DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 482 JC 730 120

AUTHOR	Grable, John R., Ed.
TITLE	Role of the Department/Division Chairman in the Community College. A Report of a Conference at Sam Houston State University Community Junior College Graduate Program, July 31-August 1, 1972.
INSTITUTION	Sam Houston State Univ., Huntsville, Tex.
PUB DATE	Apr 73
NOTE	32p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Available from the Bookstore, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas 77340. $2.00 per copy
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; *Community Colleges; Conference Reports; *Department Directors (School); Educational Responsibility; Noninstructional Responsibility; Post Secondary Education; Role Perception; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Department Chairman Role

ABSTRACT

A conference on the role of the department/division chairman in the community college was sponsored by the Community Junior College Graduate Program of Sam Houston State University. The following were presented: (1) "Role of the Department Chairman in Improving Community College Instruction" by John Lombardi; (2) "Role of the Department Chairman in Staff Development" by John E. Roueche; (3) "The Division Chairman in the Multi-Campus Community College" by Bill Priest; (4) "The Role of the Department Chairman in Collective Bargaining" by Richard D. Strahan; (5) "The Department Chairman Looks at Developmental Studies" by Ruby Herd; and (6) "The Chairman in the Midst of a Revolution" by John Lombardi. (KM)

Role of the Department/Division Chairman in the Community College

A report of a conference sponsored by the Sam Houston State University Community Junior College Graduate Program, July 31 and August 1, 1972

EDITED BY
JOHN R. GRABLE

Community Junior College Graduate Program
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

April 1973

CONTENTS

Preface 5
John R. Grable, Coordinator of Community College Programs,
Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas

Role of the Department Chairman in Improving Community College Instruction 7
John Lombardi, President-Emeritus, Los Angeles
City College, Los Angeles, California

Role of the Department Chairman in Staff Development 13
John E. Roueche, Professor of Junior College Education,
University of Texas at Austin, Texas

The Division Chairman in the Multi-Campus Community College 17
Bill Priest, Chancellor, Dallas County Community
College District, Dallas, Texas

The Role of the Department Chairman in Collective Bargaining 23
Richard D. Strahan, Professor of Education, University
of Houston, and Attorney-At-Law, Houston, Texas

The Department Chairman Looks at Developmental Studies 27
Ruby Herd, Associate Dean of Instruction, El Centro College,
Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas

The Chairman in the Midst of a Revolution 33
John Lombardi, President-Emeritus, Los Angeles
City College, Los Angeles, California

PREFACE

The role and scope of the department/division chairman's responsibilities in the community college constitute one of the least understood and least effective aspects of the total program of two-year colleges. Numerous questions need to be resolved. Is the chairman an administrative and instructional leader or is he simply an administrative stooge? If the chairman is, in fact, an instructional leader how does he go about providing the leadership that is so essential to the functioning of an effective division or department? How should the chairman be selected and how should he be prepared for this demanding job? What should his term of office be and how should he be compensated for his efforts?

Because it is the most rapidly growing unit in American higher education, the community college faces particularly heavy pressures for efficiency and improvement in all aspects of its operation. Properly selected, trained, and motivated department/division chairmen seem to provide the key to the development of effective instructional programs in the two-year college.

Against this background of confusion and uncertainty regarding the proper functions of the department/division chairman a Conference on the Role of the Department Division Chairman in the Community College was held at Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas, on July 31 and August 1, 1972. Over one hundred and fifty representatives of junior colleges representing several states attended. Participating in the conferences were some of the outstanding leaders in the community college movement in the United States.

This report includes edited versions of the major papers presented at the Conference. It is hoped that the report will be valuable to junior college administrators, instructors, department/division chairmen—and to all who are concerned with the improvement of teaching in the two-year college.

JOHN R. GRABLE

JOHN LOMBARDI

ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN IN IMPROVING COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTION

When we talk about improving instruction, one asks what do we mean? Does improving instruction mean increasing the knowledge or skills of the student? Does it mean increasing the power of the instructor to impart the knowledge or skill he possesses? Does it mean changing the technology of instruction? Should we replace desks with carrels in the classroom? Create units of instruction that require less attention from the instructor? Shall the instructor become a manager or foreman of a large resources center with machines, computers, and programmed materials that students can work on at their own speed and at their own convenience? Shall we make it possible for a student to do his learning at home where he can watch an ITV program or use a cassette; at a factory, office, or field; or on a tour of some kind?

A second point that needs to be kept in the forefront of this discussion is how to measure the degree of improvement of instruction. Are we interested in some standard of proficiency in the skill or knowledge the student acquired as measured by the difference between what he knew when he entered a class and what he knows when he leaves the class? In other words, "does whatever learning takes place depend primarily on the ability or aptitude of the student or on the quality of instruction?"[1]

Most of us like to believe that we are responsible for the difference in skill or knowledge that has taken place—provided the difference is positive. Few of us are willing to assume responsibility for a negative or zero difference. Failures, we insist, are not ours, but the student's. However the emphasis on accountability is in essence an attempt to make the instructor responsible for the failures as well as the successes of the students. It also explains in part the unusual concern with improving instruction.

There is another aspect to the concern for improving instruction that has special pertinence to the community college; it relates to the open door or open access policy. Because the community college is non-selective in admission, we have to revise our concepts of the college student, especially as more of them enter our educational institutions. We now have students more representative of the general population in aptitude than was formerly the case. Although never as selective as the four-year colleges and universities, junior colleges before the 1950's were more selective than they are today. The "selectiveness" may or may not have been a college policy—but it resulted in a less heterogeneous population in aptitude as in other respects. This wide range of student aptitudes makes our efforts at improving instruction more challenging and more frustrating.

---

[1] Harold L. Hodgkinson "Encouraging Change and Significance in Higher Education" *Legislative Decision Making in Higher Education How to Get the Facts* Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, March, 1972, p. 41

Still another facet of this topic is the difference between the teaching of knowledge or concepts, and the teaching of skills. The teaching of knowledge or concepts (as in English literature, history, philosophy) is less precise and more diffuse than the teaching of skills (as in typing, shorthand, bicycle riding, tennis, playing the piano, or performing a science experiment in a laboratory). Motivation of students may be the same for both types of teaching, but sustaining it requires much more effort in the teaching of concepts than in the teaching of skills. An important reason for this difference may be the immediacy of reward for the student learning a skill and satisfaction for the instructor observing the progress of the student.

Measurement of progress in the knowledge and concepts subjects is difficult —sometimes almost futile; in the skills it is not only possible to measure the degree of success but the rate of forgetting is far lower than in the others. Furthermore, once learned, the skills persist almost throughout life.

Another major difference between the two broad areas I have defined is that students are unlikely to challenge an instructor in a skill subject because in most cases he is recognized as an expert. But in history or a philosophy course, ignorance does not prevent students from disagreeing or even challenging the instructor. In fact, instructors encourage this independence; they deplore uncritical acceptance of concepts, ideas, theories. Instruction may be lively, invigorating, intensely emotional, but at the end of a discussion one would often be hard pressed to figure out what learning has taken place. As a consequence, it is extremely difficult to measure the improvement of instruction or to know if any improvement in student learning we can measure is related to the teaching. The differences between the teaching of skills and the teaching of knowledge or concepts is sometimes overlooked when people rate instructors in the skill subjects as superior to those in the knowledge or concepts subjects.

Besides the elusiveness of the process of learning and teaching, we must also recognize that in our schools an administrator or leader has no more intelligence or knowledge than an instructor. Some instructors go beyond this, claiming that acceptance of an administrative post is a sign of inferior intelligence! At best, an administrator, and especially a chairman, is considered only as the first among equals—chosen or elected to prevent anarchy and to help the group maintain parity with other departments. Good instruction is only one of the ways parity may be maintained.

From the administrator's point of view the chairman is immediately responsible for the health of the department, the welfare of the instructors and supporting personnel, and the progress of the students—all of which ultimately means responsibility for the instructional program.

In this dichotomous in-between position—part faculty, part administrator—the chairman must assure the faculty of his loyalty to the department above anything else and maintain reasonably cordial relations with the administration, always careful not to be tabbed as the tool of the administration. If he is able to reconcile these seemingly contradictory roles he can create an effective environment for the difficult task of improving instruction.

Once having established himself as capable of maintaining this fine line between concern for the welfare of the faculty and loyalty to the institution, the chairman is ready for tackling the task of improving instruction. Here he has the initiative

or may assume it. Obviously, there is no ready-made kit on improving instruction. Each chairman must work within the environment of his department. If he is among the lucky chairmen of departments in which skills are the major objectives, he can proceed with much more assurance of acceptability of plans than if he is among those in departments in which knowledge and concepts are the predominant objectives.

Observing the physical surroundings of learning is probably a good place to start the process of improvement. Any success the chairman may have in replacing worn out or obsolescent equipment; securing new equipment, supplies and assistance; refurnishing the rooms, laboratories, and offices will make for greater receptivity and cooperation from instructors in improving instruction. Visits with the instructors in their offices, classrooms, and laboratories are effective in establishing the feeling that the chairman is interested in their welfare and that of the department. At the same time, he gets an overview of the department.

Next (I use the seriatim device only for convenience; some of the activities are occurring simultaneously) the chairman should examine the state of learning by as many objective instruments or methods or data as are available. If the college has a research director he may have information on the inputs and outputs of the educational process. The chairman will need all the data available to make an adequate assessment of what is happening to the students as they pass through the classes in his department. From this examination of data about student aptitudes and learning progress and the observations of the physical surroundings, he will discover areas of excellence, moderate acceptability, mediocrity, stagnation, and even deterioration. Some or all of these conditions may be present, especially in a large department.

Enumerating inputs, aptitude of students and outputs, products and benefits, is relatively easy. We can measure (test) a student when he enters a class and when he leaves. Assuming we have developed standards we can measure the difference on the two tests. This is commonly done in the elementary and secondary schools through standardized tests. It is often done in skill subjects such as typing, shorthand, composition and reading, and mathematics. It is done less effectively in the academic subjects. We can also measure the instructor's power of student retention—an output that can be extended to the department in the form of certificates and degrees awarded, transfers to senior institutions, degree of success on local, state, or national examinations such as for registered nursing, certified public accounting, or civic service positions.

We can get student reactions, directly and indirectly. Retention is one form, although an indirect one. Another is to observe the enrollment trends in the same subjects by different instructors. A more common method is to encourage students to evaluate their experience, usually through a questionnaire.

With this data, the chairman can begin involving the instructors. Strategy and timing are important for the success of any program in this delicate area. Involvement of instructors (as early as possible) is a must. Instructors are already accustomed to sharing responsibility in the development of policy and assuming the chores and tasks such as preparing syllabuses, selecting texts, library books, equipment and other teaching materials, supervising non-professional staff, preparing the budget, making the schedule, revising catalog copy, recruiting new instructors, and evaluating probationary instructors. Involvement in these activities is important since it contributes directly and indirectly to the improvement of instruction. Involvement gives

the instructors a part in the inputs and a stake in the outcomes. Unfortunately, the chairman will rarely get as much cooperation as he may wish, for most instructors are too busy with their classroom assignments to spend much time on departmental activities. They will spend a little—which is all that the chairman should expect.

Timing is really part of the strategy. In the course of an academic year occasions occur when a discussion of this subject is natural and expected. These occasions may occur at any time of the year. They may involve the department or an individual instructor. Sometimes, the chairman may create the occasion. Here are a few that have proved effective:

(1) at the beginning of a school year, especially if the president points out weaknesses that need attention;
(2) when a self-study is being prepared for an accreditation visit;
(3) when a plan for the implementation of a law or regulation requires periodic evaluation of instructors and/or instruction;
(4) when an instructor or group of instructors asks for action because "students are not as good as they used to be";
(5) when new technologies or new theories are being discussed;
(6) when textbooks are being reviewed for possible adoption and audiovisual equipment, library books, and supplies are being ordered;
(7) immediately following a crisis such as occurred after Sputnik;
(8) when it becomes obvious that an instructor has become lax in his classroom assignments, is having difficulty with his students, and has an unusually high dropout rate.

If formal evaluation is required by college policy, the chairman can make this process an effective means of improving instruction. Depending upon the ingredients, the chairman can utilize each step from the class visitation, post-visit conference, to the written evaluation as an opportunity for the improvement of instruction. This requires more than the single sentence or check marks that characterize so many evaluation reports. Here the chairman must be specific in the reports, commending the instructor for his strengths and suggesting alternatives for overcoming weaknesses. By and large, few colleges have been able to make faculty evaluation an effective medium for improving instruction, probably because evaluation is associated with retention or separation of instructors. Disassociating the two functions—(1) improving instruction and (2) retention or separation of faculty—may be a necessary condition for effectiveness of evaluation. Considering how few instructors are separated from a staff, it is unfortunate that the latter function of evaluation overshadows the more important one of improving instruction.

A positive and effective method of improving instruction is through the use of incentives and rewards. We are accustomed to the use of these as a means of improving the learning of students but we are apt to be neglectful or wary of applying them to instructors. Yet, instructors, like students (and chairmen), need incentives and rewards, for indifference to or unawareness of what the instructors are doing may lead to less than top performance. Instructors need encouragement, notice, or stroking.

Merit pay, advancement to tenure status, promotion in academic rank, dist-

inguished teacher awards, grants and sabbaticals for experimentation, research, and study are all important incentives and rewards for the improvement of instruction. Many of these originate outside the department, but the chairman often plays a key role in the selection or recommendation of instructors for these rewards, which usually have a monetary value

There are many more opportunities for recognition of good performance that may originate with the chairman, which, although they have no monetary value, are very effective in promoting good teaching. In colleges with preparation and years of service salary schedules, these are even more important. All of them have one thing in common—personal recognition of the instructor by the chairman.

In this area, the chairman has an infinite number of occasions to recognize and encourage the members of the department, individually and collectively. I have mentioned the formal evaluation process as a major opportunity. Others occur when an instructor receives a new degree, gets an award or recognition for some service, or obtains a grant for research. Particularly worthy of commendation is the instructor's success with students, in the rate of retention, excellence of work exhibited or displayed, or outstanding performance in a contest or competition. Flattering to an instructor is the chairman's attendance at one of his public lectures. A demonstration of some departmental activity at a faculty or other meeting contributes to pride in the department which is an excellent aid to good instruction.

In this aspect of his role, the chairman should not overlook the personal, non-professional occasions when congratulations, condolences, sympathy, advice, and listening are called for. While not directly related to instruction this personal equation has an influence in the attitude of instructors toward their work, department, and the institution.

In this discussion, there has been no mention of the value of preparing, reviewing, and/or revising a statement of objectives for the department and similar statements for each course, for these seem almost axiomatic. The departmental statement forces the group to reexamine its role in the institution and to make changes caused by developments affecting the discipline. For example, the statements on foreign languages, physics, and engineering prepared just after Sputnik may not be appropriate today without considerable revision. Similarly, history, English, and sociology have been affected by the student ethnic movements of the late 1960's.

I have only mentioned in passing the need for statements on individual courses. One need not accept the glamorous claims of behavioral objectives advocates to realize that the department should have well-defined statements of the objectives of the courses, together with the degree of proficiency expected and the means for measuring the amount of learning that has taken place. How detailed these should be depends on the nature of the subject, the method of instruction, the instructor, and the students. Copies of these should be given to the students at the appropriate times.

There is no one method of good teaching. Boulding maintains that we "know that emulation sometimes produces greater productivity and sometimes less," but we "don't know very much about when it does one and when it does the other."[2] Probably the emphasis on a mix of learning and teaching procedures and techniques

[2]Kenneth E. Boulding, "The Schooling Industry as a Pathological Section of the American Economy," *Review of Educational Research*, Winter, 1972, p. 137

is related to this unknown. As a consequence, a variety of instructional approaches should be encouraged for the individual instructor and for the department.

In the first few remarks of this discussion, I posed a series of questions that are causing considerable ferment in the area of instruction. Much of this ferment is related to the quality of teaching and learning; some of it is related to finding ways of increasing faculty productivity in order to help resolve the serious financial crisis of the colleges. Whether this interest in new technologies of teaching and learning is another fad that will disappear as so many others have is still a moot question.

For the next few years department chairmen will be pressed to consider these alternatives to the traditional method of classroom instruction posed in the questions. The likelihood of indiscriminate adoption of one or another of these "miracle drugs" is very great unless each of us exercises leadership in this search for better teaching and learning at a more reasonable cost. We are being asked to prove that our present methods are the best possible to produce quality teaching and effective learning. Many, including educators, doubt that they are. Because of this challenge, the improvement of instruction, next to finances, is our most serious issue. And the chairman has the responsibility to exercise leadership in meeting this challenge. Is it true that what "we really know about learning could. . . be put on a page?" Is it true that for student learning "it makes no difference what method of instruction is used or how experienced or inexperienced the instructor is?"[3]

In the face of these discouraging questions, how would I act if I were chairman of a department? I would accept the challenges and do everything in my power to disprove the assertions of our inadequacy, not by argument but by demonstration—by the only criterion that counts, the learning of students. My ignorance of how learning takes place would not prevent me from working for the improvement of instruction. I accept the premise of our paucity of knowledge, but I also know that learning does take place. So I would recommend a variety of teaching and learning methods for the benefit of the instructors and the students to improve the quality and increase the quantity of learning. Never have there been so many aids for improving teaching and learning as are available today. While waiting for the psychologists and neurologists to decode the complicated process of learning, I would be no less assiduous in my efforts to improve learning and teaching than a doctor is in his efforts to cure a patient suffering from cancer.

In conclusion, may I say that chairmen can be most effective change agents in making the adjustment required in "teaching and learning" the new students; however, without a wholehearted commitment to full opportunity, the open door community colleges will become pallid imitations of idealized elitist colleges.

---

[3]Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer, *Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972) p. 208

JOHN ROUECHE

ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Very little has been written on the role of the department chairman; in fact, if you search the literature, you will find less available about the role, scope, function, duties, and responsibilities of the department chairman than any other academic administrator. A few years ago, Wilbert McKeachie wrote an excellent article in the *Educational Record* on the role of the department chairman; his article was entitled "Memo to New Department Chairmen," and I want to quote from that article:

> "Although the department chairmen in most colleges and universities are key individuals in determining the educational success of the college, they are generally ill-prepared, inadequately supported, and more to be pitied than censured. In many departments, the attitude of the faculty toward a colleague who accepts a departmental chairmanship is much like that of nuns toward a sister who moves into a house of prostitution."[1]

Those are strong words, but in most institutions, the moment you become a department chairman, you've left the faculty ranks, and you are one of "them," one of "them" being the administration or administrative camp. Your allegiance is probably more to the administration than to the faculty or at least so some people have said.

Five years ago, I did a study that was eventually published by the American Association of Junior Colleges. The study had to do with the effectiveness of community college remedial education programs in the United States, and in that study, we found that about 800 community colleges and junior colleges in the country in 1967 had programs or courses, or both, for low achieving, low aptitude students. We found by responses that remedial English was the most frequently offered course in American junior colleges, followed very closely by remedial reading and remedial mathematics. As more and more of these non-traditional students, new students, different students came into the community college, the college was responding by assigning more staff personnel, building more courses and more programs for more and more students, and it was impressive. In fact, in some of the colleges involved in the study, the budget, the staff allocation for those programs was somewhere between 20 and 30 percent, depending upon the college and its locale. Thus, the college was allocating 20-30 percent of its instructional budget for remedial education programs. That was impressive, for colleges had programs, they offered

[1]Wilbert J. McKeachie, "Memo to New Department Chairmen," *Educational Record*, Spring, 1968 (49), p. 221

courses. they hired faculty. they had stodents. and they spent a lot of money. The questions we were asking in our stody were these: What happens to the remedial students in those colleges? Do they stay in school? Do they persist? Do they achieve? Are they successfol when they leave the program? What about the attitnde of the student toward the program while he is there and when he leaves? For those of yoo who read that stody, it was called "Salvage, Redirection, or Costody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College." The results of the study were devastating. for we foond that very few of the community colleges could answer those questions. They simply had no data on the soccess of their students.

Five years ago, remedial education was in a sorry state of affairs, and probably still is in community colleges aroond the nation. Bot we have just finished a five-year followup to that stody, fonded by the U.S. Office of Edocation, looking at eight colleges aroond the coontry which have developed nation-wide reputations for having pat together successful developmental study programs. Three of the colleges in oor sample are here in Texas: San Antonio College, El Centro College, and Sooth Campus of Tarrant Coonty. In this study, we looked at retention; retention. f students who enrolled for any kind of academic skills deficieney, whether it was verbal skills, mathematical skills, or anything that the college measures, and if they had a deficiency, we identified those students. We also looked at student persistence in the programs, and we looked at student persistence for every semester beyond the program that they were in school. Now, that is a very base measure, yet it is very difficult to teach students if they are not in school, for if they are not there, your impact on them is zero. Secondly, we examined student achievement. We wanted to see what student grades in the developmental stodies were. We wanted to see what kind of grades the stodents earned the first semester after leaving the program. the second semester, and whether or not the student ever took a degree, certificate, or diploma. Finally, and very important, we wanted to ask those students still in the college, what do you think of the program? Was it a good program? Would you take it again? Woold you recommend that a brother take it? What is your honest feeling abont it?

Five years ago, the best retention rate we could find was somewhere aroond 20 percent. What do yoo think the worst rate from these eight schools was for students who enrolled with low academic indicators of their success in college? The worst was 75 percent and the best was 92 percent. This means that the range in the eight colleges was between 75 percent retention in developmental studies and 92 percent. and that is phenomenal. Ninety percent of the students who persisted, did so with a "C" average or better in all the courses they took. That is, their achievement as measured by teacher marks was notable and significant. In addition, skills development occurred. Stodents coold read; they could communicate. And in every college, the attitudes of those students toward the program was outstanding; in responding to the question "Would you take this program again?", over 90 percent responded "Yes" to all those questions; "Yes, I am a better person." Thus, we found that eight community colleges nationwide, open-door institutions. have found ways to admit low achieving, low self-concept stodents and do something for them, keep them in school and maximize their achievements.

There was, in addition, a rather startling and unexpected conclusion from this study, for the moment these young people left the protective enclaves of developmen-

tal studies or basic studies and returned to traditional classroom instruction, the attrition rate immediately increased and achievement declined. Undoubtedly, there are various influences which produced that dramatic shift at the end of these programs, but one reason may be that traditional instruction and traditional classrooms produced the anxiety and the failure syndrome in those individuals prior to their enrollment in the community college. Thus, the student who comes out of developmental studies where there are loving, caring, and thoughtful instructors and reenters the traditional environment is likely to experience frustration and failure. Now this is a fact which relates to staff development, and I want to explore two areas of staff development for community college faculty where the chairman, deans, and presidents all share equally. One has to do with faculty attitude development; the other has to do with instructional skills development. Bloom says in his excellent little paper, *Learning for Mastery*, that every teacher begins each semester with full knowledge and expectation that about one-third of his students will learn what the teacher has to teach and will be designated good students. Another third will learn something, but neither enough to be regarded as good students nor little enough to fail the course. And that another third will end up with "D's" and "F's". Bloom goes on to say that this set of teacher expectations creates a self-fulfilling prophecy reinforced through the system in the grading practice so that the final set of grades will approximate the initial set of expectations in the classroom. This is an area for faculty attitude development; that is, teachers looking at students as viable human beings with innate talent, creativity, and ability to learn.

Faculty attitude is a key, I would say the most important key, in community colleges ever making good on the promise of the open door. What can the department chairman do? He can help bring his faculty, his colleagues, up to date with some of the research that is coming out now with respect to persistence and achievement of students in open door institutions.

The second area I wanted to mention has to do with instructional skills development. The truth is that most community college teachers, unless they have inservice training programs or workshops on their own campus, really do not know how to begin individualizing instruction to accommodate the diverse group of students found in a typical community college classroom. I am not aware of ten graduate programs in the United States today which prepare a teacher who knows how to teach or how to accommodate individual differences in a classroom; therefore, this training must be an inservice activity; it must be staff development on campus. The role of the department chairman here can either make that a very exciting and worthwhile kind of staff development activity, or, by indifference or reluctance, the chairman can reinforce all the fears, all the apprehensions that teachers have about trying something different and learning new skills. The chairman's role in encouraging teachers to look for better ways to teach can be very important in setting up a climate of receptivity, a climate of change, and a climate of positive feelings toward students.

BILL PRIEST

THE DIVISION CHAIRMAN IN THE MULTI-CAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

I have always had an extremely deep interest in this matter of division chairmanship, because I see in this role the key to the whole community college mechanism. I think this is a slot which needs to be filled by unusually knowledgeable, competent doers. If it is not, there can be good teachers working on the firing line, with good administrators, and the organization will not put out the quality that it will if there are quality people at this division chairman level. I believe it. I've spent or caused to be spent, tens of thousands of dollars to demonstrate my interest. This is a selfish type of interest because the organization goes very well if there is competence here; it breaks down and is a herky jerky affair if there is not. By and large, division chairmen tend to be recruited from the ranks of master teachers. Unfortunately, the thing that made them great teachers does not necessarily make them great division chairmen. I think this may be one of the problems of higher level administrative decisions, in that a master teacher is often promoted as a form of reward and thrown into the situation where the demands may be quite different. What I have tried to do in this presentation is to identify the differences in the division chairman in a multi-campus district and division chairman in a single unit district, and I will summarize those characteristics a division chairman needs regardless of what kind of district he is in. I think the division chairman might be likened to a lieutenant in the Navy where he is high enough to be respected by those who may be in a lower level, he is also high enough to get the ear of those who may be in key positions on decision-making at the higher levels. He acts as sort of a catalyst by bringing the needs to the attention of those who will accommodate them. He acts also as a main communication link about which I will have more to say subsequently. Now, some of the things that a division chairman in a multi-campus district must be able to cope with. First, and I think this is the thing that hits the division chairman hardest if he comes from a single-campus district into a multi-campus district, he must be able to work with administrative machinery that is more cumbersome and less responsive than in a single campus district. The bigness, cumbersomeness, and slowness in responding seem to go together, probably because there are different layers, and one must go through the layer on the way up and through the layer on the way down, or else there is so much delegation that there are frequent backlashes because too much was delegated. This is a difficult problem, in that bigness tends to go with multi-campus districts. It is unlikely that one will find a five-campus district with 300 students in each college; thus, the size of multi-campus districts in terms of the numbers of students enrolled tends to be comparable. Another element the division chairman in the multi-campus district must be able to handle is that of selling his ideas and obtaining his share

of resources in a more competitive internal setting than on a single campus, for the multi-campus district is extremely competitive internally. This competition within a district among the colleges nominally under the same pyramid is always more fierce than competition among adjoining colleges, because multi-campus units are competing *immediately and directly* for money from the same source; therefore, it is a fight for existence in the eyes of the competitors, and as a result, one will see some very strange things. I can name, for example, districts where approximately 30 percent of the time is spent trying to torpedo the opposition, the opposition being the other colleges of the multi-campus district. This is a major problem for division chairmen, for teachers, and for everyone involved in the whole educational mechanism. Second, the chairman must be able to live with budgeting formulas, staffing formulas, and other fairly rigid restraints in contrast to a single campus where these things can be much less formally structured and changes much easier to implement. This is a major characteristic and it relates again to size, for as the organization gets larger it gets less human. In addition, there are tremendous pressures on higher level administrators for consistency and for fairness, and this is often interpreted as giving identical treatment, although identical is not necessarily fair. In fact, it could be very unfair in many circumstances that can be imagined. Thus, in Dallas, I do not pretend to give identical treatment, and I do not tell the president or the division chairmen that everyone gets an exact amount of the pie each year. We zig and zag; the pressures are different; the demands are different; the priorities are different; and I think it is stupid administration to hold to a lockstep formula. Yet, the larger one becomes, the more the tendency to push the organization toward this lockstep formula because there is a certain safety in that. It has the appearance of being objective and equal, although operationally, it may be very unequal and very poor administration. But over a period of time, if badgered enough, people on the higher administrative levels tend to adopt formulas because then the organization tends to run itself and if it doesn't, the mechanism is blamed rather than the individual who determines budget priorities from one year to the next. A division chairman must be able to develop esprite de corps within his or her division while simultaneously developing respect for his or her division among its peer divisions on other campuses. This is an important thing because even though there are smaller pyramids which represent individual colleges, they are part of a larger pyramid which represents the entire system, and the division chairman has a very delicate responsiblity in two directions: one, to run a good shop as the division chairman in his own college; second, to obtain recognition, status, and reputation among other divisions so he or she will be able to wield considerable influence in policy decisions which affect the entire district. This is true in most multi-campus administrative posts, although it is more difficult for division chairmen because they are intimately associated with the problem.

Another perplexing problem for the division chairman is one of seeing the strongest people he or she has developed siphoned off and sent to other colleges when promotions occur and replaced with new people with whom he must begin again. And yet, this is the name of the game, for the effective chairman trains those people in his division and then watches as the fruits of his labor are siphoned off and he goes back to the drawing board to start again. The chairman must not only be able to live with this situation, he must be able to get professional satisfaction

from it, and he must understand that this is, indeed, a very major contribution to the total educational mechanism.

The chairman must be able to develop respect and awareness in the district personnel office so that he gets a fair shake on referral of candidates who apply and are given basic screening interviews. Now, this factor depends of course upon the mechanics of a given system. Some systems are so decentralized that all the personnel selection is done on the individual campus in terms of recruiting. In others, it is highly centralized and all faculty recruiting is done in a central office with people sent to individual campuses either already hired or to be interviewed with "X" number to be selected from "Y" number sent out. It could be a combination of the two, but the smart division chairman tends the personnel front very closely because this is the source of supply of people who are coming into his division and with whom he will be expected to work and do a superior job. If the chairman neglects this area, he is likely to find himself out-hustled by the "opposition" (the other division chairmen), with the result that the other chairmen are able to make arrangements which are more productive in terms of recruitment and selection of new personnel.

Now, I would like to talk about some specific things, and my source of information here was division chairmen who have served both in a single-campus setup and in a multi-campus setup, and who were good enough to confer with me and supply me their perceptions. Rule number one: the chairman must give at least superficial cooperation in dealings with other campuses, but his first obligation is to his own division. I do not regard this as a questionable morality or ethics; I regard it as horsesense. The chairman is hired to run a good, strong division. He is also hired to make a contribution to the total educational effort, but he must not be so broad in his perspective that he fails to tend his own division. This may appear to be a fairly selfish statement, but I call it "enlightened selfishness." Rule number two: the chairman must study the deans and the president on his campus and the key administrators in the district office in order to know how to package his ideas in a manner most likely to win approval. This is an extremely pragmatic statement, because the chairman must be aware of the factors which cause people to approve, and those which cause them to disapprove, and their value patterns. Basically, this is selling, and selling is knowing the buyer. In many cases, the buyer is the dean of instruction, the president, or perhaps the people in the personnel office. The chairman cannot assume that a good idea will prevail simply because of its basic goodness; it will prevail because it was sold very well by a person who understands it and who articulates it in a manner which causes it to be selected rather than alternatives of which there may be many. The dean of instruction is the swing-man in the chairman's world and the chairman is very dependent upon him or her; therefore, the effective chairman must develop a relationship in which the dean knows, respects, and trusts him on matters of budget, hiring, and endorsement of requests. Rule number three: procedures for development of curriculum and approval of assignment of curriculum may be very complex in a multi-campus district. The chairman must have expertise at working with committees, for if he does not, he will simply attend the meetings, have someone else make the decisions, and he will relay the information to his division. The chairman must also be alert to what the divisions of similar type are doing at other colleges. He should share

his good ideas, after he is sure the higher level of administration knows where they came from, and he should use the ideas from other divisions with great effectiveness. He should know the human resources available at other campuses and at the district level, and he should use these resources when they are needed. Certainly, this requires some work.

I see the division chairmanship as the major spawning ground for administrators on a higher level. Speaking now of my personal reaction, I feel very uneasy and will avoid like the plague becoming involved in situations administratively which I call the "blind leading the partially sighted." Therefore, I would be most wary of bringing in the dean of a university or a president of a four-year college who is available for whatever reason and placing him in a leadership role in a comprehensive community college. I am much more inclined to look at the division chairman level and see if the people emerging have the personal traits, the training, the experience, and the capacity to perform. Here is a great pool of human talent, and this is where I tend to look when administrative openings occur. Each division chairman should recognize this as a possibility and should make a decision either that he wants to teach and be a division chairman, period; or that he likes the administrative dimensions of a division chairmanship and if he is invited to be a dean, he might be very interested. If the choice is the latter, the chairman should anticipate that he would look with favor on being selected and do something about it, so that when the time comes, he is the obvious choice and number one in line.

Now I would like to discuss some requirements for division chairmen on any campus including a multi-campus The division chairman has to establish an identity for his division with a certain healthy self-image; in other words, he has to do those things and develop the type of understanding which creates a respect for his division in leadership and the role it plays in the total educational operation. He has to be able to play the role of father-confessor and lord-high executioner with equal facility The chairman is on hatchet level, and when a faculty member does not make it, very often the chairman is given the responsibility for informing the faculty member that he will not be reemployed. This is difficult to do. It can be particularly disturbing when the person has a good attitude and has made a real effort, but just did not have it.

The chairman must be able to gain confidence up the line and down the line, especially the latter. If he does not have the confidence of the division members and is seen as some sort of an educational politician racing around feathering his own nest, he has real problems because the most vulnerable place for any administrator is what Winston Churchill called the soft underbelly. This rapport, respect, and integrity must be established down the line, and it probably ought to have number one priority. The chairman should also be able to understand individual differences, to stimulate, motivate, inspire, and perhaps even intimidate as the situation warrants, and I could develop what I mean by intimidate, and I think present it in a favorable light. There are times when the consequences of a given act must be explained to a person, with the idea that if he really wants to do it, this is what it's going to trigger, and it is called to his attention. That's the sense in which I use intimidate, not just browbeating or pushing people around. The chairman must command respect by honesty, sincerity, and consistency; he must recognize that while it is nice to be admired and loved, it is a luxury that

is not always afforded. He must inspire by example in teaching and organizational talents. It is difficult to be a supervisor of instruction teaching along side of one's fellow teachers, and be doing an average or low average job while trying to inspire them to do a magnificent job. Inspiration by example in this instance is an important thing. The chairman is the key person in the quest for quality instruction. He must know how to identify good faculty prospects. He has to be a good personnel expert among other things. He must have enough depth to understand the problems of his division members, and this can be tremendously complex in smaller institutions, particularly where many disciplines and subject fields may for administrative convenience be grouped under one division chairman. Obviously, he may not be a virtuoso on all the instruments in the band, but he should know enough about them so he can help the players become very proficient individually. He must maintain for himself the same standards that are expected of the division members. He must be a teacher of teachers because of the importance of inservice training. He must be willing to give the time it takes to mold a division, and he must be constructively schizophrenic so he can defend the teachers to the deans and the deans to the teachers, for this is one of the jobs that he will often be called upon to do.

RICHARD D. STRAHAN

THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The climate for collective actions on the part of college faculties appears to be developing quite rapidly. College and university faculties have not been receptive to such incursions in the past and a recent C.U.P.A.[1] report indicates that less than ten percent of the professional personnel involved in teaching had been organized for representation purposes in bargaining or negotiating upon matters relating to tenure, salary, and other fringe benefits. The apparent interest increase seems to be highly correlated with the restrictive acts of state legislatures in regard to budgets for higher education. When budgets are restricted and student enrollments level off, faculty members are often separated from the institutions in order to create positions for younger or less experienced faculty. When this situation occurs many older and more experienced faculty members feel the need for organizational strength to insure that adequate evaluations occur and that tenure provisions of state statutes or institutional policy are enforced.

The recent experiences that I have had as legal counsel have been with the consultation process between the Houston Principals Association and the Board of Education of the Houston Independent School District. The consultation process in this environment operates under a number of constraints. Under the Texas Education Code, Section 13.901 Employment Consultation with Teachers and the Revised Civil Statutes, Article 5154 (a) - (e) professional negotiations on a voluntary basis may be carried on with professional employees but the state has prohibited collective bargaining contracts as well as strikes. The statute cited even withdraws the right of representation to any group which proclaims that it will strike to enforce its contract or its demands. In spite of these limitations, I believe that the negotiating team and I learned some basic principles which are valid observations which may be to your benefit.

REPRESENTATION UNIT

When college faculties begin to think about organization, the limits of a unit for representation become somewhat crucial. In the private labor sector there seems to be a natural cleavage of interests which occurs between the industrial worker and the foreman or supervisor. In the community college, there is no such natural division of interest. In a recent New York study[2], an attempt was made to determine

[1] College and University Personnel Association *Journal* - Employee Organization Among Members of the College and University Personnel Association," December, 1970 Vol. 22 No. 1 pp. 12-26

[2] William F. McHugh *New York Community College Collective Negotiation Contract Survey* S.U.N.Y. January 1971

whether the position of the departmental chairman was identified more closely with the faculty or the administration. The general attitude in regard to the chairman's role seems to be that he prefers to identify with the faculty; although in instances where there is an increasing release from faculty duties for his administrative responsibility, he begins to be identified with the administrative team. Where a grievance structure is designed, it must be remembered that internal grievances disrupt organizational harmony. For this reason, the representation unit will probably be terminated in the line and staff plan below the academic dean or dean of instruction. Whether the unit line is drawn below the dean or the departmental chairman, the person who occupies this position must develop a psychological defense to the abrasions which will occur between that office and the collective interests of the organization. Much of the "nitty-gritty" of complaints and grievances will be lodged against that position because it represents the power structure of the institution or as some refer to it as "the establishment."

DEVELOPING A BARGAINING TEAM

The professional teachers' organizations have developed effective bargaining teams more rapidly than have the administrative or board teams which have negotiated with them. It has been my observation that in the first attempts at bargaining or negotiation the faculty comes away with the advantage. In most cases, they have well-prepared demands and receive a negotiated settlement on them. Since the board team often does not have well-prepared counter demands to put on the table, the faculty organization achieves a capitulation to some degree upon their demands. The administrative team must prepare with the same degree of enthusiasm as the faculty team and must be armed with performance data on prior arguments and the effects of such operations on the college. A negotiated agreement is like any other administrative tool, in that it must be used effectively to make it work.

NOTES ON PARTICIPATION

As one participates in these activities certain lessons are somewhat painfully learned. One of these is that legal counsel should be readily available. Language which may appear innocuous to the layman often has far-reaching implications in multi-year contracts. A disciplined negotiating team is also an essential. A single spokesman should always represent the group, for a skilled negotiator will exploit divisive opinions once they become known. A timely caucus can often be used to restore the negotiator's control should the team falter in this regard. A caucus can also be used effectively for a recess to discuss the possible impact of a proposal placed on the table for consideration. Dedicated effort and painstaking analysis of each proposition must precede any discussion in negotiation. The team members generally find participation exhilarating but also exhausting if the same persons participate regularly in this activity. The team roles should revolve so that new persons are constantly being trained as more experienced members are replaced. Participants report that abrasive and heated exchanges tend to influence professional relationships away from negotiations. They seem to feel that continued hard bargaining and emotional confrontation had an effect upon future advancement. No staff member should participate for so long a period that damage to his professional career will result.

THE CONSENSUS PROBLEM

Another of the difficult tasks is the development of some kind of consensus as to the importance or priority associated with various proposals. Most of the proposals advanced by faculty groups will erode the decision-making authority of the dean of instruction or the department chairman if he is not a part of the bargaining unit. More and more of the decisions which were once clearly management prerogative are bargained away to joint-decision status or by stipulation in the agreement. Board negotiators frequently bargain away that prerogative which the line officer feels is important. This occurs because the negotiator may lack a personal sensitivity to the issue and may consequently assign it a low priority in relation to other demands. Thus, in public schools the unit administrators frequently complain that they have become the "keeper of the keys" and the "enforcer of the agreement" but no longer have a vital role in the educational program. This situation may be avoided if the administrative staff provides consensus agreements, if good communications are maintained, and if good counter-demands are forthcoming. Otherwise, the board representative finds himself making concessions which actually impair administrative function.

CONCLUSION

The negotiating table is the place where the action occurs. The administrative interests which are adequately represented there seem to discover ways to protect themselves. Those officers who do not have adequate representation find their portfolios of responsibility eroding as the process continues. If the department chairman is an administrator, he should strive for representation and participation on the team. If he is identified with the faculty bargaining unit, his interests will likely be submerged in the larger faculty interests and he will tend to lose his role in management.

RUBY H. HERD

THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN LOOKS AT DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Two basic premises or assumptions always emerge when I attempt to define the educational process. One is that unless the educational experience significantly helps students to change and develop in fundamental ways it is not really worthy of the name. The other is that feelings and attitudes affect learning to an even greater degree than most of us have been willing to recognize and deal with in planning educational programs.

Moving upward from these basic assumptions, I should like to state further that the most far-reaching task that engages students and each of us is that of building a "good" self. It is a critical task for the individual person, and as it in turn determines society as a whole, it should be done well.

When we started talking about developmental studies at El Centro College my main concern as division chairman was with the possible effect that this kind of program might have on the students involved in it. Not as academicians, I must confess, but as human beings. Having taught and counseled students of all ages and backgrounds in the Dallas area I thought I knew the prospective student population. We wondered whether these students would experience yet another reinforcement of the feelings of failure, one more blow to their self-esteem, one more feeling of being put down, or one more experience they would interpret as being less than first-class.

We tried to identify the problems we were up against: low self-concept; lack of success; language difficulties; diverse cultural experiences; differing value systems; negative attitudes toward adults, particularly in educational settings; a wide range in educational achievement, particularly in communications skills; an unusual age range; a racial diversity in the student population (a new experience in itself for most of the students); different learning styles; and within the college itself, although not to a marked degree, an undercurrent of feeling that college really isn't for just anyone. There was the usual and expected concern about "lowering standards" and since student unrest was beginning to emerge in colleges across the country, there was also the feeling that we were just asking for trouble by bringing large numbers of "non-college" students on campus.

I wish I could say that we identified all these problems in advance and then planned a program that dealt effectively with each of them, but that wouldn't be true. About all we had time to do before we were into it was face up to the fact that remedial classes in English and mathematics did not appear to be meeting the needs of students or staff.

Now I have believed for a long time that all education is developmental. My experience ranges from pre-school to graduate school and most, if not all of the

problems I have identified, exist at all levels. Certainly not to the same degree, but they are there. Therefore, I did not look at developmental studies as being any different than any other good educational experience: that is, an individualized approach that actively involves the student in developing his own self in such a way that both he and society are the better for it.

One of the beautiful aspects of starting a new division or program is that of choosing and developing the kind of staff that at least gives the program a fighting chance to succeed. While we did not know nearly as much when we started the program as we have learned since, I did know that I wanted a combined counseling-instruction approach and a staff that wanted to teach in the program. A profile of the kind of person we went after would probably be something like this:

1. A person who was attractive, warm, out-going, student-oriented, fun, and articulate;
2. A specialist in counseling or in the area of instruction involved, but with a broad background of experience and knowledge;
3. A person who was not only willing but wanted to work through racial or cultural hang-ups and biases;
4. A person who was willing to work as a team member in all aspects of the program;
5. A person still involved in developing his own self;
6. A person who was "cool", flexible, and stable.

I suppose the statement I hear most often from visitors at El Centro is that we are "so fortunate to have found such an unusual staff for our Guided Studies program." That is not really the way it was. We went after what we wanted and got them and we have been involved in staff development ever since. We have had one resignation (to motherhood) from our staff since our program began and while we have added to it, it is still remarkable to note the growth which has occurred within the staff and the impact it has had on the total college.

One of the reasons for this growth, and I feel this has implications for all division chairmen, is that our program has always been a team effort with shared planning, shared teaching, shared counseling, shared failures, shared successes, shared criticisms, and shared praise. We also share deep affection and respect for each other and since we are black, brown, and white these open and honest feelings have a tremendous impact on students who are making their first moves in the direction of establishing meaningful relationships across racial and cultural lines.

One of the hypocrisies of education is that we have oftentimes been less than honest with students and with ourselves in dealing with individual differences in learning. Our efforts to cover up what is obvious are almost always far more costly than honest attempts to bring it out into the open, recognize it, and deal with it. Our experience with students in Guided Studies is that they have remarkable strengths and that they are perfectly capable of coping with learning deficiencies *if* we are. It is not the low reading score that gets them—it is the way we present it to them, the way we feel about it that gets to them.

While I may have fairly high verbal skills, I have few computational skills. I can learn them as I really need them, but otherwise I tend to ignore the whole

bit. Now, no one has ever really made me feel less of a human being because of this. They have simply said things like, "Now if you are going to complete this degree, you must make at least a B in advanced statistics." And I did, because I had to in order to do what I wanted to do. This is not a bad approach, although we try to add a little more to it.

I said earlier that I had been more concerned with the effect on students as human beings rather than as academicians that placing them in developmental studies might have. I did not mean at all that I was not concerned with their academic achievement. The two, for the most part, are tied very closely together; I just think it is necessary to deal with the human aspect first and then to continue to combine it with the academic approach. A big part of the humanness of education is to sit down with a youngster as often as necessary and get him to take a look at where he is, where he wants to go, and what he is going to have to do to get there. You hear people, who should know better, often talking about the unrealistic goals of students in developmental programs. I have not found this to be true at all. If, at the beginning, they seem unrealistic, it may be because you yourself do not know what the student is capable of achieving, or it may be that he is saying what he thinks he is supposed to say in order to be seen as someone of worth, or it may be that he is saying what his parents have conditioned him to say. For the most part, students are perfectly aware of reading problems, communication problems, the whole bit. They just do not know why they have them or what to do about them or they have not faced up to the fact that they are going to have to do something about them if they want to achieve certain goals. This is where counseling gets involved and why it is such an integral part of any instructional program.

Our students' greatest academic needs are in the areas of communication skills: speaking, listening, writing, reading, relating, and reasoning. For this reason, our whole program including mathematics is geared to meet these needs. We offer individualized reading programs which range from that for the illiterate to college level-plus. We emphasize reading for enjoyment and for information with reading skills taught as they are needed rather than in isolation. We make a special effort to provide time and opportunities for students to reflect on what they have read and to relate it to their own experience. Having been "hooked" on Fader's *Hooked on Books* approach we initiated an idea which has since become a part of every reading class. Once each week, someone, it may be the president of the college or a student in the class, shares his feelings about a book he is reading at the time with the rest of the group. Not only does this give the student the experience of listening, reflecting, reasoning, relating, responding, it also alerts him to the fact that many people continue to enjoy reading, it exposes him to a great deal more reading material than he could hope to read in one semester, and it also gives him a personal experience with college administrators and the teaching staff of other divisions.

Students have all kinds of unnecessary problems in writing, some of which are almost impossible to overcome. I was an English teacher at one time and will have to admit I thought I was fairly effective, although in retrospect I shudder at what I inflicted on those poor kids. If I have learned anything at all in my experience with our program, it is that education has to open up the world as it really is

instead of closing it off, and that too many students' worlds are closed off in too many English classes. With a few exceptions, most of our students have long since ceased to see any relationship between what they sense, think, feel, or know and putting something into writing. It is as if a kind of paralysis takes over when, with pen in hand, they stare at a blank piece of paper.

Now, I may be making too much of this. Few of us develop into major writers but even so there is something tremendously satisfying in being able to put words together in such a way that the reader knows exactly what you mean, that he understands how you felt, that he sees what you saw, that you have communicated with him in the real sense of the word. Satisfying, yes, and therapeutic. Once released, many students pour out anger, hostility, fear, hope, love, and hate onto paper. Some of them are able to follow up their writing with counseling sessions in which they work through their feelings. Others, unable at the time to do this, carry on counseling sessions with our writing instructors via penciled notes on the margins of their papers.

Our writing instructors use films without dialogue, pictures without captions, music, cartoons, unfinished sentences or paragraphs, and even their own personal feelings and experiences to involve students in writing. Their use of dictaphones also has interested me. Some students feel far more secure in talking into a machine, playing back what has been said, correcting for errors and effectiveness, and then committing it to paper. I am a lover of the King's English and believe it should be taught, but I also find myself wishing that years ago I had spent less time with tenses and diagrams and more time with the beauty and usefulness of words to communicate meaning.

I have mixed feelings about mathematics and my own lack of skill in it is probably involved here. I find myself wondering in this day of pocket computers whether it really is all that necessary to learn those tables, but then I am horrified when some kid pays $200 for a wristwatch from a door-to-door salesman that he could have bought for $49.50 downtown. The math instructors tell me that "Yes, it is still helpful to know those tables," but we do try to relate the program to consumer-type problems except for those students who are going to need some form of higher mathematics in order to achieve their goals. I think a math program should teach students the mathematical concepts they need to be intelligent and discriminating consumers and to meet the requirements of their jobs. Whether they use these concepts with pencil or paper or via the calculator seems immaterial to me.

I mentioned earlier that our program combines counseling and instruction. In addition to a great deal of counseling which goes on in the classrooms and in instructor's offices, our program offers a group counseling course and almost unlimited opportunities for individual counseling. The small groups are led by Guided Studies counselors and focus primarily on each student's efforts to develop his own self within the context of the individual, the small group, his classes, the college, the community, and the world. The student's efforts to get involved in his own learning are encouraged and supported by the counselor and his peers. Student involvement often brings anger, hostility, alienation, racial biases, fears, failures, and successes out into the open where they are accepted and for the most part, worked through. Deep and meaningful relationships develop between the members of the group. Conscious and unconscious racial hang-ups begin to crumble as they are met head-on day

after day within the security of a small group whose members care about each other.

Educational planning and/or career counseling is also a major focus in the self-development groups. All of us in education are probably guilty of saying more and doing less about career counseling than almost any other aspect of education and yet that is what the whole thing is about. Although my enthusiasm for the word "relevance" has worn thin, I really understood what students of all backgrounds were saying when they continued to scream about it. We really have not always done a very good job of tying what we teach to how we live. Although I think it is beginning to change slowly, students come to us at present with little or no factual and current information about job classifications and requirements; little or no information about employer and employee rights and responsibilities; little or no information about the importance of finding a job that is satisfying and fulfilling; little or no information about how to go about getting a job, keeping it once you get it, and advancing or moving on to another job if that happens to be what you want to do. In our small groups, we attempt to at least keep up with and understand local labor market projections, we try to bring in people who are employed in different kinds of jobs to tell students what it is really like, we role-play interviews, first days on the job, all kinds of employer-employee situations. Since most of our students are already employed in temporary-type jobs while they are in school, we use their real-life experiences as the basis for group discussion and role-play. We also bring in black, brown, and white working people who have backgrounds similar to our students and who have achieved some degree of success in their chosen field of work. They make good models and our students find them easy to relate to. Students are exposed to application forms, budgeting, employee benefits, retirement plans, and fair practice labor laws. We try to relate reading, writing, math, and all forms of communication to career planning. Even so, I still do not think we do as effective a job in this area as we should.

One of the things we feared when we were first talking about setting up a separate division of Guided Studies was that this might further alienate these students from the mainstream of college life. We set out deliberately to see that this did not happen and it has not. Things were somewhat shaky the first year or two, but I feel that for the most part, we have worked through the original feelings that being in Guided Studies constituted a "bad scene". We were able to do this because of a lot of planning:

1. Our obviously competent and attractive staff is highly involved in college activities outside their own division.
2. Our college and community offer a wide range of diversified and enhancing cultural experiences. We do not just tell Guided Studies students about these. We go with them, give them assignments to cover them, and talk about them when we get back to classes.
3. Percentage-wise, our students have probably had more personal contacts with the total college staff than any other group in the college through our book reviews and small group rap sessions with staff from other divisions.
4. We set up a peer-counseling program in the Guided Studies division and staffed it with Guided Studies students. It has now been expanded to serve

the whole college at the request of counselors, administrators, instructors, and students. The group has also been involved in a number of community activities.

5. We encourage qualified and interested students to seek out committee appointments and to raise questions at Town Hall meetings.
6. We involve students constantly in evaluating our program and we make every effort to respond to their suggestions.
7. We offer a number of short seminars which are open to any students in the college—Study Skills, Speed Reading, and Spelling. These are filled within the hour the announcement is posted, usually with students other than Guided Studies.
8. Our Writing Lab is open one or two hours per day to any student in the college. An instructor is there to help the student with any kind of problem he may be experiencing in his English class.
9. We do not see Guided Studies students as being any different from any other beginning college students or any other students who need help in reaching their goals. The students know this and that may be the main thing that makes the difference.

Finally, there is the question of evaluation. I sometimes get into trouble here because almost everyone wants to evaluate the success of this kind of program on whether the student remains in college and whether his grade point average on subsequent college courses is equal to or better than that of students who have not been in developmental studies. I do not think these assumptions are always valid.

Although we do not do enough follow-up, we do have statistical data to prove that our students make highly significant improvements in reading, writing and math skills over short periods of time. Their attitudes toward the program are highly positive. To my knowledge, not one Guided Studies student has been involved in any kind of behavior which required disciplinary action since the beginning of our program. Over half of them stay in college. Some of them do well in subsequent courses; others do not. I feel as good about the future of some who leave at the end of one semester as I do about others who go on to four-year universities. It all depends on how they feel about themselves, whether they feel okay about where they are going, and whether they know we will still be there if they decide they need to come back.

JOHN LOMBARDI

THE CHAIRMAN IN THE MIDST OF A REVOLUTION

First, I will point out a few trends as they affect the role of the department chairman. The statements are the problems; adjusting to them and/or finding answers to them are the opportunities The changes—some evolutionary, some revolutionary, some contradictory or conflicting in character—which will have a significant effect on the role are:

1. The participation of faculty in administration and in selection of chairmen is increasing, especially in states where faculty senates are strong or collective bargaining is state policy.
2. Limitations on the term of office are more common than long tenure.
3. The chairman's role is being put in writing—sometimes in collective bargaining agreements.
4. The chairman is required to perform his functions more understandably, i.e., more openly and more satisfyingly to those influenced by discretionary decisions.
5. The chairman will be working in larger institutions and his department will likewise be larger. This may result in less diversity and more centralization in decision-making.
6. In a large college there will be no teaching assignment; in a small college there may be one or two classes.
7. Ordinarily, there will be an eleven- or twelve-month assignment.
8. A trend toward administration status for the chairman as the department gets larger goes counter to democratization through election and short tenure.
9. The chairman will take a more active part in defining his role. Democratization is moving upward into the government of the department.
10. A few colleges are eliminating departments and chairmen, indicating dissatisfaction with the alleged divisiveness of the departmental organization and the dual faculty-administration role of chairmen.
11. Students want to participate in the government of the department.
12. Students will be more representative of the general population than ten years ago.
13. Concern about the educational and financial needs of low aptitude, disadvantaged, and minorities is becoming public policy. These are now called the "New Students." Financial and educational aid in the form of work-study, grants, loans, tutors and learning labs is increasing.
14. The chairman will have to grapple with tight budgets for at least five years.
15. Before the end of the twentieth century (a) a period of population stability or decline will retard the rise in enrollment, and (b) saturation will be reached in the proportion of college-age population attending college.

16. Technical-vocational education has high priority among public, business, industry, and government More federal aid will be directed toward this function than any of the others.
17. Affirmative Action or the equitable representation of women and minorities in the student body and on the staffs is a high priority federal objective.

These trends attest to the important role the chairman and the department have in our colleges. They also make it clear that the chairman's problems and opportunities today are different from those he confronted yesterday. Yesterday's problems required solutions that caused little change in the basic structure of the college and rarely threatened the security of instructors. Today's solutions often undermine the structure and threaten the security of instructors.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

The community college has become an instrument of national policy to help resolve the economic and social problems besetting our country. In 1969, President Nixon's Task Force on Education stated that "for reasons of cost, educational policy, and social policy, a substantial proportion of higher education's future expansion . . should take place at the junior college," since the "junior college can help increase equality of access to higher education, provide occupational training directly related to productive employment opportunities, and become . . . genuine community institutions for the entire population."[1]

Many people (including Vice President Agnew, other Nixon administration officials, and community leaders) openly suggest that four-year colleges and universities be reserved for the elite; the rest have or should have community colleges. We should read carefully the 1970 statements of Agnew, Nixon, and Kerr in which the concept of universal higher education is reexamined. This attitude affects the status and prestige of the community college and leads to problems that are most difficult to resolve. The attitudes are so deeply seated that years of effort to mitigate their effects have been unsuccessful. The American Dream, the prestige syndrome, the national preoccupation that everyone must go to college for an academic education all complicate the problems of the college and offer tremendous opportunities to the chairman.

THE NEW STUDENTS

A chairman has correspondingly greater opportunities participating in the metamorphosis of yesterday's junior college into today's community college, serving the new students "who in the past would not have chosen post-secondary education and may not have needed it to fulfill the jobs open to them."[2]

---

[1]Arthur M. Cohen and Associates, *A Constant Variable* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971) p. 139

[2]S. V. Martorana, "Open Enrollments in Senior Institutions," *The Community Services Catalyst*, Spring, 1972, p. 21

This metamorphosis is most noticeable in our large urban centers in Newark, Chicago, Detroit, New York, Cleveland, Los Angeles and Dallas. Already we have black colleges, Chicano colleges, Puerto Rican colleges. Not so conspicuous are the colleges with (Anglo) white students from poor families in our rural areas, white ethnic students in our cities, and American Indians on the reservation.

Although this change in student population is taking place at a rapid rate, our adjustment is proceeding at a much more leisurely pace. One might even suggest that this is so because many of us are unaware or unmindful of the change. Perhaps, some of us even hope it will go away.

Problems for the chairman start with the nature of his position—as his dean and president perceive it, as he perceives it, and as the faculty perceive it. To a great extent, success, failure, or the chairman's very existence in the organization will depend upon his ability to assess these perceptions and to adapt his administration accordingly. This may sound like tacking, but it need not be. Within the constraints of dean and president on one side and the faculty on the other, the chairman can help develop an effective, even a distinguished department. Knowing and understanding these constraints lead to opportunities that enable one to bridge the gaps created by them, i.e., (1) to bring about an understanding of viewpoints among the instructors and the administration and (2) to create an environment in which the department may operate effectively to help the college achieve its objectives.

The flurry of experiments to eliminate departments and chairmen may be traced to the alleged shortcomings on this dichotomy of the chairman's role—neither administrator nor faculty. As a result, departments are alleged to be divisive and chairmen unreliable in carrying out college policies.

So far this is ethereal but let's take a few specifics. Staff development is among the most important roles in which the chairman is cast. How much can he do in this area if the administrators give him little responsibility and the faculty look to their union or senate for support? In such a seemingly inauspicious setting, how can one exert any influence? The indifferent chairman will shrug his shoulders and do as little as possible; he does not even have sense enough to resign. However, a resourceful chairman, within whatever parameters he is forced to work, can exercise leadership. Just think of the influence an instructor sometimes exerts on other instructors. He has no position or authority. Yet, by the force of his personality, drive, or some other trait, he becomes a leader—sometimes the leader. The chairman has the opportunity to do no less since he has the tremendous advantage of a title that gives him immediate status as the *de jure* leader. To become the *de facto* leader of the department one must be more resourceful than any member of the department. In other words, "the chairman acquires *de jure* power and responsibility; he earns *de facto* power and responsibility by demonstrating his ability as a leader."[3]

How effective one will be as chairman depends upon his ability to maintain *de facto* and *de jure* power and responsibility; on his ability to enlist cooperation of instructors in those areas in which he possesses freedom of action. This may require the tact not to frighten a timid president or dean into thinking that one is usurping his authority and the wisdom to realize that faculty loyalty to a union may be a stronger bond than loyalty to the department.

---

[3]Sir Eric Ashby. *Any Person, Any Study An Essay on Higher Education in the United States* (New York McGraw-Hill, 1971), p 66

Staff development can take place without elaborate plans or organization. Instructors are not impervious to suggestions if they are convinced that the chairman considers good teaching the most important step in the improvement of student learning, that the improvement of community college instruction must come through the instructors.

Related to staff development is Affirmative Action, the name given to a public policy for insuring equitable treatment of ra' '-! minorities and women. In education affirmative action is interpreted to mean that the composition of the student body should approximate the composition of the population served. In addition, the proportion of instructors, administrators and other employees should also approximate the proportion of the population.

Considerable opposition has arisen in universities to a strict interpretation of this policy. The claim is made that affirmative action is or may result in reverse discrimination, admitting students and hiring faculty on the basis of color or sex rather than on ability. Few people deny that in the past college admission procedures and employment policies have been discriminatory. What the more fair-minded are asking is that we not destroy the system by indiscriminate adherence to a quota system.

The opportunity for chairmen in this area is to institute a program to recruit Blacks, Chicanos, Indians, and women to achieve a balance within a reasonable period. Community colleges have a reasonably good record on admission of students, although not as good as some claim. Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Indians are still underrepresented in the student body in most communities. The record on employment is very poor, minorities and women are underrepresented on most professional and non-professional staffs.

The chairman's opportunity is to secure faculty cooperation in developing and implementing an affirmative action program for the department. For obvious reasons implementing a policy for recruiting a student body more representative of the population will be much easier than one for recruiting such a faculty. The problem on faculty recruiting has been difficult even during the expansion years from 1950 to 1970. It may become a contentious issue during a plateau or a declining rate of student admissions.

DEVELOPMENTAL AND MINORITIES STUDIES PROGRAMS

Just mentioning developmental and minority studies programs brings forth myriad problems and opportunities. To a large extent the way in which we "solve" these problems will determine the accuracy of Moynihan's statement that in 1966 he was almost certain that the nation will, or wants to, accomplish this goal. Moynihan's pessimism is in part attributable to the financial crisis that has been with us for the last ten years. A far more important reason for the pessimism may be our lukewarm commitment to the open door and its corollary, universal higher education. Within our colleges there are strong undercurrents of opposition to the open door.

Standing in the way of achieving our goal are the mores, attitudes; myths about an institution called a college. The very word "College" creates an image of some higher creation. Just consider how narrow is the gap between the elementary and

secondary school and how wide between secondary school and college. The gap is wide even after years of doubling and quadrupling of college enrollments.

This gap and the aura of the ivory tower that still clings to the word "college" creates an isolation from reality. Some of us are deeply concerned about standards, quality, value of the A.A. We are fearful that students who are not "college caliber" will get passing grades and ultimately an A.A. taking sub-collegiate courses. In this concern and fear of debasing grades and degrees there is the assumption that a passing grade or an earned degree has the same significance as *sterling* on silver or *18-caret* on gold.

To change the mores, attitudes, myths associated with the word "College," is tantamount to creating a revolution in higher education. But this is what we have been doing ever since the first junior college was established And in the course of the years, we have been developing a rationale of our own, a new set of attitudes, mores, yes, myths—different from those of the four-year college and university. The opportunity is to enable the new students to enjoy the fruits of the revolution started in 1900 for the middle class students of that era.

This in essence is what is done whenever an excluded group attacks the privileges of the ruling class. Long before the community colleges came into existence, the emerging bourgeoisie attacked the nobility and clergy who were certain that birth gave them the right to maintain an exclusive policy. No matter how gifted a member of the middle class may have been he was unable to enter the ranks of the elect. As gifted a writer as Thomas Hardy, for example, could not qualify for admission to college in the England of the 1890's.

Some educators still believe that only the well-born are worthy of a liberal education. In the 1930's a president of a New York City College (probably Shuster of Hunter) wrote:

> You must remember that such students will not often be taught by the most glamorous of American teachers. Sometimes indeed—and I regret to say this—they are addressed by instructors who have a profound contempt for their charges, and compensate for their nostalgic evocations of Oxford by looking about them with aversion.

Are some of us showing the same contempt for the new students?

In the early 1900's, Americans accepted the responsibility of educating the young people from immigrant families. Today we are being asked (or forced) to educate the new students. We may think our task is more difficult than that of our predecessors. It is not, but even if it were, it merely makes our opportunity more difficult, but not less urgent. But first we must believe in the potential educability of all our young people not only the well-born, the affluent, the members of the middle class.

Enumerating the problems caused by the admission of the new students will turn fear into panic unless we can put this phenomenon into proper perspective. The new courses and curriculum will no more debase our colleges than the "snap" courses we now have in our catalogs or the wide variations in standards prevailing among the members of any department represented in any college.

A problem that is no nearer solution now than it was before the student activism period is due process for students. Our tradition clothes instructors in the classroom with divine right, a right derived by virtue of the degrees and credentials conferred upon him by the university and the state. His authority over students seems as autocratic—sometimes it may be benevolent despotism—as that of any divine right ruler. A student has little recourse regarding most aspects of the learning process after he enrolls in a class. Bills of rights have been drawn but they have had little effect on the ruler—ruled relationship in our classes.

Consider, for example, that an instructor rarely assumes responsibility for a student's failure; although he will invariably accept credit for a student's success. He can do no wrong! Accountability attempts to change this practice or attitude by placing responsibility on the instructor for a student's failure. So far it has made a great splash but has hardly touched the college instructor.

THE CHAIRMAN'S OPPORTUNITY

The chairman has (and most exercise) the opportunity to mitigate the instructor's power over the students by acting as a disguised ombudsman in many individual cases of alleged injustices. But this does not resolve the basic problem. The opportunity is still wide open for developing departmental policies that reduce to a minimum arbitrary power and insure competent teaching.

Arbitrary power is being curtailed in departments that have introduced behavioral objectives with defined levels of proficiency; departmental examinations; grading standards; non-punitive grading; independent study. These changes may also have some effect on improving instruction and evaluating its effectiveness. The search for alternative methods of teaching and learning focuses on student responsibility for his learning, thereby reducing his dependence on the instructor.

The department chairman has assumed a tremendous responsibility for resolving the most serious problems our community colleges have ever experienced. The opportunities are equally great to effect the changes required (1) by society's concept of the community college; (2) by the admission of new students; (3) by the development of participatory democracy through collective bargaining or some other form of negotiation; (4) by implementing affirmative action, especially as it applies to faculty employment practices, (5) by revising courses and curriculum to make room for developmental and minorities studies programs; and (6) by accepting the challenge of accountability. The chairman will have the unique experience of trying to do more with much less money. The topping off of enrollment may help in some of these problems; it may aggravate some problems.

These are a few of the major issues in which a chairman may exercise leadership that will make the transition from yesterday's community college to today's a less traumatic experience for the teacher, but unless the chairman has a commitment to the new student he will exacerbate rather than help the college make the adjustment.