DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 284 JC 740 038

AUTHOR Terrey, John N.
TITLE Planning for Community College Concerns.
PUB DATE 15 Nov 73
NOTE 14p.; Presented at the ICASB Annual Meeting, Des Moines, Iowa, November 15, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; Administrative Organization; *Collective Bargaining; College Administration; College Role; *Community Colleges; *Educational Planning; *Governance; Governing Boards; Post Secondary Education; Program Evaluation; *Trustees

ABSTRACT

Community colleges, if they are to be an alternative in higher education, must establish a role for themselves different from traditional higher education. The 1202 Commission created by the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, in which State commissions coordinate planning of postsecondary institutions, represent a threat to this new role. The primary responsibility of the board of trustees is to see to it that the institutional programs and services are provided to the people who can benefit from them in the most effective and efficient manner possible. Trustees hold assets in trust; therefore neither students nor faculty, as beneficiaries of the trust, should serve as trustees. Trustees should not evaluate the results of a plan, since they should be part of the team that established the objectives and made the plan. Planning, which is a continuous process, and evaluation should emphasize effectiveness over efficiency. A strong trend exists on campuses toward collective bargaining, which may be destructive to the higher education process. The best approach to this problem is to find a way to make governance work so that collective bargaining is within the institution's governance structure. To achieve shared governance, the administrative structure and the governance structure, which have been isolated in community colleges, must be brought together. Shared governance also necessarily involves changes in leadership and decision-making. (KM)

(Speech delivered by John N. Terrey, Deputy Director, State Board for Community College Education, Olympia, Washington, at the ICASB Annual Meeting held in Des Moines, Iowa, November 15, 1973)

PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONCERNS

Before setting forth some of my convictions, I would like to tell you that I do not come before you unfettered by prejudices. I have some pronounced prejudices about the community college movement. It is only fair that these be shared with you at the outset so that you can evaluate the comments I make in the light of the prejudices I hold.

The world of higher education is beset by concerns. In many ways we are going through future shock-- that is, we are trying to analyze and respond to the concerns of higher education. Toffler defined "future shock" as: "The dizzying disorientation brought on by the premature arrival of the future."

As we confront this situation, we can either stand in fear, deep in the remembrance of things past, or we can rejoice as we stand here with an opportunity to shape the future. I hope your sights are on the future. That is the reason that you have stood for election as trustees. And that is why you have given, and are giving, so generously of your time, your energies, and your intellect in public service.

The concept of the community college, so far, is longer on promise than it has been on performance. I have no arguments with the promises, but I seek-- and I hope you, too, seek-- to improve the performance so as to close the gap between the dream and the reality. John Gardner concluded that: "The greatest American educational invention of the twentieth century is the two-year community college." I am afraid the truth is that on this issue the jury are still deliberating.

Robert Hutchins, less charitable, described the community college movement as: "Confused, confusing, and contradictory. It has something

for everybody. It is generous, ignoble, bold, timid, naive, and optimistic... Its heart is in the right place; its head does not work very well."

Regardless of these contradictory assessments, the facts are that approximately one-third of all students entering college in the United States are doing so through the "open doors" of the community college. The growth is amazing, even in the midst of declining enrollments in higher education.

Who are the students who constitute this growth? They are of all ages, all ethnic groups, and all socio-economic groups. They are not only traditional college bound students who are brought up to believe that going to college is a necessary part of growing up but-- in ever increasing numbers-- new students. They are non-traditional students-- students whose parents did not attend college-- students who in their wildest moments of fantasy never gave serious thought to attending college.

In the State of Washington the best single document incorporating the dream of the community college is the law drafted and adopted by the legislature in 1967 which created our system of 27 community colleges within 22 districts with about 130,000 students. In fulfilling the role of the community colleges, the law directed the community colleges to:

> "...Offer an open door to every citizen, regardless of his academic background or experience, at a cost normally within his economic means."

And to:

> "Insure that each community college district shall offer thoroughly comprehensive educational, training, and service programs to meet the needs of both the communities and the students served by combining, with equal emphasis, high standards of excellence of academic transfer courses; realistic and practical courses in occupational

education, both graded and ungraded; and community services of an educational, cultural, and recreational nature."

And finally:

"...That community colleges are, for purposes of academic training, two-year institutions and are an independent, unique and vital section of our state's higher education system, separate from both the common school system and other institutions of higher learning...."

Thus, the enabling legislation of 1967 declared that the community colleges were to be independent, open door institutions with comprehensive programs. They were, in fact, to be "democracy's colleges" by extending the opportunity for higher education to all.

There are several reasons for the "open door" concept. One is the concept of access to opportunity. Another is that the community college was to be an alternative to traditional higher education. This latter aspect has not been very carefully analyzed. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman in their book, The Academic Revolution, list community colleges as part of the anti-university movement. By that they meant that the community college was to be an alternative to traditional higher education.

In no way does this cast aspersions on the four-year colleges and universities. It simply says that there will be diversity rather than conformity in the structure of higher education. It also clearly implies that community colleges must establish their own role--- thier own reason for being-- and that the role should be different from the traditional in higher education.

The traditional university structure selected students to fit its purposes. Since they perceived themselves as primarily academic institutions, they selected students who had demonstrated academic ability through high school achievement or through college placement examinations. However, the community colleges with an open door policy accept all students regardless

of previous academic background. One writer summed up this situation precisely by stating:

> "... As soon as colleges forego the luxury of selecting students to fit colleges, they take on the obligation of designing colleges to fit students."

What the nature of that design should be is a topic that time does not permit us to examine today. It is a responsibility, however, that must be borne in mind by trustees and other decision-makers.

Before leaving the subject, I would like to touch briefly on the question of independence. In our state the community colleges-- prior to 1967-- were a part of the common school system. They were operated by the school district in which they were located. For this reason, in the legislation when the word "independent" appeared, most of us viewed that term as "independent from" the common schools. Today, after more than half a dozen years of trials and tribulations, the concerns which we face in our daily activities with "independence" reflect much more on the necessity of preserving our independence within the family of higher education than from the common schools.

One example I would cite as a potential danger is the creation of the so-called 1202 Commissions by the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. Section 1202 calls for the creation of a state commission and assigns to it the general overall responsibility for coordinated planning of postsecondary education. I have considerable concern about the prospects of the community colleges sustaining their uniqueness if their destinies are to be planned by people whose backgrounds and knowledge and commitments are to the traditional concepts of higher education.

We are going to have comprehensive and coordinated planning of higher education. It is inevitable. We owe it to the taxpayer. I do not quarrel with that. I simply sound an alarm that we run a risk-- and a great risk--

that in those deliberations we need to protect the concept of the community college so that no one does violence to our mission.

In the time that remains, I would like to touch briefly on my perceptions of the role of trustees. Then turn to the question of planning. And finally to the issues of professional negotiations and governance.

What is a trustee? Why are members of a governing board called "trustees"? They are called trustees because literally they are involved in a trust relationship. Their trust responsibilities include:

a. To operate the institution in the public interest. (The ultimate source of power is the public to which all others in the governance of the college must bow. In practice, the public means the elected members of legislative bodies, the executive and the judicial officers.)

b. To account to official bodies and to the public for actions taken and funds used.

These are traditional responsibilities. Let me translate those traditional responsibilities into an operational definition. I believe the primary responsibility of the board of trustees is to see to it that the programs and services of the institution are provided to the people who can benefit from them in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

The most significant aspect to me is that the trustee holds assets in trust. Here the assets are opportunities, the benefits of which accrue to someone else, someone other than the trustee who holds the assets in trust. There is certain wisdom in the trustee concept, but there is genuine genius in the concept of a board of trustees. The board operates as a unit; individual members have no authority to act for the corporation or to endeavor to direct its affairs unless the board as a whole has given specific authorization for that purpose.

If you followed my logic carefully, there can be no mistake in your mind, as there is none in mine, that I do not believe either students or faculty can serve on boards without violating the "trust" concept, for the

simple reason that they are the beneficiaries of the trust. On the other hand, however, I believe that the board should be engaged continuously in a dialogue with students and faculty.

The faculty has a primary responsibility in program. Today, the lack of a clear definition of program and its requirements is one of our chief weaknesses. Boards cannot be expected to allocate funds wisely to ambiguous and poorly defined programs. This challenge should be put to the faculty. Properly executed, the task of program definition shapes policy. I contend that the shapers of policy are more significant than the deciders of policy.

If the faculty wants power, look within. It has power; however, at the moment very dormant power because it has not assumed its rightful responsibility for the clear and un-ambiguous definition of the educational programs of the institution.

Morton A. Rauh set forth six responsibilities for a board of trustees. These are:

1. They hold the basic legal document or charter of origin, and therefore bear primary responsibility for holding and executing the authority conferred by the charter.

2. Trustees are responsible for evolving the purposes and goals of the institution and assuring that those are consonant with the charter and other legal constraints.

3. The trustees are responsible for planning the present and the future development of the institution.

4. They select and determine the tenure of the chief executive.

5. They hold the institution's assets in trust.

6. Boards of trustees (not individual trustees) act as a court of last resort when other internal components are unable to resolve problems.

One veteran observer of boards made the observation that every time the board of trustees meets, the agenda should contain but two items; The first item ought always to be: "Shall we fire the president today?" If the answer is "Yes" then Item Two on the agenda should be: "Who is to serve on the committee to select a new president?" The board should then

adjourn. But if the decision on the first question is, "We shall not fire the president," Number Two should be: "What can we do to support the administration?"

The president becomes the symbol of the board and its power. In reality, the board is no better than its agents, which are the president and his staff.

Perhaps as the role of trustees is discussed, the emphasis that is most often stressed, and improperly so, is on the question of authority. The responsibility that receives the least attention and which is most important is planning. It is the responsibility of the board of trustees to declare the principal objectives of the institution. A college needs a plan, a statement of objectives. The trustees have an obligation to see to it that a plan is developed. In fact, they cannot conduct any intelligent and responsible review of performance unless a plan has been adopted. I strongly believe that planning is essential and that management by objectives is the format the plan should take so that review of performance or accountability is possible.

Peter Drucker, in 1954, when he outlined for the first time the concept of management by objectives, cited its primary advantage:

> "To give full scope of individual strength and responsibility and at the same time give common direction to established team work."

As implied from Drucker's words, management by objectives requires team work and team evaluation. I remain concerned about the tendency I perceive of trustees setting themselves apart to evaluate the results of a plan. I believe that the trustees should be a part of the team which establishes the objectives and should be evaluated with the rest of the team. If the plan is realized, the trustees are successful. If the plan fails, the trustees must look for the reasons.

Let me close this phase by making an observation about two general types of trustees and asking each of you in turn which you think you are, and which you think would be most effective.

1. Do you insist on clearly stated goals,
   or
   Do you control performance rather than goals?

2. Do you bring risk in gains into the open,
   or
   Do you conceal the distresses of work?

3. Do you define goals in the present environment?
   or
   Do you control the controllable?

4. Do you unify the group behind goals,
   or
   Do you unify the group behind policies?

5. Do you discuss the goals before stating them,
   or
   Do you issue directives?

6. Do you judge performance against results in the environment,
   or
   Do you judge performance in terms of what the person has done or spent?

7. Do you emphasize ideas from the outside,
   or
   Do you emphasize "our thinking"?

Before leaving the subject of planning-- the most under-utilized aspect of our responsibility, I would point out that I abhor plans while I respect planning. What I mean to convey is that planning is a process that goes on and on continuously. Planning is a human process. Two of the best books on this subject which I would recommend highly to you are:

Douglas McGregor's classic, The Human Side of Enterprise,

and an obvious derivative of that:

David Ewing's, The Human Side of Planning.

Let me cite without amplification eleven of the cardinal principles of planning. These include:

1. Accomplish planned results through your people.
2. Get the participation of your people when you plan.
3. Set measurable objectives to assure balance results in your critical areas of responsibility.

4. Visualize yourself as a strategist to get a maximum return on a minimum investment.
5. Time each major action to get maximum acceptance by those affected.
6. Develop your budget to support your program.
7. Forecast with a view to what you can make happen.
8. Organize around necessary activities rather than around people.
9. Define your policies so that your people can make most decisions.
10. Develop standard procedures on methods for repetitive operations with significant cost/profit impact.
11. Develop performance standards that are measurable.

Finally, the unifying element in these principles is the need for evaluation. And, in evaluation the most essential point is to look at what happened rather than search for a culprit.

The whole purpose of planning in the first place is to see to it that the goals and objectives that are determined to be worth pursuing are as effectively and efficiently realized as possible. The purpose of the plan, as the purpose of management, is not to plan and not to manage but to get results. And the results should favor effectiveness over efficiency. By this I do not degrade efficiency, but effectiveness is achieving what it is you seek to do, and efficiency is the achievement at the least possible cost.

In this connection, Stephen Bailey cited the great philosopher/president of Pre-War Czechslovakia, Thomas Masaryk, who once defined our task for us. After decades of struggle in the harsh arena of public life, Masaryk summed up his philosophy: "You see how it is: the method must be absolutely practical, reasonable, realistic -- but the aim, the whole, the conception, is an eternal poem." In that respect, it is never achievable but always worthy of pursuit.

We have lived with a Professional Negotiations Law since 1965 in the State of Washington. The survival has not been without problems. Recent legislative hearings have revealed a strong trend in the direction of Collective Bargaining on our campuses. Theodore J. St. Antoine, Dean of the Law School at the University of Michigan, said: "Faculty unionization is most significant development in a decade of labor relations. By 1980,

practically all institutions of higher education will be organized." Since our energies are finite, I do not believe it to be a wise expenditure of those energies to fight the inevitable. We should use our energies to make collective bargaining work.

Lyman Glenny of the University of California at Berkeley recently outlined what he called the pressures on higher education, and these are the trends that will be on us between now and 1980. One of the trends that he noted relates to collective bargaining by faculty. All that he perceives is not necessarily to our liking; in fact, we may pay a fairly heavy price for collective bargaining. Let me cite Glenny's own words:

> "Today one can hardly keep track of the changing power relationships among faculty, students, administrators, and board members. Yet the future is likely to make the shapers of power and the roles of each group much clearer-- primarily as a result of unionism and collective bargaining. Contracts will not only reassure a threatened faculty about possible loss of tenure but will cover working conditions, teaching loads, advising, independent study, and even the curriculum and hours taught. The trade unions have shown time and again that once bargaining starts, regardless of rules and laws to the contrary, anything and everything is negotiable.
>
> The new power relationships will be contractual, and such contracts will be made by unions with state level officials, not those at the institutional level. Power is eventually left for the president and his staff. It could be almost purely administerial-- to carry out contract provisions.
>
> The overall trends resulting from unionism will be conserving ones: Faculty will protect themselves, more rigidities will confront administrators and faculty members, and due process provisions of many kinds will be carefully followed;
>
> What will be greatly impaired will be change, flexibility, and adaptability, which all of the trends previously mentioned will demand of a collegiate institution successfully responding to the imperative demands of the 1970s and the 1980s."

A small booklet which I would recommend to you is by Ray Howe, entitled The Community College Board of Trustees and Negotiations with Faculty. It is published by AACJC.

To me, the unfortunate part of collective bargaining is that it forces the adversaries into one of two camps. Most issues worthy of serious negotiation have more than two sides. Two-sided problems must seldom exist. Persuasion and consensus can accommodate several groups and therefore more closely represent the real world. Persuasion and consensus can be brought about through the structure of governance.

The point I am making here is that I think collective bargaining may be inevitable, and it may be disruptive to the process of higher education as we have come to know it. The best and perhaps the last opportunity we have is to find a way to make governance work so that collective bargaining procedure is within the governance structure of the institution. By governance, what I mean is the development of the processes and structures of decision making.

Colleges are political entities. Woodrow Wilson, while the president of Princeton University, is reputed to have said that campus politics made the smoke-filled rooms of convention hall appear to be citadels of Virtue. The reason for these are many. Let me cite a few:

1. Conflict is natural. It is to be expected in a dynamic organization. Conflict is not abnormal, nor is it necessarily a sympton of a breakdown in the college community.

2. The college is fragmented into many power blocs and interest groups, and it is natural that they will try to influence policy, so that their values and goals are given primary consideration.

3. In the college small groups of political elites govern most of the major decisions. However, this does not mean that one elite group governs everything, but the decisions are divided up with different elite groups controlling different decisions.

4. In spite of this control by elites, there is a democratic tendency in our colleges.

5. Formal authority is severely limited by the political pressure and bargaining that groups can exert against authorities. Decisions are not simply bureaucratic orders but are instead negotiated compromises among competing groups.

6. External interest groups have a great deal of influence over the the college, and internal groups do not have the power to make policies in a vacuum.

Without going into considerable history, let me simply say that it is my conclusion, based on my observation, that community colleges have been more bureaucratic and less collegial than the other members of the higher education family. There has been generally an absence of a shared governance structure, while there has been a dominance of the administrative structure. The existence of these two structures-- the governance structure on the other hand--must be consciously, deliberately, and rapidly brought together. They cannot continue to exist in splendid isolation. The administrative structure has traditionally had responsibility for planning, for obtaining and allocating funds; while the governance structure has responsibility for the educational program. The result has been what Talcott Parsons has called a "layered society." Each group or structure recognized and respected the territorial imperative of the other. However, as with collective bargaining, the activity does not permit all the power blocs to participate. The administrative structure and the governance structure must be brought together. It is impractical and impossible for one structure to plan and for another to manage programs. When brought together, all the constituencies need to be included: trustees, administrators, faculty, and students.

Morris Keeton in his book, Shared Authority on Campus, has set forth certain criteria which any governance structure must incorporate. These are:

1. The authority of structure should reflect a genuine commitment to enfranchised constituencies previously unrepresented, or under-represented.

2. The process and prerogatives of governing should be designed to foster the cooperation of each constituency and to further the contributions for which it has special competence.

3. The system of governance should provide for a division of labor between policy making and managing. The system should provide effective means for constituencies to be heard and heeded at the level or locus where their particular concerns receive final disposition.

4. The existence of diverse constituencies with often conflicting interests and perspectives need not imply that all fundamental policy making becomes a process of group negotiation-- of collective bargaining, compromise and accommodation. Procedures must exist to resolve differences without collision or conflict.

5. The rapidity of external and internal changes require proccesses of governance which are more flexible than has been typical in the past.

Shared governance in higher education is no different from what is taking place in all organizations. Participation is not a magnanimous gesture; it is an operational necessity. I believe that in the long run, collective bargaining as an adversary activity is detrimental to the mission of the community college. The only alternative I perceive is the recognition of all groups on campus-- faculty, students, administrators, and soon classified personnel-- as political blocs to be brought together through participative decision-making processes. Otherwise, the inspiration which is a community college will end in an unresponsive structure. The key to this is leadership.

If the organization of the future is not to be the hierarchical pyramid of the past, but rather a horizontal system in which decisions are reached through a consensus and consultation, then leadership is needed. The transition is not easy to implement. Many convictions must be changed. Many cherished practices must be unlearned. The leader's principal task must be to see that all who want to and have the talent are given an opportunity lead. Growth, change, and development must be put into their organization.

What goes into the organization must reflect the basic needs of people. These are:

1. A sense of welfare-- a minimum standard of "enough" in material living.

2. A sense of equity-- the feeling that he is being treated justly.

3. A sense of achievement-- the feeling that he is making progress. (Progress toward goals seems to be more important than the goals themselves.)

4. A sense of participation in deciding what the goals will be.

Harlan Cleveland describes the executive of the future as a leader of equals. He will be more intellectual, more reflective than executives of the past. He will be "low keyed" with a soft voice and high boiling point. He will shc a talent for consensus and a tolerance for ambiguity. He will be willing to take a risk. He will have a penchant for optimism, the knowledge that hope, not fear, moves people creatively. He will find private satisfaction in public responsibility. Cleveland puts it this way:

> "The future executive will therefore be something of an intellectual, not only by training but by temperament as well. If the executive is not himself plowing through the analysis, he is not making decisions; he is merely presiding while others decide. The obligation to think hard, fast, and free is one executive function that cannot be delegated."

As I said at the outset, we stand here with an opportunity to shape the future. Let us think deeply and act compassionately so that we will not in the future be sniffing that intoxicating breath of wasted opportunity.

Those are my concerns.

Thank you for letting me share them with you.

Dr. John N. Terrey