

The Luke Principle: Counting the Costs of Organizational Change for One-Stop Service Models in Student Affairs

Melissa Ousley*

For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest haply, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, this man began to build and was not able to finish. Or what king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and desireth conditions of peace. Luke 14:28-32 (Thompson, 1988)

The Luke Principle states that the successful implementation of any organizational change requires a counting of the costs (Ousley, 2003). As developers do not construct a building, nor do governments go to war, without counting costs, administrators in higher education should not reorganize units or merge departments without counting costs. This manuscript addresses the costs of implementing a one-stop service model. In the implementation of a one-stop service center, the costs include (a) the remodeling of facilities; (b) the acquisition and training associated with technology; (c) the opportunity costs of choosing the one-stop model over an alternative model; (d) the hiring, training and compensation of staff; and (e) the emotional costs for staff as they make a paradigm shift, learning new tasks and adapting to an environment with new boundaries and relationships. The human element must be considered in implementing change. Staff members need time to grieve the loss of the old work environment and time to adjust to the new work environment. Countless cultural issues arise as a result of a change, and it is difficult to plan for the nuances of personality and culture that can dramatically affect the work environment and productivity. In making a decision to implement change, it is essential to count these costs and be prepared for dealing with the consequences of these changes.

Management fads leading to organizational change often originate in nonacademic sectors and are absorbed into higher education through the use of powerful narratives (Birnbaum, 2000). These trends follow a cycle in which many institutions virtually or symbolically adopt the fad to show acceptance that the new method is being followed, but eventually, the fad is abandoned. In a few cases, the new methods are adopted effectively, and these success stories

* Melissa Ousley is a research analyst in multicultural and student affairs at University of Arizona. Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to mousley@email.arizona.edu.

lead more institutions to adopt the fads, perpetuating the cycle (Birnbaum, 2000).

The push in some higher education institutions to transition from traditional silo methods of offering student services to an integrated one-stop model is an organizational trend originating from government and business (Federal Benchmarking Consortium, 1997), and this trend is currently being pursued in community colleges nationally (Moneta, 2001). The silo model processes tasks from department to department, whereas the one-stop model provides comprehensive services in one location. For example, in the silo model, students enroll in the admissions department, complete paperwork in the office of financial aid, select classes with an advisor, and register for classes with registration staff. The one-stop model combines these steps so that students work with one person in one office, rather than working with several offices and staff members. The explanation in adopting a one-stop model is that colleges and universities face pressure from multiple sources to be more accountable, efficient, and customer-service oriented (Hrutka, 2001). Implementing a one-stop model uses resources effectively in a student-centered environment (Marsee, 2000).

This article presents findings from qualitative research on one-stop service centers in three community colleges. The effectiveness of the organizational change from a silo model, where parts of a process or service are provided by separate departments, to a one-stop model, where processes and services are integrated in a single location, is evaluated for each site. The following research questions guided this study. (a) Do one-stop service models place more emphasis on customer service? (b) What is reflected in the design and function of the one-stop service center? (c) What was the process for obtaining employee input on design? (d) What was the process for implementation for each of these colleges? (e) Was the center implemented successfully? (f) What staffing model was used? (g) Were staff members required to obtain additional training? (h) Was compensation for one-stop duties offered? (i) How did administrators and staff react to the reorganization of student services and the implementation of a one-stop center? (j) Did administrators and staff invest in the change or resist it? and (k) How did work relationships change?

Literature Review

Integral to the discussion of student services' practices and organizational change is an exploration of the context in which institutions have turned to the one-stop model. Decreasing resources, increasing assessment and accountability, changing demographics, globalization, and technology create pressure for institutions of higher education to become more efficient, transforming their values and assumptions to be more like businesses (Kezar, 2001; Levin, 2001; Zumeta, 2001).

In the 1980s and 1990s, colleges and universities were driven to find alternative sources of financial support as government contributions to institutions decreased (Bower, 1992; Callan & Finney, 1997). A correlating factor was the demands for greater accountability for public institutions. Federal and state restriction of discretionary resources created increased resource dependence at the institutional level (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). As a direct result, educational and industrial interests created partnerships. As partnerships formed, colleges gained access to resources in business and industry, and these partners gained direct and indirect power over colleges. Direct power can be observed in the obligations for accountability coming from resource providers and governing boards. Indirect power is evident in the influence of business and industry on operational practices in higher education. Individuals in power often use the corporate model as a standard for practice in higher education and adopt business practices for colleges and universities (Zumeta, 2001).

From resource providers and constituents, there were also demands for colleges to become more student-centered and community-centered (Hrutka, 2001; Moneta, 2001). Community colleges faced an expanded market of students and responded with a greater variety of programs and services. They became the colleges that would serve everyone, with continually evolving missions (Richardson & Leslie, 1980). These expanded services and programs required greater funding, which were non-existent (Hovey, 1999), and the result was that colleges were forced to provide greater results with fewer resources.

Pressure to restructure results in institutional changes in efficiency, which enhances legitimacy and survival. This pressure is the context in which one-stop centers have been developed. Changes for efficiency cause institutions to become more machine-like. The goal is uniformity and a smooth process that guarantees customers receive the same standard of service in each encounter. This strategy works well in simple, brief encounters (Gutek & Welsh, 2000), but it may not be conducive to complex student services. Ritzer (2002) believed that higher education is becoming increasingly “McDonaldized,” providing students with convenience, almost instantaneous service and greater access. The downside is that rational systems “dehumanize work environments” (Ritzer, 2002, p. 22) and worker autonomy is diminished through “the regulation of employee work schedules and a reduction in decision-making discretion” (Birnbaum, 2000, p. 15).

Because many professionals in student services work from a professional model rather than a mechanized one, this loss of autonomy is one of the greatest causes of conflict in implementing a one-stop model (Ousley, 2003). Mintzberg (1979) contrasted mechanized, rational systems with the professional bureaucracy, which relies on the standardization of skills and its associated design parameter of training and indoctrination. The professional

bureaucracy hires duly trained and indoctrinated specialists for the operating core and gives them considerable control over their own work. This autonomy means that the professional works relatively independently of colleagues, but closely with the students served. The professional bureaucracy is like the rational machine bureaucracy in that design or standards predetermine what is to be done, but the machine bureaucracy relies on the authority of hierarchy or power of office, whereas the professional bureaucracy relies on the power of expertise. This power of expertise is valued in higher education (Mintzberg, 1979).

Institutions of higher education are not rational. They are socially constructed, and context and culture are integral to understanding power dynamics (Kezar, 2001). Members of educational organizations, whether professionals or support staff, are not rational, and they are neither flexible nor subservient (Kezar). Attempts to make institutions of higher education more efficient, more like the business model, often fail because of differences in values and cultures. Businesses focus on market sensitivity, customer orientation, innovativeness, productivity, and profit. Institutions of higher education are criticized for appearing insensitive to economic realities, are motivated by idealism rather than profit, and subsidize education and services (Birnbaum, 2000). While businesses may have clear goals and well-defined products, colleges and universities have multiple and conflicting goals and intangible outcomes (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Kashner, 1990). In addition, employees may be more committed to their profession than their institution (Dill, 2000). Because of differences in mission and structure, business practices may not be a good fit when adopted in an academic environment (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Moreover, because one-stop service models utilize business practices, they may be met with resistance from professionals in higher education who have different values. Careful consideration of institutional context is needed before implementing this model.

Methods

Procedures

A case study of the values, practices and effectiveness of the implementation of one-stop centers served as the source of data for this study. A case study reveals institutional context and allows the holistic study of a phenomenon (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). The three community colleges included in this study were selected based upon the implementation of a one-stop center within the last five years and accessibility to the researcher. Institutional names have been changed to protect confidentiality.

Within each site, participants were selected with the goal of creating a sample that was representative of all those affected by the move to the one-stop model, including entry level staff, mid-level staff, mid-level supervisors, and

administrators. This holistic approach was critical to get a comprehensive view of the effects of model implementation (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). Participants were asked to voluntarily contribute to the study because they had worked at the institution before, during and/or after the implementation of the one-stop service center. They were interviewed individually by the researcher and asked open-ended questions about the implementation process and effects (see Appendix). Interview questions were tailored to the roles played in implementation (staff roles versus supervisory roles). To understand the range of employee reactions to change, participants included professional and paraprofessional staff, mid-level administrators, and senior administrators from a variety of student affairs areas (admissions, advising/counseling, assessment, financial aid, and registration). Document analysis and observation was also used and supported the findings from interviews.

To analyze the data, the researcher first conducted within-case analyses of data (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). Based on a review of the literature and the research questions, themes were identified. These themes included (a) a renewed emphasis on customer service, (b) the need for employee input, (c) the process and effectiveness of implementation, (d) the staffing model, (e) training and compensation issues, and (f) reactions to organizational change by administrators and staff. Cases were then compared to identify emerging patterns (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). This article presents the results of the cross-case analysis identifying common patterns among institutions regarding the implementation of one-stop centers.

Because of the small sample studied and the importance of specific cultural issues to individual institutions, the study results are limited. This study is a brief examination of a method of organization and does not reflect all institutions that have implemented a one-stop service center. This study also does not involve longitudinal observation of the stages of implementation and the unfolding of the model. As such, specific recommendations for practice may not be readily applicable to other institutions, but there are some general recommendations helpful to institutions in managing change.

This study focused on the cultural effects and effectiveness of the implementation of one-stop service centers on work environments and issues for staff and administrators. Future research on one-stop service centers should evaluate how the centers are functioning and the effects on students.

Participants

Multi-Campus College is a multi-campus community college, consisting of five small campuses (three of which were chosen for this study), in an urban area of a large city in the southwestern region of the United States. Interviews were completed at three campuses. Campus A enrolls nearly 6,000 students, Campus B serves more than 9,000 students and Campus C enrolls approximately 3,500

students. The average age of students attending Multi-Campus College is 28 years, and 25% of students attend full-time. Students of color make up 39% of the student population. Multi-Campus College is a Hispanic-serving institution, with 29% of students identifying as Latino. Female students outnumber males 55% to 44%.

Multi-Campus College has one-stop student service centers at each of the campuses. Implementation was the result of a mandate from the institution's chief academic officer, but each campus was given autonomy for compliance. Each campus has implemented a different version of the one-stop concept, and each has different functions and staffing procedures. The primary reason the centers are physically and functionally different on each campus is because each campus has its own budget, resources and culture. Thus, each campus made its own decisions on how the model would be implemented. A college-wide model for services is now being discussed to provide consistency in services.

A total of 21 interviews were conducted for Multi-Campus College. At Campus A, a supervisor and five staff were interviewed. At Campus B, the dean, three supervisors and four staff were interviewed. The dean, two supervisors and four staff were interviewed at Campus C. Years of service ranged between less than a year and 30 years. These participants were demographically representative of the general student services personnel population at Multi-Campus Community College.

Services offered at one-stop centers at Multi-Campus College included admissions, assessments, financial aid, brief advising on selecting classes, registration and transcripts. A rotation model was used to staff the one-stop centers. Staff members were borrowed from the departments and expected to be generalists in the services provided.

Metropolitan Community College is a single campus community college in an urban area of a large city in the mid-western region of the United States. Metropolitan Community College serves about 40,000 students yearly. The majority of students, 59.3%, work part time or full time. The average age of students is 27.5 years. Students of color make up 15.3% of the student population, with 9% of students identifying as African American. Female students make up 52.4% of the student population.

The dean, three supervisors and four staff members were interviewed for a total of eight interviews. Years of experience range between three and 27 years. Participants were demographically representative of the population in the student services division.

One-stop services included admissions, financial aid, and registration. Advising and counseling, parking services, student identification services, and veterans'

services were located near the one-stop area in a large student service center. Administrators worked the one-stop counter with front line staff, and students requiring more than brief services were referred with a card, phone call, or escort.

Suburban Community College is a single campus community college in the suburban area of a large city in the mid-western region of the United States. The college serves approximately 18,000 students per semester. Approximately 31.2% attend college full time, and the average age is 26.9 years. The student population is primarily white, with 11.3% of students being of color. Female students are 55% of the population.

The dean, five supervisors, and six staff members were interviewed for a total of 12 interviews. Years of experience range between 2 and 15 years. Participants were demographically representative of the population in the student services division.

The one-stop center provided admissions, academic and career assessments, academic advising, and educational and personal counseling. Also, other services of access and support services for students with disabilities, career counseling and employment opportunities, financial aid advisement, registration, and experiential and service learning counseling and placement were provided.

Results

The results of this study are organized below by research questions and themes. Research questions were based on the implementation of the one-stop model in higher education and on a literature review on trends, professionals and organizational theory in higher education.

Research Questions One and Two

Do one-stop service models place more emphasis on customer service and what is reflected in the design of the college's new student services facility and function of the one-stop service center were the first two research questions. Emphasis was placed on efficiency and customer service in trainings at all three sites, per interviews and documents on training. One staff member at Metropolitan expressed this:

Before, it was a zoo. We would get done with registration during peak at 11 p.m. The lines would go outside the building.... Four hours was the norm for registration—now it's 5 to 30 minutes.... Departments were located on different areas of campus and this was very stressful. We needed to consolidate the process. It was a physical and psychological shift in providing services.

Another staff member at Suburban commented,

There was congestion, long lines, and run around. The dean brought donuts to calm the students. We joked about needing valium licks in the halls to calm the crowds.... Now there are no lines, there is more Web use, and there is more communication among staff.... Coming back from the break when we were implementing the model was an adjustment.... We had to adjust to other offices and functions. But the students view it as positive with no run around and faster, better communication, and we can interact with other departments. There is more of a community.

One-stop centers were structured to use generalists to screen and triage service requests, providing general service for the majority of these requests. Generalists referred students for more complex service needs. One administrator at Multi-Campus College Campus A summarized the benefits of using generalists this way:

We have got to support students and make an accessible one-stop. My philosophy is to have generalists because we need to meet the needs of the students—the direction community colleges are going is to have generalists, not specialists. When the administration doesn't support this philosophy, teamwork and camaraderie breaks apart and we become silos again.

This model is designed for streamlining services for the sake of efficiency and for improving customer service.

Research Questions Three, Four, and Five

The third, fourth, and fifth research questions were these: What was the process for obtaining employee input on design? What was the process for implementation? Was the center implemented successfully? Reported input ranged from no input to serving on implementation committees. All staff at all three colleges interviewed reported a desire for more participation in the implementation process. No matter how smooth the transition to the one-stop model, participants at all three colleges reported anxiety about change and wishing for more information. One supervisor at Suburban stated,

The most negative thing about the change was waiting for the building to open and the anxiety and rumors about the change. My staff were sure it wouldn't be the way they wanted. It was a fear of the unknown, and no amount of information would put them at ease. When they saw that "We weren't screwed over," they liked the new model.

Many participants also reported stress over adjusting to multiple changes at once. These changes included a new facility, new methods for completing tasks, new technology, new work relationships, and new departmental identities and culture. Regarding these changes, one staff member at Metropolitan concluded,

Staff don't like the new system. Three separate departments merged. They had cliques plus too many changes at once (the Y2K technology conversion, the physical move, training, and peak registration.) People were overwhelmed.

Conflict also occurred in the implementation of the one-stop centers when administrators, professionals, and support staff had conflicting values and ideas for design and function. On Multi-Campus College Campus A, one upper-level staff member stated,

The concern we've had with higher education all these years is that we're lowering ourselves to the mall mentality of our culture and we're not seen so much as a place where one goes to experience higher learning, but it's just another service provider, where do I go to get this thing done.... It's the take-a-number approach. I worry about that, I worry about what it says to people and what it gives students for expectations. It used to be, you go to college and you fit into the college culture. That was part of the whole growing up process, you go to college and you fit into the culture. Here we are doing the consumer culture for colleges and where are students going to get that bigger experience of education and learning? I worry about that.

Whereas at Multi-Campus College Campus B, a mid-level supervisor responded,

People pictured it differently. We wanted one counter, not a round desk. We need more signage and communication to students. We were assured that it would be two full-timers. Instead we have the two-hour rotation. It's hard to balance departmental needs because we are limited when it's peak or when staff are on vacation. We have five people to cover five days a week plus evenings. I don't feel that one-stop is the best use of my time, because I'm sitting out there while the paper on my desk piles up.

Values between professionals and paraprofessionals differed greatly and conflict arose as these employees moved to an environment where they worked together. This point was reflected by one staff member at Multi-Campus College Campus C who noted,

People are territorial, some are not willing to answer questions for other departments.... There are more spats—some people transferred out. Now people are getting along, more willing to help. They see what others do and have more understanding by being in other people's shoes. There is conflict about people not pulling their weight—some have gone elsewhere. There is no accountability for those who are still here, and others have moved on because of inequity.

Expectations differed as to how much input and participation employees should have in implementation. The greatest conflict between staff and

administrators occurred at Multi-Campus Community College and Metropolitan Community College, whereas acceptance of the one-stop service model was more complete at Suburban Community College and less resistance occurred. At Suburban, one staff member explained,

The environment has been positive—we work in a collaborative manner, and there is more effort to work this way. The information specialists' help is phenomenal, they pitch in if additional staff is needed.

Research Questions Six, Seven, and Eight

What staffing model was used, were staff members required to obtain additional training, and was compensation for increased duties offered were the sixth, seventh, and eighth research questions examined. Staff reactions to staffing models differed depending on whether a rotation was used and whether compensation was offered. Reactions at Multi-Campus Community College and Metropolitan Community College were largely negative because rotation models were used without compensation. Departments were merged and staff members were cross-trained to serve shifts as generalists. Resistance resulted when staff objected to added duties and increased training without compensation. One upper-level staff member at Multi-Campus College Campus C explained,

What is most stressful is being short staffed and having high turnover. We have to start over training new people, and staff are expected to do more at more levels for more people. There are constant shifts. The technicians are not paid enough for the work they are doing. There is a lot of responsibility and expertise is needed. We have had multiple changes with technology, the physical move, training, and classification and compensation issues. Staff felt threatened. They are frustrated and resist because of compensation issues.

Cultural conflict emerged as small departments were integrated into a larger work environment. Employees had to adjust to a new identity and culture and to changes in the nature of the tasks performed. One supervisor at Metropolitan expressed it this way:

Things got bad with needing to know so much and learn about new technology. We had to bring in a professional for team building, and to help with interpersonal issues like how to get along with others, getting to know people, even music was an issue. We had 60 people and they liked different radio stations. There were lots of issues, coffee, lunch, eating at desks, dress codes. Admissions was more professional and registration and financial aid were more relaxed. People were not used to working out front. There was no formal dress policy by the institution, so it was hard to enforce. We had dirty dishes in the sink, and the fridge was an issue. Small

things became major problems. We are trying to bridge these gaps—every month we have a celebration for bonding. Food has a tendency to make people forget about ups and downs.

Reactions to the one-stop model were more positive at Suburban Community College because generalist positions were created and marketed through a competitive hiring process with increased compensation commensurate with the greater need for training and skills required by the position. One administrator articulated how the model was more positive at Suburban by explaining it this way:

There was a lot of training including formal training tests, who to refer to, etc. The generalist positions were created by taking positions from department areas. This was somewhat voluntary, and many positions were vacant. There were three positions from admissions, financial aid, and advising and counseling. It isn't going to work unless it's staffed. There were new classifications, titles, and pay levels. We did a good job in creating excitement about the new philosophy and the new way of doing business. We picked generalists who were customer service oriented.

These generalists were cross-trained to provide triage and general service for the division and to assist departments that are short-staffed. All but one staff member interviewed reported that the generalists were assets to the student services division.

Research Questions Nine, Ten, and Eleven

The final three questions explored were: (a) How did administrators and staff react to the reorganization of student services and the implementation of a one-stop center? (b) Did they invest in the change or resist it? and (c) How did work relationships change? The overall representation of the one-stop student services centers at each site was positive, but resistance and cultural conflict were present at each site. As the student service departments restructured, administrators and staff faced environmental and cultural changes in working with new groups of people and learning new methods for completing tasks. A supervisor at Suburban described these changes as follows:

There were cultural issues between departments—conflicting dress codes, where to eat. We didn't think about that when we were making changes. There was a loss of cohesiveness and tension between boundaries. Admissions/registration blended with financial aid. There were different cultures blending and a loss of connection with core groups. There were changes in identity and a blurring of boundaries.

This resistance and cultural conflict was minor at Suburban Community College. All but one of the staff interviewed indicated that the new model was

positive and that they enjoyed working with staff from other departments in the new center. One staff member stated:

The third floor records team is fairly satisfied. There are no problems, and they are more task oriented and happy to not be front line. They are more introverted people. They get the information they need, communication is good, and they have better knowledge on who does what in other departments. The second floor registration staff feels the same, with more contact and communication with other departments. The (one-stop) success center team is wonderful, they help problem solve and are team oriented, student focused.

Staff said that the new model was an improvement for students and the use of generalists was helpful in serving students and easing the workload for departments. The group who resisted was the advising and counseling staff. One staff member explained that the reason for this resistance was a difference in service philosophy between people-oriented professionals (the counselors) and task-oriented paraprofessionals (the rest of the department). Specifically, this staff member described this resistance as:

They are competent professionals but want to have free reign and opinions. They want to be the center of attention, where they were before. Service is now like a pyramid (the generalists screen most of the questions and work is filtered so counselors get fewer but deeper questions), but they don't see it this way. They don't feel appreciated, but degraded, rather than seeing the big picture and that they are the center of the model.

This participant felt that these professional staff members had different values and this caused conflict.

At Multi-Campus Community College and Metropolitan Community College, resistance and cultural conflict occurred as staff members were cross-trained as generalists and merged from small departments into a larger division. While staff acknowledged that working with new people created greater appreciation for each staff member's role, seemingly minor issues caused discord. Staff argued over dress codes, how coffee was prepared, choice in radio stations and which clock had the correct time. One administrator from Multi-Campus College Campus B noted:

It is important to have a model that is individualized to the needs of the campus, with matching physical facilities and philosophy. It's a perpetual growing service and it is never done as a delivery mechanism. The ability to customize is good. There was a cultural adjustment. Admissions and financial aid now share space. There was conflict over how the coffee should be made, so we now have two coffee pots. People have different methods for answering phones. The clocks on the walls in each area were

set to different times, and there was conflict over when staff left for the day. We resolved that by using the clock on the telephones to know the standard college time.

While these were issues faced at Suburban Community College initially as staff learned to work together, enough departmental identity was preserved to minimize conflict. At Multi-Campus and Metropolitan, new identities had to be created. At Multi-Campus College Campus C, a staff member stated:

There were no incentives or compensation. With the classification/compensation study, people stayed technicians and we know that specialist appeals did not go through. If they had, we would be more willing to do one-stop. Why should I do a specialist's job? Human resources justified it by saying there was not enough critical thinking in our job. They say, "Thanks for going above and beyond, but we won't reclassify you."

Multi-Campus still faces resistance from staff, particularly because of inequities in position classification and compensation.

To combat similar types of resistance, Metropolitan used social events to bond workers and established weekly staff meetings to provide training and opportunities for feedback. One administrator at Metropolitan described the morale in this way:

When you break bread with someone, you see them in a different light....If the staff are not happy, students don't get the best service. We recognize milestones, graduations, take pictures....We have excellent, creative people who are dedicated to their jobs. We recognize that they have families and that's more important than their job. People have to know that you are genuinely concerned about their well-being....People need to be comfortable enough to vent with no repercussions.

As a result of these training and teambuilding efforts, morale has improved at Metropolitan.

Discussion

The dynamics of institutional traditions and staff culture provide unique issues for each institution. As institutions of higher education consolidate student service departments to form one-stop service centers, staff must learn to work in new ways with new people, and to become generalists.

Small departments merge to form larger, more comprehensive departments and employees lose former identities to form new social systems. This process requires cross-training and socialization to the new environment. It may lead to resistance and symbolic adoption of the one-stop trend in an effort to cope with change and appease administrators. The danger of this symbolic adoption is that if it defines the implementation, it may lead to the eventual

abandonment of the innovation (Birnbaum, 2000). Findings from this study reflect Birnbaum's theory on organizational change in higher education: if the one-stop service center is adopted only symbolically and is not integrated into the core of the institution, the restructuring will not be successful and will not translate into different models of actual service delivery. If employees are not able or willing to resolve interpersonal and cultural issues and form new identities, the one-stop center is doomed to fail. There will be no changes in the organization and delivery of student services.

Shifting from a silo paradigm to a one-stop service center can be a daunting task, and this model may not fit well in every institution. The Luke Principle states that change requires extensive planning and commitment within an organization, from all of organization's employees. The social and cultural implications of change must be considered (Ousley, 2003). Without commitment from all employees, implementation will be symbolic rather than actual (Birnbaum, 2000). For the successful implementation of a one-stop center, an infusion of resources is needed to provide adequate training and staffing that both provides quality service to students and incorporates the values of student development (Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000).

The literature indicated that colleges are changing in response to pressure to be more efficient and focused on customer service (Hrutka, 2001). The results of this study support the argument that a focus on efficiency and customer service also serves to preserve the college through increased marketability and increased status. The sites within this study enjoyed increased status as other colleges benchmarked the one-stop service centers. Also, in comparing student feedback about services at these community colleges with four-year institutions, participants at Suburban stated that service at the community colleges was superior to service at the universities with the restructuring to a one-stop model.

With an emphasis on efficiency and customer service, services at one-stop centers are task and skill oriented rather than focused on student development. The philosophy of student development is rarely congruent with express service. While utilizing a student development approach is not viewed as cost-effective as is providing efficient service using generalists in a one-stop center, it pays through increased retention and graduation rates and through holistic student development (Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000).

The "low-cost" strategy of hiring part-time staff to provide student services is the current trend (Rhoades, 1998). One-stop centers using part-time staff may be more cost-effective short-term, but costs in staff retention and organizational change may make them less cost-effective in the long run. High turnover of staff, training costs, and the cultural costs to the work environment may outweigh the benefits of efficient, customer-centered service.

The implementation of the one-stop centers for Multi-Campus Community College and Metropolitan Community College are likely symbolic because both sites are still combating cultural issues and resistance among staff to the one-stop model. The lack of buy-in by many staff impedes the paradigm shift to the one-stop concept. While more services were consolidated, some staff members operated as if they remained in a silo structure by referring without screening requests and without providing generalized service at the one-stop service center, and some expressed a desire to return to the old silo model. Working at the one-stop center but not providing generalized service (i.e. physical presence but not actual compliance) is a mimetic effort to show attempts at compliance in response to pressures to change, and such a situation reflects a symbolic adoption of a fad (Birnbaum, 2000). Compensation to generalists and reinforcement by peers resulted in effective implementation and staff commitment at Suburban Community College. All but one of those participants interviewed favored the one-stop model, and considered cross-trained generalists to be an asset to the student services division.

Reactions at Multi-Campus Community College and Metropolitan Community College were largely negative because rotation models were used without additional compensation. Departments were merged and specialized staff members were cross-trained to serve as generalists. Staff objected to added duties and increased training without compensation. Cultural conflict emerged as small departments were integrated into a larger work environment, resulting in further resistance to the one-stop model. Employees had to adjust to a new identity and culture. As employees lost autonomy through a controlled work environment, deskilling occurred as skills were downgraded in providing general services (Mintzberg, 1979; Rhoades, 1998).

Reactions to the one-stop model were more positive at Suburban Community College because generalist positions were created and marketed through a competitive hiring process. The generalist positions received increased compensation commensurate with the greater need for training and skills required by the position, underscoring the value of the positions. Position applicants were told upfront what the generalist position would entail. These generalists were cross-trained for providing triage and general service for the division and for assisting departments that were short-staffed.

The move to a one-stop center requires a major paradigm shift, and this kind of change takes time and resources. Because restructuring service models impacts employee jobs, resistance is likely to occur (Ousley, 2003). Communication is critical to encourage staff to disclose the reasons for resistance and to alleviate fears about change. Staff may be reluctant to release control of functions they consider their area of expertise, or they may be concerned about an increased workload. Staff may also have concerns about compensation and job security. Rewards and increased equity in pay can

increase acceptance and underscore the value placed on the change, as observed at Suburban Community College.

Staff may also have concerns that some functions are not appropriate for a one-stop center. For example, functions in which a confidential environment is needed, such as in counseling, may not be a good fit in the one-stop model due to concerns in the work environment and cultural atmosphere. It is possible that staff feel comfortable with the concept being promoted in the change, but are concerned with how it will affect the day-to-day atmosphere. As change is implemented, staff may be moved to a new work area or interact with new co-workers. These cultural issues alone can undermine organizational change (Ousley, 2003).

To establish commitment to the change, input and participation in decision-making is essential. Staff members must be included in every aspect of the design to identify functions and reduce obstructions that can develop in providing service. Staff input is crucial in creating an efficient model and establishing cooperative team building among staff. Staff feedback is especially important when looking at cross-functional tasks. Institutional context, departmental culture, territoriality and how changing boundaries impact relationships must be considered. It is important that administrators do not implement significant changes at once as multiple changes overwhelm staff. Continual evaluations of one-stop functions and dialogue with staff and students are necessary to assure that the one-stop service center is functioning as planned. These elements constitute the counting of costs needed to facilitate a paradigm shift in providing service.

References

- Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they come from, what they do, why they fail*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bower, D. (1992). *Company and campus partnership: Supporting technology transfer*. New York: Routledge.
- Callan, P., & Finney, J. (1997). *Public and private financing of higher education: Shaping public policy for the future*. Phoenix: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Dill, D. (2000). The nature of administrative behavior in higher education. In M. C. Brown II (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (pp. 92-110). Boston: Pearson.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983, April). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Federal Benchmarking Consortium. (1997). *Serving the American public: Best practices in one-stop customer service*. Retrieved January 15, 2003 from <http://www.npr.gov/library/papers/benchmrk/>

- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change. In M. C. Brown II (Ed.), *Organization & governance in higher education* (pp. 313-335). Boston: Pearson.
- Gutek, B., & Welsh, T. (2000). *The brave new service strategy: Aligning customer relationships, market strategies, and business structures*. New York: Amacom.
- Hovey, H. (1999). *State spending for higher education in the next decade: The battle to sustain current support*. San Jose, CA: State Policy Research, Inc. for the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Hrutka, M. (2001). Student services for distance learners: While some things change, some things stay the same. *NetResults: NASPA's e-zine for student affairs professionals*. Retrieved January 15, 2003 from <http://www.naspa.org/netresults/article.cfm?ID261&category=Feature/>
- Kashner, J. (1990). Changing the corporate culture. In W. Steeples (Ed.), *New directions in higher education: Managing change in higher education*, 71, 20-22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kezar, A. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levin, J. (2001). *Globalizing the community college*. New York: Palgrave.
- Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. (1995). *Analyzing social settings*. Boston: Wadsworth.
- Marsee, J. (2000). The one-stop concept. *NACUBO Business Officer*, July, 56-60.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). The professional bureaucracy. In M. C. Brown II (Ed.), *Organization & governance in higher education* (pp. 50-69). Boston: Pearson.
- Moneta, L. (2001). Online and physical services: A student affairs paradox. *NetResults: NASPA's e-zine for student affairs professionals*. Retrieved January 15, 2003, from <http://www.naspa.org/netresults/article.cfm?ID=87&category=Feature/>
- Ousley, M. (2003). *Coffee pots and clocks: Cultural challenges to organizational change in higher education*. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring of academic labor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Richardson, R., & Leslie, L. (1980). *The impossible dream? Financing community college's evolving mission*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Ritzer, G. (2002). *McDonaldization: The reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thompson, F. (Ed.). (1988). *The Thompson chain-reference bible: Fifth improved edition*. Indianapolis, IN: B. B. Kirkbride Bible Co.
- Woodard, D., Love, P., & Komives, S. (2000). *Leadership and management issues for a new century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zumeta, W. (2001). Public policy and accountability in higher education: Lessons from the past and present for the new millennium. In D. Heller (Ed.), *The states and public higher education policy* (pp. 155-189). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Appendix A: Interview Questions for Staff

- How long have you worked for this department? This institution?
- What is your current position? Has your classification changed since the one-stop student service center was implemented? How do you feel about this change in classification?
- Describe the current staffing organization and functions of your one-stop center. How does your position fit into this organization? What was the staffing organization before the center was implemented? How did you fit into this organization?
- Before the change in structure, what was a typical day like? Why was the change made?
- What input did you have in creating the center? Did you feel your voice was heard? If so, at what levels and by whom?
- What was the process for implementation?
- Is the new structure better or worse for you and why? What was the first week like? How did the structure work? What was the office like? What is a typical day like now?
- Did you have to learn new skills to work in the new structure? If so, what training was offered? How was this training similar or different to previous educational or on the job training you have had? What incentives or compensation were provided?
- How do you feel about the move to a different structure? Is this better or worse for you, and why? Is this better or worse for students, and why?
- Are the numbers of students served tracked? Is this number greater or smaller than before the change? How do students give feedback and what do they say?
- What were the most negative or most stressful things about making the change? How did you deal with these issues?
- What were the most positive or stress reducing things about making this change? How have the changes benefited you?
- How have your relationships with co-workers changed since the implementation of the new structure?
- If you had the time, money and power, what would you change about the experience of making this large organizational staffing change or about the one-stop center?

Appendix B: Interview Questions for Deans and Supervisors

- How long have you worked for this department? This institution? What is your current position?
- Describe the current staffing organization and functions of your one-stop center. How does your position fit into this organization?
- Why did you change to a new structure? Where did this idea come from? What is the ideal service model and provider? What is the mission statement and philosophy of your center and how does it fit your college's mission statement and philosophy?
- What was the staffing organization before the center was implemented? How did you fit into this organization? What was a typical day like?
- What input did you have in creating the center? Did you feel your voice was heard? If so, at what levels and by whom?
- What vehicles for communication did you use to discuss the change with the staff, public and students? What was the process for implementation?
- Did front line staff have to learn new skills to work in the new structure? If so, what training was offered? How often do trainings occur? What incentives or compensation were provided to staff in making this change? Describe your resource provisions for the center: human resources (staffing, job descriptions, organizational chart, pay levels), budget and technology needs and resources. Please give me a copy of documents that illustrate this.
- How do you feel about the move to a different structure? Is this better or worse for staff, and why? Is this better or worse for students, and why? What is a typical day like now?
- How do you obtain feedback from the public and students? How often is this done? Please give me a copy of the instrument used for feedback and a summary of the feedback received.
- What were the most negative or most stressful things about making the change? How did you deal with these issues?
- What were the most positive or stress reducing things about making this change? How have the changes benefited you?
- How have your relationships with staff changed since the implementation of the new structure?
- If you had the time, money and power, what would you change about the experience of making this large organizational staffing change or about the one-stop center?