office was the largest one and the newest one. It had its start prior to 1966 as part of the local public school system and was originally established to provide a number of vocational and technical programs for high-school age youth and adults. In 1966 this specific vocational program was organized as a community college. In 1979 an arts and sciences program was added, making it a comprehensive community college. The college served a metropolitan area with a population of 400,000. In addition, the college operated an off-campus urban center which was in the same building as the district administrative offices.

The oldest college (College 1-B) in the district was established in 1929 as a junior college and provided two years of college work that led to professional courses or a liberal arts degree. Through the years the college's emphasis expanded from its liberal arts offerings to include commercial subjects, a teacher preparation course, adult education, and special career courses, which resulted in a name change to a community college in 1962. The college was located 35 miles from the district administrative offices in the southern part of the community college district in a community of 24,500.
The third college (College 1-C) in this system was established in 1946 as a junior college and as part of its local public school system. It was located in the northern part of the district in a community of 31,600 about 40 miles from the district administrative offices. Its name was changed from a junior college to a community college in 1964 to coincide with its mission to provide a comprehensive program for its community.

The Nebraska multiunit community college district

The Nebraska multiunit community college district included in the sample was described as a multicampus community college and was established in 1973 to serve a 15 county area. Two of its three campuses were located in rural communities. All three campuses offered vocational/technical programs, and just one of the three offered a college transfer program. The two campuses that provided only vocational/technical programs operated on the quarter schedule and conferred associate of applied science degrees to their graduates of vocational programs. The other campus, which had both the vocational/technical programs and the liberal arts programs, was on a semester schedule and offered both associate of arts and associate of science degrees. The district was governed by a board of directors and an area president, whose administrative offices were located on one of the campuses. The chief administrator at each campus was called a campus director.
The oldest campus (Campus 2-A) in this multicampus community college district recently celebrated its 50th anniversary as the state's first technical college. The campus, which was established in 1941, was located 27 miles from the district administrative offices in a small community of 1,800 people. The campus housed the computer services and business functions for the entire district. A majority of the students attended full time and many took advantage of on-campus housing. The campus had only vocational/technical programs available and emphasized high technology and customized training for business and industry.

The newest campus (Campus 2-B) in this multicampus community college district was established in 1973 in an urban area with a population of 180,400 and housed the district administrative offices in a wing of its single-unit facility. The campus offered only vocational/technical programs and operated on the quarter schedule. The majority of students attending were older and part-time. It operated as a commuter campus as no campus housing was available.

The smallest of the three campuses (Campus 2-C) in the district, with reference to enrollments, was 44 miles from the district administrative offices. The campus was established in 1967 and was the only one offering both vocational programs and academic transfer courses. It was also the only one of the three campuses operating on a semester basis. The 640 acre campus, which included a farm, was located in a community of 12,600. It had campus apartment style
housing available for its students and in addition, provided offices for several community social service agencies.

The Missouri multiunit community college district

A multicollege district that served a four county metropolitan area in Missouri was the third sample for this study. The multicollege community college district was first organized in 1964, but actually carried on the traditions established by the city's junior colleges which had their beginning in 1915. From the beginning and until 1964, the junior colleges were administered by the city's school district. The voters in the city school district, plus seven suburban school districts, approved the formation of the multicollege community college district in 1964. In 1969, five years after the formation of the district, the three colleges as they existed today were opened and served a district population of approximately 1,330,000. All of the colleges were commuter colleges and were comprehensive in the types of programming and services they had available. The district was administered by a six-member board of trustees and a chancellor. The district administrative offices were located adjacent to the downtown campus with the offices being constructed on the top floor of the downtown campus parking ramp. Each college had a president as its chief administrative officer.

The college (College 3-A) that served the northern part of the metropolitan area was located about 20 miles from the district administrative offices on a 205 acre campus. It operated an extension
center in a school district that was annexed to the community college district in 1986. It was the smallest of the three colleges with reference to enrollments. As a part of its comprehensive curriculum and program offerings, the college coordinated the programs and training opportunities for the entire district in the areas of aviation maintenance and veterinary technology.

The downtown college (College 3-B), which had the largest enrollments of the three colleges in the district, was centrally located near the city's business and industrial area on a 25 acre site and was within one block of the district's administrative offices. It also operated an extension campus. A unique function of the college was that it was responsible for the district's entire allied health programs.

The southern and eastern parts of the metropolitan area were served by the third college (College 3-C) in the district, which was located about 20 miles from the district administrative offices on 147 acres. It also had an extension campus which became a part of the district in 1984. A district-wide function of the college was that it provided the automotive technology program and coordinated PACE courses for the entire district.

Data Collection Instruments

The Campus Administrator Response Questionnaire (see Appendix C) was a modified questionnaire prepared by the researcher from a compilation of similar instruments in the literature (Buckner, 1976; Jensen, 1965; LaHay, 1985; Wilch, 1986). The questionnaire was
reviewed by members of the researcher's committee and other individuals in the researcher's community college. Based on their feedback, adjustments were made in the questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire was to collect basic descriptive information about the institution and the administrator. The questionnaire was completed by each chief unit administrator in each of the three multiunit districts included in the study. The questionnaire requested information in three areas: personal data, institutional data, and administrative responsibilities, and was completed by the administrator prior to the interview.

The Structured Interview Guide (see Appendix D) consisted of many interview questions found in the literature and then adapted by the researcher to this study. In addition, new questions were formulated by the researcher with assistance from her program of study committee members and staff members of the pilot district. The questions were open-ended and pertained to Mackenzie's (1969) management functions, self-perceptions and feelings about the unit administrative position, relationships, information flow, challenges and issues, changes, and future directions.

The interview was used to clarify the responsibilities of the unit administrator and gain additional insight about his/her role. The interviews were taped and structured in that each of the nine administrators were asked the same questions in the same sequence. This procedure was used to allow for as much uniformity as possible in the interview process.
Both the Campus Administrator Response Questionnaire and the Structured Interview Guide were approved by the Human Subjects Committee at Iowa State University prior to their use.

Data Collection Process
After the three multiunit community college districts were selected by the researcher with assistance from her major professor, a letter (See Appendix A) was mailed to the president/chancellor of each district requesting his permission to involve the unit administrators in the study. Upon granting the permission, each president/chancellor was asked to send the names, addresses, and phone numbers of each unit administrator in the district to the researcher.

The researcher then sent a cover letter (see Appendix B) with the Campus Administrator Response Survey (See Appendix C) to each chief unit administrator in each of the three districts. A total of nine chief unit administrators were contacted. Each administrator was asked to complete the questionnaire and return it by mail along with his/her job description, organizational chart, and college catalog to the researcher.

One week after the questionnaires were sent, the researcher contacted each campus administrator by phone to establish a time for the face-to-face interview to take place on his/her campus. Two weeks before the interview took place, the researcher sent the chief unit administrators the Structured Interview Guide (see Appendix D) with a letter (see Appendix B) that encouraged them to review the questions prior to the interview.
The researcher conducted the interviews on seven different days within a four week period. The chief unit administrators were interviewed on their campus. Each interview took approximately 1 1/2 hours and was taped.

Analysis of Data

The three tools for collecting the data, the questionnaire, the interview, and the document analysis of the organizational chart and job descriptions, provided the information the researcher used to answer the research questions. The college catalog submitted by each unit administrator was reviewed to provide background and historical information about the district and each unit.

The organizational charts were used to identify titles associated with the chief unit administrator position and to determine the numbers and titles of those in direct reporting relationships with the chief unit administrator.

The job descriptions of each chief unit administrator were analyzed to identify the responsibilities of each administrator. Mackenzie's (1969) five management functions were used to categorize the responsibilities as included in the job descriptions and then make comparisons within the district and across all three districts. The results were reported in table form.

The data from the Campus Administrator Response Questionnaire were presented in a table format and used to compare and contrast the results from the three districts and nine administrators included in the
study. The questionnaires provided personal data, institutional data, and data about administrative responsibilities. Frequencies and means were used to describe the data in numerical terms.

The information from the taped interviews was first typed verbatim, and then analyzed by the researcher. To complete the analysis of the data from the interviews, the researcher reviewed and summarized the responses for each interview question and reported that under "Findings of Structured Interviews" in Chapter 4. As a part of that process, notable phrases and quotes expressed during the interviews were included in the responses. During this entire process, the researcher noted common themes and ideas that appeared throughout the responses given by the administrators who were interviewed. The analysis of the interview responses included an identification of the responsibilities of the chief unit administrator. Mackenzie's (1969) five management functions provided the framework for categorizing roles and responsibilities. Feelings and self-perceptions were summarized and evaluated according to the degree of uniformity that existed among the responses by each of the nine administrators.

All of the data collected from the document analysis, questionnaires, and interviews were compiled to respond to each of the five research questions originally identified for the study.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

An Overview

The purpose of this chapter was to report the findings compiled from the data that were used by the researcher to identify the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators within multiunit community college districts. The data were collected by involving nine chief unit administrators from three different multiunit community college districts. Interviews were conducted with each administrator, in addition to having each of them complete a questionnaire and submit organizational charts, job descriptions, and college catalogs to the researcher for analysis.

The questionnaire elicited basic demographic information on the profile of the institutions and the profile of the chief unit administrators. The organizational charts provided data about the numbers and titles of those in direct reporting relationships with the chief unit administrator. An explanation of responsibilities associated with the position of chief unit administrator and the perceptions the administrators had about those responsibilities resulted from the interviews. The job descriptions were used to analyze responsibilities in relation to five categories of management functions. All of the data were used to make comparisons among all of the administrators involved in the study. A more detailed description of the findings follows.
Findings of Campus Administrator Response Questionnaire

The responses to the Campus Administrator Response Questionnaire (See Appendix C) provided demographic information about each of the subjects interviewed and each of their respective campuses/colleges. For reporting purposes, the multicollege community college district in Iowa was identified as System 1, the multicampus community college district in Nebraska as System 2, and the multicollege district in Missouri as System 3.

Each of the nine chief unit administrators involved in the study received the questionnaire in the mail and completed it prior to the interview. Personal data compiled from the questionnaire revealed that eight of the nine administrators were male, one was female, and

| System 1 - A | 52 | Male | White | Married |
| System 1 - B | 47 | Male | White | Married |
| System 1 - C | 44 | Female | White | Married |
| System 2 - A | 58 | Male | White | Married |
| System 2 - B | 43 | Male | White | Married |
| System 2 - C | 63 | Male | Asian/American | Married |
| System 3 - A | 47 | Male | White | Married |
| System 3 - B | 48 | Male | White | Married |
| System 3 - C | 50 | Male | Chicano | Married |
all nine were married. Seven were white, one was of the Chicano ethnicity, and another was Asian/American (See Table 1). Their ages ranged from 43 to 63 with the median age being 48 years.

With reference to how long each of them had been in his/her present position and what type of position they had held prior to assuming their present one, four had moved from other colleges to the district to assume their present position, and five assumed it by moving internally from some other position within the district (See Table 2). Of the four administrators that moved to their district for the chief unit administrator position, two of them were employed in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 1</th>
<th>Title in Previous Position</th>
<th>Years in Present Position</th>
<th>Years in Present Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System 1 - A</td>
<td>Assoc. Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - B</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - C</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2 - A</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - B</td>
<td>Assist. Campus Director</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - C</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3 - A</td>
<td>District Director</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - B</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - C</td>
<td>Acting Dean</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the small rural district. The other two were in the two larger districts.

One of the unit administrators interviewed was presently serving as an interim president for one year in addition to serving as vice chancellor of educational services for the district. Of the other eight, the only female in the group had been in her position for 1 1/2 years and had moved to the district for the position. Two of the chief unit administrators had been in their positions for 12 years. Average tenure as a chief unit administrator was 6 to 7 years.

Of the positions held prior to their present position, four had been deans or acting dean, two were vice presidents, one was an assistant campus director, one was an associate vice chancellor, and one was a district director.

Three of the nine administrators had been employed by their district for over 20 years. The average tenure in the district for the nine was almost 13 years.

The titles of the chief unit administrators (See Table 3) were not consistent among the three districts. The two larger districts, which were multicollege community college districts, assigned the title of president to their chief unit administrators. One was called an interim president. Four of the presidents, which included the interim president, in the two multicollege districts also had the title of vice chancellor because each had assigned district-wide responsibilities. The chief unit administrators in the two multicollege districts reported directly to the district chancellor.
The chief unit administrators in the multicampus district were called campus directors and each reported directly to the area president of the multicampus community college district.

Annual salaries of eight of the nine administrators were $60,000 and above; one had a salary in the range of $55,000 - 59,999.

In reviewing the academic background and areas of study of the nine responders to the questionnaire (See Table 4), only one had an A.A./A.S. degree. All but one administrator had both a B.A./B.S. degree and a M.A./M.S. degree. Five with B.A./B.S. degrees had some type of an educational major and four with M.A./M.S. degrees had an educational
Table 4. Degrees and areas of study of chief unit administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>System 1 - A</th>
<th>System 1 - B</th>
<th>System 1 - C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Architecture/Ed.</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>Ed. Adm.</td>
<td>Counseling/Psych</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 2 - A</th>
<th>System 2 - B</th>
<th>System 2 - C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS</td>
<td>Auto Body</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Ind. Arts Ed.</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD/EdS</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Curric/Instruct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Admin/Supr. of Voc. Ed.</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 3 - A</th>
<th>System 3 - B</th>
<th>System 3 - C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Secondary Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>Counseling/Stu. Personnel</td>
<td>Secondary Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Counseling/ Psychology</td>
<td>Higher Ed. Admin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

major. Seven of the nine had post-graduate degrees. Of the two that did not have a post-graduate degree, one administrator was presently a candidate for a doctoral degree. Only one of the nine administrators had no degree above a master's degree.

Institutional data from the questionnaire provided information about the individual campuses/colleges and districts (See Table 5).
The oldest multiunit district included in the study was the one located in Iowa, as it was established in 1966. The Missouri district was formed in 1969, and the rural district in Nebraska was the newest of the three. It was established in 1973.

Table 5. Institutional data: Year established, enrollments, and operating budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 1 -</th>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>Fall 1990 Enrollments</th>
<th>FY'91 Operating Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - A</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$ 6,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - B</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - C</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - A</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>$ 7,834,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - B</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>10,383,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - C</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - A</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$ 7,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - B</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - C</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>4,836</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater differences in age were observed when noting the dates the individual campuses/colleges were started. In the Iowa district, one college had a 62 year history as it was started in 1929. Another one in the same district was founded in 1946. The third college was established in 1966, the same year the district was formed.

Two of the three campuses in the Nebraska district also came into their district with some history and traditions, as one had been
established in 1941 and the other in 1967. The origination of the third campus coincided with the establishment of the district in 1973.

In the metropolitan district in Missouri, the origination of each of the three colleges was at the same time as the establishment of the district in 1969.

College/campus enrollment numbers for the study were based on full time equivalent enrollments in the fall of 1990. Enrollments on each campus in the Iowa district ranged from 1,120 to 2,500; in the Nebraska district from 650 to 2,800; and in the Missouri district from 3,000 to 5,000.

The campus/college operating budgets varied from $2,750,000 for one of the Iowa colleges to $20,000,000 for the largest college in the Missouri district. There appeared to be a relationship between enrollments and operating budgets as the unit with the largest enrollments within each district had the largest operating budget.

The numbers of employees on each campus that were directly supervised by each chief unit administrator ranged from 4 to 12 employees (See Table 9). In most instances, the employees supervised were campus administrative personnel.

The campus administrators were asked to select from a list of 12 administrative responsibilities those functions that were most demanding of their time and administrative skills, those that were least demanding, and those functions where administrators preferred spending their time and using their skills. The 12 administrative responsibilities were central office requests, business and financial
management, personnel management, facilities/equipment management, curriculum/instructional management, economic development, public relations, students, alumni, legislation, professional activities and fund raising. The results were shown in Table 6. Each chief unit administrator selected three responsibilities that were the most demanding of the administrator's time and administrative skills. The responsibility that was selected as being most demanding for the greatest number of chief unit administrators was business and financial management. Their second selection was personnel management, followed by curriculum/instructional management. Three other areas identified in this group were facilities/equipment management, public relations, and central office requests. Although the respondents were asked to prioritize their top three selections, errors were made by them in following those directions, so it was not possible for the researcher to record accurate findings with reference to the prioritizing of administrative responsibilities.

In selecting the three responsibilities that were least demanding of time and administrative skills, all nine administrators selected alumni as one of the responsibilities. Fund raising, as an area of responsibility, ranked second and the area of legislation was third. Other areas of responsibilities included in the responses to this question in order were professional activities, students, central office requests, and economic development.

When respondents were asked to identify the responsibilities in which they would prefer spending their time and utilizing their
Table 6. Skill and time demands of the administrative responsibilities of chief unit administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Demanding Administrative Responsibilities&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Least Demanding Administrative Responsibilities</th>
<th>Preferred Administrative Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Financial Mgmt</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Curriculum/Instr. Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Mgmt</td>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Equipment Mgmt</td>
<td>Professional Activities</td>
<td>Personnel Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Economic Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Requests</td>
<td>Central Office Requests</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Dev.</td>
<td>Facilities/Equipment Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Responses are ranked and listed in priority order. The first responsibility in each list was selected by the greatest number of chief unit administrators. The last item was selected by the fewest number of administrators.

administrative skills, their top choice was curriculum/instructional management, followed by public relations as their second choice. Other choices in priority order included the responsibilities of business and financial management, personnel management, economic development, students, facilities/equipment management, professional activities, and fund raising.
The last question in the questionnaire asked the chief unit administrators to prioritize the groups of individuals they worked with most closely by using the numbers one through five, with number one representing the group they worked with most closely (See Table 7). Seven of the nine administrators selected other campus administration as the group they worked with most closely. The other groups in priority order were central office administration as second, followed by faculty, community members, and students.

Table 7. Campus and community work relationships with chief unit administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Administration</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Administration</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*mean = an average of the numbers used to rank choices. Number 1 was the group worked with most closely; numbers 2 through 5 were used to rank the other four groups with #5 identifying the group that administrators worked with least closely.

Findings of Structured Interviews

Each participant, as a chief unit administrator within a multiunit community college district, was asked to respond to 36 questions in a face-to-face interview held on the administrator's campus. The participants were encouraged to speak openly and to ask for
clarification or explanations if necessary. Anonymity and confidentiality were assured by the researcher, and the researcher received complete cooperation from all of the participants. A summary of the responses to the interview questions follows.

**Question 1:** Describe the geographic location of your campus in relation to central office. What impact does your geographic location relative to central office have on your campus operation?

In the three districts included in this study, variations existed in the location of the central office in relation to its units. (See Table 8) In two of the three districts, the district offices or central administrative offices were located on one of the campuses, and in one instance, the offices occupied a space in the same building as the campus operation. Only one of the community college districts had administrative offices established in a location away from each of its three colleges. The colleges in the Iowa district were located 10, 35, and 40 miles from central offices. Two campuses in the Nebraska district were established 27 and 44 miles from the area president's administrative offices. Twenty miles separated two of the colleges from district offices in the Missouri district.

When discussing the impact of the location of the central administrative offices to each unit, the respondents indicated that it had little impact and that geography was not a factor. The issues of having autonomy, being intrusive, giving preferential treatment, and being neglected came through in the discussions. Accessibility, travel distances, convenience factors, and communication mechanisms were
other factors that created concerns in multiunit districts. One of the campus directors, who was located 27 miles from the central administrative offices, concluded it was advantageous to be closer to administrative offices because "it makes it easier to communicate" and

Table 8. Locations of campuses/colleges in relation to central office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Campus A</th>
<th>Campus B</th>
<th>Campus C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 miles</td>
<td>35 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 miles</td>
<td>same building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 miles</td>
<td>1 block</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

table to administrative offices. Being closer also made it easier for central office staff to come to campus.

Each of the two campus administrators that were located near the administrative offices recognized the fact that the central office staffs were effective in not being intrusive when it came to campus operations. In the Missouri district, a concern was expressed five years ago about the consideration to locate the administrative offices on the downtown campus and if that location would be detrimental to all three colleges. The possibility of being detrimental existed if the
downtown campus got preferential treatment because of its closeness to the central office or if the central office was intrusive in the operation of the downtown college. The president of the downtown campus explained that the central office location had not been detrimental and attributed it to the personalities of the district office staff and the college staff.

Three of those interviewed implied that being a distance from central offices allowed them greater autonomy; those three were located between 20 and 45 miles from their district administrative offices. A Missouri college president expressed it this way: "You would think you would have more autonomy in being apart from central. On the other hand, it is mostly perception. You feel you have more autonomy; you also feel you are more neglected."

According to some respondents, the effects of geography and the differences in locations of central offices and units were lessened because of the communication tools that were being used in the district. Facsimile machines, computer main frames, voice mail, and phone systems were used to simplify and enhance communicating among all of the units in the district.

One of the presidents in the Iowa district did suggest that because the central office was not located on any of its campuses, central office administrators did not have much contact with the student environment. That president felt that was a disadvantage.

**Question 2:** To whom do you report directly? Who on campus reports directly to you?
All of the chief unit administrators in the multiunit districts interviewed reported to the district's chief executive officer. Those chief unit administrators that had the title of president reported to a chancellor. The chief unit administrators who had the title of campus director reported to an area president (See Table 3).

Each of the unit administrators explained that their deans and administrators of main functions reported to them directly and formed the management team for the respective campus/college (See Table 9). One of the Nebraska campuses had program supervisors reporting directly to the campus director; the program supervisors were classified as faculty rather than administrators.

In the Nebraska multicampus district the number of individuals reporting directly to the chief unit administrator ranged from 10 to 12. In the two larger districts, the numbers of administrators reporting directly to the unit presidents varied from four to ten.

**Question 3:** How often are you in contact with central office? For what reasons are those contacts usually made?

Six out of the nine unit administrators interviewed said they were in contact with central office daily, often by telephone or the use of voice mail (in the Missouri district). The other three administrators varied in their responses and said they had contact with central office one to three times weekly. Contacts with central office were not restricted to just the area president/chancellor, but included all central office administrators and staff.
Contacts were made with central office primarily for sharing information, seeking input, and requesting clarification. In addition, two of the presidents from the Iowa district used the contacts to coordinate efforts on projects and make preparations for meetings.

Table 9. College/campus personnel with direct reporting relationships to chief unit administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 1</th>
<th>System 2</th>
<th>System 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-A (10)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2-A (12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3-A (6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. to President</td>
<td>Asst. Campus Dir.</td>
<td>4 Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of College</td>
<td>1 Dean</td>
<td>1 Assoc. Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Deans</td>
<td>Business Mgr.</td>
<td>1 Non-administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assoc. Deans</td>
<td>4 Coord. &amp; Suprs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Director</td>
<td>4 Dept. Chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-B (5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2-B (11)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3-B (7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of College</td>
<td>2 Deans</td>
<td>3 Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Director</td>
<td>2 Directors</td>
<td>Business Mgr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Dept. Chairs</td>
<td>2 Program Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-C (4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2-C (10)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3-C (7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Asst. to President</td>
<td>Asst. Director</td>
<td>Asst. to President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Deans</td>
<td>1 Dean</td>
<td>4 Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Coord. &amp; Suprs.</td>
<td>1 Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Program Suprs.</td>
<td>Security Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

()a = numbers of personnel reporting directly to chief unit administrator of that unit.

The topics discussed were most often related to budget issues, personnel, physical plant, and business operations or were project oriented. It was suggested by one president in the Missouri district
that those functions that were centralized were often the reason for the contact with central office.

Central office contacts in the Iowa district included contacts among the college presidents themselves since each of the presidents also served as a vice chancellor with district-wide responsibilities.

**Question 4:** How often do you meet with central office administration? What subjects tend to be most often addressed?

Formal meetings between chief unit administrators and central office administrators, including the district chancellor/area president, varied from having weekly meetings to meeting two or three times a month. Other than the regularly scheduled meetings called by the district chief executive officer, chief unit administrators also met individually with other central office administrators when a particular issue, project, or concern needed to be addressed.

According to those interviewed, the topics most often addressed at the meetings between the chief unit administrators and central office administrators were budget and financial issues, personnel and staffing, planning, facilities, policies, and policy implementation. Other subjects that were topics for discussion and information included preparation for board meetings, legislative issues, academic issues and programs, collective bargaining, and student issues. The meetings were also used by the unit administrators to share information about what was happening on their campuses and to coordinate efforts on projects.
One unit administrator expressed a concern regarding the "fuzzy line" between the responsibilities of the chief unit administrators and the responsibilities of the vice chancellors and expressed a need for clarification.

**Question 5:** How does your geographic location in relation to the other campuses in the district affect your operation?

Answers to this question varied from it doesn't affect us and has no impact on us to the implication that units within a district were in competition with each other. One chief unit administrator believed because there were three colleges in the district, more administrators, equipment, and supplies were needed than if there were just one college in the district. On the positive side, this same individual theorized that by having the three colleges in three different communities, each community had greater support and ownership of the college; therefore, the colleges "were viewed as the center of the community."

Because the chief unit administrators in the Iowa district also had district-wide responsibilities, one of them acknowledged there was a convenience factor involved, particularly when considering the time required if a president had to travel to the other campuses. A different perspective was shared by one of the unit administrators in the rural community college district. Because the campuses were not far apart, it was not difficult to travel among them and their locations were conducive to bringing all of the staff together from the three campuses for a staff development day.
One president speculated that the college closest to the central administrative offices might have a more difficult situation because of being "over-shadowed by the chancellor." An observation by another administrator focused on the feelings that resulted when other chief unit administrators in the district failed to appreciate the distinctiveness of the students and the geographic area served by a particular college.

If there were a lack of communication among the unit administrators, it was difficult to be informed about what was occurring on each campus in the district. This created, according to one of the campus directors interviewed, "a self-sufficiency" or "the idea you are a college independent of the other two."

Two of those interviewed discussed the concern of competition among campuses. One concluded that because there was not a lot of duplication of programs, "that helped in that we are not directly competing for the same students." A different president implied there was some competition among the colleges in certain areas, particularly in continuing education and in serving the needs of business and industry. That same individual suggested that some competition was healthy and explained that efforts were being made to avoid duplication, especially when it involved expensive programs.

Question 6: How often do you meet with the other chief campus administrators in your district? Who usually initiates the meetings? What subjects are usually addressed?
All of the individuals interviewed stated they had no regular meeting times among themselves that excluded the chancellor or area president. The chief unit administrators from the rural district met occasionally without their president when it was mutually agreed upon by all three and if work needed to be done on a special project.

The administrators from the Iowa district met informally at times without the chancellor for the purpose of sharing information about campus and district concerns. All could initiate the meetings. The informal meetings were most often used when the weekly meetings with the chancellor were cancelled because of the chancellor's schedule.

In the large metropolitan community college district, the chief unit administrators did not meet informally with each other. When meetings were initiated, they were initiated by the chancellor and consisted of their formal weekly meetings, which included the chancellor, the vice chancellors, and the three presidents. One president gave this explanation: "We are such an intertwined district that it would not be productive for the three of us, because we rely so much on the three vice chancellors to get our job done." This same idea was reinforced by another president in the district who said: "We don't deal with each other a lot; we deal with the vice chancellors since they have what we want. They can help us do things while the other presidents can't help me do much." Another president shared that contact was occasionally made with the other presidents by phone.
The topics discussed at the informal meetings of the chief unit administrators were often issue oriented or projects with district-wide implications. As an example, the Nebraska administrators had been working on a district-wide proposal for tech prep and a recommendation for automating student service activities.

**Question 7:** What are your primary concerns in working with the other chief campus administrators in your district?

The chief unit administrators in each of the three districts used these phrases to describe their relationships with their counterparts: "There is a great deal of trust with the presidents; we are a good team; and we work very well together."

Specific concerns regarding communicating, uniformity, and support for each other were expressed. One administrator suggested "communication is an area that can be improved in any organization." When decisions were made, "we had to look at the college and the effect that any decision would have on the overall." Another administrator said we have to be sure we are all "singing from the same hymnbook" when sharing information with our faculty and staff; that means "coordinating our message and doing it somewhat uniformly." In addition, one of the Nebraska administrators believed it was necessary to "interpret area policies and administer them the same on all three campuses so we can maintain some consistency in what we are doing and not create problems for employees when they get treated differently on different campuses."
The feelings of one administrator were expressed in this way: "I think you are on guard at all times." His statement expressed concern regarding the necessity for each chief unit administrator within a district to understand the differences and uniqueness of each campus within the district and how those differences impact programming, student services, and resource allocations.

An administrator in the metropolitan district said,

Any time when you have a multicampus operation, you are going to have a degree of pushing and pulling with reference to the centralization/decentralization issue. The presidents work together, especially when we are trying to protect those functions that we believe should be decentralized, especially educational delivery.

Question 8: What professional organizations are of most benefit to you?

Each of the nine individuals interviewed responded to this question by naming the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) and its affiliates as being of benefit. Other organizations named included:

AAHE - American Association of Higher Education
AVA - American Vocational Association
National Alliance of Community and Technical Colleges
National Association for College and University Business Officials
National Council for Resource Development
American Technical Education Association
National Association of Financial Aid Administrators
President's Council of Missouri Community College Association
Phi Delta Kappa local chapter
**Question 9:** When you are seeking advice from someone outside of your organization about an issue facing you on your campus, who are you most likely to contact?

The responses were evenly divided among the following groups: business and community members, contacts through professional associations, former co-workers, counterparts in colleges and universities, and specialists. One chief unit administrator replied that no advice was sought, and if an outside opinion was needed, his spouse was asked.

The value of having contacts and a network was described by one who was interviewed: "As an administrator, you can't know everything, but there are people who know what you need to know."

**Question 10:** What responsibilities do you have that are unique to you and your campus as compared to the other campuses in your district?

The majority of the uniquenesses described by the unit administrators related to differences in programming on their respective campuses. For example, in the Nebraska district, two of the campuses just had vocational/technical programs available. One of those two specialized in the high/heavy tech programs and served as a training center for several major businesses and industries, including General Motors and John Deere. The other vocational/technical campus had the added responsibility of providing educational programs to three correctional facilities. The third Nebraska campus was unique in that
it was the only one that had an academic transfer program available in addition to its vocational/technical programs.

One of the Iowa administrators identified three specific projects related to programs that were unique: a scholarship program operated in cooperation with Georgetown University which provided training for Central American students, an ESL (English as a Secondary Language) credit program, and a communications media program which operated as a two plus two program with a high school adjacent to the college and involved college students attending the high school campus where the program was housed.

The colleges in the Missouri district also had some unique programs that were operated on a district-wide basis. One college specialized in the allied health programs and training for child care workers, another in aviation maintenance and manufacturing processes, and the third in automotive and PACE programs.

Other uniquenesses shared by three of the administrators related to changing the perceptions the community and the other campuses in the district had about a campus. For one college, it meant changing the perception of the old junior college strong in its academic transfer programs to one of a comprehensive community college. In another district, one of the communities had shown animosity toward the college when it changed from being a junior college to part of a community college district. Changing those feelings involved having the president re-establish close ties with the K-12 schools and the community. Another administrator felt responsibilities were unique
because of "the very pluralistic make-up of our student body" in relation to the other two campuses in the district. The fact the campus was strictly a commuter campus (the other two were residential) and had an older and larger part-time student population contributed to its uniqueness.

One of the campuses in Nebraska was unique in the fact that more than 50 percent of its students were from outside the district's 15 county area, resulting in statewide recruitment for the campus. That same campus did extensive follow-up with its graduates by sending a questionnaire to employers six months after the graduate had been on the job to assess quality of that individual's preparation for the job.

Two of the administrators identified their extensive involvement in their communities as a uniqueness. Another was unique because of being responsible for the administration of a large externally funded program. The responsibility for a major extension campus was unique for one of the Missouri college presidents.

**Question 11:** What responsibilities do you have that have district-wide implications?

Four of the chief unit administrators had the title of president/vice chancellor. The vice chancellor role was associated with specific district-wide responsibilities. In their vice chancellor roles, two of the administrators were responsible for district educational and instructional services, which included the development and coordination of programs and program changes. A third president/vice chancellor had responsibility for student development
services, administrative data processing, and telecommunications. The other was a vice chancellor for administration and directed district-wide business office operations, human resources, staff development, and facilities.

One of the chief unit administrators in the Nebraska system supervised the district business office and computer system located on his campus. The other two Nebraska administrators had less clearly defined district responsibilities, but one did occasionally represent the district at state instructional officer meetings. The other identified his district responsibility as helping the other two campuses and area office understand the importance of the academic transfer programs and their relationship to the vocational/technical programs.

Because of a background in student personnel work, one of the administrators in the Missouri district was working on two special projects addressing financial aid and the counseling and advisement system in the district, with the goal to improve the quality and uniformity of those two programs throughout the district.

**Question 12:** How would you describe the status of your position as chief campus administrator?

In response to this question, four of the administrators related their status to the degree of autonomy they had in managing their campus or college. It was described by one as: "Each campus administrator is the responsible person for that campus operation." Another said, "Even though we are a part of a system, I think they see
me as the leader of this institution, almost autonomous from the
district, and for external purposes, I see nothing wrong with that."

Four of the administrators in describing their status said their
communities identified with the college, not the district. For example,
when coordinating training programs for business and industry, one
administrator found that the businesses wanted to work with the
college, not necessarily the district. Another said, "The people I work
with do not understand the intricacies of our district organization and
they really don't care." A similar view was expressed in this way, "A
lot aren't even aware we are part of a district, and it is reinforced by
the autonomy we have to manage locally."

The feelings the communities had toward their colleges and chief
unit administrators were related in some instances to the involvement
of the administrator and college personnel in community activities and
organizations. Because of that, one administrator was "regarded as the
person that can get things done. I do have the authority to do it" and
also knew the chancellor would support and back what was committed
by that administrator. For that to happen, this administrator
expressed, "There has to be a lot of trust and understanding."

The chief unit administrators had other thoughts about the status
of their position. Their quotes specifically were:

In the community I am the CEO and I relate to other
CEOs as a CEO.

It is a position of very high status.
At national meetings as AACJC, I am considered a president of a college, just like the presidents of other colleges.

When you look at our district, we have trained a lot of presidents for other community colleges and from that viewpoint, it is recognized that a campus president here certainly has the ability to go on to operating his/her own college, whether it be a single college district or a multicollege district.

One of the administrators responded to this question by sharing why his/her district consciously decided to call its chief unit administrators presidents.

There is a lot of status associated with titles. . . . There is a status that goes with that title of president. . . . The recognition by the community of you as the president far exceeds and serves to your benefit than if you were carrying a title of executive dean or vice-president.

Only one negative comment was made regarding the status issue, and it was made by one of the Iowa campus administrators. That administrator explained that the chief executive officers of the community colleges in Iowa have a presidents' group. It was only in this group that this president felt like a "second-class citizen" because the other presidents considered the chancellor of the district as the head of the college and did not recognize the three college presidents in the multicollege district as presidents and one of their peers.

**Question 13:** What area or responsibility do you feel is being most neglected by you? From your perspective, what is the reason this has occurred?
Specific areas that were being neglected by several of the administrators included fund raising and grantsmanship, alumni development, faculty, and personnel management. Some expressed the desire to spend more time in the communities they served, with the public schools, and with business and industry. One administrator wanted to be more involved with academics, particularly in program development, program refinement, program improvement, and in just having opportunities to sit in some classes "to get a feel for what is going on in the classroom." Another wanted to be better informed about "what is going on day to day at the level of detail that I would like to know."

One of the respondents, rather than identifying a particular area, said, "It varies from day to day. You put your emphasis on the most pressing responsibility at the time. . . . I don't think that means anyone is neglectful in his/her responsibility; it is just the situation at the time."

Reasons for not giving more attention to these areas were described as: lack of time, the timing is not right, the financial situation at the time, a lack of interest or desire because "the return is disproportionate to the effort," the demands on the president and president's office, the rapid growth of the college, and lack of administrative and support staff, particularly in personnel management and in the academic/instructional area.

Question 14: What changes would you like to see in your responsibilities as chief campus administrator?
Most of the changes suggested were one of two types, changes the individual campus wanted to make or changes that campus administrators wanted that would involve a change in participation from the central administrative offices.

From the perspective of the chief unit administrators, suggestions for changes included the following:

- increase in support personnel.
- more input and involvement in the income side of the budget, particularly income sources involving grants and contracts.
- more authority in the area of administrative services involving auxiliary services, physical plant, and grounds.
- more involvement with programs.
- more opportunities to visit faculty and classes.
- more time to devote to long range planning for the campus.
- more time to work with faculty, staff, and the community.

Two campus administrators specifically wanted to have more coordination from central offices in the areas of personnel management and instruction/academics. With reference to the area of personnel management, a need was expressed to have help at central office with "the bureaucracy of those processes."
Question 15: What concerns or issues exist because you are part of a multiunit community college district that would not exist if you were in a single institution district?

A variety of concerns and issues related to multiunit districts were identified by those interviewed. Those described by the chief unit administrators from the Nebraska multicampus district were

- the coordination needed "to maintain the outward visibility of being one institution."

- the time and effort needed to develop special projects. "Sometimes it takes more time to get things moving and developed with a broader kind of involvement."

- the recognition that each campus has its own history and traditions and how that impacts the history and traditions of the district.

- the tendency for each campus in a district to move in its own direction.

- consistency of operations among all campuses in the district.

- "the autonomous individualistic attitude" a campus may have and how that impacts a district.

The issues and concerns expressed by the unit administrators in the Iowa multicollege district included

- the dilution of dollars because of duplication of staff for service-oriented areas, as the library.

- the costs of operating a multicollege district because of the multiple levels of administration and having equipment/materials/supplies in more than one location.
- the slower response time by a college to new ideas and programs because of needing approval from other units in the district.
- slower communication in order to reach out to all units in the district.
- coordination of efforts.
- the allocation of financial resources for campuses as compared to district offices.

The administrators from the Missouri multicollege district expressed the following concerns:
- decision making is a slower process.
- the governance process is more complex because of trying to get input from all segments of the district. "The bigger the organization, the more complex it is."
- consideration for the impact of decisions on each unit within the district.
- communication and articulation among units in the district.
- recognizing and respecting "the culture of the district and the culture of each unit."
- district vice chancellors' areas of responsibilities in relation to campus administrators' responsibilities.
- fairness of treatment to faculty and personnel district-wide and how that influences morale.
- the complexity of trying to get everyone together to work on something.
- fairness of the allocation of money to units in the district.
- presidents being kept informed about the chancellor's contacts with board members.

- consistency of messages to legislators by the presidents and chancellor. "The only person that can speak to them with any authority is the chancellor."

- respecting the territories of each unit.

- "The time it takes to get anything done because of the complex situation to work with."

Although the majority of concerns and issues reflected negative aspects of multiunit districts, two administrators had something positive to say about being in a multiunit district. One explained there were better opportunities to serve the people and community because of the location of the campus to its community as compared to having just one campus in a district. As administrator of a smaller campus in a multiunit district, he/she believed more services were available to the campus, as statewide coordination, labor market surveys, and institutional research than if the campus were a single institution. The costs of providing those services in a single institution district could be prohibitive.

**Question 16:** What major concerns or issues are you now addressing on your campus?

Each of the administrators in the three multiunit districts expressed concerns related to finances and budgetary matters. Those concerns influenced some of the other issues described by the chief unit administrators.
The administrators from the Nebraska district described their major concerns and issues that were presently being addressed on their campuses:

- ensuring that high tech programs are current and updated.
- coordinating efforts with local high schools and education service units to prepare students for vocational/technical programs.
- upgrading facilities.
- managing limited financial resources because of economic slump and state resources.
- establishing a post secondary coordinating commission by the state legislature.
- creating unity on campus by getting different programs and departments to work together.
- developing new evaluation processes for programs and faculty.
- developing a tech prep model to use with local high schools.
- working with social service agencies.
- developing a fiber optic system.

The administrators from the Iowa multic和平ice district described their major campus concerns and issues:

- moving to a shared governance structure that would allow more operational decisions to be made at the department level.
- addressing needs of full-time faculty.
- combining programs with other campuses for cost effectiveness and to avoid duplication of programs, i.e. electronics technology, auto mechanics.

- increasing use of the instructional television system through district wide programs, i.e. nursing, hazardous material technology, pharmacy technology.

- developing new vocational programs.

- making "appropriately managed student housing available."

- determining performance objectives for arts and sciences.

- evaluating and improving the foundation.

- developing a tech center.

- arranging for facility maintenance and repair.

The administrators of the colleges within the Missouri multicolllege district identified the following concerns and issues presently being addressed on their campuses:

- planning budgetary needs for capital improvements, expanding programs, and purchasing instructional equipment.

- expanding use of telecommunications.

- expanding use of computer assisted instruction.

- evaluating allied health programs in relation to responding to workforce needs.

- reducing the numbers of part-time faculty in relation to full-time faculty.

- replacing veteran faculty upon retiring and the time and money involved in doing that.
- improving the concern shown to and the treatment of students.
- planning for the next five years.
- improving faculty morale.
- handling increased growth without suitable facilities.
- expanding the district by annexing a school district.
- evaluating part-time faculty.
- maintaining special projects with limited resources.

Question 17: Please talk about one or two duties you perform under the planning category that you consider most significant.

All of the chief unit administrators were involved in long range/strategic planning activities as a district function under the direction of their district chief executive officer. The purpose of the long range planning was to provide general directions for the district and individual campuses. Each of the campuses had a separate plan, except for one campus which basically used the district plan as its plan. In most instances the district management group led by the chancellor/area president initiated the planning process.

The administrators in the Missouri district described the process as identifying strategic statements for the district. The campuses then established objectives based on the strategic statements. The administrators from the Iowa district called their process 20/20 which involved developing a vision for the next few years.
Planning for the Nebraska campuses began with the program areas on each campus identifying directions they wanted to go; those were then combined to form the individual campus plans. "The campus plan is eventually amalgamated into the district plan." After the campuses identified their objectives, the campus management teams or planning committees outlined the strategies for accomplishing the objectives, established timelines, and assigned responsibilities to the objectives. Included in the process were the allocation of staff and financial resources, and a plan for curriculum changes and facilities.

An Iowa administrator described the value of planning in a multiunit district with this statement: "We not only need the college plan, we need to make sure there is coordination of those plans under an umbrella as a district." "To lead the campus plan and to coordinate with the district" was the way a second president described the planning role.

Some other duties related to planning included the day-to-day planning by an individual administrator and the weekly meetings with campus deans to review what needed to be done that week. Preparation for North Central Accreditation was described as a significant planning responsibility in one of the districts. One president used quarterly administrative meetings to determine administrative objectives for the year, assign responsibilities to them, and then evaluate progress in accomplishing the objectives.

**Question 18:** Describe one or two duties you consider significant that fall into the organizing category.
The involvement of chief unit administrators in the function of organizing varied considerably. One referenced organizing as a function used "to address special projects or special activities that need to be carried out." Another related to organizing and prioritizing his/her daily plan.

The Iowa multicollege district administrators described an organizational structure change that had been under consideration for three years before it was recently adopted. It involved establishing a Dean of the College to whom the academic dean and dean of student services would report. The change was encouraged "to get a balance and assure that those areas work very closely together." It has also resulted in "a better usage of our finances and our resources and assuming more cooperation in dealing with things . . . and to understand the problems the other areas have."

One of the colleges in the Iowa district made another organizational change which involved moving developmental education from student services to the academic area. The president described the change as being positive and said, "It made a tremendous difference in how developmental education and remedial studies were viewed by regular faculty members."

Some organizing functions occurred because positions were not filled and changes had to be made to cover responsibilities associated with the vacant positions. One college, which had a vacant dean's position of student development, divided the responsibilities among
three administrators at the college. Due to financial limitations, another president made organizing decisions by thinking about what staff you have and then how do you organize them, classified staff, faculty, and administrators, to get the job done. It has meant people taking on additional responsibilities rather than filling vacant positions. In a few cases, it has also meant discontinuing some of the things we've done in the past.

Another administrator was working on changing the role of the department coordinator/chair by encouraging them to take "an increasing leadership role in terms of planning and budgeting" and become more involved in decision making. In the past, the department chairs' role historically has not been administrative in nature, and the change was being resisted because "they want to retain their faculty status."

An overlap in the services provided by two divisions, specifically the continuing education operation and regular programs, was an organizing issue that was being addressed in one college to prevent jealousy and infringement upon territories.

One of the administrators in the Missouri district admitted to an attempt to redo the college organizational chart and found it very time consuming because it required making major decisions. It involved trying to determine how to get things done and "organized under somebody to make sure it happens," deciding who to assign it to, "and then how do we get it moving."
Question 19: What one or two significant duties related to staffing do you perform on a regular basis?

Campus administrators were uniformly involved in planning for staffing needs for their campuses. Each of them was directly involved in interviewing and hiring those individuals that reported directly to them, namely their administrative group. Each of them gave recommendations to the district chancellor/area president regarding the hiring of faculty and administrators.

Four of the chief unit administrators, of which two were from the Nebraska district and one each from Iowa and Missouri, said they were directly involved in interviewing faculty. One of the four expressed why with this statement: "I believe there is such an incredibly important commitment that we make to someone when we ask them to join faculty." Another president, who was not directly involved in the formal interviews with candidates for faculty positions, made a concerted effort to meet them all informally when they were on campus for interviews. A second administrator who did not personally interview faculty, but did want to be kept informed about who was being interviewed said, "I don't have to have a lot of involvement in most cases because I have excellent people who are capable of hiring good staff."

One administrator in describing a staffing style and how staffing decisions were made said, "I always think in terms of the team, the qualities we have already in place, and what qualities we might need." An additional staffing function was described as identifying a focus
that needs to be addressed when hiring. The focus the administrator referenced was employing more minorities on his/her campus.

Other staffing functions performed by some campus administrators included giving a direction or emphasis for staff development activities, influencing those who are not performing as they should "either through staff development on to the point of termination," evaluating those that report directly to the chief unit administrator, and reviewing evaluations of faculty and other staff. Additional staffing responsibilities consisted of "adjusting assignments and making changes to best utilize people," making staff reductions, and "influencing the selection of faculty by sharing my standards and expectations with my deans" who interview for faculty positions. Planning for staffing needs, evaluating ratios of part-time faculty and full-time faculty, assessing support staff needs, and convincing other chief unit administrators and the district chief executive officer that additional staff were needed described other staffing functions for chief unit administrators.

**Question 20:** The administrative function of directing makes reference to bringing about action toward desired objectives. Please discuss one or two duties that you consider most significant that exemplify the directing function.

Describing their directing functions resulted in the chief unit administrators and college presidents talking about their roles as facilitators, establishing courses of action, encouraging campus administrators to assume responsibility for getting things done
according to plan, and managing differences by seeking input from different groups within the college, as faculty and support staff.

Reactions to the directing function varied from "my involvement in directing is minimal" to "that is about 95 percent of my job" and "that is one of the more significant roles." Another said, "I don't find myself directing very often in the sense of being directive. I consider it more facilitation." The administrator who identified with minimal involvement in directing said, "I hire good people, I give them general direction, and I expect them to deliver."

The chief unit administrators used their campus councils or administrative teams to assist them in the directing function. For some it was identified as determining a course of action and then having help and encouragement by the campus chief to get it accomplished. The campus management group was also used to be the "main avenue for flowing information through down to the staff" and vice versa. A different campus administrator used the management council to "provide direction and guidance."

An aspect of the directing function was described by one administrator as "delegation to get a job done by someone and then follow-up." The follow-up often involved a one page written progress report for the administrator and was used by him to check on progress and be informed about what activity had occurred. An additional point made by this respondent was "you have to delegate with confidence."

"I wouldn't want any staff person to do something I wouldn't do myself" was the explanation one campus administrator used to describe
how role modeling was utilized as a tool for the directing function. Directing, according to this campus administrator, involved "building an atmosphere that builds the concept we are in this together."

The function of directing was also described as "trying to get something done at the time it is suppose to be done." Coordinating was another aspect of directing that was accomplished by bringing the district management team together to discuss and become informed so we were "all telling the same story." Another example of directing involved the campus leadership describing a direction for the campus to go, and then coordinating efforts through committees to further study the issue and bring about specific action.

Responses were made by some campus administrators that combined the directing function with the controlling function because suggestions for measuring results and setting standards were also included. One response associated directing with "having and holding to high standards." A second response described the directing function as deciding "what kind of an outcome we are looking for, what is timely, and what is appropriate."

**Question 21:** The controlling function involves such things as establishing standards, measuring results, and taking corrective action, all with the intent that progress toward objectives is occurring according to plan. What one or two significant duties do you perform that would fall into the controlling category?

Responses about duties related to the controlling function included ideas related to standards, evaluation, disciplinary
procedures, making changes, problem solving, and taking corrective action.

Three respondents specifically discussed the issue of setting standards as a controlling duty. One expressed it in this way: "I feel very responsible for the direction of the institution and for the image of the institution, and I do set those standards." The administrator who made that statement continued by describing how the standards were shared with all college staff at the beginning of a school year. Those standards were then used as checkpoints for progress during the year, and if desired progress wasn't being made, the situation was reviewed and changes were made to continue the action desired.

Standards were used by another administrator in relation to disciplinary procedures with staff. He explained that remediation with staff might involve establishing or re-establishing standards for a particular employee. Quality standards in serving the students were measured in one college by having students complete satisfaction surveys.

Other opinions about the controlling function were expressed by the chief unit administrators. One administrator said, "I would rather control by setting the direction, not by stopping action that might be taken." This administrator used "a team effort to get things done and a team effort to control things once they were going."

"I guess my administrative style is not controlling as much as guidance and direction . . . do more in providing guidance, direction, and encouragement than a lot of controlling. The evaluation process in
place is part of it and allows the input." This administrative style according to the campus administrator who ascribed to it explained that it may take longer to achieve what needed to be done, "but feel when you get there, you have a better and more cooperative staff that are willing to work on it to get the job done."

An administrator in one of the multicollege districts believed in control; "Control is brought about through the evaluation process." This administrator went on to explain, "I feel very strongly about certain directions we need to take" and when progress isn't being made, "I approach it in a problem-solving way . . . analyze what is happening," and then make some changes.

Another campus administrator, in talking about controlling, suggested the education profession was one that avoided "confrontation at all costs." For that reason he/she said,

Controlling was related to directing. . . . When you delegate a job to be done and it isn't being done to what you consider satisfaction, then you have to take corrective action and coach, provide some coaching to the administrator on what you want, how to go about doing it, what your expectations are . . . You have to measure results and if the results aren't there, you have to take corrective action.

Question 22: Of the five categories, - planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling, which do you find occupies most of your time? Of the five categories, which do you find occupies the least amount of your time?
Table 10 shows responses to both parts of the question. Five of the administrators in responding to what management functions occupied most of their time named two functions instead of one. They did that because "planning and directing tie together very well" or "planning and directing, it would be hard to separate the two . . . planning directions and then the coaching function" or "my directing and controlling, if we interpret that as those little nudges, is what I spend the bulk of my time doing." Two administrators said, "I wish it were planning."

In summarizing the management functions that occupied most of the unit administrators' time, one third of them chose planning, two thirds chose directing, two out of nine chose organizing, two others selected staffing, and one selected controlling. To rank order them, directing was the function identified by the majority of administrators. Planning was second, followed by organizing, staffing, and controlling.

Directing was cited as a function by all nine who were interviewed that involved either the most time or the least amount of their time. Six responded that directing was where they spent the greatest amount of time; three said it involved the least amount of their time. Two in the latter group explained they didn't spend much time with "directing in the directive sense." One commented, when the team knows where it is headed, "I don't think you have to spend much time directing."
There appeared to be less doubt in the responses by the chief unit administrators of the management functions concerning where they spent the least amount of their time. Controlling and directing were each named by one third of those interviewed. Two respondents who specified controlling as the function involving the least amount of their time said it was because "I don't take that approach" and "Controlling is just not something I see that is done by one person."

Table 10. Time requirements of the management functions of chief unit administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Occupies Most Time</th>
<th>Occupies Least Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - A</td>
<td>Planning/Directing</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - B</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - C</td>
<td>Planning/Directing</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - A</td>
<td>Organizing/Directing</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - B</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - C</td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - A</td>
<td>Organizing/Staffing</td>
<td>Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - B</td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - C</td>
<td>Directing/Controlling</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The organizing function was listed by two administrators and the planning function by one. The staffing function did not appear at all in the last group. To rank order the functions that occupied the least amount of time, the controlling and directing functions were first, followed by the organizing and staffing functions.
Question 23: What other duties do you perform on a regular basis that do not fall into one of the categories?

Seven of the nine chief unit administrators identified their participation in community activities/organizations as a duty they performed on a regular basis. From their perspective, it was a duty that could not be categorized under the five management functions. Involvement in community was expressed as a way to "help the visibility and the image of the college." One administrator said, "We have to work with our constituency and I would say that is 99 percent of the job if you are going to be successful as a president." Another stated, "I'm very much of an external president and heavily involved in community activities, as the chamber." One described it as "the PR (public relations) function, the listening to people throughout the campus and throughout the community." The view of another campus administrator was expressed in this way, "Those things, while they may not be directly college oriented, they are certainly indirectly going to help us keep the college going."

Two of the administrators identified other activities that coincided with their external roles. One involved fund raising and work with the foundation, and the other described it as dealing "with the community and the politics of this business."

An administrator in the Missouri district described another duty, in addition to community participation, that involved "plans that are really not expressed in annual plans . . . types of hidden agendas," as the improvement of the image of the college and the improvement of
teaching at the college. According to this administrator, those agendas were very important.

One of the two administrators who did not identify community involvement in responding to this question said, "I think my major responsibilities could fit into those five groups." The other administrator described how "I just get in there and help get the job done."

**Question 24:** Consistent with the duties you have, how do you feel about the amount of authority you have to carry out those responsibilities?

Each of the chief unit administrators expressed they felt comfortable with the amount of authority each of them had and several said, "I have all of the authority I need." Many acknowledged that with the authority they had, they still had to be cognizant of the entire district. Another admitted that "I have all of the authority I need, other than the constraints placed on a multicollege system." Those constraints related to the functions of the vice chancellors in the large metropolitan district.

Two were specific in involving the support they had from their chancellor in relation to the authority issue. "I feel that I have the authority I need and can make commitments and feel confident that I will be backed up."

One other point made by an administrator in the Missouri district referenced the authority each of the presidents had to carry out responsibilities without having the chancellor look over his/her
shoulders. In turn, this administrator explained, "We don't bother him (the chancellor) incessantly. . . . We do make decisions, but those decisions do not occur in a vacuum. . . . We have to be concerned about the general welfare of the district, as well as my concern about this particular unit."

**Question 25:** What do you perceive to be your greatest obstacle to being successful as a chief campus administrator?

Specific obstacles discussed by the respondents included time, money, complexity of job, lack of administrative and staff support, and individual weaknesses. In expanding on the obstacle of not having enough time to get the job done, one administrator said, "I find that I have very little time to get the big picture. . . . It is easy to get too involved in detail." That administrator expressed how important it was to continuously do professional reading "to get some of the big picture kinds of issues that are out there, that I feel like I need to be on top of in order to be a good leader." Another campus administrator described the reason for the lack of time as "being burdened and falling into the activity trap."

Time as an obstacle was referenced by one administrator in describing the frustrations experienced related to the length of time it took to accomplish goals and make changes. "A change agent, especially in an institution that is this old, needs to be evolutionary in their thinking. I can't be revolutionary."

Time also was a factor for the administrator who said, "My greatest obstacle is myself in terms of being able to organize myself
to do everything that I would like to do." A reference was also made to
time when describing the "burdensome part of my responsibilities in
terms of the time required to control and monitor some of the
budgetary/financial duties."

One of the presidents described an obstacle that had existed, but
now had been eliminated because of a concerted effort to correct the
situation. The obstacle was the "working relationship with the K-12 in
terms of appropriate program development."

**Question 26:** In thinking about the different groups that are part
of the district, as central office staff, faculty, students, non-teaching
staff (campus administrators), alumni, board members, and community
members, with what two groups do you communicate the most? With
what two groups do you communicate the least? What form/forms of
communication do you use most often with each group?

The one group campus administrators most often communicated
with was their campus nonteaching staff which included campus
administrators (See Table 11). This was true of eight of the nine
individuals interviewed. Central office administrators and campus
faculty were the groups each specified by four respondents. One
administrator selected community, and another picked students as one
of the two groups that were communicated with most often. One
campus administrator wished he/she could tell me students were the
group communicated with most often. One

When identifying the two groups that were communicated with
the least, eight campus administrators identified the alumni group, and
six selected board members. Three campus administrators said
students were one of the groups they communicated with the least, and one campus administrator specifically mentioned the other chief unit administrators (campus directors) as a group. Alumni were chosen because most of the colleges did not have formal alumni associations or functions. Two administrators specifically said they communicated with some alumni through community involvement.

With reference to communication with board members, most of the campus administrators said they saw the board members at the regular board meetings and that was the extent of that relationship. Two administrators explained they had some contact with the specific board members who represented the district where their campus was located. One campus administrator described the process that was used if a contact with a board member was needed or desired. It involved the administrator first making a contact with the chancellor to inform him about the contact that the campus administrator wanted to make with the board member.

Two of the administrators who had selected students as a group that was communicated with very little said they did communicate with a few students, particularly the leaders of student organizations, but they did very little communicating with the students as a group.

Verbal was the dominant form of communication used by the campus administration with all groups except alumni. With that group, communicating was most often done through a newsletter or a mailing of some type. One administrator said, "I'm not a memo person;" another
Table 11. Communication patterns by chief unit administrators to selected groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 1 - A</th>
<th>More Communication</th>
<th>Less Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 1 - B</td>
<td>Central Office Staff</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 1 - C</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2 - A</td>
<td>Central Office Staff</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2 - B</td>
<td>Central Office Staff</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2 - C</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Campus Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3 - A</td>
<td>Central Office Staff</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3 - B</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3 - C</td>
<td>Campus Administration</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Communication</th>
<th>Less Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Administrators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Campus Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a The numbers in the summary represent the numbers of administrators selecting that group.
responded, "I prefer communicating face to face rather than by telephone."

Communications with central office and campus administrators were predominately verbal, in addition to the use of printed materials, which were usually informational items. One administrator described communication with those two groups as 75 percent verbal and 25 percent written.

The communications with board members were usually verbal, except one administrator acknowledged that any communication from him/her with board members was by letter.

**Question 27:** In what kinds of decision making do you participate?

All of the administrators were involved in decision making both at the campus level and at the district level. One administrator described it as "involvement in policy decision making" through weekly district administrative meetings with the chancellor as compared to involvement in "operational decisions" made at the campus level. Decisions at both the campus and district levels often involved staff, budgets, and planning.

Another opinion about participation in decision making was expressed in this way, "I don't try to be greatly involved with the detail, but looking more at the global view from the college and district viewpoint." An opposite view was expressed by another administrator in the same district who wanted more involvement in the details of the college and said, "I stick my nose in everywhere" and
viewed it as a way to be kept informed as to what was going on within the college.

One campus administrator described the process of giving input into decision making at the district level as "open and free," not a "stress type of input." One of the campus administrators from the rural multiunit district verbalized how important it was to obtain input for campus level decisions from all staff and described the process as being structured and planned on his campus. As an example, with reference to budget planning, input began at the program level and then was reviewed and prioritized by the campus management team.

Table 12. Groups that influence the decision making of chief unit administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - A</td>
<td>Students, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - B</td>
<td>Community, Other Campus Presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - C</td>
<td>Other Campus Presidents, Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - A</td>
<td>Campus Assistant Director, Area President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - B</td>
<td>Campus Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - C</td>
<td>Campus Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - A</td>
<td>Faculty, Campus Administrative Team, Other Campus Presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - B</td>
<td>Chancellor, Other Campus Presidents, Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - C</td>
<td>Faculty, Campus Administration, Other Campus Presidents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aListed in the order as given in the response.
Eventually final recommendations were brought to the district administrative team.

Some of the campus administrators described how decision making, in some instances, was more unstructured and occurred when they were asked for input in an informal manner.

**Question 28:** What individuals or groups influence you the most in your decision making?

On all campuses except one, campus administrators and/or central office administrators influenced the decisions made by chief unit administrators more than other groups (See Table 12). One president listed students as being the most influential group because "we are here to serve students" and identified the community as the second group because "we are trying to meet community needs." Faculty were also identified as a group that influenced decision making at times.

**Question 29:** What is your role in promoting change on your campus? What is your role in promoting change in the district?

Each of the chief unit administrators described his/her role in promoting change on his/her campus as being significant. The following quotes explained their roles and responsibilities:

Helping develop a direction of where we ought to be going and then getting people to buy into that particular direction is my job.

When a change is appropriate, it needs to be supported and initiated.
I'm a change agent through ideas that I might have to push along and ideas that they might have that I can support. . . . I see myself more as an idea purveyor and a supporter.

I have responsibility for planning, identifying, and facilitating the structure that would allow for change.

My role is leading it; I enthusiastically think about it, propose it, maneuver it, and manipulate it, whatever it takes.

I'm the catalyst for change.

If change is to occur, the president has to lead the change, proclaim his/her willingness to change, and encourage the change.

Their role in promoting change within the district was less precise for some chief unit administrators, but others said it was comparable to their campus role. Four administrators described their role in promoting change at the district level as one of supporting change in the district. They also affected and influenced change in the district through their input and participation as a member of the district administrative team. One president described the role as being significant because as a member of the central office administrative team, "I have an equal opportunity to influence change in the district." Three others described the role as being less important, having less impact, and having less authority to promote and structure change in the district. In addition, one concluded it was much more difficult to influence change in the district than on one's own campus.

Question 30: With reference to central office policies and procedures, what limitations are placed on you in running your campus?
The general response to this question was summarized in this statement made by one of the campus administrators: "The limitation is staying within the board policies and procedures" and being uniform across the district in how they are applied. A view expressed by another campus administrator: "As long as we are operating within policies, we have a great deal of individual discretion and freedom to exercise our own styles."

Other factors that were considered as limitations included money, particularly in the allocation of it to all units within the district and how the allocation might affect a campus operation, associated paperwork and paper flow (one contract used by a college required nine to eleven signatures and was viewed as being burdensome), and the lack of professional staff. One president said that "the whole personnel policy and procedures were a limitation."

**Question 31:** What are your perceptions regarding the autonomy of your campus in relation to central office?

All nine individuals interviewed had positive feelings about the degree of autonomy each of them had. The chief campus administrators in the small rural district said they had "a great deal" of autonomy. The administrators from the Iowa district also said, "We have all of the autonomy we need." The college administrators from the metropolitan district described their autonomy as having a "healthy mix between centralized and decentralized functions."

One administrator compared autonomy to the pendulum on a clock and suggested more problems surfaced if the pendulum was too far to
one side or the other or if the district was too centralized or too
decentralized. There seemed to be a good balance because the district
was right in the middle with reference to centralized and decentralized
functions. Another administrator in the same district expressed the
idea that areas that were centralized "were done with the idea of
improving efficiency as well as effectiveness and that made sense, but
the academic program was decentralized, and that was the way it
should be." The third administrator in the district recognized autonomy
"as a function of how much money we have, so given the fiscal realities
we have, I think our autonomy is about right."

An administrator of a college located near the central
administrative offices commented that autonomy was not the issue as
compared to the confusion that sometimes existed in the local
community about what was community college and what was district.
This seemed to occur particularly if there had been something in the
media about an activity at the college and the district name was used.

One other thought expressed about autonomy was stated: "I do
feel we have a great deal of autonomy. I also know the limits and in
that case, it is autonomy with limits, but that is no different than any
other organization."

**Question 32:** What changes would you like to see occur in the
relationship between your campus and central office?

One chief unit administrator from each of the three districts was
satisfied with his/her relationship with central office and said no
changes needed to be made. Two administrators expressed a desire to
have more communication with their chancellor, particularly in the form of regularly scheduled meetings. Having more communication would keep the chancellor better informed about campus and student needs. That same administrator wanted the chancellor on campus more often.

College administrators in another district made two suggestions for change: they wanted greater control of auxiliary services, physical plant and grounds, and business functions on the campus; and they wanted clarification and definition of the vice chancellors' roles "so they know where their responsibilities end and ours begin."

Campus administrators in the third district expressed a need for additional district-wide leadership by hiring administrative staff at the district level in the areas of personnel and academic affairs. The change was needed to improve program planning district-wide to avoid program duplication and to assist with articulation and transfer agreements.

**Question 33:** What influenced you to be in the position you are today?

Two administrators answered this question by saying they had consciously planned a career move to a college presidency and one, in particular, viewed the present position as a step on his/her career ladder, but not a final step.

Some of the responses tended to be more philosophical in nature. For example, one of the campus administrators first started working in a community college in 1975 and had made the move from secondary
teaching because "the community college was one of the last frontiers of education. . . . We are still flexible and have the ability to meet community needs like no other post secondary institution. . . . I guess I got hooked on it. . . . I decided to see if I could make a contribution."

Another campus administrator who had a background in industry and a vocational trade explained:

When I was working in the trade area, there seemed to be a feeling that that was something lesser. My desire was to try and develop some pride in the technical field. It is something to be proud of and it is a worthy kind of career. I've tried to promote that in working with students, faculty, and staff, and it has motivated me to be in a position where I can do something about that.

One campus administrator in Nebraska took the position because family resided there, and it provided an opportunity to return home.

Other administrators described their reasons for being in their present position:

I like diversity and I have never been bored in this position. Each day brings new challenges and opportunities.

I think it is just an internal drive to want to do more and the desire to be more involved.

I thought I could do it better than the people who were doing it.

One administrator who got a job in a community college quite by accident after having experiences as a secondary principal and a university teacher described himself as a convert and said, "I would never do anything else."
The president who was viewing this position as a career ladder step described why it was working out well.

This kind of position for a first presidency where you are a president in a district offers the best of all possible worlds. You still have somebody to back you up when you've made a mistake or you aren't sure about something. You have somebody to go to who has good experience and can give you good advice, particularly with politics and political situations. . . . On the other hand, out here on my campus, I do have autonomy. The kind of experience I've gotten in terms of community experience, as well as the big overview, are things that are going to serve me very well when it comes time to move on.

**Question 34:** In what ways has your role as chief campus administrator been what you expected it to be? In what ways has it not been what you expected it to be?

The chief unit administrators were in total agreement their roles were what they expected them to be and that there weren't any surprises. Initially, one administrator was apprehensive about community and college relationships and involvement in community organizations and concluded that the community contacts and associations were really enjoyable. Another "expected a great deal of the time would be consumed with personalities and personnel issues, and that is exactly right!"

Another believed that the two important jobs for administration were to find the very best people and create an atmosphere so they can contribute to the organization to the best of their ability. . . . I had
that hope of that expectation coming into the position. . . . It has turned out to be what I expected.

Other goals and expectations that had been met involved "keeping programs updated with technical evolutions," having graduates experience success in finding employment, and providing a team-working relationship for all staff. Another administrator fulfilled his expectations of running the campus better than the previous administrator, influencing the freedoms and support faculty should have, and improving and expanding campus facilities. One chief unit administrator saw the campus administrative position as a way of providing leadership in higher education without having to work with a board.

In responding to ways their roles had not been what they expected, three campus administrators said it had been what they expected. Two had expectations that things would move faster than they did. One was surprised at the number of speaking engagements requested and how demanding fund raising and community outreach could be. Personnel functions and the "bureaucratic budget" process were unexpected by one administrator and this same individual had "some goals related to instructional leadership" that had not been addressed as desired. More contact with students was the expectation of one campus administrator; this had not occurred because of "the time and demands on a president" and the characteristics of the commuter student. One administrator, who had previously been a community college faculty member, did not expect the extent of involvement with student services and community outreach. In
addition, "I hadn't visualized the complexity of being in a multicollege district."

**Question 35:** At the end of the day when you leave campus, what do you feel best about?

The chief unit administrators described their satisfactions and good feelings about:

- what we do for business and industry. "So often we think of education trailing behind business and industry and at times, we are helping industry keep up with changes."

- seeing "something happen that you didn't think could happen."

- seeing the college grow and move forward toward what had been planned.

- their team of people working together for the benefit of students and their own benefit.

- being able to get something for the campus that was wanted and needed.

- getting my personal daily "to do list" done.

- knowing that "we make a significant difference for the students we contact and we do it in a quality way." Stated in another way: "When we look at the people that attend community colleges, I think we give hope to a lot of people that wouldn't have hope without us."

From this researcher's perspective, one president summarized the feelings of all those interviewed in this way: "I'm really committed to community colleges, and I believe they are just so important. I feel
very proud I'm a part of community colleges and the human resource
development that goes along with them."

**Question 36:** If you had the opportunity to become a chief campus
administrator in a multiunit district again, how would you feel about
assuming that position?

Three chief campus administrators replied by saying they would
assume a chief campus administrator position again. One described it
in this way: "It's been terrific, a lot of fun, and with a lot of rewards." Another opinion expressed, "I wish, in all honesty, that I knew about
community colleges earlier in my career."

Three said they would assume a chief unit administrator position
again but did describe conditions that would need to be present. One
said it would depend on who the district president was. Another
administrator would consider it if a different set of challenges were
there. The third wanted a district that was decentralized and similar
to his/her present one "in the sense of the types of people in decision
making roles in the district." This person added, as a campus president,
"I want to be more than a caretaker, more than a site manager." I want
to be involved "in the real college functions."

Three of the administrators said they would not accept another
campus presidency in a multicampus district again. Two of the three
implied they were presently satisfied with their positions, but if they
did decide to change positions, they would want to be the chief
executive officer of a single college district or a multicampus district.
The third administrator in this group definitely was using this
experience as a step to becoming a president of a single college campus. As a further explanation, this administrator added: "It isn't meant to be negative in any way. . . . It is just part of the progression. I would see going to another district in a position like I have now as a lateral move and I would not want to do that."

Two of the administrators that said they would not take a similar position again shared what they had heard and been told. "There is no doubt in anyone's mind it is much more difficult to work in a multicollege district. . . . If you can be a president in a multicollege district, you can be a president anywhere."

**Other Comments:** Those interviewed were asked to make any other comments they chose about their position as a chief unit administrator that were not discussed in the interview questions. The majority felt the questions had been thorough in looking at their position. One administrator did reiterate, "I enjoy my work very much. . . . I've had a lot of good cooperation from my area president and my board."

Another administrator described how he viewed the multicollege concept:

> We really and truly see ourselves as three independent colleges, individual colleges with the joint resources of the district at our disposal. Staff see it that way, we think that way, and our faculties strongly support that. We are a small college but have the advantage of being part of a family with sister institutions, and that is an advantage because it increases our visibility and increases our clout in the state.
Another re-emphasized how demanding the chief unit administrator's job was and felt a way needed to be found to give the administrator more opportunity to be involved with academics and students. A similar view was expressed by another chief campus administrator:

It is a very difficult position to be able to balance all the things that need to be done. . . . A lot of it is being able to figure out where to spend your time that is most rewarding. . . . I try to run a college that has a lot of input from people. . . . The problem is that that is a very time consuming way of running a college, on building consensus and talking to everybody.

One administrator identified an important responsibility that a president of single college district had that presidents within a multicollege district did not have, and that was a direct and close relationship with a board of directors/trustees.

Findings of the Chief Unit Administrator's Job Descriptions

An analysis of the job descriptions for each chief unit administrator was conducted to provide additional information about the roles and responsibilities of the chief unit administrators, particularly in relation to Mackenzie's (1969) five management functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling.

The job descriptions that were analyzed were for only the chief unit administrators. Those chief unit administrators who were also
vice chancellors had separate job descriptions for that position and those job descriptions were not included in this analysis. The job descriptions for each of the chief unit administrators in System I were the same. This was also true for each of the chief unit administrators in System 3. The chief unit administrators' job descriptions in System 2 were not all of the same. Two of them were identical, and the third had some slight differences and involved additional responsibilities.

An analysis of the management functions (See Table 13) was completed by the researcher and involved categorizing each of the responsibilities/duties in the job descriptions into Mackenzie's (1969) five management functions. The table reflects the number of responsibilities in each management function category. In addition, Mackenzie included communicating as a function that occurred throughout the management process. The researcher included that function as a separate item in analyzing the job descriptions because communication was included as a specific duty in each job description. Public relations, which included community involvement, were listed as a separate function because it was a responsibility that was included in the job descriptions and did not fit into one of the five management function categories.

The job descriptions for the chief unit administrators in System 1, which was the Iowa multicollege district, listed more directing responsibilities than any of the other management functions. Only one responsibility in the job description involved the controlling function.
All five of the management functions were distributed more evenly in the job descriptions for System 2, the multicampus community college district in Nebraska. To a small extent, the planning and controlling functions did dominate with reference to the job responsibilities listed in the job descriptions of the chief unit administrators.

In System 3, the Missouri multicollege district, the management functions of directing and controlling were equally represented in the responsibilities listed in the job descriptions. They were followed by the planning and organizing functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Function</th>
<th>System 1</th>
<th>System 2a Campus A/B-C</th>
<th>System 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*The first number represents Campus A; the second number represents number of responsibilities for Campuses B-C.  
*b*The number represents the number of responsibilities in the job description that represents the management functions.
All nine of the job descriptions listed at least one duty involving community and public relations and one responsibility involving communicating.

The researcher also observed that under "the specific skills required" in the job descriptions for the chief unit administrators in System 3, this statement appeared: "ability to plan, to organize, to staff, to direct, and to control campus operations". Each of Mackenzie's (1969) five management functions were included in that statement.

After numerical tabulations were completed regarding the numbers of responsibilities from the job descriptions that represented each of the five management functions and the public relations function, the researcher determined there was a total of 69 responsibilities in the job descriptions of the nine chief unit administrators. Upon further calculation to determine which of the management functions represented the greatest number of the responsibilities in the job descriptions, the directing function involved the greatest number of duties.

A ranking of the management functions based on the responsibilities in the job descriptions placed directing in first place, planning in second, followed by controlling in third place, organizing in fourth, and staffing in fifth. In relating the rank of the management function to the responsibilities in the job descriptions, more responsibilities included in the job description of the chief unit administrators involved the directing function than any other function. The staffing function which was ranked fifth represented the lowest
number of responsibilities in the job descriptions. The planning, controlling, and organizing functions were ranked between directing and staffing.

The functions of communicating and public relations each involved one responsibility listed on the job descriptions.

Responses to the Research Questions

To accomplish the goal of this study, which was to investigate the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators within multiunit community college districts, the researcher identified five questions to address. The responses to the five research questions reflected a compilation of the findings from the data collected through personal interviews, questionnaires, and document analysis of job descriptions and organizational charts. The findings are as follows:

Research Question 1: What was the profile of individuals who hold positions as chief unit administrators within a multiunit community college district?

The individuals in chief unit administrative positions in multiunit community college districts were people who believed in the mission and goals of the community college. They viewed the position as a way to make a difference, have a positive impact on faculty and students, serve their community and respond to its needs, and satisfy their own personal and career goals. They were also the individuals who represented the college to the community.
The majority of the nine chief unit administrators in this study were white married males with a median age of 48. One administrator was a white married female and two of the male administrators were non-white.

More than half of the chief unit administrators in this study obtained their position as an internal promotion within their district. All of them except one received an annual salary of $60,000 or more.

The academic backgrounds of the chief unit administrators were varied. Each of them had at least one degree in education except for one college president. Each of them had a post-graduate degree except two and one of the two was in the final stages of attaining a doctoral degree.

All of the nine unit administrators identified AACJC (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges) and its affiliates as a professional organization that was helpful to them. Other national organizations, one state organization, and one local organization were also named as being beneficial to the unit administrators.

Eight of the nine administrators identified peers, business and community leaders, and college and university personnel as the individuals outside of their district organization they would contact if information or assistance were needed. It was through their professional organizations they were able to develop valuable contacts and professional relationships.

**Research Question 2:** What roles and responsibilities were ascribed to the chief unit administrator?
The roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators in multiunit community college districts were varied and broad in nature. They viewed themselves as being responsible for the administration and leadership of all campus/college programs, activities, and special projects. They felt comfortable with the amount of authority they had to carry out their responsibilities. In addition, the majority of them had realistic expectations as to what their roles and responsibilities as a chief unit administrator would be. The extent of their involvement in community activities was unexpected and a surprise to some, but they also found it enjoyable.

When given the option to select three areas of administrative responsibilities out of a list of 12 that were most demanding of their time and administrative skills, the chief unit administrators chose business and financial management, personnel management, and curriculum and instructional management. They also identified alumni, fund raising, and legislation as the three areas of responsibilities in which they did not spend much time. When asked to identify the areas of responsibilities where they preferred to spend their time and use their administrative skills, seven of the administrators preferred to spend their time with curriculum and instructional management. The other areas of responsibilities preferred by them included public relations, business and financial management, personnel management, economic development, and students. Satisfying central office requests was one responsibility that was not demanding or preferred. All of the areas of responsibilities were handled by the chief campus
administrator in a more general and directing manner, rather than in a way that dealt with the small details of the responsibility.

The chief unit administrators also saw themselves as being responsible for establishing the image and role of the college in their respective communities. From their perspectives, they felt it was very important for them to be actively involved in community organizations and activities, including chambers of commerce and economic development groups.

A majority of the chief unit administrators had roles and responsibilities that extended beyond the geographic area served by their respective campuses/colleges and involved district-wide responsibilities. Those responsibilities were more general in nature and included special projects or functions as educational/instructional services, administrative services, and student development services.

In essence the chief unit administrators in multiunit districts described themselves as leaders in higher education and assumed the responsibilities that were identified with leadership.

Research Question 3: From the chief unit administrator’s perspective, what was the relationship between the chief unit administrator and central office?

Describing the relationship between the chief unit administrator and central office in a multiunit district required an examination of the factors that influenced and affected the relationship.

One of the factors examined was the physical location of each unit in relation to central office and the impact that had on the campus
operation. There was a consensus by the administrators interviewed that location and geography had little effect or impact on the relationship between the campus and central office. Some believed it was easier to be autonomous if central offices were at a distance from campus, but the administrators of those campuses that were adjacent to central offices described their degree of autonomy as being similar to the autonomy of the other units in the district. One reason distances did not affect relationships was the communication methods, such as facsimile machines, computers, and voice mail that were used in the districts.

The issue of central offices being intrusive or being neglectful in their associations with the individual campuses was found to be more related to the personalities of those employed in central office, rather than the location of the office. This was also the case in determining if the college nearest the central office was receiving preferential treatment.

Another aspect of the relationship was the organizational structure of the district and its units. Each of the administrators in this study reported to the chief executive officer of the district. In the multicollege districts (the Iowa and Missouri districts), the chief executive officers were chancellors, and the chief unit administrators were called presidents. In the multicampus district (the Nebraska district), the chief district executive officer was an area president and the chief unit administrators were called campus directors. Presidents in the Missouri district expressed the need for a clarification of their
responsibilities and the responsibilities of the vice chancellors in their district.

The contacts made by chief unit administrators with central office contributed to the relationship between them. The contacts were made frequently, often on a daily basis, and were made with a variety of people in the central offices for various reasons. The purpose of the contacts was to give or request information, often relating to those functions that were centralized, as personnel, budgets and finances, business operations and facilities.

The regularly scheduled meetings involving the district chief executive officer and the chief unit administrators and other central office administrators were a significant part of the relationship. The meetings in two districts were scheduled weekly and in the third district, twice a month. The chief unit administrators valued the meetings and saw them as being necessary for communication and coordination purposes. They were most often used for planning and addressing issues related to budgets, personnel, physical plant, policies, and legislation. The meetings also gave the unit administrators an opportunity to keep the central office administration informed of activities on their campuses.

A majority of the chief unit administrators in the three districts had some responsibilities that were district-wide, in addition to the administrative responsibilities on their individual campuses. The four chief unit administrators, who had the title of president/vice chancellor, described their relationship with central office by saying,
"We are central office." They considered both the district and their individual campuses as they managed their district-wide responsibilities.

The degree of autonomy for each unit was another factor that influenced the relationships of chief unit administrators with central office in a multiunit district. Each of the administrators in this study expressed satisfaction regarding the degree of autonomy each of them had to run his/her campus. The autonomy issue was not a limitation for them in managing their campuses. Operating their units within the policies and procedures established for the community college district and addressing present fiscal realities were identified as limitations in managing their individual units. They admitted the limitations were not unrealistic.

Although the chief unit administrators were positive about their relationships with central office, some of them had suggestions as to how the relationship could be improved. Having more contact and communication with the district chancellor on a more regular basis was one suggestion. Others involved making the two functions of personnel and academic affairs in one district more centralized and the business service functions in another district less centralized.

One president suggested that relationships with central office could be improved if they increased their efforts in informing all personnel in the district about the services and functions performed by central office that affected and enhanced the campus operations.
Having that information would aid in understanding the allocation of funds for district office operations.

The significance of the relationship of chief unit administrators with central office was reinforced when four of the nine administrators identified central office as one of the groups they communicated with the most. In addition one third of them said their decision making was influenced by their chief district administrator.

Each of the chief unit administrators acknowledged the importance of the relationship with central office. They identified with being a part of the chief district administrator's management team and took that responsibility seriously.

**Research Question 4:** What was the relationship between the chief unit administrators within a multiunit community college district?

In general, the chief unit administrators had positive feelings about their relationships with their counterparts in their multiunit district. Although a level of satisfaction existed, the chief unit administrators made suggestions for improving the relationships.

An awareness and realization that decisions and events on one campus could not be done in isolation existed among the chief unit administrators. They acknowledged that what occurred on one campus had an impact in some way on the other campuses in the district. For that reason, the chief unit administrators realized the need to coordinate and to keep each other informed. They also understood the
necessity for interpreting policies and administering decisions in a uniform manner throughout the district.

One frustration expressed was in relation to having the chief unit administrators recognize and understand the traditions, uniquenesses, and differences each unit in the district possessed. The lack of understanding impacted campus and district operations in a negative manner.

The relationship among the chief unit administrators in a district was also influenced by their district-wide responsibilities. Having those responsibilities required the chief unit administrators to broaden their perspectives to include the other units, rather than just their own campus. With those duties, they were representing the entire district. Their district-wide responsibilities also gave them additional reasons for contacting the other unit administrators and building good working relationships with their counterparts.

The chief unit administrators within a district seldom met as a group without the central office administrators. If the chief unit administrators called a meeting, they used it to share information or work on projects.

The location of units within a multiunit district had little impact on the relationships among the chief unit administrators. However, a concern with reference to location existed for the chief unit administrators who were required to travel to the units to administer district responsibilities.
Competition among units in a multiunit district was not a major issue. If it did occur, it usually involved competition for students for similar programs. The degree of competition lessened if there were less duplication of programs.

When the chief unit administrators were asked to identify the groups that influenced them the most in their decision making, more than half of them chose the other chief unit administrators in the district as a group that influenced them. They all recognized the important roles each of them had on their campuses and in the district.

Research Question 5: What management functions were performed by the chief unit administrator within a multiunit community college district?

Mackenzie's (1969) five management functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling were used as the basis for gathering the data and for answering this question.

With reference to the planning function, the chief unit administrators, along with their campus management teams, were responsible for developing the unit plan to coincide with the district's vision and plan. The unit plan included the objectives and strategies for achieving objectives of the various programs and divisions on the campus.

The chief unit administrators were also involved in the district planning function because of their roles as members of the chief district administrator's management team. Planning at the district
level encompassed developing the vision and/or strategic statements for the district.

Other planning responsibilities for chief unit administrators included daily planning, weekly meetings with campus management teams, and the preparation for special projects such as North Central Accreditation.

The chief unit administrators identified the lack of time as being an obstacle for their being more involved in planning. The tendency for them to be too involved in the details created limitations for their involvement in examining the broader, global issues.

The second management function, the organizing function, was accomplished by the chief unit administrators in a variety of ways. For some, it meant organizing special projects/activities and their daily to-do lists. Others referenced changes in campus organizational charts, academic services, and the department chair's responsibilities. The existing financial condition in the multiunit districts was a factor in one organizing function that involved job reassignments to compensate for the vacancies on their campuses. Redefining program boundaries and territories was an organizing function completed by one unit administrator to address jealousy and infringement between two divisions within the college.

Staffing was an administrative function that required active involvement by the chief unit administrators. All of them participated directly in the hiring of their campus administrators. Four chief unit administrators were directly involved in interviewing and hiring
faculty. The chief unit administrators in two districts described their active participation in hiring their counterparts in their district. Giving recommendations to their chief district administrator regarding campus personnel to be hired was another staffing function in which all participated.

The chief unit administrators completed other staffing functions by sharing their standards and expectations with others on campus involved in hiring and evaluating personnel. They gave specific direction or focus to staff development activities, planned for staffing needs, and communicated the staffing needs to district office and the other chief unit administrators.

As the chief unit administrators talked about their directing functions, they described their roles as being facilitators, delegators, and managers. They enlisted the assistance of their campus management teams to help with the directing function. It was through the management teams the plans of action were coordinated and information was shared. Delegating responsibilities and inspiring others to follow through with jobs that needed to be done were described by the chief unit administrators as other directing functions.

Managing change as a part of the directing function involved chief unit administrators significantly, both at the campus and district level. When managing change at the campus level, the chief unit administrators described their role as being responsible for initiating and leading change, supporting and encouraging change, and making change happen.
The role of the chief unit administrator in promoting change at the district level was more vague. Some believed they had opportunity to influence change in the district and were expected to support it. Several of the administrators agreed that change in multiunit districts, because of their size and complexity, required more time and effort.

The controlling function was viewed by the chief unit administrators as one that involved the establishment of standards for the college, its programs, and its personnel. It also entailed the processes of coaching, evaluating, and problem solving, which were used by chief unit administrators to aid them in the controlling function. One administrator considered the amount of time required for monitoring and controlling budgetary and financial duties as an obstacle to the controlling function.

When the chief unit administrators were asked to identify the management function that involved the greatest amount of their time, the majority selected the directing function. The directing function also represented the largest portion of their responsibilities in their job descriptions. The chief unit administrators listed the planning function second involving the use of their time, followed by organizing, staffing, and controlling. In the analysis of their job descriptions, the planning function ranked second followed by controlling, organizing, and staffing.

The chief unit administrators were asked to identify the management functions that occupied the least amount of their time. One third of them picked the directing function and one third selected
the controlling function. These were followed by the organizing and planning functions. The staffing function was not included in this group.

Mackenzie (1969) also included communicating as a general function that occurred throughout the management process, and for that reason, the chief unit administrators were also asked to respond to questions about their communication patterns. In prioritizing the groups the chief unit administrators communicated with the most, they ranked campus administrators first, followed by central office staff and faculty. The groups the administrators communicated with the least were alumni, followed by board members and students. The preferred form of communicating to all groups was verbal. The exception was the alumni group, who usually received newsletters or direct mailings as a form of communication.

Another function Mackenzie (1969) described as being a general function was decision making because it permeated the entire work process. Each of the chief unit administrators were involved in the decision making process at the district level and on their individual campuses. Decisions at the district level often involved broader issues, as policy recommendations. The decisions made at the campus level were usually more operational in nature and were made with input from the campus management team. Obtaining participation in decision making by staff at all levels on the campus was part of the process used in one district.
The majority of the decisions made at both the district and campus levels focused on issues related to planning, budgeting and staffing. They were made with the realization that both campus and district decisions impacted the entire district and affected all units in the district. Decisions could not be made in a vacuum.

There was one other management function identified by the chief unit administrators that was not included in Mackenzie's (1969) plan, but one they considered to be important. That was their public relations and community involvement function.

Chapter Summary

The data collected to answer the research questions were presented and discussed in this chapter. The findings from the Campus Administrator Response Questionnaire described personal and institution demographics. The responses from the interviews provided information about the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators and the perceptions the administrators had about their roles. The relationships the chief unit administrators had with their various campus, district, and community constituencies were also described in the interviews. The analysis of the job descriptions for the chief unit administrators provided additional data about their responsibilities in relation to their management functions. Mackenzie's (1969) management model was used to draw conclusions about the relationships between the responsibilities of the chief unit administrator and five management functions.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, & RECOMMENDATIONS

The concluding chapter of this study is presented in three sections. The first section is a summary of the study, which includes a summary of the findings. The second section is a discussion of the conclusions and implications as a result of the analysis of the findings. The final section presents recommendations for future research related to chief unit administrators in multiunit community college districts and for other uses of the study's findings.

Summary

The basic purpose of this study was to identify the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators in selected multiunit community college districts. The study also examined the perceptions the chief unit administrators had toward their roles and the relationships they had with campus, central office, and community constituencies.

Specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What was the profile of individuals who hold positions as chief unit administrators within a multiunit community college district?

2. What roles and responsibilities were ascribed to the chief unit administrator?
3. From the chief unit administrator's perspective, what was the relationship between the chief unit administrator and central office?

4. What was the relationship between the chief unit administrators within a multiunit community college district?

5. What management functions were performed by the chief unit administrator within a multiunit community college district?

The sample utilized in the study consisted of nine chief unit administrators located in three multiunit community college districts. The three districts were selected on the basis of their location, size, governance structure, and willingness to participate. A qualitative approach was implemented to conduct the study and method triangulation was used to collect the data. The collection of data was accomplished through on-site interviews with the chief unit administrators, questionnaires, and a review of documents from each college.

Summary of major findings

The major findings which resulted from the analysis of the data were summarized and explained as follows:

1. The majority of the chief unit administrators in the multiunit community college districts studied were white married males with a
median age of 48. One of the administrators was a white married female and two of the males were non-white.

2. More than half of the chief unit administrators obtained their position as a result of an internal promotion within the district. Average tenure as a chief campus administrator was 6 1/2 years and the average tenure in the district was 13 years.

3. The title used by the chief unit administrator in the multicollege community college districts (the Iowa and Missouri districts) was president; the title used by the chief unit administrator in the multicampus community college district (the Nebraska district) was campus director.

4. All chief unit administrators reported directly to the chief executive officer of the multiunit district.

5. More than half of the chief unit administrators had doctoral degrees.

6. The chief unit administrators within a district knew their own campus budget totals but were unsure about the total for the district operating budget.

7. The number of personnel reporting directly to chief unit administrators ranged from 4 to 12, with the majority of them being campus administrators.

8. From a list of 12 administrative responsibilities, the chief unit administrators chose business and financial management, personnel management, and curriculum/instructional management as being most demanding of their time and administrative skills. The
three areas of responsibility that were least demanding of their time were alumni, fund raising, and legislation. The two top choices of administrative responsibilities where the chief unit administrators preferred spending their time were curriculum/instructional management and public relations. Their third choice was evenly divided among business and financial management, personnel management, and economic development.

9. Of these five groups, central office administrators, other campus administrators, faculty, students, and community members, chief unit administrators selected other campus administrators (deans, directors, supervisors) as the group they worked with most closely. Students were the group they worked with least closely.

10. Although campuses ranged from being in the same building with central office to 44 miles from central office, the geographic location of the campus in relation to central office did not impact the campus operations.

11. The chief unit administrators met more often as a group when the meetings included the district chief executive officer.

12. The chief unit administrators had positive feelings about the relationships they had with the other chief unit administrators in their district.

13. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) was identified as being a beneficial professional organization for chief unit administrators in multiunit community college districts.
14. Many differences, particularly in programming, existed among the units within a multiunit district.

15. Four of the chief unit administrators also had the title of vice chancellor because of their district-wide responsibilities. The responsibilities included educational/instructional services, student development services, and facilities/administrative services.

16. All of the chief unit administrators had positive feelings about the status they had as a chief unit administrator.

17. Finances, coordination of efforts, communication, and response time were the primary concerns chief unit administrators attributed to being part of a multiunit community college district as compared to a single institution district.

18. Issues presently being addressed on the campuses in the multiunit districts included finances/budgets, programs, faculty, and facilities.

19. With reference to the five management functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling, the directing function was selected by the chief unit administrators as the one that occupied most of their time. The directing function represented the largest portion of their responsibilities in their job descriptions. The planning function ranked second.

20. Each chief unit administrator identified public relations and community involvement as an important administrative responsibility.

21. The relationships between the chief unit administrators and central office were influenced by the geographic location of each, the
communication methods used within the district, the types of contacts between unit administrators and central office, the district-wide responsibilities assigned to chief unit administrators, and the degree of autonomy by each unit.

22. All of the chief unit administrators concluded they had all the authority they needed to carry out their responsibilities.

23. Chief unit administrators communicated most often with their campus administrators (deans, directors, supervisors), and least often with alumni.

24. Chief unit administrators participated in decision making both at the district and campus levels and were most influenced in their decision making by campus and central office administrators.

25. The role of the chief unit administrators in promoting change was perceived to be more significant on their campuses than at the district level.

26. Each of the chief unit administrators had positive feelings about the degree of autonomy each of them had in running his/her campus.

27. Chief unit administrators had positive feelings about the role they had because they were making a contribution and a difference. In addition, the position was fun and challenging and provided opportunities for personal and career growth.
Conclusions and Implications

The conclusions discussed in this section were drawn from and based on the researcher's analysis of the findings and results of the study. Each conclusion was accompanied by a statement of its implication in order to clarify the significance and meaning of that conclusion.

**Conclusion 1:** The chief unit administrator position in the multiunit districts studied was dominated by white males.

**Implication:** The multiunit districts must make a sincere effort to hire qualified females for chief unit administrator positions.

**Conclusion 2:** The majority of the chief unit administrators in the three multiunit districts had post-graduate degrees.

**Implication:** It appeared that obtaining a chief unit administrator position without a post-graduate degree would be more difficult, unless it was achieved as an internal promotion within the district. An examination of the responsibilities and status of the position would seem to justify the post-graduate degree requirement.

**Conclusion 3:** The chief unit administrators within the smaller multicampus district (the Nebraska district) had more personnel reporting directly to them than the chief unit administrators in the larger multicollege districts (the Iowa and Missouri districts).

**Implication:** Chief unit administrators in a smaller multiunit district were more involved with the details of
the campus operation because there were fewer layers of administration.

**Conclusion 4:** Chief unit administrators concluded that the majority of their time involved issues and concerns related to business and financial management, personnel management, and curriculum/instructional management. They preferred spending their time with curriculum and instructional management and public relations.

**Implication:** Chief unit administrators desired to be involved in the learning and teaching that occurred on their campuses. They recognized the value of being engaged in community activities and organizations as a part of their public relations effort.

**Conclusion 5:** Chief campus administrators communicated more often and worked more closely with their campus administrators (deans, directors, supervisors) than other campus, district, or community groups.

**Implication:** It was important for the chief unit administrator to select his/her administrative team carefully as that group was responsible for the management and operation of the campus.

**Conclusion 6:** For the three multiunit districts in the study, the campus operation was influenced more by the personalities and perceptions of the chief unit administrators than the location of the campus in relation to central office.
Implication: Campuses that had one building which also housed the central office experienced the same degree of autonomy as the campuses located 40 miles from the central office. The personalities of campus and district administrators and their perceptions regarding autonomy impacted campus operations more than the geographic locations of campuses and central office.

Conclusion 7: Working relationships among the chief unit administrators in a district were improved when they worked together as a team and trusted each other.

Implication: Relationships with other chief unit administrators were enhanced through communicating and administering policies and procedures uniformly throughout the district.

Conclusion 8: Although a multiunit district was comprised of campuses, each campus within the district had opportunities to be unique, particularly with their programming.

Implication: It was important for a chief unit administrator to be aware of community and student needs, so the administration and college could respond to those needs through their programs and services.

Conclusion 9: It was possible for chief unit administrators in a multiunit district to also have responsibilities that were district-wide.
**Implication:** Having district-wide responsibilities aided a chief unit administrator in keeping abreast of what was going on throughout the entire district and gave the administrator a broader, more global perspective on which to base decisions and influence change.

**Conclusion 10:** The position of chief unit administrator in a multiunit community college district was one of status.

**Implication:** Although a chief unit administrator was not the top administrator in a multiunit district, it was a position that was recognized and respected in the community and in professional associations as being one of status.

**Conclusion 11:** The management function of directing required more of the chief unit administrators' time and was the function used most in carrying out the responsibilities in their job descriptions.

**Implication:** Good interpersonal and communication skills were required for a chief unit administrator to be effective in using the directing function, which was associated with facilitating, delegating, coordinating, motivating, and managing change.

**Conclusion 12:** Chief unit administrators need to be actively involved in community activities and organizations as a part of their job responsibility.

**Implication:** The chief unit administrator had a responsibility for representing the college to the
community and being in touch with community needs. Community involvement was an important part of public relations and assisted in establishing desirable perceptions about the college in the community.

**Conclusion 13:** Chief unit administrators had an important role in decision making at both the unit and district level.

**Implication:** Decisions in a multiunit district cannot be made in a vacuum. Consideration must be given to how decisions impacted the district and each unit.

**Conclusion 14:** The chief unit administrators had positive feelings about the positions they were in.

**Implications:** Being a chief unit administrator in a multiunit district was worthy of consideration by those aspiring for leadership positions in community colleges. The job was demanding, but rewarding. It also provided good experiences and training for the top administrative position in a single institution district or as the chief executive officer for a multiunit district. In addition, it provided an individual the opportunity to be a president of a unit without having to be responsible for working with a board.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings and conclusions of the research, the researcher made the following recommendations:
1. Because the study was limited to the chief unit administrators in three multiunit districts, it is recommended that the study be expanded in scope and compare and contrast findings of this study with a larger population of chief unit administrators.

2. One of the factors that influenced relationships among chief unit administrators in a multiunit district was recognizing the differences of each unit and understanding the culture of each unit. It is recommended that a study be conducted that would examine the impact and effect of the cultures of each unit within a multiunit district on the culture of the district itself.

3. The relationships among administrators within multiunit community college districts were influenced by several factors, including the individual characteristics of administrators. A study assessing individual characteristics by using an instrument such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator would be of value in examining those relationships.

4. Economic development was one of the administrative responsibilities that some chief unit administrators desired involvement. An examination of the perceived and actual roles of chief unit administrators in economic development could be valuable in defining how this responsibility should be viewed.

5. Multiunit community college districts strive to improve their effectiveness and responsiveness to their constituencies. Technology is one of the tools that can be used to accomplish this. A study that examined the present and potential uses of technology in the
management of multiunit districts and in the delivery of programs would aid multiunit districts in their planning and in serving their communities.

6. Some of the administrators in this study said their communities identified with the local college/campus, rather than the district. The identity issue is one that multiunit districts face. A study that explored the types of perceptions community members had about their district and their college and the factors that influenced the perceptions could help multiunit districts and their units in marketing and promoting themselves.

7. Some multiunit districts are part of a state or university system. Each of their units is managed by a chief unit administrator. A study that examined and compared the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators in university or state systems to those in multiunit community college districts governed by local boards would provide additional information about administration in institutions of higher education.

8. The growth of multiunit districts in the last 30 years has been significant. It is for that reason that more information, including the results of this study, be shared about multiunit organizations and the administration of them in university classes, in professional publications, and at professional organizations and meetings.

9. Boards of directors and administrators in multiunit districts could find it helpful to use the results and conclusions of the study for writing job descriptions, developing criteria for performance
evaluations, and planning for the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators.

Closing statement

The chief unit administrator in a multiunit district is an important administrative and leadership position. For the individual desiring an upper level administrative position, the chief unit administrator position is worth seeking because of the responsibility, authority, and status with which it is associated.

The researcher anticipates the findings of this study will contribute to a better understanding of the administration and leadership of multiunit community college districts, particularly the administration and leadership of the units that comprise the multiunit district.


APPENDIX A

Letter to District Chief Executive Officer
Dear Dr. Smith:

As chancellor of a multi-unit community college district, you represent a segment of post-secondary institutions that have experienced tremendous growth in the past 25 years. It is this segment of higher education that will be the focus of a study I am conducting for my dissertation research.

I am currently employed as Director of the Small Business Development Center for the Iowa Valley Community College District, which is a multi-college community college district. In addition, I am a doctoral candidate in Higher Education at Iowa State University and am in the process of completing my program by preparing to conduct my research. As my dissertation topic, I will be investigating the roles and responsibilities of the chief campus administrators within multi-unit community college districts.

The purpose of my study is to analyze the duties of chief campus administrators and broaden the understanding of how they perceive themselves in their role. My data will be collected by conducting a personal interview with each chief campus administrator on his/her own campus. In order to gather accurate information, I will be taping the interviews. Respondents will not be identified in the study and all data will be treated confidentially. In addition, I will ask those being interviewed to complete a questionnaire prior to the interview and to send me his/her job description, organizational chart, and college catalogue.

Your consent for your institution's participation in this study is needed. If you agree to participate, please send me the names, addresses, and phone numbers of your chief campus administrators so that I can contact each of them to establish a time for the interview. You can write me at: Judy Nissen, 1914 S. 5th Avenue, Marshalltown, Iowa, 50158.
Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. My work phone is (515) 752-4643 and home phone is (515) 753-0091. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Judy Nissen
Doctoral Candidate

Larry H. Ebbers
Major Professor
APPENDIX B

Letters to Chief Unit Administrators
April 5, 1991

Dear:

I have received your name from your president because of my request to include your community college district and your campus in my doctoral research. I am a Ph.D. student in higher education at Iowa State University and as my research topic am investigating the roles and responsibilities of chief unit administrators within multi-unit community college districts.

The purpose of my study is to determine the duties and responsibilities of chief campus administrators and broaden the understanding of how they perceive themselves in their role. In addition, the feelings you have about your position and the relationships you have with other district constituencies will also be included. Data for my research will be collected from a questionnaire, a personal interview, and an analysis of certain documents.

I have enclosed a questionnaire and ask that you complete it and return it to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope, along with your job description, organizational chart, and college catalogue by April 15, 1991. I will be calling you by April 12 to establish a time to conduct a two hour face-to-face interview with you on your campus.

Prior to the interview, I will send you the questions that will be used in the interview. That will give you an opportunity to become familiar with them and allow the interview to be conducted in a more timely manner. It is important that you know that your campus will not be identified in the study and all data will be treated confidentially.

I am excited about my research and appreciate your willingness to be involved in my study. I am looking forward to meeting you!

Sincerely,

Judy Nissen
Dear

As a follow-up to my telephone conversation with you earlier this week, I am confirming the date and time we established for my interview with you. It is scheduled for ____________ and will be held in your office on your campus.

The interview questions are enclosed and I encourage you to review them prior to the interview. In addition, I would like to remind you of the documents I had requested from you. They include:
- Campus Organizational Chart
- Your Job Description
- College Catalog

I will plan to get those from you at the time of your interview.

I'm looking forward to meeting you. If you have any questions please don't hesitate to give me a call at 515-753-0091.

Sincerely,

Judy Nissen
Dear : 

I just wanted to thank you again for allowing me to interview you for my doctoral research project. All of the interviews are completed and I am now in the process of compiling data and drawing conclusions.

I enjoyed the opportunity to meet you and to learn about your college, and district. I hope our paths will cross again! Thank you for your help!

Sincerely,

Judy Nissen
APPENDIX C

Campus Administrator Response Questionnaire
PERSONAL DATA:

1. How long have you been employed in this district?_________
   How long have you been in your present position?_________
   What is your present title?__________________________

2. What position did you hold prior to the present one?
   __________________________________________________________________
   Was the position held in your present institution?_______
   If not, where?________________________________________

3. Your age:____

4. Gender: ____Male  ____Female

5. With what ethnic group do you identify?
   ____white (non-Hispanic)  ____Native American
   ____black (non-Hispanic)  ____Asian/Pacific Islander
   ____Chicano/Hispanic  ____Other (specify)_______

6. What is your present marital status?
   ____single  ____divorced or separated
   ____married  ____widowed

7. What is your current annual contract salary?
   ____$25,000 - $29,999  ____$45,000 - $49,999
   ____$30,000 - $34,999  ____$50,000 - $54,999
   ____$35,000 - $39,999  ____$55,000 - $59,999
   ____$40,000 - $44,999  ____$60,000 and above

8. Who is your immediate supervisor (by title)?
   __________________________________________________________________
9. List your major area of study for each degree held:

A.A. or A.S.: ____________________________

B.A. or B.S.: ____________________________

M.A. or M.S.: ____________________________

Ed.D.: ____________________________

Ph.D.: ____________________________

INSTITUTIONAL DATA:

10. What is the name of your campus? ____________________________

When was it established? ____________________________

What was your campus full time equivalent enrollment for fall 1990? __________

What is your campus operating budget for present fiscal year? __________

11. What is the name of your community college district? ____________________________

When was it established as a multi-unit district? ______

What is the total present operating budget for your district? __________

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES:

12. How many and what level of employees do you directly supervise?

____ Faculty

____ Non-teaching Staff

____ Administration (Specify by title): __________

__________________________________________
13. What three areas of responsibilities are most demanding of your time and administrative skills? (Identify by numbering 1, 2, and 3 with # 1 being most demanding.)

____ central office requests  ____ public relations
____ business & financial management  ____ students
____ personnel management  ____ alumni
____ facilities/equipment management  ____ legislation
____ curriculum/instructional management  ____ professional activities
____ economic development  ____ fund raising

14. Of the items listed in question 13, what three areas of responsibilities are least demanding of your time and administrative skills?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. Of the items listed in question 13, what areas of responsibility would you prefer spending your time and administrative skills?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

16. As the campus chief administrator, rank the groups listed below in order of degree as to who you work most closely (#1 - work most closely; #5 - work least closely).

____ community members  ____ faculty
____ central office administration  ____ students
____ other campus administration
APPENDIX D

Structured Interview Guide
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

1. Introduce myself and explain briefly the nature of my research study.

2. Explain guidelines for conducting interview.
   A. Interview will be taped.
   B. Responses to questions will be treated in confidential and an anonymous manner.
   C. Individual being interviewed will have the option to not respond to a particular question.

PART 2: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Describe the geographic location of your campus in relation to central office.
   What impact does your geographic location relative to central office have on your campus operation?

2. As a point of clarification regarding your organizational chart, to whom do you report directly?
   Who on campus reports directly to you?

3. How often are you in contact with central office?
   For what reasons are those contacts usually made?

4. How often do you meet with central office administration?
   What subjects tend to be most often addressed?

5. How does your geographic location in relation to the other campuses in the district affect your operation?

6. How often do you meet with the other chief campus administrators in your district?
   Who usually initiates the meetings?
   What subjects are usually addressed?

7. What are your primary concerns in working with the other chief campus administrators in your district?

8. What professional organizations are of most benefit to you?
9. When you are seeking advice from someone outside of your organization about an issue facing you on your campus, who are you most likely to contact?

10. What responsibilities do you have that are unique to you and your campus as compared to the other campuses in your district?

11. What responsibilities do you have that have district-wide implications?

12. How would you describe the status of your position as chief campus administrator?

13. What area or responsibility do you feel is being most neglected by you?

   From your perspective, what is the reason this has occurred?

14. What changes would you like to see in your responsibilities as chief campus administrator?

15. What concerns or issues exist because you are part of a multi-unit community college district that would not exist if you were in a single institution district?

16. What major concerns or issues are you now addressing on your campus?

   I would like to ask you some questions now more specifically related to your responsibilities and duties. For my research, I have divided administrative functions into 5 categories: planning, organizing, staffing, directing (bringing about purposeful action toward desired objectives), and controlling (ensuring progress toward objectives according to plan) and will reference those categories in my questions.

17. Please talk about one or two duties you perform under the planning category that you consider most significant.

18. Describe one or two duties you consider significant that falls into the organizing category.

19. What one or two significant duties related to staffing do you perform on a regular basis?
20. The administrative function of directing makes reference to bringing about action toward desired objectives. Please discuss one or two duties that you consider most significant that exemplify the directing function.

21. The controlling function involves such things as establishing standards, measuring results, and taking corrective action, all with the intent that progress toward objectives is occurring according to plan. What one or two significant duties do you perform that would fall into the controlling category?

22. Of the five categories, - planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling, which do you find occupies most of your time?

Of the five categories, which do you find occupies the least amount of your time?

23. What other duties do you perform on a regular basis that do not fall into one of the categories?

24. Consistent with the duties you have, how do you feel about the amount of authority you have to carry out those responsibilities?

25. What do you perceive to be your greatest obstacle to being successful as a chief campus administrator?

26. In thinking about the different groups that are part of the district, as central office staff, faculty, students, non-teaching staff, alumni, board members, and community members -

- With what two groups do you communicate the most?
- What form/forms of communication do you use most often?
- With what two groups do you communicate the least?
- What form/forms of communication do you most often use with them?

27. In what kinds of decision making do you participate?

28. What individuals or groups influence you the most in your decision making?

29. What is your role in promoting change on your campus?

What is your role in promoting change in the district?
30. With reference to central office policies and procedures, what limitations are placed on you in running your campus?

31. What are your perceptions regarding the autonomy of your campus in relation to central office?

32. What changes would you like to see occur in the relationship between your campus and central office?

33. What influenced you to be in the position you are today?

34. In what ways has your role as chief campus administrator been what you expected it to be? In what ways has it not been what you expected it to be?

35. At the end of the day when you leave campus, what do you feel best about?

36. If you had the opportunity to become a chief campus administrator in a multi-unit district again, how would you feel about assuming that position?
APPENDIX E

Job Descriptions
POSITION TITLE: President

REPORTING RELATIONSHIP: Reports to the Chancellor

POSITION SUMMARY:
The college President shall be responsible to the Chancellor for managing the overall program of the college, coordinating the programs of instruction and directing the development and operation of the college consistent with District directions. The President shall assume the duties of chief executive of the college in conformity with Board policies and administrative procedure.

QUALIFICATIONS:
Must have a Masters Degree, preferable in education or administration. A minimum of three years of experience in community college leadership is preferred.

TYPICAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:
1. Direct, coordinate, supervise and evaluate the total program of the college.
2. Coordinate the selection of personnel for recommendation to the Chancellor.
3. Manage a program of instructional services, including curriculum revision, improvement and expansion.
4. Manage programs of staff orientation, in-service training, evaluation and professional improvement.
5. Establish and maintain communication systems within the college and intra-District.
6. Develop short-range and long-range planning for the college in concert with District plans.
7. Develop a system of handling all necessary reports to the District Office and other agencies.
8. Establish and manage a campus administrative organization sufficient in size and scope to meet functional needs of the college.
9. Develop and administer the total college budget within framework of the District-wide activities.

10. Coordinate college public relations and development efforts and assist the Chancellor in District-wide activities.

11. Manage an effective student development program.

12. Coordinate the delivery of a comprehensive community education and community services program.

13. Develop effective methods for assuring the welfare and morale of employees and students.

14. Supervise the operations of the physical plant, including renovations, additions and new facilities.

15. Serve as a continuing member of the District Administrative Council.

16. Perform other duties as assigned by the Chancellor.

CREDENTIALS:

None
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POSITION: Campus Director,
REPORTS TO: Area President

QUALIFICATIONS:

Required: Master's Degree in educational administration or related area. Five years of teaching and administrative experience.

Desired: Earned Doctorate and Community College experience desired.

GENERAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

The Campus Director has the overall responsibility for the management of the Campus under the policies and guidelines established by the Area President and the Governing Board. The Campus Director, therefore, has the responsibility for selecting and organizing staff, allocating resources, and coordinating efforts of all departments in a manner which establishes and maintains quality educational programs.

SPECIFIC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

1) Prepares and justifies an annual budget to the Area President and the Governing Board and manages its expenditures throughout the fiscal year.

2) Select and nominate for appointment; assign or alter the assignment; recommend suspension, promotion, or dismissal of employees in accordance with the policies and guidelines of the Area President and the Governing Board.

3) Establish and maintain long-range plans regarding programs, services, resources and facilities and to communicate such plans to staff, Area President, and the Governing Board.

4) Establish and maintain compliance with local, state, federal, and selected organizational guidelines, reporting procedures, such as vocational program applications, claims, and North Central Accrediting information.

5) Establish and maintain a comprehensive evaluation and development effort which assures the quality of the educational program of the campus.

6) Provide continuous leadership and direction for the execution of the services and educational programs of the campus including such things as the Management Council, and the maintenance of an effective communication system.

7) Establish and maintain liaison between businesses, industries, institutions, organizations, and the community in general, and the educational programs of the campus.
8) Interpret policies of the Governing Board by establishing rules and regulations for the operation of the campus.

9) Carries out other duties which are necessary to the smooth functioning of the campus or may be assigned by the Area President.
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JOB ANALYSIS

POSITION: Campus Director

REPORTS TO: Area President

GENERAL DUTIES:

The Campus Director has the overall responsibility for the management of the Campus under the policies and guidelines established by the Area President and the Governing Board.

SPECIFIC DUTIES:

1. Prepares and justifies annual budget to the Area President and the Governing Board and manages its expenditure throughout the fiscal year.

2. Selects and nominates for appointment; assigns or alters the assignment; recommends suspension, promotion, resignations, or dismissal of employees in accordance with the policies and guidelines of the Area President and the Governing Board.

3. Establishes and maintains long-range plans regarding programs, services, resources, and facilities and communicates such plans to staff, Area President, and the Governing Board.

4. Establishes and maintains compliance with local, state, federal and selected organizational guidelines, reporting procedures, etc.

5. Establishes and maintains a comprehensive evaluation and development effort which assures the quality of the educational program of the Campus.

6. Provides continuous leadership and direction for the execution of the educational programs of the Campus.

7. Establishes and maintains liaison between business, industry, institutions, organizations and the community in general.
PUBLIC RELATIONS:

Important attributes of any employee of Community College, Campus, along with the official performance of the work assigned, are the personal appearance and public relations. The employee should make every effort to be well informed, pleasant, courteous and cooperative, and to act in a manner to command respect of co-workers and all college personnel. An optimistic attitude, patience and tolerance will help the employee in many situations in the College.
JOB TITLE: President
PAY CLASSIFICATION: A-A
LOCATION: All District Locations

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:
The campus president is responsible to the Chancellor of the District for (1) participating in the development and implementation of the philosophy, goals, and policies of the District, (2) serving as chief administrative officer of the campus and assuming responsibility for its educational program, services, and facilities, (3) providing constructive interpretation of District and campus philosophies, policies, and procedures for faculty, staff, and students, (4) providing leadership for the campus in developing and maintaining a balanced educational program appropriate to the specific needs of the community, (5) recommending the assignment and termination of campus personnel, (6) providing a climate which encourages instructional innovation, (7) administering the campus budget as approved, and (8) representing the campus in the community.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:
1. Maintain a comprehensive program of instruction in general transfer programs, occupational programs, and continuing education programs.
2. Maintain a comprehensive student services program to include student activities, counseling and guidance, admissions and records, placement, financial aid, and health services.
3. In case of an emergency or unusual situation, ensure that all aspects of campus services are provided.
4. Supervise the process and provide the leadership required to maintain regional accreditation for the institution, and as necessary, apply for the accreditation or licensing of individual programs.
5. Recommend to the Chancellor desirable changes in organization and staffing designs for the campus.
6. Maintain a system of shared governance which complements the District governance system and insures adequate internal communication.
7. Approve campus regulations and procedures.
8. Appoint campus committees and advisory groups.
9. Assign the task of generating funding proposals.
10. Decide when, during an emergency, it is advisable to cancel classes, close the offices for the day, and inform the appropriate District officer of the decision.
11. Approve travel authorizations for campus staff.
12. Maintain appropriate relationships with alumni through alumni organization or other mechanism.

13. Participate in educational consortia.

14. Develop and implement a campus Affirmative Action Plan which complements the District plan.

15. Coordinate the presentation of special campus events with the appropriate District office.

16. Coordinate campus committees with District committees.

17. Cooperate with the District in assuring the effective operation of the campus and District Affirmative Action Plans.

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE:

1. Doctorate in higher education preferred or commensurate training and experience.

2. Five years experience in administration in a multi-campus system.

3. Teaching experience, preferably in a community college.

SPECIFIC SKILLS REQUIRED:

1. Ability to plan, to organize, to staff, to direct, and to control campus operations.

2. Ability to interpret the District and campus mission both orally and in writing to the various publics.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS:

None specified.
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Organizational Charts
Assistant Campus Director will serve as chief administrator in the absence of the Campus Director.
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