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Chapter I
The Research Problem

Introduction

How decisions are made in organizations is a matter of interest to social scientists. The disciplines related to this phenomenon include political science, sociology, and psychology among others. Organizational theorists examine the issue in the context of the for-profit firm or the not-for-profit organization. Often such decision making is examined with the intent of determining whether the organization achieved its stated goal (Cyert and March, 1963). Political scientists call the process of making decisions in the political context "policy making." To many political scientists policy making is viewed as dependent on power and influence relationships. Those groups or constituencies with the resources to achieve their goals usually do so (Dye, 1972; Lindblom, 1980). In higher education, policy making or decision making is often thought of as governance. Governance is the network or system of structures and processes by which policies or decisions are made. The fields of sociology and political science have each contributed to understanding how decisions are made in higher education institutions. Increasingly, governance has been examined from a political perspective (Baldridge, et. al, 1978).
For the purpose of this study, policy making and organizational decision making will be used to describe the process of organizational choice. Each describes the aspects of process and structure which surround an organization's choice for action. Process is that part of decision making which includes the flow of the issue to resolution—how the issue is modified, changed and finally resolved as people give it consideration. Structure is that aspect of organization which sets the pattern of relationships among and between units of the organization. Structure is pertinent to decision making because it serves, in a figurative way, as the switchboard, directing issues to those parts of the organization functionally equipped to deal with them. Policy making and decision making are considered to be descriptive of an organizational activity called choice. Choice is the action of deciding to do one or another activity.

There are several models of decision making. One familiar model is that of rational action. This model suggests that decisions are based on an assessment of the alternative choices and their relative value when measured against a desired goal. Those decisions are made which maximize opportunity for goal achievement and minimize the potential costs of reaching that achievement (Thompson, 1967). A second familiar description of how decisions are made is political. In this model, interest groups place value on various actions they might take and then concentrate their resources on achieving those ends. Those decisions are made by the preferences of an elite group. Alternately, interest groups will seek a balance between their interests, a compromise, and make a decision based on that compromise (Dye, 1972, pp. 18-23). There are other models as well. For this study, however, of
special interest were models of academic decision making, and they are considered below.

Background of the Problem

Decision making in higher education institutions has been examined in depth, often through the use of governance models. The literature on governance offers four major conceptual approaches to decision making: bureaucratic (Stroup, 1966; Blau, 1973), collegial (Millett, 1962, 1978), political (Baldridge, et. al., 1978) and organized anarchy (Cohen and March, 1974). Each offers a different perspective on the question of how decisions or policies are made in colleges and universities. The bureaucratic approach uses as its base Weber's concept of an idealized bureaucracy including hierarchy of function, formalized communication, appointed personnel, position security (tenure), and member loyalty to organization (Stroup, 1966). Because universities and colleges are chartered by state governments and because of their formal rules of operation, e.g. by-laws, faculty manuals, they fit the bureaucratic model as Weber defined it. Baldridge points out that this description of decision processes is particularly useful for the routine operations that universities undertake, e.g. book buying, student billing, affirmative action procedures (1971, p. 4). Allison (1971, Chapter 3) and Downs (1966, p. 2) suggest that the bureaucratic structure significantly affects the way an organization makes a choice. Baldridge tends to deemphasize the importance of bureaucratic facets in the university's policy process, since the focus is on hierarchical
structure (1971b, p. 4). Allison suggests that the bureaucratic model has a subtle and powerful hold on organizational processes (1971, p. 87).

Millett offered a collegial approach. This concept is related to the bureaucratic approach because it depends upon the rationality of professionals (Blau, 1973). Millett's point is that there is a collegiality of professionals rather than a hierarchy of professionals. Collegiality is rational in that it is the result of professional attention to the pursuit of knowledge in academic disciplines. This model is similar to the impersonality that Weber identified in idealized bureaucracy. Millett also included, as co-decision makers in his model, students, alumni, and administrators (1978, p. 14). He drew no structural ties among the groups, suggesting not a hierarchy or a set of power relationships. Instead he suggested that common interests and consensus are what bind groups together into a productive organization (1978, p. 14). His approach is related to the political process because of his recognition of constituencies bound together in common interest. That concept is the basis of political organization. Allison writes:

Men share power. Men differ about what must be done. The differences matter. The milieu necessitates that . . . decisions and actions result from a political process (1971, p. 145).

It seems as though Millett unwittingly acknowledges both bureaucratic and political approaches in the collegial view.

Baldridge, et. al., assert that decision making in universities and colleges is best explained by a political system paradigm (1978, pp. 9-10). Policy making is viewed as the focus of interest groups
who actively seek resolutions favorable to their own interests.

Assumptions of the political model are:

1. inactivity is normal; people choose not to participate in most issue resolutions.

2. participation is fluid; people do not necessarily stay with an issue from beginning to end.

3. activity is related to interest groups; most action seems to be managed by groups rather than individuals.

4. conflict is normal; on most issues groups disagree about what ought to be done.

5. authority is limited; no one has complete power.

(Baldridge et. al., 1978, pp. 35-36)

The political model acknowledges the way people in the university interact, the divergent goals of interest groups, the interrelationships of issues. The model consists of a four-step process which Baldridge observed as he watched policy being made. The steps include:

1. Interest Articulation: The identification of and attachment to a problem, possibility or an issue by an interest group. The group then inserts its issue, possibility or solution into the agenda.

2. Legislative Stage: That portion of time in the process when negotiation and compromise narrows the range of choice to a politically feasible policy proposal.

3. Formulation of Policy: Choice is made by an authoritative and legislative body, or responsible group. The decision is binding, and represents a clear course of action.

4. Execution of Policy: The policy is integrated into the activity of the organization. This sets the stage for groups to articulate new issues related to the policy and begin the cycle again (Baldridge et.al., 1978, pp. 40-41)

Baldridge's model defines how policy is made. His description of the policy process is clearer than Millett's or Stroup's. While Baldridge, et. al.
spell out what happens in stages, the other two models require greater inference by the analyst in order to be descriptive of the policy process. Baldridge's model is dynamic but structured. It is dynamic in the sense that it recognizes the interplay of many groups and issues simultaneously. It is structured because of its focus on the policy process as a series of stages that recur. The last model of governance to be considered is more dynamic and less structured than the political model. It is the model of the university as an organized anarchy. Organized anarchy, or the garbage can theory as it is also known, suggests that decision making is not wholly rational. That is to say that decisions or choices are the product of an almost random mating of problems and solutions. Conflict is evident in the model. People with various preferences, biases and job-related functions attach themselves to problems that they see, solutions that they possess, or both. The problems, solutions, and conceptually, the people attached to them, are drawn from a figurative garbage can by decision makers. The drawing of problems and solutions and their pairing represents organizational choice or decision. The model is also based on Down's notion of problemistic search (1966). People scan their work environment, seek alternative solutions to problems they see, choose one and proceed. Olsen and March (1976) characterize search as depicted in Figure 1.
The model is also based on conflict. People have different perspectives on issues and preferred solutions for action and work to achieve their goals within an organizational context. Since any number of organizational participants may be involved in a decision situation, there is little rationality, predictability or orderliness about decision making.

The garbage can model shares some similarities with the political model and the other models. It is influenced heavily by political conflict and its attention to the ways units and actors work to assure satisfaction of their own needs and interests. It assumes that units' and actors' view of the situation colors preferences based on the principle of value maximization. While this is implicit in the political model, it is more explicit in the model of organized anarchy.

Each of the four models of higher education governance presented above describes one view of how decisions are made. While more recently developed models, e.g. political and garbage can, are persuasive, there are elements of
the bureaucratic and collegial which have merit. For example, the
decision process is invariably structured in some way so that an issue
must go through some hierarchy before reaching resolution. In that
hierarchy bureaucratic principles no doubt operate. For issues of
educational policy, consensus is often sought and the judgements of
the teaching faculty are weighed on a professional rather than political basis. Baldridge et al. assert that, although the bureaucratic
model does not explain the processes of conflict, the collegial
model is more often hoped for than achieved (1978, pp. 30-33).

Thus there are four models of governance which emphasize aspects
of decision making. None is designed as an analytic means of exploring a decision. They are descriptive and can only be used for the
analysis of a policy decision by inference. An analyst would be
required to deduce an analytic strategy from them. Thus their usefulness for purposes of policy analysis is limited.

Rationale for the Study

The purpose of examining the aforementioned models of governance
in higher education has been to describe how scholars view that process. But the models built from their observations are limited in their ability to guide analysis of the decision making process. In other words what is needed is a strategy for examining how decisions have been made in specific situations. Such a strategy could
be grounded in the conceptual models of governance and should enable the analyst to tease out findings of interest to all the models of governance.

Sought for this study was a strategy for analysis which would systematically highlight various features of the decision making process. Based on the conceptual frameworks of governance models, the analytic strategy would have to be attentive to (a) the movement of an issue from the early stages to resolution, (b) to the relationships between units, offices and committees, and (c) to the roles that people play in the process. Also required would be (d) a recognition of other constituencies that are evident in decision making. For example, the affect that organizational goals have on choice should emerge from such an analysis (Thompson, 1967). Similarly, the strategy would have to show where conflict emerges in the policy process.

Thus, exploring a strategy for analyzing how decisions are made was the primary interest of this research. That such a strategy would be useful has been suggested by Baldridge et. al. (1978, p. 41), Allison (1971, p. 272), Hines (1974), and Deans (1980). The research problem, then, was to seek out an analytic strategy that was well grounded in theory and to apply it to the study of a policy decision after the fact.
Conceptual Framework of this Study

Lindblom asserted that the policy process is highly complex (1980, p. 4). Baldridge et. al. suggested that the policy analyst need be attentive to matters of goal setting and conflict over values, the process of change and adaptation to different situations, the role that interest groups have in conflict, and finally the legislative and decision phases of the process (1978, p. 41). Those categories represent some of the complexity to which Lindblom referred. In a slightly different characterization, Lindblom suggested the need to examine constituencies, information flow, and power and authority relationships that individuals create as they participate in the process (1980, p. 124). Sought therefore, was an analytic strategy that would examine the policy process in multiple ways. Such a strategy would heighten various facets of the process without oversimplifying its complexity.

The work of Baldridge et. al. (1978), Lindblom (1980), or Olsen and March (1976) could have guided this study in an indirect way. Inference and deduction from their work could have been the basis for developing an analytic strategy. Instead, the work of a political scientist represented an extant means of analyzing the policy process. The work of Graham Allison (1971) was chosen for three general reasons. Allison offered multiple frameworks for analysis, which allow various facets of the process to be highlighted, which demonstrate where conflict occurs, and which demonstrate the roles that people play in the process. In addition, Allison's approach showed a way to
build an analytic model which would focus on the longitudinal aspects of the policy process. Finally, the analytic approach of Allison is well grounded in organizational and political theory.

The work of Edward Schneier was chosen as the basis of the longitudinal segment of the analysis. Similar to Baldridge's four-stage model of governance, Schneier identified as many stages, but with slightly different labels. Those stages include:

1. Issue Definition: Conditions in the organization or environment of interest to organizational units and members which are translated into issues for the purpose of organizational action.

2. Proposal Formulation: Issues are scrutinized and specific proposals for changed policy or for continued maintenance of the status quo are developed by units or members involved in the issue.

3. Support Mobilization: Organizational units and members are induced by each other to decide for or against alternate policy proposals.


This strategy for policy analysis offers a view of the process from beginning to resolution. It, rather than Baldridge's model, was chosen in order to be able to differentiate between an analytic strategy and models of governance. The differences in definition between Schneier and Baldridge are small. The major difference is that Baldridge's approach has been developed more fully to explain policy making rather than to analyze it.
To be sure, Lindblom criticized the stage by stage approach to analysis. He suggested that such an analytic style alone fails to recognize complexity: actors are the same through all stages; stages cannot be clearly differentiated, and may collapse into each other as one solution becomes the next problem (1980, pp. 3-5). He suggests that other analytic strategies are also useful.

For that reason, and in order to get at issues, structures, conflict and the roles that people play in policy making, the three Allison analytic models were also used. He refers to his models as "conceptual lenses;" each lens provides a distinctive focus for analysis (1971, p. 2). Thus, one reason for choosing the Allison approaches was their clear analytic function. The approaches are explicitly analytic. In describing the analytic function, Allison wrote:

The logic of explanation requires that (the analyst) single out the relevant, important determinants of the occurrence. Moreover, as the logic of prediction underscores, he must summarize the various factors as they bear on the occurrence. Conceptual models (of analysis) not only fix the mesh of the nets that the analyst drags through the material in order to explain a particular action; they also direct him to cast his nets in select ponds, at certain depths, in order to catch the fish he is after (1971, p. 4)

Thus, the analytic models focussed on questions of issue, structure, conflict and actor roles.

Related to the explicit nature of the analytic models was their construction. Allison built his models on Merton's notion of paradigm—"a systematic statement of the basic assumptions, concepts and propositions employed by a school of analysis" (Merton in Allison, 1971, p. 32). Each of Allison's models therefore is composed of five parts:
1) the basic unit of analysis; 2) organizing concepts; 3) a pattern of dominant inferences; 4) general propositions; and 5) specific propositions. In this way, for each model, Allison linked his analytic approach to the conceptual bases of policy making in political science and organizational theory. Another reason, then, for using Allison's models of analysis was their close conceptual links to relevant theory about governance. Further discussion of this point is found in Chapter II, Review of Related Literature.

This research had as its conceptual base four approaches to decision analysis. One, Schneier's longitudinal approach was without a paradigm similar to those developed by Allison. The present researcher developed a paradigm for Schneier which was parallel to those of Allison. In the Schneier paradigm, the four functional stages of the policy process represent the organizing concepts. The complete paradigm is found in Appendix A. The other three approaches to policy analysis used in this study were those developed by Allison, which he called: Model I—the Rational Actor (1971, pp. 32-35); Model II—Organizational Process (1971, pp. 79-96); Model III—Governmental Politics (1971, pp. 162-181). Each of the four analytic strategies was linked to the literature of decision making. Each provided a distinctive, if not unique, focus on the event which was examined. Together, the four analytic approaches offered a strategy for exploring how a decision was made.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to implement the four analytic strategies by performing an analysis of a decision. To do that, it was necessary to develop an analytic paradigm for one approach (Schneier's longitudinal model) and to restate to fit the Hartwick case those paradigms previously developed by Allison. What was of primary interest was the degree to which the four analyses contributed to understanding how the decision was made.

In particular, this research focussed on the ability of each analytic strategy to identify, describe and highlight aspects of the decision making process. For example, examination of the degree to which each analytic strategy could help delineate the role that organizational structure played in the process was one important aspect. Also of interest was the way the policy issue was modified by, or in some way affected, the process of decision. Specific roles that participants played in the process and in the structure were addressed by these analytic strategies. The research questions which guided this study were:

1. How do each of the analytic strategies show off or emphasize different facets of the policy case which was examined?

2. What were the requirements of each strategy concerning the data needed for the particular analysis, and how were the data used?

The policy case analyzed was a decision made at Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York. Finally adopted in November, 1975,
the decision resulted in a modification of the College's statements of educational objectives and graduation criteria. The process, which was lengthy, began in March, 1974, and involved the faculty and academic officers of the College.

Methodology

This research was undertaken as a case study. It was a qualitative, descriptive study, intended to explore specific analytic strategies which would provide additional insights about how decisions are made. A case study was undertaken because the logic of the research problem required a specific decision situation for its focus. Lofland noted that the case study could "provide an explicit rendering of the structure, order and patterns found among a set of participants" (1971, p. 7). Filstead also noted that proximity to the data makes it possible to develop "analytical, conceptual, categorical components or explanation" (1970, p. 6).

Lijphart noted that the case study method can properly be used to confirm theory (1971). This would necessarily require that the strategy for analyzing the case be firmly grounded in the theory that is to be confirmed. The analytic frameworks chosen make it possible to make comparisons with the academic models of governance.

Mintzberg argued that a direct research strategy may offer greater insights than quantitative methodologies. He has described his own methodology as follows:
1. The research has been as purely descriptive as we have been able to make it.

2. The research has relied on simple—in a sense—inelegant methodologies.

3. The research has been inductive.

4. The research has, nevertheless, been systematic in nature.

5. The research has measured in real organizational terms.

6. The research, in its intensive nature, has ensured that systematic data are supported by anecdotal data.

7. The research has sought to synthesize, to integrate diverse elements into configurations of real or pure types (1979, pp. 582-589).

Mintzberg argued for more research that examines one case in greater depth, more fully explored (1979, p. 584). The case study method offered this opportunity.

Case studies nonetheless present limitations. Findings from such studies are difficult to generalize. Further, the data available may escape the researcher's ability to integrate it (Selltiz, 1959, pp. 59, 65). For this study, however, the case methodology presented a research framework which served to explore and illuminate previously established propositions (Wirt, 1977, p. 411).

**Data Collection:** In order to use the case method to its best opportunity, i.e., to get close to the data (Lofland, 1971), to link seemingly disparate bits of information (Glazer, 1967), and to take credible conceptual leaps (Mintzberg, 1979), several methods were used in data collection.
Informal Conversation: As the decision to restate educational objectives and graduation criteria came to a conclusion during the period from September to November, 1975, the researcher had informal discussions and conversations about the issue with active participants in the deliberations. These included: 1) the Dean of the College; 2) the Chairman of the Faculty; 3) the Coordinator of Institutional Research; 4) the Associate Dean for Special Programs; and 5) several members of the faculty active and interested in this issue.

These conversations served to bring the issue to the attention of the researcher and as a result, this issue was identified as the policy decision on which this research would focus.

Archival Material: After the conclusion of debate and adoption of new policy, the researcher examined all relevant archival records. These included: Faculty Meeting minutes, Faculty Council minutes; Planning Council minutes; Committee on Institutional Research minutes; and the minutes of the faculty standing committees where discussion of the issue occurred.

In addition, the data from various inventories done on campus were examined, e.g., Institutional Goals Inventory, Institutional Functioning Inventory. The Chapter dealing with Hartwick College in Lindquist's Strategies for Change (1978) was also a source of information. Finally, communications between committees and the various proposals for policy change were examined.
Neustadt asserted that he would rather have interview data than archival data, since the latter is less complete in some important ways than the former. Meeting minutes generally are expressed without the scope of emotion that accompanied the substance of what was recorded. There is much that happens in meetings that is not recorded. For those reasons Neustadt prefers memory and interviews, even though memories are sometimes clouded and inaccurate (Neustadt in Allison, 1971, p. 181)

The archival data did however serve two important purposes. It provided the paper trail of the decision: what happened (formally), at what time, and who participated in the formal setting. Thus were discovered the chronology of the decision, and the changes that took place in the proposals. Also: the data supported the earlier, less formal assessment of the key actors.

Focussed Group Interview: Because memories lapse, more importantly because actors know only their part in the decision, it was useful to draw together some actors who played important roles in the early stages of the process. These included: the Chairman of the Faculty, two Chairmen of the Planning Council, the Coordinator of Institutional Research, and the Chairwoman of the Committee on Institutional Research. Since these people played key roles in the structure at the time this policy issue was current, a structured interview was held with them as a group. It was taped and transcribed; the interview questions and transcription are found in Appendix B. That a focussed
group format proved useful was demonstrated by the results: participants were clearly helped to recall points that they had forgotten, and became aware of what happened at points in the process in which they had not been involved.

This technique is useful when preliminary analysis of the situation has yielded some significant elements, patterns and structures, and when the people interviewed were involved in the situation. An interview guide sets forth the major area of inquiry and the interview focusses on the subjective experiences to garner their definitions of what happened (Merton, Fishe, and Kendall, in Bellinger and Greenberg, 1978, p. 171). This focussed group interview followed those guidelines. If employed systematically, it would appear that the focussed group interview could provide information for gaps which Allison identified as problematic in Model III (1971, p. 181). This is supported by Bellinger and Greenberg, who suggest that this technique creates synergy: "The combined group effort produces a wider range of information, insight and ideas" (1978, p. 176).

Interviews with Selected Actors: Several members of the Hartwick faculty and staff were interviewed individually. They were chosen using two criteria: 1) because of the special role they played in the decision process; or 2) because they played no special role, but as active faculty members they were aware of what was happening, and therefore could be judged to have a useful perspective. The
latter group included teaching faculty from the departments of History, English, Psychology, French and Political Science. The former group, chosen for the role they played, included those in the focussed group interview plus the former President's widow, the Associate Dean for Special Programs, and the Dean of the College.

In all cases each of those interviewed was very cooperative and as thorough as memory allowed in his responses. The interview schedules incorporated the flexible format suggested by Selltiz (1959, pp. 263-268). Nonetheless, many interviewed preferred to tell the story their own way. Thus the interviews turned out to be less than fully structured, though still useful in corroborating events or shedding new light on them.

Following the interview procedure, a survey instrument was distributed to Hartwick Faculty and relevant administrative staff. The instrument was derived from archival and interview data. It was distributed to 103 persons; 40 completed instruments were returned. The survey was distributed to those who were at Hartwick during the period when the issue was live. The purpose of the instrument was to seek the perceptions of people who participated in the process. Structured to follow the decision process from its beginning to conclusion, the survey focussed on people and their roles, and committees and their roles in the decision. A copy of the instrument is found in Appendix D.

Operational Questions and Data Analysis: The data developed for this study were analyzed using the constant comparative method cited by Glazer and Strauss (1967, pp. 101-115). This method encourages a systematically analytical approach to the data, since the researcher categorizes the data by properties of theoretical importance. The
data were examined in light of twenty-seven operational questions. As Allison stated, these were questions an analyst would ask if examining a decision situation using a specified analytical model (1971, p. 257). This researcher developed specific questions to fit the Schneier paradigm in an operational way. For the three Allison models, his operational questions were used, changes being made only to fit an institutional rather than international policy setting.

Questions posed by the Schneier Model were:

1. What were the antecedent conditions which created a need for change in the status quo?
   a. What units or actors were involved in identifying the problem or posing the issue?
   b. To what degree was the problem formulation phrased to strategically position the issue for action?

2. What proposals were put forth?
   a. How did the proposals relate to the issue?
   b. What units or actors made the proposals?
   c. How were the proposals related to unit goals and objectives?
   d. To what degree were the proposed alternatives phrased to strategically position the issue for action?

3. How was support generated for alternative proposals?
   a. What units and actors worked at developing support?

4. To what degree was choice made by power and/or influence?
   a. How did units and actors work to maintain consensus until decision was reached?
Questions posed by Allison Model I: Rational Actor

1. What was the problem?

2. What are the alternatives?

3. What are the strategic costs and benefits associated with each alternative?

4. What is the observed pattern of (organizational) values and shared axioms?

5. What are the pressures in (the organization's environment)?

Questions posed by Allison's Model II: Organizational Process

1. Of what (units) does the organization exist?

2. Which units traditionally act on a problem of this sort and with what relative influence?

3. What repertoires, programs and standard operating procedures (SOP's) do these units have for making information about the problem available at various decision points in the organization?

4. What repertoires, programs, and SOP's do these units have for generating "alternatives" about a problem of this sort?

5. What repertoires, programs, and SOP's do these units have for "implementing" alternative courses of action?

Questions posed by Allison's Model III: Bureaucratic Politics

1. What are the existing action channels for producing actions of this kind of problem?

2. Which players in what positions are centrally involved?

3. How do pressures of job, past stances, and personality affect the central players on this issue?

4. What deadline will force the issue to resolution?

5. Where are foui-ups likely? (1971, p. 257)
By examining the case in light of the twenty-seven questions, two results were obtained: first was a detailed understanding of how the policy was reached; second, and to the point of this study, was the opportunity to assess the degree to which the Allison and Schneier frameworks enhanced the ability to explain what happened.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of the study was to use four distinctive approaches to the analysis of a policy case. Such an examination was intended to explore the degree to which a strategy consisting of four theoretically-grounded analytic models could explain how a decision was made. Thus, whether the analytic models would highlight aspects of the process was one facet of the study. A second facet was whether those aspects of the process which were highlighted tended to support any of the models of academic governance, and if so, how. Finally sought was information about what kinds of data each of the analytic models required. This study is significant for the reason that it was intended to provide more information than currently exists about the decision process and about how it might be effectively analyzed.

Further, this research contributed information that was previously suggested by others. Allison, for example, suggested that his work might be used to analyze organizational policy (1971, p. 272). Chapman (1979) used Allison's Model III to examine the certification process at the University of Illinois, College of Education. Others, e.g. Hines (1974), Deans (1980) have referred to Allison's approach as
useful, as have Lindblom (1980). This researcher has not found the application of the multiple frameworks approach at the institutional level; this study makes a contribution by performing such an analysis.

**Limitations of the Study**

It was the intent of this study to apply analytic strategies to the decision process. Since the study dealt with institutional decision making, it was a case study. Such studies are of limited generalizability (Selltiz, et. al., 1959, p. 60). These studies do, however, provide a useful means for model building and model confirmation (Lijphart, 1971, p. 691). The case method also provides a way of making coherent large numbers of apparently unrelated details (Selltiz, et. al., 1959, p. 60).

Another limitation of this kind of study is that it must be after the fact (Allison, 1971, pp. 237-244). A decision must have occurred before analysis can be brought to bear. To study the decision in process, as in the participant observer method, could affect the decision, or conversely, data analysis which precedes the outcome could be inaccurate (Selltiz, et. al., 1949, pp. 200-210). A consequence of a post hoc study is that data is sometimes not available. Such information as the flow of conversation, emotional outbursts, committee and member digressions and informal positions that actors took were not recorded (Allison, 1971, p. 251). Additionally, some key actors may be gone and therefore unavailable.*

*For example, the College President from 1969-1976 died five months after the policy decision, and before research had begun. Other key actors also left the college shortly after the decision was made, and were unavailable for interviewing.
Organization of the Study

Chapter II consists of a review of relevant literature. Examined more fully are approaches to decision making from the perspectives of public policy, organizational theory and academic governance. Attention is given to relating theoretical models to analytic models.

Chapter III is an explication of the Hartwick case using the Schneier and Allison frameworks as the tools of analysis. Chapter IV summarizes the study, presents conclusions concerning the research questions, and offers recommendations for future research.
Chapter II
Review of Related Literature

Introduction

In this chapter a review of literature related to this study is presented. This review serves to place this study in the context of related research in the areas of governance and policy decision making, and to examine concepts which are related to those on which this study is based. The literature examined here is closely related to the conceptual approach of the study. The policy process is examined as one way of dealing with policy analysis. The relationship between the policy process and academic governance concepts of the policy process are explored. Subsequently, however, other views of policy making are also presented, and related to relevant literature in academic governance.

All the material, though, is clustered around the conceptual bases of the study, as suggested by Schneier and Allison. Consequently, the organization of the chapter is designed to focus closely related research on the four analytic strategies important to this
study. The Policy Process section thus concludes with an examination of Schneier's process model. The other sections examine The Issue, (Allison I), The Role of Structure (Allison II), and the Role of the Individual (Allison III). Inserted between the two sections on structure and individual is a section on conflict, since conflict is related to both roles of structure and individuals.

The Policy Process

In the fields of sociology and political science, there has been ongoing interest in and attention paid to decision making. There is increasing agreement that policies or decisions are outcomes of a process. In organizations with clear cut and tangible goals there is a rational decision process. That process is described by Figure 2: (Bobbitt, et. al., 1974, p. 294):

![Rational Decision Process Diagram]

**Figure 2**

The Rational Decision Process
A similar process is found in Downs, who emphasizes the scanning requirement of the decision maker. The decision maker identifies potential problems in this related environment and thence proceeds through a process similar to that in Figure 1 (Downs, 1967, pp. 175-176). Cyert and March offer a model of the decision process which focuses on attention to the constraints organizations place on decision makers. They suggest that organization rules usually guide the scope of the alternatives explored by the decision maker (Cyert & March, 1963, p. 126). Lundberg also clearly delineates a process for decision making (1964) as do others (Simon, 1965; Mintzberg, 1976). A choice cycle is also presented in the garbage can theory. This four-step process describes: decision maker world view, environmental stimulus, response to stimulus (decision) and feedback (March and Olsen, 1976).

Political Science Policy Process

There are models for policy process in political science also. Process here is defined as the steps through time an issue takes, beginning with its identification and concluding with its resolution. Easton's systems model demonstrates how the demands and support of the environment affect the political system. That system, in turn, allocates value, rendering decisions and actions, and provides feedback to the environment (Easton in Dye, 1972, pp. 18-19). A rational model of policy making requires complete knowledge of societal values, a complete set of alternative policy choices, a means-end analysis and finally decision (Dror in Dye, 1972, pp. 26-27).
This is similar to rational models in organization theory.

Policy Process in Academic Governance

In the literature of academic governance, Baldridge is pre-eminent in establishing a process model for decision. He characterizes decisions as moving through a four-step process: interest articulation, a legislative stage, policy formulation and finally policy execution. This process is used for decision about issues that emerge from the social structure of the university. The thrust of this approach is to explore patterns of conflict that emerge from interest groups vying for specific outcomes (Baldridge, 1978, pp. 40-41).

Schneier's model includes four functional stages:

1. Issue definition: a process whereby political issues are articulated from the preferences of individuals and groups.

2. Proposal formulation: a process of formulating specific proposals for policy, either change or maintenance of the status quo, from identified issues.

3. Support mobilization: the activation of groups or individuals to support or oppose alternative policy proposals.


Political concerns are as much a part of this model as they are of Baldridge's, but the focus is more on process than on conflict. Hines used the Schneier conceptualization for analysis of governors' roles in educational policy making, and commented on the following: 1) There may be disadvantages to subdividing the
process sequentially when involvement is probably not sequential, and probably overlaps the artificial sequence. 2) Advantages included the distinguishability of what actors did and when they did it. Also, this conceptualization focuses on the activity which leads to enactment and focuses on the "processes [which] were critical in the choosing of policy alternatives from which final policy decisions were made" (Hines, 1974, pp. 37-38). He also suggested that this approach helped achieve a broader understanding of relationships in the process and facilitated the organization of data (1974, p. 39).

Clearly one approach to policy analysis is a strategy which examines the evolution of a policy through a number of defined, logical steps. The Schneier model, beginning with definition and ending with enactment is not dissimilar from the Baldridge view, or from the more rational views of organizational theorists: basically the process includes problem definition, analysis, choice and implementation.

Other Analytic Frameworks

The remainder of this chapter will explore concepts related to each of Allison's conceptual frameworks. Each section examines a substantive area of literature (e.g. the issue, the Role of Structure, etc.) and its relationship with the appropriate analytic framework devised by Allison.
The Issue and Model I, The Rational Actor

The notion of the rational actor as Allison depicts it in international relations is dependent on well-known concepts in organizational theory. Included are: certainty, complete knowledge, closed system thinking and determinateness. These concepts derive originally from economics, where the concept of the rationally motivated economic man developed (Heilbronner, 1961, pp. 38-42). Rather like the rational decision process cited in the preceding section, economic man set objectives and goals, calculated the course of action which was most effective in achieving those objectives, and then acted accordingly. Effectiveness was determined by value maximizing tests; decisions were made from an array of choices with value attached to each (Bobbitt, et. al., 1974, p. 23). This approach is appealing because it lends to human activity a purposefulness which we value highly (Allison, 1971, p. 28).

Organizational Theory:

In organizational theory the concept of purposefulness and value maximizing is generally cast in terms of closed system thinking (Thompson, 1967, pp. 4-5). In this approach, all variables are known, i.e., knowledge is complete, because all environmental vagaries are ignored, or conceived of as variables for which plans can be made. Since knowledge of organizational variables is also complete, certainty, i.e., predictability or consistency is assured. The organization can proceed to goal achievement by making choices based on certain knowledge of environmental and organizational factors. If
certain factors are unknown, a number of "if-then" propositions allow for organizational decision in the context of those variables and of organizational goals (Cyert & March, 1963, p. 19).

Another view of organizations suggests that the closed system approach is more normative than descriptive (Thompson, 1967, p. 6). This alternate approach recognizes that uncertainties often intrude on decision making. Called "open system" this approach recognizes that the environment shapes organizational choices (Thompson, 1967, pp. 6-7).

Environmental uncertainty requires that organizations develop ways to search or scan (Downs, 1966, p. 175) their environments, learn from them and then decide. Instead of value maximizing, organizations must be content to satisfice, or accept less than maximum (Thompson, 1967, p. 9).

Whether knowledge is certain or assumed, whether goals are known and clear cut or assumed and ambiguous, the press of time and the requirements of the organization demand that decision makers decide (Downs, 1966, p. 185; March & Olsen, 1976). Organizational structure helps, because it serves to constrain activity. Bobbitt, et. al., define structure as the "system of defined organizational roles and the relations among them in terms of communication, authority, and work flow" (1974, p. 54). Presumably organization members perform specific functions in organizations and are not required to have
complete knowledge about everything, only about their assigned sector.

In classical literature the organization of work is arranged so that there is no overlap of function and so that communication is efficient between parts of the organization that require coordination. In addition, since organization goals are determined at each organizational level by the top level, there can, in theory, be little opportunity for conflict.

The making of a decision in such a setting includes the assessment of values derived from tests made at each stage of the process—problem identification through choice (Simon in Gore & Dyson, 1964, pp. 112-115). Again, complete knowledge of all aspects of the decision is assumed, making value maximization possible. It is on the fundamental assumption of the principle of complete certainty that the Rational Actor model rests. Allison's assumption is that the basis of issue definition, analysis and choice rest on these assumptions (1971, p. 36).

Academic Governance:

Stroup suggests a similar approach. By relying on abstract rules he suggests that the top level does have such knowledge (Stroup, 1966, p. 19). Control throughout Stroup's bureaucratically organized university is supported not only by rules, but by a hierarchy of authority as well (1966, pp. 22-23). That authority is probably nowhere as clear as it is in the faculty. Stroup labels that specialization, a factor whereby a group or individual is attentive to one
area predominantly (1966, pp. 58-59). In bureaucracies, such specialization is common; in academe it is supported by specialization as a profession (Blau, 1973, pp. 10-12). To hire a professor, an academic specialist is hired—and by definition given authority (Schein, 1972, p. 7).

When organizational and environmental factors are controlled, when knowledge is certain, as is assumed in a model of rational action, then the issue is the variable which becomes important. The nature of the issue, its complexity, its scope or impact on the organization are the factors which the rational decision maker works with in assessing which alternative choice will produce the desired outcome. The basis of statistical decision theory is dependent on different ways the issue or problem can be conceived. Each approach to the problem is then defined and a solution figured which will maximize the desired outcome for any particular conceptualization of the problem (Shubik in Gore & Dyson, eds., 1964, pp. 36-37). Thus, the importance of analyzing decision making as if it were done under rationality is to examine how the issue is shaped, how it is conceived of, and what happens to it in the process through which it flows.

The second approach to analysis that is considered is the role that the organizational structure plays in decision making. Assumptions in this second approach are different from those in the approach just examined, and center around irrational consequences of a logical structure.
The Role of Structure; Model II, Organizational Process

Allison's first model depends on the rational aspects of bureaucracy. Clear assumptions about the fullness of knowledge, certainty of goals and drive to maximize goal achievement are the crux of Model I. Thus, if the Rational Actor Model is grounded in rationality, Model II, Organizational Process explores the irrational side of bureaucracy.

The point of Model II derives from discoveries made by many recent observers of organizations. The fundamental point is that full knowledge is not achievable, but consistent behavior is desirable. Therefore, consistency is accepted and maximization of goal achievement is deferred. In Simon's terms, this includes bounded rationality, factored problems, satisficing, uncertainty avoidance, search, and repertoires (Simon in Allison, 1971, pp. 71-72). Allison also includes assumptions of Cyert and March: quasi-resolution of conflict and organizational learning (Cyert and March in Allison, 1971, pp. 76-77).

Rationality and Satisficing:

Bounded rationality and satisficing are two terms which need little explanation. Both were coined by Simon, the former to connote the limits that humankind has in processing information or doing work. The latter was coined to describe an acceptable outcome (Simon, 1964). In both cases, classical rationality is desired but not achievable. Uncertainty avoidance is a concept which relates
organizational effort to choice in light of what is known rather than what is projected (Thompson, 1967). Uncertainty avoidance also connotes, since it is short term in nature, an avoidance of long-term problem solving approaches (Thompson, 1967).

Quasi-resolution of conflict means that open conflict is averted, and problems are resolved by providing organizational units with independence and resources to avoid conflict with other units.

Problemistic search, search, and repertoires are concepts related to the need for decision making. Problemistic search and search are similar to the proposal formulation stage of the Schneier model. They are the processes whereby a range of alternative action available to counter the identified problem are identified. Mintzberg (1976, p. 266) identified the process similarly. Allison depended on the Cyert and March characterization (1963, p. 126). A repertoire, in Allison's approach, is recognition that this process occurs regularly and that organizations use this approach consistently (1971, p. 72). In each case, "the decision maker factors unstructured situations into familiar, structurable elements" (Mintzberg, 1976, p. 247). The aggregation of enough data about one situation, or enough situations that recur in similar form, suggest that the organization change its ongoing procedures or policies; that is organizational learning. Such learning is marginal, i.e., procedures and policies will change only enough to include the "new situation" (Allison, 1971, p. 77).

Structure in Academic Governance:

Several studies demonstrate the difficulty of changing things in the university setting. House describes the difficulty of effecting change regarding evaluation techniques (1974). Hobbs examines what
is likely to happen, and who is effected when change is suggested (1974). From a slightly different perspective, Jellema (1972) and Richman and Farmer (1974) indicate the costs to institutions whose operations are so constrained that massive change is necessary.

Allison's Model II explores the irrational affect structure has on decision making. What appears as rational to organizational units likely appears to analysts overseeing the total organization as irrational. Alluded to in this model is organizational conflict. The next section of this literature review deals with conflict in the decision making. Consideration of conflict could have been given in the section on Organizational Process or in the section on bureaucratic politics. Since conflict has important relationships to both approaches, it was inserted as a bridge between the two.

Conflict

The conflict literature is also relevant. Allison refers to the "quasi-resolution of conflict" as characteristic in his second model (1971, p. 76). Schmidt and Kochan found three fundamental causes of conflict: competition for scarce resources, drives for autonomy and sub-unit interdependence (1972, pp. 351-369). Corwin correlated conflict with degrees of bureaucratization and professionalism in colleges and universities (1969). Pondy identified a process of conflict including four stages: latent, felt, perceived and manifest (1967). Allison suggests that in governmental organizations conflict is dealt with by the addition of resources (1971, p. 76). This may not be as true in the higher education setting.
Conflict in Higher Education:

The three characteristics of conflict identified by Schmidt and Kochan have been reflected in the higher education literature. Baldridge, et. al., offer insight on this issue. Presented are findings which show patterns of conflict in various types of institutions. For example, academic departments in private liberal arts colleges have more autonomy over their budgets than do departments in other types of institutions. Yet, individuals report that their personnel contracts are more restrictive than personnel contracts in other kinds of places (1978, pp. 4-5). The point is that conflict is an issue for both organizational units and for individuals. It is important to recognize that conflict plays a role in both organizational and personal terms; therefore, conflict should be a consideration for analysis at both levels and in both approaches.

Loose Coupling:

In terms of conflict between units, Meyer & Rowan (1975) and Weick (1976) among others suggest that organizations work to mediate conflict by "loose coupling" units. "Loose coupling lowers the probability that organizations will have to . . . respond to each little change" (Weick, 1976, p. 6). Basically, loose coupling recognizes that unit autonomy is required for professional kinds of activity. Loose coupling is the term for a situation where events or things preserve self identity and maintain separateness, but also recognize a responsiveness between the objects or events (Weick, 1976, p. 4).
Thus, autonomy is preserved, and interdependence is recognized. Meyer and Rowan suggested that this concept is more appropriate for educational institutions than it is for production organizations or political bureaucracies.

In terms of other kinds of unit-level conflict, demand for resources is the most well known. Pfeffer and Salancik found that departments with control over resources tended to maintain control, even though the needs of other departments had increased (1974). Jellema also discovered that units became highly conflictful as the organizational resource base was reduced (1971). Reflection on conflict over resources suggests that one reason why a shift in resource patterns is problematic for units is that such a shift, especially a loss of resources, means a forced change in standard operating procedures and routines. Allison suggests that units are much more able to deal with budgetary feast than famine (1971, p. 85).

Conflict between units is certainly one important consideration in policy analysis. Another consideration is the effect that conflict has on individuals as they play out their roles. Thus, the conflict literature does serve as a bridge between Allison's second and third models of analysis.

Returning to the concept of goal autonomy as a cause of conflict, one recognizes that goals within an organization are personally derived as well as organizationally structured. In other words, individuals have personal and professional goals as well as the goals
which the organization imposes on them. Literature beginning with Barnard (1938), extended by Simon (1951), Georgiou (1973) and most recently by March and Olsen (1976) support this. The Choice Cycle (cf. Chapter 1, p. 12) of March and Olsen is based on an individual view of the organizational world (1976, p. 12). Their work describes the chaos of organized anarchy which derives from the disparate goals and viewpoints that organizational members have. The conflict which results is the basis for Allison's Model III. An examination, then, of Individual Roles and Bureaucratic Politics follows.

Individual Roles & Model III, Bureaucratic Politics

Allison's second model explores the implications of some of the irrational aspects of bureaucracy. The third model, Bureaucratic Politics, explains systematically decision making as a political process. The basis for this model comes from Hilsman, who reported three characteristics: 1) "a diversity of goals and values that must be reconciled before a decision can be reached;" 2) "the presence of competing clusters of people within the main group who are identified with each of the alternative goals and policies;" 3) "the relative power of these different groups of people included is as relevant to the final decision as the appeal of the goals they seek or the cogency and wisdom of their arguments" (Hilsman, as quoted in Allison, 1971, p. 157). Another concept on which Allison based his third model was Neustadt's statement that government consists
of separated institutions sharing powers (Neustadt, as quoted in Allison, 1971, p. 148).

The analytic paradigm that Allison derives from these and other precepts is related to some of the concepts considered above, e.g., the garbage can (March & Olsen, 1976), the political model (Baldridge, et. al., 1978), or loose coupling (Weick, 1976). In some ways Allison's conceptualization is more satisfying because it focuses on specific actor behavior in ways that the others do not. The remainder of this section explores those relationships.

Diversity:

First listed above is "diversity of goals." This is not a new concept in political science; nor is it new in sociological organizational theory. Barnard's characterization of zones of indifference recognized the possibility that individuals in organizations might disagree about what ought to be done (Barnard, 1938, pp. 165-ff.) Simon continued this strand, not only with the concept of inducements-contributions, but also in the multiple concept of goals. Goals, Simon related to "constraints or sets of constraints, imposed by the organizational role, which has only [an] indirect relation to the motives of the decision makers" (Simon, 1964, p. 21). This concept was stretched to its furthest extreme by March in describing a soccer game with no rules played on a round field where goals were as indiscriminate as the players (Weick, 1976, p. 1).

In a somewhat different context Gross discovered a multiplicity of goals in universities. Goals in these organizations were viewed
differently not only among the constituencies—professoriate, administration and students—but within those constituencies as well (1968).

There is a tie between the concept of loose coupling and divergent goals statements. Normally discussion of divergent goals is viewed as dysfunctional (Bobbitt, 1974), or is incorporated into the conflict literature (Schmidt & Kochan, 1972). Weick's notion of loose coupling, however, explores the usefulness of an organizational structure, i.e., loosely coupled, that allows for divergent goals. In some senses the goal divergence causes loose coupling by forcing the organization to face goal diversity within. But goal diversity can also be created by legitimate organizational goals which result in conflict, thus forcing the organization to choose between constraining rules or loose coupling (Weick, 1976). It is possible that loose coupling creates the dual-facing roles people have in organizations that Allison describes with the Secretary of State (1971, pp. 165-166). Emerson similarly defines the role of the Academic Vice President (in Dibden, 1968, pp. 57-72).

Participation:

In Allison's model, as in the garbage can model, role is tied to goal. March and Cohen figuratively attach a person to a solution or a problem as the stream of issues moves along (1974, p. 82). Presumably the relationship between the person and issue is due to the person's expectation of goal achievement; therefore that person is related to the issue by role. Further, since expectations are
multiple, i.e., several varied expectations of the person, and sev­
eral by the person of his environment, any one person is tied to many
issues simultaneously. March and Cohen also stress that participants
may only actively participate in one issue at a time (1974, p. 82).
This, too, is a part of Allison's third model; actors are forced to
take stands by virtue of deadlines and position (1971, pp. 168, 178).

Hirschman, in another context, has discussed the same phenomenon,
i.e., participation. He suggests that a participant has two options
which he calls exit and voice. Exit, as implied, represents the
opportunity to leave a situation. Voice is the resolution to change
practice. A consumer of goods is more likely to not buy the product
again (exit), rather than try to get it changed (voice) (1970, pp. 21-
43). What makes voice work, according to Hirschman, is a theory of
loyalty. Loyalty results from participant judgments about certainty
of exit compared to possibility of improvement, or ability to influ­
ence the organization (1970, p. 77).

Central to Allison's model III is Neustadt's concept of separ­
ate institutions sharing power. This concept is also found in the
literature of higher education governance. Obviously, at the state
level the proposition can be stated in tact. Hines (1974), Theilen
(1976), and Dean (1980) have examined this proposition. At the
university level the names for the "institution" change, but the con­
cept remains the same. Salancik and Pfeffer (1974) explore the shared
power of academic departments. Pfeffer and Moore continued this notion in an extension of the model (1980).

Other Concepts of Shared Power:

The concept of shared power is most prevalent in the area of faculty bargaining units. Walters explained how the Massachusetts State Universities wrote governance into their collective bargaining agreement (1973). Boyd suggested a realignment of power under collective bargaining, with greater power going to the trustees and administration and less staying with faculty elite (1973). Ping saw collective bargaining as the opportunity for resolution of some issues between two parties, versus an endless dialogue in campus governance bodies (1973). Jenks found possibilities in unicameral governance; "it created a force for cohesion among three power groups" (1973).

Summary

There is a substantial body of literature in organizational theory and in the literature of higher education governance that is related to the conceptual models around which this study centered. The literature reviewed is similar enough in focus, so that performing an analysis of an intra-organizational case using analytic models designed for international affairs seemed warranted. It should be pointed out that this was not an exhaustive review; rather, a selective overview was presented.
Chapter III
Analysis of Data

Introduction:

The data which served as the basis for examining the problem are analyzed in this chapter. An overview of the data collection process and data sources was presented in Chapter I. Presented here is a brief descriptive background of the situation—the decision to change the statements of educational objectives and the graduation criteria. More importantly, this chapter includes analysis of data related to that decision.

The largest part of the chapter is given to examining the data in terms of the Schneier and Allison paradigms. There are a total of twenty-seven questions which were used to explore the data. For purposes of clarity, each section of this chapter includes specific propositions related to each of the four analytic strategies, an analysis of data following the logic of that analytic approach using the specific operational questions pertinent to each approach, and conclusion focusing on the information yielded and the data used. The next section, however, presents a brief historical account of that era at Hartwick when the Educational Objectives and Graduation Criteria Decision was made.

Background of the Situation:

Adolph G. Anderson became sixth president of Hartwick College in September of 1969. His goal was to make the college distinctive
proceed. That decision was in keeping with Anderson's pattern of clearly choosing activities which would move Hartwick to broaden itself. The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between organizational knowledge and organizational ability to change course. Characteristically, Anderson turned the project over to an ad hoc campus committee.

The Committee on Institutional Research (CIR), as it came to be called, accomplished very little in its first two years of work. As it developed an effective method of working, CIR utilized national instruments, e.g., Institutional Goals Inventory, to determine how the college was doing. While not an official committee in faculty governance, the CIR was an informal and recognized committee, whose members were on official committees and managed to insert its agenda into the college governance system. This committee, by virtue of its functions and overlapping memberships, played a significant role in the educational objectives and graduation criteria issue.

The committee which formally raised the issue of Educational objectives and graduation criteria was the Planning Council. This committee was formed as a result of a conflict between the President and faculty in 1973. Due to a "shortfall" in admissions, the 1973-74 enrollment projections were low enough to eradicate any proposed salary increases. The faculty was upset and talked of collective bargaining. Instead of forming a bargaining unit, a group of faculty worked on a proposal for shared governance—including financial decisions—during the summer of 1973. They presented their proposal to the faculty for a "Collegium" in September; it was defeated.
Instead, in December the faculty approved a Planning Council whose function was to:

a. Propose and review immediate and long range goals, programs and priorities of the College.

b. Propose guidelines for the allocation of resources.

c. Suggest means to achieve the goals of the College.

d. Work with the committee on long range planning of the Board of Trustees.

e. Work with appropriate administrative offices, other faculty committees and the faculty at large in developing the ongoing master planning required by the New York State Regents. (Faculty minutes, Dec. 10, 1973).

The Council's first agenda items were setting the selection process for a new academic Vice President, and determining policies concerning affirmative action procedures. It considered its first substantive items to be the "review of graduation requirements and their relation to Hartwick's objectives." They began that task in June, 1974.

The Council worked from June, 1974, until February, 1975, before turning the issue over to the Faculty Council. That group was a part of the formal faculty governance system which served as the Executive Committee of the Faculty, and it was the group which could enter the issue formally into the Faculty's agenda. It was the Faculty Council which had charge of the issue from February, 1975, until its approval in November of that year.

During 1974-75 the chief academic officer served as Acting Vice President and Dean. In May of 1975 President Anderson was hospitalized, and though he returned to work in the summer and through the autumn, he was not well and died in early April, 1976. A newly-appointed
Vice President and Dean started in June, 1975, and worked at Hartwick during the last months of activity on the issue.

This brief sketch provides an overview of some of the issues and events with which the College dealt during the period 1970-1975. Out of the trend for renewal begun by President Anderson, one of the many issues that emerged was a proposal to restate the College's Educational Objectives and Graduation Criteria. That one decision is the case that was used as the means for implementing the four analytic strategies. What follows are four separate analyses of how that issue was decided.

Analysis of the Data:

In order to assure a systematic analysis of the data from four different points of view, the same format for each of the analytic models was used. Therefore, each of the four sections of data analysis began with a statement of specific propositions. These propositions are logical derivatives from the paradigms that underlay each of the analytic models. That is to say that the analyst, matching the assumptions of the analytic strategies with the case under examination would suggest propositions that would result from the logic of the assumptions in each analytic strategy. The specific propositions were then followed by the operational questions related to that analytic model. Finally, conclusions about the analysis were presented. Those conclusions not only summarize findings about what the analysis yielded, but also discuss the data used and the way it was used. The order in which the four analyses were presented was first Schneier's longitudinal approach, then Allison's Models I, II and III.
The first case analysis prepared was written using Schneier's longitudinal model as the conceptual lens. This analytic strategy was based on the assumption that policy results from a four stage process. Those stages include: issue definition, proposal formulation, support mobilization, and decision enactment. The following analysis was guided by the operational questions which derived from those four stages. The Specific Propositions represent assumptions about the dynamics of the decision process, i.e., about how the four stages, and the issue under consideration, and the participants interacted to make a decision.

Specific Propositions:

1. It is likely that proposals to radically alter the college's educational objectives and graduation criteria would be met with resistance. The nature of the issue definition-proposal formulation stages is to identify a problem and develop a range of alternative solutions. This is achieved through the work of various groups with differing perspectives.

2. Those groups not involved in the issue definition stage will be involved in the proposal formulation stage. There will be unit interest in framing the problem in ways relevant to each unit's mission and goals. Proposal formulation will link the issue from the group perspective to an alternative.

3. Radical policy proposals for educational objectives and graduation requirements will be leveled or made less radical in the support mobilization and enactment stages. Mobilization will serve to bring people aboard, but at a price—a compromise in the proposals to what those being asked to support the proposal can live with. Enactment is the point where consensus and substantive compromise meet and decision is reached. Since the stages are organizational as opposed to unit-related, positions will be isolated and determined during these stages of the process.
Operational Questions:

1. What were the antecedent conditions which created a need for change or re-evaluation of the status quo?

There were two rather discrete sets of conditions; the absence of either would have prevented the issue from emerging. One stream which occurred in 1973 was related to severe conflict over compensation and a resultant restructuring of the governance system. The other was a period of presidentially-induced ferment about the educational process, beginning in late 1969.

In April, 1973, the Faculty was informed by the President that there would be no salary increases for the Faculty in 1973-74. The freshmen class of September would be significantly smaller, and tuition could be increased no further. The Faculty considered unionizing (interview with Hartwick College Faculty members), but a moderate faction persuaded the Faculty to adopt a resolution calling for a Planning Council. According to one of the moderates, had such a step not been taken, "the President would have been ridden out of town on a rail" (Faculty interview). Proposals for a modified governance structure were discussed through the summer and autumn of 1973. "The proposals would have substantially changed the present relationships among the Faculty, the President and the Board" (Rude, 1973).

Thus, the Faculty created a planning body, with a general charge, but little specific work. The council was assigned the duty of conducting a search for the new academic vice president, but quickly turned to the objectives and criteria (Report of Planning Council to the Faculty, 9/11/74).
The Planning Council was established in reaction to fiscal problems the Faculty perceived the college had. It was established to give the Faculty voice in areas where they previously had had little, e.g., admissions and financial planning, and to strengthen their role in educational planning and development (Dean of the College, 1973). The financial concern which triggered the establishment of the group was no part of their discussion during the period 1974-1975.

The other stream of activity, the absence of which would have caused this issue not to arise, was that of educational ferment. Anderson as President worked hard to get the Faculty engaged in an active dialogue about the nature of education. To that end, he brought several luminaries in higher education (Rauschenbush, Hodgkinson, Pitkin, Chickering) to campus. In 1971, at the invitation of Chickering, Hartwick became one of five colleges and universities to join the "Strategies for Change and Knowledge Utilization Project." A research project funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, the Strategies project, as it was known, was designed to examine how a campus used knowledge for the purpose of organizational change (Lindquist, 1978). Anderson appointed a liaison committee to work with Strategies staff members, and they quickly engaged in the search for agenda items and disagreement about what the agenda should be. This was the Committee on Institutional Research (CIR), and much of Lindquist's chapter V is the account of the work of that committee (1978). Lindquist's Strategies for Change (1978) is the publication of research done under the NIMH project; Chapter V. is the case study about Hartwick.
There were three points that are important about this committee, however. First, the group (CIR) was committed to the process of using knowledge to generate change. Second, the group was committed to making change possible; to this end membership was voluntary, and group members served as low profile missionaries about the work of the committee to faculty less inclined to change. Third, the committee felt that clear goals were important for them and the college (Lindquist, 1978).

Another part of this educational ferment stream was Hartwick's participation in the College Center of the Finger Lakes (CCFL). By 1973 faculty from the member campuses (Hartwick, Elmira College and Alfred University) were exploring programs in faculty development—the improvement of teaching, primarily by strengthening the interpersonal skills and sensitivity levels of faculty members who voluntarily participated. Ultimately about half of the faculty participated in this program (report to the Lilly Foundation, 1976). This project was administered through the Office of Institutional Research and the Committee on Institutional Research.

1a. What units or actors were involved in identifying the problem or posing the issue?

Data show that the issue crystallized in the Planning Council. In part, this was caused by the committee's charge: "to propose and review immediate and long range goals, programs and priorities of the College" (Faculty minutes, Dec. 10, 1973). In part the issue crystallized in the council because members felt the need for a clear
goal statement, a need which had developed previously in CIR. In other words, members of the Planning Council had learned from the Strategies Project the importance of stating goals before planning action (Lindquist, 1978).

In June, 1974, Planning Council met, and their agenda included:

- Graduation requirements: There was general agreement that this issue was fundamental to all others and needs attention first.

- The Problem: Fulfilling present graduation requirements and meeting the objectives are not necessarily the same things.

- The task: to develop requirements for graduation which will reflect more adequately the college's objectives.

(Minutes of Planning Council, June 21, 1974)

It was at that point that the issue was identified and took the next eighteen months to be resolved.

Membership on the Planning Council included the President, the Dean, the Chair of the Faculty, two faculty members from each of the three divisions (Humanities, Physical and Life Sciences, and the Social and Behavioral Sciences) and two students. Since committee meetings at Hartwick are open, others came as well. They included the Associate Dean for Student Services. The staff for the committee, i.e., secretary, data preparer, etc., was the Coordinator of Institutional Research.

1b. To what degree was problem formulation phrased to strategically position the issue for action?

The issue was immediately important to the college for at least two reasons. First, the Faculty expected the Planning Council to be
an important hedge against administrative usurpation (interview with faculty member). Second, members of the CIR saw the Planning Council as a vehicle for introducing new ideas. In its first report to the Faculty, Planning Council alluded to specific activities it had undertaken, e.g. Affirmative Action policies and search for a new Academic Vice President and Dean. The majority of the report concentrated on "the establishment of agenda priorities in consideration of immediate and long term goals of the college."

a) One of the conclusions of the Planning Council during its summer meetings is that an immediate and primary task of the college should be to reexamine, reevaluate, revise and/or reaffirm its educational objectives. Since the objectives set forth on page 11 of the College Bulletin have not been reconsidered in the past decade, the task might be recommended for that reason alone. But it is of more immediate concern in the light of the following considerations:

1. We are in process of selecting a Vice President for Educational Affairs who will lead us in quest of our objectives.

2. We are making plans for a program of Faculty development under the terms of the Lilly Foundation grant.

3. We are implementing means of making the freshman year more effective.

Clarity concerning our educational objectives should be of help to us in all of these areas.

The Planning Council also is persuaded that a statement of objectives which is enshrined in the customary fashion in the early pages of a college catalog receives scant attention from the Faculty and students. Therefore, the Council recommends that the educational objectives of the college be included in some specific fashion among the requirements for graduation. In other words, that the alumni of the college be people who have achieved its educational goals.
While the Council has no specific set of requirements to propose, it does recommend that any statement of requirements be brought into line with the most recent statement concerning degree requirements by the Board of Regents and that it express clearly the idea that the students' credits comprise a single liberal arts program which involves both breadth and depth, rather than making distinctions between major and distribution requirements.

b) Other agenda items whose effective consideration is strongly related to the establishment of agreement concerning what shall be educational objectives for the Hartwick College degree:

1. Evaluation of performance (student, faculty and administrative)
2. Freshman year and its use
3. Contract approach to education
4. Educational use of museum and archives
5. Hartwick's relationship to CCFL or other Consortia
6. AV needs
7. Consolidation of approach to performing arts; inclusion of drama and dance as well as music and art
8. Study of enrollment projections with particular attention to problems of financing higher education and development of plans for tapping markets other than 18-21 year olds.

The Council is especially anxious to receive early input from the college community with regard to the above items and requests:

1. Recommendations from other appropriate standing committees of the faculty including Faculty Council, Academic Standards, Faculty Salaries and Budget, etc.
2. Advice and recommendations from informally structured groups of faculty and students and interested individuals of the Hartwick community.

December 13, 1974, has been suggested as a target date for action concerning educational objectives. The Council will maintain effective liaison with the Long Range Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees.

(Report of the Planning Council to the Faculty, Sept. 11, 1974).
The Planning Council did position the issue strategically for action. This was done by relating this issue to others which were current at the time, by relating it to the ambiance of the period, and by establishing a deadline for action—mid-December. By requesting "input" from faculty committees and informal groups, and by relating the issue to an operative philosophy that Anderson, the Strategies Project and CIR had tried to create, the issue was made an all-college affair.

2. What proposals were put forth?

From July, 1974, to April, 1975, many proposals were presented. The proposals were of several types:

1. Educational objectives and graduation requirements
2. Either educational objectives or graduation requirements
3. Modification to earlier proposals
4. Neither proposal objectives nor requirements, but "thoughts on" these items

Some proposals started with objectives and then derived requirements. Others started with requirements and then generated objectives. Some proposals were derived from the data generated by the Institutional Goals Inventories (IGI) which had been administered in the preceding years.

There was little separation of the two issues, Educational Objectives and Graduation Requirements; most saw the issues as interchangeable. Some, therefore, presented only comments or ideas for
graduation requirements while others presented only proposals for
or comments on educational objectives. There were some proposals
that were copies of another institution's statements (e.g. Alverno
College) or were anonymous documents that seemed to relate to the
general issue.

2a. How did the proposals relate to the issue?

The proposed statements of objectives related either to the
statements in the Hartwick College Catalog of 1973 in terms of their
language and direction, or to the goals inventory done in earlier
years. Each proposal was firmly linked to some preceding goal state­
ment.

The proposed statements of graduation criteria followed a similar
pattern. Most contained the operative rules for graduation; that is,
they followed the conventions of semester hours, distribution require­
ments, major requirements, grade point requirements, etc. Some tried
to move away from specific language, except where state regulations
required specificity, e.g. 120 semester hours.

Comments or "thoughts on" the issue tended to be more innovative
or less traditional in their substance. For example, one set of
"questions for discussion" included these:

Peer learning? How facilitate? Obviously, this takes
place all the time, the problem is what is to be learned?
There is no such thing as "unstructured learning." How
do faculty view students? Are expectations too low here?
(from a Faculty member to
Planning Council)

Some tended to include a broader range of substance for considera­
tion under the rubric of educational objectives.
2b. What units or actors made the proposals?

Proposals in varying degrees and varying numbers came from five individuals (three faculty and two administrators) and a subcommittee of Planning Council. The proposals were in varying degrees of specificity. Some people got caught up in writing and amending. For example, one faculty member offered at least six proposals (Professor of History, July, 1974, through May, 1975). Each proposal was slightly different in emphasis and all after the first were acknowledged to have been prepared after discussions with other faculty (interview with faculty). Two other faculty members each presented two proposals (Professor of Religion and Associate Professor of Chemistry). The Coordinator of Institutional Research and the Associate Dean for Off Campus Programs each presented proposals.

Proposals were made to the Planning Council from September, 1974, until February, 1975. The Professor of History, Professor of Religion, the Coordinator of Institutional Research were members of the Planning Council; the Associate Dean for Off Campus Programs was a regular attendee at the meetings. The Associate Professor of Chemistry was the only maker of a proposal who was not directly involved formally or informally with the committee.

2c. How were the proposals related to unit goals and objectives?

The proposals from the two administrators showed a similarity to agenda items under consideration by CIR. Those proposals were concerned with the consistency of objectives to IGI goal data which showed desired goals. They were concerned with other agendas, too, i.e., the
freshman year, the advising system, and alternate routes by which a student could successfully complete requirements.

With the above exception, all other statements of objectives were free of allusion to various unit goals or objectives. There was no evidence to show that unit objectives got in the way of a college-wide statement.

The proposals for graduation criteria, though, were more closely and directly affected by unit goals and objectives. For example, the Teacher Education Committee responded that a guidance department would be useful (minutes, Teacher Education Committee, Nov. 20, 1974). The Individual Student Program Committee responded that "two options" to the degree were adequate (minutes, ISP, undated, 1974). The ISP Committee was arguing that the non-major route to the degree should be retained. Other responses reflected similar parochial approaches.

The most particular of all was the response of the Committee on Academic Standards. The task of the Committee is to determine or judge college academic policy in relation to what students or faculty have done or want to do (Faculty Manual, Hartwick College, 1978). The Committee's concern was that requirements not be made vague or loosened (minutes, Committee on Academic Standards, October 10, 1974).

3. How was support generated for the alternative proposals?

The Planning Council wanted an open process for this decision (interview). Thus, proposals presented to the faculty in September,
1974, were listed as "Samples." The council asked faculty committees to respond with "inputs" (Planning Council, Sept. 11, 1974). In effect the proposal formulation stage and the support mobilization stage overlapped almost completely from September, 1974, to May, 1975, when the Educational Objectives were approved. The Graduation Requirements, finally approved in November, 1975, also experienced overlap between formulation and support stages. What was presented in September, 1974, were proposals that represented an idea rather than a full-blown decision ready to be legitimated. Interviews with Planning Council members indicated that the council had no specific proposals in mind; instead they wanted to better match objectives and graduation requirements, and they wanted a map or blueprint in the form of educational objectives by which they could chart the college's future. The strategy Planning Council employed was to generate support for an idea.

At first proposals were vague and uncertain. All were received over several months. The Planning Council was simply collecting ideas.

There was substantial discussion on campus about the proposed changes. In part the discussion was required because of Planning Council's request to committees. In part the issue was discussed because enough people on campus were involved with it for the level of awareness to be high. This is discussed more fully in the section below. Thus, the proposal that emerged from the proposal/formulation stage was that change be made. The support mobilization stage overlapped in that people were made aware and most brought to consensus
that a change was needed. Specific proposals were generated and received, thereby heightening interest, sparking thought, increasing ownership and involvement. The two stages occurred simultaneously by design it seems.

3a. What units and actors worked at developing support?

The survey data credits President Anderson as being the sustaining force behind this policy change. Thirty-seven out of forty responses claimed that Anderson's support, catalytic behavior, and discussion is what kept the issue alive. Interviews also supported the point that Anderson's interest was central to this issue and usually focussed on it.

The record shows that others played important roles. The Professor of Biology held positions which effectively linked Planning Council to Faculty Council, and as Chair of the Faculty he was viewed as a campus leader. He was first elected Chairman of Planning Council, a post he relinquished after being elected Faculty Chair in September, 1974. But he retained membership on Planning Council and, as Faculty Chair, chaired both Faculty Council and Faculty meetings. He was active in CIR and had been one to be involved in the CCFL faculty development program (interview). The Coordinator of Institutional Research also played a key role. She was the secretary for Planning Council, Faculty Council and CIR. As Coordinator of Institutional Research she was also involved with faculty development. The archival data showed that Faculty Chair and the Coordinator of Institutional Research played
a larger role than was suggested by the survey instrument. Interview data supported the archival data. Thus, it can be deduced that their role was behind-scene involvement.

The center of activity on this issue was the Planning Council. Its strategy was to generate interest by having other committees involved in the process (Planning Council, September 21, 1974). The CIR was also important in keeping the issue active. By 1974-75 the Chair of the Nursing Department chaired the committee, and its numbers had grown; average attendance was twenty (Minutes, CIR, 1974-75). Thus, this committee, too, provided a vehicle for generating support for change.

4. To what degree was the choice made by power and/or influence?

For purposes of this question power is defined as authority to effect an outcome in spite of what others would do if they had the authority (Bobbitt, et. al., 1974, p. 96) Influence is defined as getting others to do something they would not have done without persuasive intervention (Bobbitt, et. al., 1974, p. 130). It also is important to know that this was a two-part policy: that is, one part had to do with a restatement of educational objectives; the second had to do with graduation criteria. The Educational Objectives were approved in April and May, 1975; the Graduation Criteria, in November, 1975.

Power, however, had been used long before the issue ever reached enactment. The proposals emerged from Planning Council in February, 1975, more similar to the past policy than the new idea. For the
objectives, the group with power—which meant votes—modified the working through March and April, 1975. For the graduation criteria, the power was evidenced by the establishment of a Committee on Style in November, 1975. The membership was perceived by those interviewed as very conservative. This group made both substantive and stylistic changes in the requirements.

Powerful people were put in charge of drafting the proposals which were presented in February, 1975. This included a Professor of History and a Professor of Religion. While they were not the center of a conservative coalition, they essentially built the bridge for compromise between the conservative and liberal groups. The conservative coalition was centered around a Professor of Psychology who was opposed to virtually everything, e.g., while voicing no critical comments in Faculty Council, he consistently voted "no" almost every vote, and when asked would not explain why (Lindquist, 1978, p. 108). The conservative block was composed of senior faculty (interviews).

Part of the reason for their power was that those supporting the radical changes had the active support of few countervailing senior faculty. The people supporting change included the President, the acting Dean and some other administrators and junior, often untenured, faculty members.

The President was, in some ways, disinterested in the outcome (although he was a champion of the process). There was also a large
group of faculty members who did not care much about the issue. They believed that the Planning Council was powerless, that this issue was only "talk" and they did not participate actively (interviews). Thus, when it came to a vote, the proponents never had a chance.

4a. How did units and actors work to maintain consensus until the decision was reached?

There was much hard work for consensus in the decision. One Chairman of the Planning Council and member of CIR reported that he argued the case for significant change before many clubs, organizations and faculty departments (interview). There is no evidence that any kind of formal coalition was developed to fight the radical change which the proposals suggested. Yet such a coalition did emerge.

That a coalition grew was due to the work of the history department chair and a professor of religion. Their regular hallway discussion with other faculty served to show the people they talked with that not all were in favor of radical change, and that there were ways to compromise. Once it was demonstrated to a number of faculty that proposals could be modified and that there were others who also wished to modify the proposals, a consensus that supported less radical restatements of educational objectives and graduation criteria emerged. The consensus was reached, without the overt use of power and maintained by the interest of those opposed to radical change. Thus, the consensus was maintained by informal hallway discussion among faculty from various divisions and departments.
Conclusion:

There were several conclusions that were evident from analysis of this case using the strategy based on Schneier's work. The conclusions that could be drawn focussed primarily on the usefulness of the four-stage approach and the kinds of data which were used in analysis of the case.

It appeared as though the stages of proposal formulation and support mobilization as specified by Schneier could be collapsed in this instance. It was difficult to judge whether the activities occurring between September, 1974, and February, 1975, were more characteristic of the proposal formulation or the support mobilization stage. Fundamentally, all that was proposed was a statement that the educational objectives and graduation criteria be changed. There were formally no committee or council proposals; all proposals were generated individually.

With the development of proposed changes by individuals, there was also support for those proposals being generated. Gradually, people were inclined toward either a radical change or a relatively modest change. There never appeared to be a question of whether there would be any change. In a sense, therefore, the decision enactment stage was also collapsed into the proposal formulation stage. What did happen was that as soon as Planning Council announced its agenda, people began to formulate proposals. Thus, the period from September until the following February was a time when several proposals were offered.

Since the proposal formulation stage was encouraging of individual activity with committee examination of proposals, support mobilization
occurred simultaneously. As individuals considered the issue and prepared their proposals, others were consulted and support from them was sought. As the issue was discussed widely enough across campus, a camp emerged for supporters of radical change and another camp emerged for those interested in less change. By February, 1975, those two camps could be clearly identified and the outcome, for an analyst, would have been predictable. Support mobilization occurred simultaneously with proposal formulation.

Issue definition and decision enactment stages were quite clearly defined. The issue definition stage went through the Spring and Summer of 1974. The decision enactment stage occurred in May, 1975, for the statement of Educational Objectives and in November, 1975, for the Graduation Requirements.

The specific propositions for the Schneier paradigm were supported generally.

1. It is likely that proposals to radically alter the college's educational objectives and graduation criteria would be met with resistance. The nature of the issue definition-proposal formulation stages is to identify a problem and develop a range of alternative solutions. This is achieved through the work of various groups with differing perspectives.

Proposition 1 was supported in the first two parts, but not in the last part. Data showed that there was resistance to radical changes in policy, that there was a range of proposals offered, and that they were derived in this case from individuals, not campus committees as had been supposed.

2. Those groups not involved in the issue definition stage will be involved in the proposal formulation stage. There will be unit interest in framing the problem in ways relevant to each unit's mission and goals. Proposal formulations will link the issue from the group perspective to an alternative.
Proposition 2 was supported in two of three parts. Those committees and informal groups which were involved were involved after the issue had been defined in Planning Council. The involvement of those groups occurred in the proposal formulation and mobilization stages. It was found that units did attempt to address the problem in ways that were relevant. For example, the Committee on Academic Standards and the Committee on Individual Student Programs both dealt with the proposals in terms of their own interests and needs. Unit interests, e.g. CAS and CISP, were reflected in the work individuals undertook to write proposals. Those unit interests also were reflected in the growing numbers of people who would not support radical change. No group perspective emerged in a strong enough way to link an issue to an alternative choice.

3. Radical policy proposals for educational objectives and graduation requirements will be leveled or made less radical in the support mobilization and enactment stages. Mobilization will serve to bring people aboard, but at a price—a compromise in the proposals to what those being asked to support the proposal can live with. Enactment is the point where consensus and substantive compromise meet and decision is reached. Since the stages are organizational as opposed to unit-related, positions will be isolated and determined during these stages of the process.

Proposition 3 was confirmed in all parts. It became clear early in the process that radical changes would not be accepted, and therefore it was only a matter of time until a levelling process began. By the time the issue had reached enactment, all radical elements had been withdrawn from the proposals on which the faculty voted. The support mobilization stage did serve as a filtering ground, where people identified with and joined one of two groups supporting the issue from different sides. The price of support was, generally, a change in proposed statements which represented only a modest shift from the policy then in effect. At the conclusion of the process, decision was by faculty vote. Individual attachment to a unit or committee did not play any role in the final vote. Individual faculty positions could be determined.

The data that were most useful in examining the case with the Schneier strategy were:

The interview data, particularly focused group data were useful since the atmosphere of that interview helped people to remember what happened at various times in the process.
Data from Lindquist's Chapter V of *Strategies for Change* were also useful in providing a background and context for this event.

**Analysis B - Allison 1: The Rational Actor**

The second analysis was based on Allison's first analytic model. This strategy for analysis assumed that policy results from the rational actions of a single decision maker. Key variables which support this type of analysis included 1) a definition of rationality, i.e., which action will maximize the chance of achieving some desired outcome; 2) identification of the single or unitary decision maker; 3) explanation of the issue so that a cogent analysis could be given of how the issue affected rationality and the decision maker. The following analysis was guided by the operational questions which Allison suggested an analyst would ask if analyzing an outcome using this analytic strategy (1971, p. 257). The specific propositions represent assumptions about how this decision was reached based on the analytic model of decision as a rational action, found in Allison (1971, pp. 32-35).

**Specific Propositions:**

1. The college would reject those proposed educational objectives and graduation criteria which would create the greatest uncertainty for the college. That is, alternatives posing uncertainty about what the college would do differently compared to what it had been doing would be rejected. Also rejected would be alternatives which would have created uncertainty about the perception the clientele would have about the college.

Thus, the college would reject any alternative which it perceived would position it in a different way, e.g. as an experimental college in the mold of Goddard or Sarah Lawrence.
2. The college would accept those proposed educational objectives and graduation criteria which would serve to clarify perceived unfocussed or conflictful objectives and criteria, but would not alter radically the operations of the college or the perception of the clientele. In other words, the college would seek solutions which kept change as minimal as possible in order not to disrupt operations and to retain a known clientele base.

Thus, the college would seek to refine its statements of educational objectives marginally in order to increase its share of potential clientele.

Operational Questions:

1. What was the problem? Why did Hartwick College restate its educational objectives and graduation criteria?

President Anderson, from early in his tenure, pressed members of the college to examine carefully what they were doing and the reasons for their activities. He asked the Faculty to develop a clear sense of mission and identity. It was important to him that the Faculty reach consensus about what they did; this was, in part, his philosophy, and in part a reaction to the previous president who had given the Faculty little autonomy (interviews).

It was rumored, though never proven, that Anderson wanted to transform Hartwick into an experimental college along the lines of Sarah Lawrence or Goddard (Lindquist, 1978, p. 89). The rumor was supported by the presence of innovators e.g. Esther Rauschenbush, Royce Pitkin, Arthur Chickering, Harold Hodgkinson. It was further bolstered by Hartwick's participation in Chickering's national study, "Strategies for Change and Knowledge Utilization." Many faculty perceived Anderson's thrust to be experimental from the way he presented ideas or asked questions. For those faculty who desired change, his
approach was refreshing; for those whose interests were more traditional, his approach was confusing and threatening (Lindquist, 1978, p. 93).

During the period from 1971-1974 several innovations were explored. For example, there was an attempt to develop an experiment in student evaluation, and a number of projects to collect data about the college and its students were carried out. Administered were the CSQ (College Student Questionnaire), the IGI (Institutional Goals Inventory) and the IFI (Institutional Functioning Inventory). The college became involved in the CCFL (College Center of the Finger Lakes) Faculty Development Program, for which it received substantial funding from a Lilly Foundation grant (1974-77). These activities heightened an awareness in the Faculty that there was much discussion, but little clarity, about the institution's missions and goals.

The CIR, originally the liaison group with people from the Strategies Project, first articulated the problem in the spring of 1974. One of the priorities of the committee was "... considering the difference between goals for the college as they were perceived by different members of the community. In other words, ultimately on what basis do we grant a degree?" (Lindquist, 1978, p. 106). The question continued to be raised in one form or another. The Planning Council, charged in 1973 with establishing goals and priorities for the college, identified lack of direction as a problem. The problem was phrased in at least three ways: 1) the college must know where it is going before it leaves on the journey (Coordinator of Institutional Research); 2) the educational objectives were not necessarily reflected in graduation criteria (Planning Council); and
3) the college had to decide whether it wanted to become experimental (survey).

Other problems also were interjected or related. The class entering in September, 1973, was disappointingly small; its size had precluded pay raises for 1973-74 (Presidential Announcement, March, 1973). Thus, the issue of clientele support for the college was a matter of concern on the campus. The governance structure was changed to include faculty in a planning process, and data was sought on future demographics. In 1974, the Development office was created to try to raise substantial gifts and grants. Finally, the President won approval from the Board to Plan deficit budgets for the college for up to four years, until the development office took hold.

The problem then was fundamental: What kind of college would Hartwick be? What would be its educational objectives? On the one hand, there was enthusiasm for tackling the project. For those enveloped in innovation this was an opportunity. For those aware of the college's position problem vis a vis clientele, this was needed to get the college back on track.

2. What were the alternatives? What proposals were made to restate the educational objectives and graduation criteria?

Essentially, there were two kinds of proposals made. There were proposals that were significantly different from the objectives and graduation requirements as they were in force in the years 1971-75. There were also proposals which were only slightly different from the policy of the early 1970's. What could be termed "radical" proposals were submitted not only by those who were perceived as innovative,
but also by those whose philosophy was different from the status quo, but not necessarily innovative.

Objectives: To examine this section of the data, objectives were studied first, across the range of alternatives. For those who desired major change in the statement of educational objectives, the nature of the change had to do with constructing statements which possessed behavioral qualities. Desired was a way to match graduation requirements (what a student had to do to graduate) with measurable college objectives. That method would help the college to know how well it was doing with its students compared to what it wanted to do.

The most outspoken in this point of view was the Coordinator of Institutional Research, who presented some specific proposals and comments which supported behavioral objectives, as opposed to the vaguely stated objectives which were then in place. For example, in July, 1974, she sent a memo to Planning Council:

But it seems to me that it would be an exciting task to work at specifying behavioral characteristics which reflect acceptable performance in relation to each of the college's objectives. Perhaps these ought not be overly precise, but they might furnish the student with useful clues as to where he needs to concentrate.

During 1974, the college submitted to the New York State Board of Regents the required biennial progress report. In that document the college listed institutional goals of a different order from the catalog statement of objectives that year. The Coordinator of Institutional Research prepared this report, and the statement which follows demonstrates her approach to and interest in the problem.

To promote in students self reliance;
To help students develop problem solving and decision making ability;
To stimulate the desire for and provide the climate conducive to learning;
To encourage the acquisition of evidence and the disciplined and discriminating use of that evidence;
To make each student aware of his uniqueness and the necessity to use his talents for the whole of society;
To make students aware of the content and historical roots of their culture, thus providing a base for understanding other cultures and defining their own identity.


Below is the proposed statement of educational objectives that was presented to the faculty February, 1975. It incorporated some traditional wording, e.g. defining type and characteristics of the college, but added seven items which were to be measurable competencies, testable not only by satisfactory completion of coursework, but by other means as well.

The following would replace the three paragraphs headed "Objectives" on pages 10 and 11 of the 1974-75 catalog.

Hartwick College is a four-year, independent, coeducational, liberal arts college granting the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees to capable students, regardless of age, race, sex, or creed. It provides instruction in, and stresses the relatedness of, the humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, the natural sciences; and emphasizes personal integrity, ethical and spiritual values, and effective and responsible participation in a democratic society.

Hartwick College encourages learning by providing a climate that helps students:

1. To achieve self reliance;

2. To become aware of their individual identities, as well as of their need to participate in society;

3. To develop problem solving and decision making abilities;

4. To make disciplined and discriminating use of evidence;
5. To understand the nature of the world and the content and historical roots of their own culture and others;

6. To acquire depth of knowledge in their areas of specialization;

7. To gain an ability to communicate and apply knowledge, which will enable them to participate effectively in society.

The attainment of these goals is among the objectives of all of the educational activities of the college, both curricular and extra-curricular. They are sought by various means, with varying emphases, and in ways which are appropriate to the individual specializations of the students. Students are encouraged to seek and to achieve those goals for themselves, drawing upon the advice and guidance of members of the faculty and staff for assistance when necessary.

Within the liberal arts tradition certain kinds of learning experiences contribute in special ways to progress toward these goals. Therefore, students are expected to demonstrate, either through courses taken or in other appropriate ways, competencies which involve the structure of language and of ideas, experimental methods, physical performance, historical processes, and creative thought and activity.

Intended was a strategy that would link graduation to fulfillment of mission. If a student graduated then, because of the linkage, the college would have met its objectives. The differences between the catalog statement of 1974-75 and the proposal of February, 1975, are several. (See Table 1.)

The proposed educational objectives suggested some radical alterations. Where previously specific objectives had been stated in certain fields, literature, foreign language, and religion, the proposals made no specific mention of these. Where the proposals advocated self-reliance, problem solving and decision making abilities, the catalog statements said nothing. The college was offered two dichotomous choices, one student oriented, the other tied to disciplinary knowledge.
TABLE 1
Differences Between Catalog Statement, 1974-75
and Proposal, February, 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>CATALOG (1974-75)</th>
<th>PROPOSAL (2/75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (3,4,7)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (2,5,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>yes (G)**</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>yes (G)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>yes (G,D)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>yes (A,B)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Wherever item numbers have been indicated, there was the inference that the item referred to would be included some way in the objective. Items appearing in the February, 1975, proposals were numbered according to the proposal.

**The items from I to O represent the substantive portion of the proposals of February, 1975. The items with a letter show the crossover with the statement of objectives in the 1974-75 catalog.
A second option available to the college was a small shift in the statement of the objectives. Such alternation would recognize the changes that the college had undergone since 1970, but reduce the distance between 1974 statements and what was proposed. As the college reached consensus in April, 1975, that is what happened. In the adopted statement of educational objectives, there was evidence of compromise, blurring of behavioral objectives and the possibility of academic disciplinary requirements. Below find the catalog statements of 1974 and the adopted statements of educational objectives that appeared in the 1975-76 catalog.

Objectives as found on pages 10 and 11 of the 1974-75 catalog:

Hartwick College is a four-year, independent, coeducational, liberal arts college granting the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. It offers an education of sound scholarship to capable students, regardless of race, sex, or creed. The central purpose of Hartwick College is to encourage intellectual excellence. The college provides students with opportunities to acquire a liberal education and competence in a major subject.

Hartwick College emphasizes the inter-relatedness of the humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, and the natural sciences, effective and responsible participation in a democratic society, personal integrity and social responsibility, and ethical and spiritual values.

Accordingly, Hartwick College helps students to develop a command of the English language; an ability to organize, criticize, and express ideas effectively; a familiarity with major literatures and philosophies of the world; a recognition of the importance of foreign languages and cultures; an appreciative understanding of the creative arts and self expression through them; a knowledge of religions; a comprehension of the methods of sciences and mathematics and a knowledge of the natural world; a knowledge of man, his past and present behavior and social organizations.
Educational Objectives (adopted April, 1975)

The following statement of educational objectives has been adopted by the Hartwick College Faculty and approved by the Board of Trustees:

Hartwick College is a four-year, independent, coeducational liberal arts college, which accepts students as candidates for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees, regardless of age, race, sex or creed. It provides instruction in and stresses the relatedness of the humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, and the natural sciences; it emphasizes intellectual excellence, ethical values, and effective and responsible participation in a democratic society.

Hartwick provides opportunities for students:

1. To expand their awareness of the world by exposure to the intellectual perspectives of a variety of disciplines and to the content and historical roots of their own and other cultures;

2. To acquire depth of knowledge in one or more areas of specialization;

3. To learn the disciplined and discriminating use of evidence in making decisions and solving problems;

4. To gain an appreciation of creative processes in the arts and sciences and to develop their own creative abilities and give expression to them;

5. To achieve self reliance and to develop their personal style, values and beliefs, in a manner consistent with becoming responsible and productive individuals.

These goals are among the objectives of all of the educational activities of the college, both curricular and extracurricular. They are sought by various means with varying emphases, and in ways which are appropriate to the individual specializations of the students. The faculty and staff of Hartwick College assist the student in identifying and achieving these goals through instruction, advice, guidance and example.

The statements of objectives which were adopted in April, 1975, combined some of the statements of the proposal, e.g. use of evidence
with decision making and problem solving. Similarly, self reliance was coupled with responsibility. A "variety of disciplines" allowed for the inclusion of religion, literature and foreign language, compared to their apparent exclusion in the proposal.

Thus what emerged was a compromise. The proposal of 1975 was weakened or ignored in order to accommodate more traditional possibilities. If the proposals were characterized as student oriented and the 1974–75 policy statements were characterized as traditionally oriented, then the outcome represented a continuation of the traditional approach modified to demonstrate how that approach served the interests of students.

Graduation Criteria: The decision was of two parts. The first dealt with the statement of Educational Objectives; the second dealt with the vehicle for achievement of objectives—the Graduation Criteria, or requirements for graduation.

The variety of alternatives proposed for graduation criteria was much broader than the alternatives for objectives. Nonetheless, the proposals were either substantially different from the 1974 requirements, or minor modifications thereof. The only common features of all proposals were the 120 semester hour requirements, the absence of which would have jeopardized the New York State Charter; and the completion of a major. One proposal had no distribution requirements (Associate Dean for Off-Campus Programs).

A second proposal required study in history, the natural environment and human communities (Professor of Religion). A third required
that thirty semester hours be required in at least six of seventeen fields, including philosophy, literature, religion, biological sciences, physical sciences, mathematics, psychology, sociology, economics, political science, history, art, music, physical education, interdisciplinary studies (Professor of History).

So far as other competencies were concerned, the Professor of Religion proposed that a student be able to "organize, criticize and communicate ideas, solve problems effectively and engage in creative self expression." The Professor of History proposed "participation in some extra-curricular activity of the college." Both of those professors proposed a senior project. The full proposals are found in Appendix E.

As with the statement of objectives, there was a choice of alternatives offered to the faculty in the graduation requirements. And, as with the objectives, the decision was to move less far from the 1974-75 requirements than had been proposed. The three proposals from the Professors of History and Religion and the Associate Dean for Off-Campus Programs were melded into the proposal the faculty received in April, 1975. But even the final proposal that went to the floor of the faculty contained "competence" and was different in style and substance from the rules in effect in 1974-75. The graduation requirements that were adopted in November, 1975, did not contain much of that language. The 1974 catalog requirements, the proposed requirements and the adopted requirements are found in order below.
Degree Requirements, pages 38, 39 of the 1974-1975 Catalog:

General Requirements for All Degrees:

Successful completion of a minimum of 120 semester credits, excluding physical education and performance music credits generally in excess of 16 credits.

A minimum grade point average of 2.0 in credits offered for graduation.

Successful completion of four semester credits of physical education.

Completion of the senior year as a full time, matriculated Hartwick College student. Seniors in approved programs for which full experience off campus is required or deemed desirable are considered to be in residence. Examples are nursing and medical technology students in approved, accredited hospital laboratories, students pursuing independent study off campus or study at another college or university as a part of their programs approved by the Committee on Individual Student Programs, students in Hartwick language study abroad programs and students in approved Visiting Student Programs.

Seniors who do not fall within any of the categories above and who wish to be excused from the residency requirements may request waiver from the Committee on Academic Standards.

Completion of the Undergraduate Record Examination Area Test.

Successful completion of an approved program of study.

a. A student may satisfy this requirement by successfully completing a program which he has developed with the approval of the Committee on Individual Student Programs.

b. A student may satisfy this requirement by successfully completing a departmental or interdepartmental major area of concentration and at least thirty semester credits (exclusive of physical education and applied music) outside of the division in which he is pursuing his major. Of the thirty credits, nine must be in each of the divisions outside of the major division; six must be in interdisciplinary courses; and six in courses of the student's choice. A transfer
student entering Hartwick in January or later of his freshman year must complete three credits of interdisciplinary study; a student entering Hartwick College in January of his sophomore year or later is not required to complete any interdisciplinary study. The requirement of completing at least thirty semester credits outside of the division in which he is pursuing his major must still be satisfied.

c. At least 24 semester credits in the major area of concentration must be of C grade or better. The overall average in one's major area of concentration must be at least 2.0. In addition to his major area of concentration, a student may take a minor, if he so desires, by completing a program of at least 21 credits in the minor area approved by the appropriate department. The student must have a minor advisor. If he completes his minor program with a grade point average of 2.0 or better, the minor will be recorded on the student's transcript along with his major.

Proposed Degree Requirements, April, 1975:

The following would replace the section on pages 38, 39 of the Catalog:

General Requirements for all degrees:

1. Successful completion of a minimum of 120 semester credits or their equivalent, of which a minimum of 30 credits shall be taken outside of the division in which the student has his primary area of concentration. (Generally performance music credits beyond 16 credits and physical education credits other than those for coaching competency courses do not count toward this requirement.)

2. A minimum grade point average of 2.0 in credits offered for graduation.

3. Completion of the senior year as a full time, matriculated Hartwick student.

4. Planning and successful completion (in consultation with the members of an academic department or of an individual advisory committee) of an approved program of studies in which the student shall:
a. demonstrate to his department or advisory committee
the mastery of the skills required for his speciali-
zation, the ability to communicate effectively about
his field, and an awareness of the relationships
between his field and other areas of scholarship
and life;

b. Complete during his final year (either individually
or in cooperation with others--students or faculty)
a project of research, scholarly investigation,
pre-professional experience or artistic achievement;

c. Satisfactorily demonstrate to his department or
committee either through courses taken or in other
appropriate ways, an acceptable level of competence
in each of the following areas:

1. The structure of language and ideas;
2. Experimental methods;
3. Physical performance;
4. Historical processes;
5. Creative thought and activity.

The following examples without being exhaustive,
illustrate the content of these areas:

1. Grammar, logic, math, etc.;
2. Laboratory science, field studies, similar
investigations;
3. Performing arts, physical education, etc.;
4. Political, literary, religious and other
kinds of history;
5. Creativity in research, literature, philo-
sophy, etc.

Approved and adopted by the Faculty, November, 1975:

In an approved program a student must:

1. Successfully complete the equivalent of four academic years
of full-time study, with the final 30 credits completed as
a matriculated Hartwick student, and with a minimum grade
point average of 2.0 in courses offered for graduation.
The standard course load at Hartwick is 30 credit units per
academic year and the successful completion of a minimum of
120 credits, including at least 60 credits earned at Hart-
wick, is required for graduation. (Performance music credits
beyond 15 credits and physical education credits do not count
toward this requirement.)
2. a. Fulfill either:

(1) The provisions of a program approved by the Committee on Individual Student Programs, or

(2) The requirements of a departmental (or interdepartmental) major program which will include the completion of 30 credits (exclusive of physical education) outside of the division in which the student's work is primarily concentrated, with at least nine of these credits in each of the other divisions; and the completion of three credits in physical education.

b. Earn a grade of C or better in a minimum of 80% of the credits in the area of specialization, and an overall average of at least 2.0 in the area of specialization.

c. Complete in the final year a project (amounting to no more than 9 credits) of research, artistic achievement, or pre-professional experience; or in some way demonstrate to the major department or the Committee on Individual Student Programs ability to do mature work in the area of specialization.

3. Demonstrate to the satisfaction of the appropriate department or the Committee on Individual Student Programs:

a. Mastery of the skills needed for the area of specialization, ability to communicate effectively about the field, and awareness of the relationships between the field and other areas of scholarship and life.

b. Ability to reason soundly and test hypotheses empirically.

c. Ability to acquire knowledge through the use of resources such as libraries and museums and apply that knowledge in solving problems.

d. Appreciation of some of the major achievements, past and present, in the arts and sciences.

**Difference between Proposals and Approved Policy:**

The differences between the proposals offered in April, 1975, and the graduation requirements adopted in November, 1975, were primarily
matters of form. The adopted policy required specified numbers of courses in the three academic divisions, i.e., 9 hours each in the two divisions outside the division of the major department, and 12 more hours in either or both of those divisions, or in interdisciplinary or non-departmental study. The proposal, while it also required 30 hours outside the division of the major department, was quite a bit more flexible than the adopted policy. Not only was there no specification in terms of courses required per division, but the proposals made it possible to demonstrate knowledge of such material not only in course work, but in other unspecified ways. An interviewer indicated that the approved policy was adopted because the faculty preferred to have competence demonstrated by course work and preferred minimal specifications for all areas, humanities, natural sciences and social sciences.

Another difference between adopted policy and proposal was the minimum grade point average in major which was not proposed but was moved in Faculty meeting and adopted. The proposals required only a 2.0 average overall to graduate. The adopted policy retained a minimum average requirement that had been present in the 1974-75 statements.

Differences between 1974-75 Policy and the Policy adopted in November, 1975:

The comparison between the old and new policy was also noteworthy. The distribution requirement was transferred from old to new almost intact. The only change was elimination of a mandatory interdisciplinary course requirement. The new policy paid less attention to the
specifics of the senior year and to the specifics of transfer credit. The old statements reflected changes that had been made in the preceding decade concerning transfer students and senior standing, and the relative emphasis on what, by 1975, was standard practice seemed unnecessary (interview).

A change that was made was a subtle change in the policy concerning minimum performance in the major area of concentration. The new policy required "80% of the credits in the area of specialization" to be "at the grade of C or better." The old policy required "at least 24 semester credits in the major area of concentration must be of C grade or better." The overall average in one's major area of concentration had to be at least 2.0 in the old and new policies. The 80 per cent rule was a slightly tougher standard. Most majors required 30-36 semester credits. The significance of the change was to move the minimum number of C courses from 8 to some other number, depending on the number of courses in a major curriculum. There was never given any guidance to the Registrar concerning rounding; consequently, students that fell .2 of a course short did not graduate (Registrar).

For both statements of objectives and graduation criteria, the college had a range of alternatives proposed. In the case of both statements, there was exploration into changes that would have affected the institution significantly. In both cases, however, the final versions were only slightly different from the previous policy in substance. For those most interested in change, it seemed as though
the approved versions were changes of little note or were reactionary (interviews). The next two research questions examine some of the possible reasons for this phenomenon.

3. What were the strategic costs and benefits of each alternative?

The choices available to the college were presented for discussion among the on-campus constituencies (faculty, administrators, and students) in various forums. No doubt that it was in those forums that modifications of ideas and proposals were discussed and shaped, though not in terms of strategic consequences (interviews). Two kinds of consequences were possible in this decision: internal consequences, to faculty and students; and external consequences, including change in quantity and quality of potential clientele and other potential support. Internal consequences could have had an impact ultimately on the environment by affecting ultimately the perceptions of potential clientele.

Internal consequences of adopting the original Proposals: It was the perception of those interviewed that adoption of the original proposals would have meant a significant change in the educational activities of the college. For some this would have been perceived as a benefit; for others it would have been less than beneficial. The changes proposed were viewed by proponents as an opportunity to make college more active and make the student more responsible for his or her own education. A partnership was envisioned between teacher and learner. The proposals would have helped to foster this environment, in the eyes of
the proponents. Course syllabi would have been changed, teaching styles would have changed, and serious consideration of disciplinary linkages would have been required, according to those interviewed.

These perceived benefits would have been offset by disruptions that some predicted, if the proposals were adopted. For those faculty who perceived that they were to teach "subject matter, not students" (Lindquist, 1978) the shift in teaching styles would have been difficult at best. Hodgkinson noted that the teaching—learning settings at Hartwick were traditional, a change in that would have had unknown consequences (Lindquist, 1978, p. 101).

A change in requirements as proposed would no doubt have created a change in enrollment patterns within departments and divisions. For example, it could be assumed that the elimination of distribution requirements would have meant reductions in enrollment in the humanities division and in the natural science division (Coordinator of Institutional Research). This, of course, would have caused disruptions to the class schedules and created an imbalance in supply of some parts of the curriculum relative to demand. The imbalance would have created conflict and dysfunction in the faculty and the student body.

It is possible that attrition could have increased had the proposals been adopted. Such an increase would have been caused by an inadequate number of desired courses for the demand. Also an increase in attrition could have resulted from students leaving for another college with more structure and therefore less individual responsibility. It was uncertain what number of students wanted to become "self-reliant." (interview). The character of the student body
had not changed to the degree that assumptions could be safely made that the student body would embrace the proposals and stay at Hartwick (Professor of History).

Also, it was possible that adoption of the proposals would have created heavy demand for more resources in some academic departments. The magnitude of change contemplated could well have created a demand for equipment and supplies that would have further disrupted a budget that was in 1975-76 out of balance by over 100,000 dollars (Annual Report, Hartwick College, 1976) and got worse over the next two years.

Finally, it was possible that the adoption of the proposals would have led to open revolt on the part of conservative, traditionally-oriented faculty who were not eager for change. Interview data suggested that had the faculty committed to what others perceived as radical change successfully pressed the issue, there would have been "blood." Potential for conflict was high and appeared to be of very high cost if the conflict materialized.

External consequences of adopting the original proposals: Three kinds of consequences would be predicted from the adoption of the proposals:
1) the clientele would change in nature and be substantially different than hitherto; 2) the nature of faculty recruited would change and be more characteristic of an experimental college; 3) sources of potential support would change. No systematic examination of the positive or negative potential affects of any of the alternatives was made. In fact, the class which entered in 1973 was small and its size, in part, was one
of the underlying causes of the discussion. 1) In other words, there was an awareness that the college had to respond to its environment (interview). 2) No data exists concerning any change in the characteristics of faculty hired. 3) Finally, a development office was created in 1974-75. The Vice President of Development claimed never to be sure of college direction and was concerned about funding sources if the college did become perceived as experimental (interview).

4. What were the observed patterns of values and norms?

The college was significantly different in 1974 than it had been five years earlier. This was due primarily to President Anderson's belief that a college faculty should participate in making educational decisions and continually examine educational goals and priorities. His speeches, his meetings, his announcements at faculty meetings served to raise questions about what was important and what was occurring in higher education on a national level. His visitors to campus also made the Faculty aware of national trends and interests and opened a dialogue that made change if not acceptable, at least able to be discussed (interview).

Anderson's strategy set up two patterns. One pattern was an emergent interest in baccalaureate education using methods not previously used on campus. There was interest in defining goals, in challenging students in personal growth issues as well as academics, and in discovering new ways to do these things. The other pattern was one of
strengthening the faculty governance structure. The leadership in the faculty became committed to involving all the faculty committees in the structure. Full discussion of an issue meant not only committee discussion, but substantial informal discussion among colleagues. The Planning Council was the result of a failed "Collegium" idea that would have created a collegial governance structure. The President favored the collegium, but it did not carry.

One other example points out the two patterns well. In 1974 the Institutional Goals Inventory was administered on campus. In 1974 the faculty administrators felt that "community" was the most important goal to be attained. Table Two shows how the goal priorities were listed in the various constituencies. The table also shows that students most desired "personal development" as the primary goal toward which the college should have aspired. After "community" the Faculty aspired to have an intellectual-aesthetic environment.

"Community" was defined as:

...maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty and administrators.

Intellectual-Aesthetic environment--means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

In one sense, Anderson had, by 1974, turned the college's attention to goals of collegiality and a challenging environment. It was
Table 2

ORDERS OF SIGNIFICANT GOAL PRIORITIES* FOR TOTAL GROUP AND FIVE SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and Goal Area</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Trustees</th>
<th>Alumni &amp; Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual personal development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intellectual orientation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual/aesthetic environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Short-, medium-, long-range planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reading, writing, math competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reputable standing in academic world</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.) Democratic governance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11.) Broad extra-curricular program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.5) Consensus about goals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.) Vocational preparation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.) Freedom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* relative degree of effort needed to move from "Is" to "Should Be"

( ) = not a significant priority for Total Group

(Office of Institutional Research, March, 1974)
interesting to note that student priorities for self development did not rank high on the faculty list. Yet those developmental priorities were concerns of such groups as CIR and those individuals associated with the CCFL faculty development program.

In the end those norms of community—the willingness to let all participate assured that the college would not accept what a majority of its faculty thought of as radical movement away from traditional liberal education.

**Conclusions:**

A striking conclusion about Model I analysis in this context is that the logic of the analytic strategy leads one to focus on the substance or content of the issue. This focus was due to the nature of the questions the analyst would ask using the tenets of Model I. The qualifications of the setting, i.e., a college based decision situation rather than an international relations problem, also contributed to the focus being directed toward the problem substance. In another setting where two organizations or two parties are involved, the focus must shift to the actions each party would take, and the explanation of those actions. But in this case, with a second organization not involved, analysis tends to focus on the alternatives and their substance to a greater extent than would be the case were the analyst required to examine policy alternatives of more than one organization as the two organizations interacted.
The changes that resulted from over a year of discussion were minor. The changes which had the effect of changing requirements for students were three: The addition of a senior thesis or senior project; the modification in minimum standards for performance in the major area of concentration; and the deletion of the interdisciplinary study requirement. What had been intended by those who originally proposed the changes was a change which would have had the effect of using the graduation requirements as the test for whether the college was achieving its educational objectives.

The changes in the educational objectives were in appearance editorial, that is, they were essentially restated as if they were measurable goals. The substantive difference was that personal development, as it appeared in the IGI summary, became a part of the Educational Objectives Statement in a more direct way. In the 1974-75 policy, the College took responsibility for providing information and help to students. In the policy adopted in 1975 there was a shift in wording to emphasize that students were to be responsible for a variety of things. The original theory was that if a student had met graduation requirements (as proposed rather than adopted), then the college would have achieved the objectives it set for its students.

Specific propositions for this model were supported.

1. The college would reject those proposed educational objectives and graduation criteria which would create the greatest uncertainty for the college. That is, alternatives posing uncertainty about what the college would do differently compared to what it had been doing would be rejected. Also rejected would be alternatives which would have created uncertainty about the perception the clientele would have about the college.
Thus, the college would reject any alternative which it perceived would position it in a different way, e.g., as an experimental college in the mold of Goddard or Sarah Lawrence.

The college did reject all radical changes, changes that would move it away from what it had been doing. It also refined its policy statements to more accurately reflect what it was doing at that time. Unconfirmed, however, were those aspects of the specific propositions which had to do with the reasons for the changes. No interview data or any other data supported the proposition that the traditional versus experimental college dichotomy was clear cut. It was not clear to people that those were the only two choices; thus, that part of the first proposition was flawed. While there was concern expressed that the President wished to make Hartwick an experimental college, this was not a consideration in discussion surrounding this issue. Rather, the experimentalism that was perceived had appeared at the beginning of Anderson's tenure, and apparently only a myth continued to 1975; it was that myth which led to the formulation of that portion of the first proposition.

2. The college would accept those proposed educational objectives and graduation criteria which would serve to clarify perceived unfocussed or conflictful objectives and criteria, but would not alter radically the operations of the college or the perception of the clientele. In other words, the college would seek solutions which kept change as minimal as possible in order not to disrupt operations and to retain a known clientele base.

The second proposition represented overstatement similar to that in the preceding proposition, but for a different reason. The part of the proposition dealing with refinement was confirmed by the data. In fact, the adopted Educational Objectives did reflect a changed perception the college had of its mission. The second part of the proposition was written to acknowledge the college as a rational actor operating in a dynamic environment where it would compete for students. That portion of the proposition was intended to parallel Allison's notion of an interactive rational actor. In fact, there was no interest expressed by anyone interviewed or gleaned from any of the survey data which showed the least bit of interest in potential clientele on the part of those involved in the decision.

The data that were most useful for this analysis were:

Archival data, particularly the records of proposals for policy change and the proposals that were formally presented to the faculty.

Interview data were useful in discovering the meanings and intentions behind some of what was proposed.
Lindquist's (1978) record of Hartwick's involvement in the Strategies Project was also of considerable help in putting the issue into a milieu that was unique to the college at that time (1970-75).

**Analysis C - Allison II: Organizational Processes**

The basis for the third analysis was Allison's second analytic model. The logic of the analysis rested on the assumption in Allison's model that policy results from the effect which routines, standard operating procedures, and goals of the units that comprise the organization have on the processes of decision. The operational questions which served to guide this analysis were those which Allison suggested an analyst using an organizational process approach would ask (1971, p. 257). The specific propositions represent assumptions about how the decision was reached based on Model II (Allison, 1971, pp. 78-96).

**Specific Propositions:**

1. Any policy outcome is less dependent on proposal quality or external factors than it is on organizational variables within the college. Those variables include organizational structure, patterns of interaction within the structure, and the degree of diversity in approach to the activities of various organizational units. A policy outcome will not be chosen from a wide array of options.

2. A policy outcome will require approval of the important policy making bodies. The proposed policy will be amended until it can be accepted by the unit with the most influence, and will, in its approved form, differ only slightly from the previous policy. Thus, the new policy will not require organizational units to vary their activities to any significant degree.

The operational questions related to this model focus on two factors: the units which comprise the structure of the organization, and the ways those units have for examining and implementing possible change. The first two questions deal with issues of structure; the
last three deal with repertoire, programs and standard operating procedures for a) providing information, b) generating alternatives, and c) implementing alternatives.

1. **What units exist within the college?**

In the analysis of an international event, this question is directed at governmental agencies which are more numerous and more complex in their missions and functions than are the units in a small, liberal arts college, the focus of this study. Obviously, there exists in a college an administrative structure, including the offices of the President, the Academic Vice President and the Vice President of Finance and Development. There also exists at Hartwick the Faculty, which according to the by-laws, reports to the President. Administratively, the Faculty consists of sixteen academic departments and physical education. For purposes of governance the Faculty is divided into three divisions, Humanities, Physical and Life Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. Faculty members in physical education and the library may vote in the division of their choice (Hartwick College, Faculty Manual, 1978).

The Faculty also organized its work in several committees. In 1974, these committees included the following major and minor committees (Hartwick College Committees, September, 1974, Office of the Dean).
Table 3
The Major and Minor Committees, Hartwick College, 1974-75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR COMMITTEES</th>
<th>MINOR COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td>Committee on Academic Standards*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Council*</td>
<td>Committee on Admissions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>Financial Aids*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee on Faculty Salary and Budget</td>
<td>Committee on Athletics*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Convocations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Individual Student Programs (ISP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Interdisciplinary and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Departmental Curricula (COIN)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Library*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Student Affairs*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*students were selected to serve on these committees.

The major committees were defined as those dealing with policy matters of general importance to the college, whether academic, personnel or financial. These committees met regularly and at some level dealt with institutional policy. The minor committees were issue specific, i.e. constrained by their charges to deal with certain, defined issues. Most are self explanatory; some are not. For example, the Committee on Committees is charged with creating slates to guide the Faculty in selecting committee memberships each year.

The President and Dean were ex officio members of all standing committees. Other administrative personnel attended, and generally served as staff to other committees. The Associate Dean for Off-Campus Programs attended ISP meetings and served as head advisor for students who chose the ISP. The Director of Athletics and the Associate Dean for Student Services worked with the Athletic Committee and the Student Affairs Committee, respectively.
A committee which was extant in 1974, but not a part of the governance system formally was the Committee on Institutional Research. This committee was the liaison with the Strategies Project and by 1974 was composed of faculty, students and administrators who had been caught up in the change process. This committee served as the umbrella group for several issues, including the use of information, e.g. what to do with Institutional Goal Inventory and Institutional Functioning Inventory data; student issues, e.g. the advising system; faculty teaching issues, e.g. CCFL Faculty Development Program (Summary of Activities of Committee on Institutional Research, June, 1975).

The other notable point about the structure in 1974-75 was that the Planning Council was newly constituted. That committee resulted from the serious conflict over faculty salaries in the spring of 1973 and had only begun functioning in March, 1974. By September, 1974, the group had met several times and had established an agenda for itself. Nonetheless, survey data showed it was not then considered a part of the standard governance system since it had done nothing and was an uncertainty to the faculty.

In 1974-75 the administrative structure of the college consisted of three Vice Presidents reporting to the President. These included the Academic Vice President and the Vice Presidents for Development and for Financial Affairs. Also reporting to the President was the Office of Institutional Research. For the issue of educational objectives and graduation criteria the administrative office most affected was that of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College.
Reporting to this office were:

The Associate Dean for Special Programs  
The Associate Dean for Student Services  
The Director of Admissions  
The Academic Department Chairs, including Athletics and Library  
The Registrar

Appendix E provides the organizational chart for 1974-75.

2. What units traditionally act on a problem of this sort and with what relative influence?

On issues of this sort, the college previously had appointed special task forces or committees. In 1963 when the 3-3 calendar was proposed and adopted, a special committee was created (interview). This was also true for other policy issues, e.g. Pine Lake, advising and the study of the December Term (interview). After the special committee or task force reported, the faculty, chaired by the Dean, would approve or legitimate the recommendation, with amendments. Traditionally, then, units acting on a problem of this sort would include the faculty and a special committee.

For this decision, however, the pattern was different. First of all, survey data showed that faculty believed that three committees (CIR, Faculty Council and Planning Council) identified the issue. Archival and interview data showed that the issue arose in CIR informally and was also considered formally in Planning Council, where the issue emerged formally. The Faculty Council was delegated the issue in order to manage it on the floor of the Faculty. The Faculty Council did this to perform its duty; this Council had no brief for the issue (interviews). The single body that usually dealt with problems
of this type was the Faculty; the committees of the faculty had not before been involved in policy making of this type.

The offices of the President and the Dean were not large in terms of staff support. Since each of the Associate Deans had their own functional areas of responsibility, the Dean was essentially without staff. Because these units, in this setting, were more attuned to individuality than departmental functioning, they were considered in the Model III analysis.

The Faculty:

The unit that was most involved at the conclusion of the process was the Faculty. The by-laws of the college provide for Faculty control of the curriculum; this issue was clearly related to curriculum. The meetings of the Faculty were run according to Robert's Rules and modifications thereto, to which the Faculty agreed. Through late 1974 Faculty meetings were chaired by the Dean; in January, 1975, the Chairman of the Faculty (newly elected) took over that task. In April, 1975, when the Statement of Objectives were passed, the work was done on the floor of the Faculty through the parliamentary techniques of motions and amendments (Faculty Meeting Minutes, April-May, 1975).

However, when five faculty meetings in September and October, 1975, which were given over almost entirely to discussions of graduation criteria failed to bring the issue to closure, the Faculty turned the matter over to an ad hoc Committee on Style (October 6, 1975). In principle, the committee was to reconstruct in stylistic English the substance to which the Faculty agreed. Up to and during the autumn the faculty process had been one of parliamentary debate. There was no question
among respondents to the survey or among those interviewed, to this researcher who observed in October and November, 1975, that the role of the Faculty was most influential.

The second part of this operational question asks the relative influence each unit has in decisions of this type. Influence was defined as the ability to convince another to do something that otherwise would not have been done, even though the convincer did not have authority (Bobbitt, 1974, p. 130). Table 4 shows those units that were perceived as influential and the degree to which they were such. For the purpose of this table, the Faculty was considered a unit.

Table 4
Hartwick College Committees and Their Relative Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEES</th>
<th>INFLUENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Council</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments, Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salary and Budget</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Financial Aids</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Committees</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convocations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Students Program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and Non Departmental</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While Faculty perceived that the committees were involved as reported above, and the records show that committees were invited to respond to the proposals, the records also show a slightly different pattern of participation. That pattern will be discussed in the remaining three operational questions for this model.

3. **What repertoires, programs and Standard Operating Procedures do these units have for making information available at various decision points?**

The complexity in a small college is different from a federal government. While units within a small college have parochial interests, e.g., disciplinary considerations, other factors, such as technology, are fairly uniform. Information was passed by memoranda, reports, speeches, committee meetings, campus newspaper and word of mouth. It was mentioned in several interviews that there was more careful attention to the process of information sharing than was customary. Most of those interviewed felt this was a reaction of the Faculty to their perception that the President had kept financial information from them the preceding year. Not only was the Faculty reacting to that issue, but it was also testing the notion of "community" that had been identified in the IGI data as an aspiration. Thus, the mode of behavior for the Faculty at that time was to share information.

Information in this case constituted the messages that the Planning Council and other committees transmitted during the issue.
In September, 1974, the Planning Council distributed to the Faculty a summary of its previous activities, including a statement which indicated that educational objectives and graduation criteria were paramount issues on their agenda. The group called for responses to "sample statements" included in its report. The written responses came from the following committees from early October through December:

- Faculty Council
- Appointments, Tenure and Promotion
- Academic Standards
- Admissions and Financial Aids
- Athletics
- Convocations
- Individual Student Programs
- Interdisciplinary and Non Departmental Curricula
- Library
- Teacher Education
- CIR
- Student Services Staff

The information sharing that occurred in these communications served the purpose of 1) offering various positions in principle, 2) offering technical reactions, and 3) relating the proposed ideas to the work of the responding committee. For example, Faculty Council and ATP responses were of the first order; each response added ideas or pointed to various concepts in the proposals and developed those points further. The Academic Standards Committee responded with technical concerns about implementation and about constraints on the college due to state education requirements. The Athletic Committee, the Convocation Committee and the Admissions Committee each indicated that new statements would be acceptable, since the committees had little to do
with such things. These committees also explained how their actions were supportive of the proposed changes.

The second part of this question deals with decision points. For those interviewed one of the frustrations was that there were no formal decision points. Discussion in committee, especially Planning Council, seemed interminable. Planning Council originally decided "to do the groundwork." Initial proposals were drawn and discussed from September, 1974, through February 1975. The Faculty took the issue in late February, and the first decision on educational objectives was reached in April. Graduation criteria were decided upon in November, 1975. There was no schedule of decision points, with the exception of requested responses by October, 1974, to Planning Council's original proposal of September. Archival data showed that the various committees responded in a timely way. What was evident in the minutes of the Planning Council was the number of proposals (21) that were drafted and discussed before a proposal which received Council consensus was presented to the Faculty through the Faculty Council. It was this process of refinement which occurred within the committee structure and which contributed to the delayed decision.

4. **What repertoires, programs and Standard Operating Procedures do units have for generating alternatives about problems of this sort?**

Data from this study showed that discrete alternatives were not generated. This was due to several factors. First, the committees were requested to provide responses or "inputs." The issue was not theirs,
but Planning Council's. Data showed that while most committees did respond, the nature of their response was passive, in the ways mentioned above.

The only unit that developed alternate proposals was the subcommittee of Planning Council so charged. This subcommittee presented at least three different proposals, each a small modification of the one before. These alternatives were modified from the samples of September, 1974, in language and in substance. The members of the subcommittee reported that modification occurred as they received responses from other committees, but more importantly, as they spoke with colleagues around campus and not necessarily those on Planning Council.

There were two points worth noting. The committee responses and personal contact tended to constrain the proposer's latitude and the proposals were thereby more likely to win consensus. Secondly, because no formal proposals were presented until February, 1975, alternatives were considered, but as suggested modifications rather than as different substantive proposals. This process of refinement occurred from September through actual approval in May and November, 1975.

Thus, the alternative statements of the idea for change were enough a part of the discussion that Planning Council lowered expectations for radical change and prepared itself to accept what the Faculty would accept.

The degree to which members of the Planning Council were committed to adopting a policy which would have had the graduation criteria as the evaluation instrument for the college's educational objectives
was strong, particularly for the Biology Professor and the Coordinator of Institutional Research (interviews). The time taken to refine proposals also served to prepare them and others for the realization that such change was not readily acceptable. The process of generating alternatives offered an opportunity for compromise so that a variety of opinions could be melded into the final policy and consensus could be achieved.

5. What repertoires, programs and Standard Operating Procedures do units have for implementing alternative courses of action?

This question is one which implicitly contrasts the second model with the first, and the contrast was clearly evident in this case. Model I assumed unitary singular action by the college. The Planning Council also assumed that the college, i.e., the Faculty, would take action as one. Those interviewed expressed belief that by deciding on college objectives, i.e., educational objectives and graduation criteria, the college could then proceed with future activity. Those interviewed assumed that the changes would be implemented on a college-wide basis, since the whole community had been involved in the process and had presumably made the goals and objectives their own. As such, implementation was only the concern of the Registrar and the Academic Standards Committee. Only in this context was the matter mentioned.

In fact, graduation at Hartwick was, and continues to be, a departmental matter. Each department certifies that its majors have satisfied
all requirements and are therefore recommended to the Faculty for graduation. The Registrar is the academic accountant. As executive secretary for the Academic Standards Committee, the Registrar advises that group on policy and prepares recommendations for continuance of students on probation (according to policy) and for students who have appeals on other academic matters (Registrar's Policy Book).

Several aspects of the proposed graduation criteria were of concern to the Registrar from the perspective of future implementation. There was concern about the proposal to do away with the physical education requirement. In his judgment state regulations required no fewer than three courses in physical education. (This was subsequently approved.) He requested that no groups other than those that were authorized be allowed to recommend a student for graduation. (His request was subsequently heeded.) He criticized any wording that made the rules more vague. The Academic Standards Committee wrote to Planning Council:

Overall the Committee on Academic Standards believes that the new listing is vaguer and more general than are the current listings of requirements. Unless there is extensive revision, the Committee on Academic Standards would prefer to retain the current listing (February 20, 1975).

The issue about which the Registrar was most upset was the "80% rule." In previous listings, it was required that a student had to earn "at least 24 semester credits in the major area of concentration [at the] C grade or better." In the approved graduation criteria of 1975, "80% of the courses presented for the major must be at
grade C or better." The Registrar was convinced that the new rule was at best awkward and at worst unworkable. For example, a student whose major required 13 courses, needed a C in 12 courses, since 11.2 was 80% and no courses worth .2 semester credits were available. Yet since the Faculty was not responsible for implementing this, his concern went unheeded (Registrar).

So far as departmental approval for graduation, department chairs interviewed indicated that the new criteria made little difference in judging a student *vis a vis* graduation. The statements of objectives, originally intended to be behavioral, turned out not to be. Graduation criteria which would have been consistent with those behavioral objectives, turned out to be measures of course work in distribution requirements and major. Departments therefore judged their students essentially no differently in 1977 than they had in 1975.

**Conclusion:**

Two major conclusions were gleaned from the analysis using this approach. Additionally, this approach created a question that would have been left unanswered but for the other analytic methods. The conclusions deal chiefly with the structural implications of decision making. The question raised, but unanswered, points up a blind spot which the analyst using the logic of this model would discover. That also is a conclusion to be considered.
This analytic strategy focuses on the effect organizational structure has on policy making. The analyst using this strategy concentrates on the means that the structure, i.e., organizational offices, departments, committees, or units, has for sharing information, generating alternatives, and implementing the decision. Underlying this approach is the concept that organizations search, discover problems, and deal with them in the context of their structure.

The first conclusion drawn from this analysis was that of the effect the implementing structure (i.e., the academic departments) had on the way the policy was implemented. For them, the new policy statements made little difference in the way they viewed the way their students achieved the bachelor's degree. The chief effect of the new policy was on the computation of the minimum grade point average in major. Departmental certification for the degree involved checking cumulative averages, and fulfillment of major department and distribution requirements, and that function remained unchanged with the new statements. The intended use of the graduation criteria as the measure of the degree to which the college and its students had achieved mutual objectives was routinely ignored by the departments (interviews). Department chairmen gave no thought to the statement of Educational Objectives as they certified students for graduation using the measure of the graduation criteria. The organizational structure and the routines and procedures related to it essentially served to buffer the organization from changing its ways. Thus, in the case of this policy change, the
organizational structure mediated or levelled the degree of change by minimizing any impact the change might have had on the way the structure worked.

This analysis demonstrated another change, not in the realm of policy, but of practice. In some ways it was more pervasive and lasting. This analysis showed a change in the organization's style of collecting, sharing and acting on information. There was a conscious decision made in the Planning Council to involve all Faculty committees in the discussion process. That decision was implemented, and through the committee structure, the Faculty was well informed about the issue. Beyond the information function, there was an eagerness to involve the Faculty in the process actively. That is, the views of individuals were sought out and given serious consideration. This approach had originated in the CIR, and due to the cross membership in that committee and Planning Council, it became a part of the approach to decision making through that part of the structure.

There is little doubt that the drive for involvement and the effort to heighten individual and unit participation in the policy process was one strategy of President Anderson. That strategy was successful, largely because of the development of CIR working with people from the Strategies Project. The data from IGI showed clearly that faculty and administrators aspired to a goal which was defined as "community"—the commitment to the general welfare and mutual respect for opinions. Thus, while no policy was ever made, the process adopted for making a
policy concerning educational objectives and graduation criteria was the demonstration in practice that the college's aspiration toward community was achieved in many ways.

The question which this analysis raised but did not answer was: "Why did the decision take so long to make?" The process took approximately eighteen months. It began in the Planning Council and concluded on the floor of the Faculty. During its first months (April-September, 1974), it was under discussion in the Planning Council. From September through December, 1975, the issue was discussed by the Faculty Committees, whence it was returned to Planning Council. In February, 1975, the issue was sent to the Faculty Council, and after discussion there, it went to the Faculty (March, 1975). The Educational Objectives were approved in April and the Graduation Criteria were approved in November, 1975. There were periods when the issue was delayed by other more pressing matters, e.g. Affirmative Action policy, appointment of a new Academic Vice President. This policy took a long time to make.

The analytic strategy used was excellent for raising the question of timeliness regarding decision making. The logic of its approach, however, was not appropriate for exploring the reasons which explain why the decision took so long. That committee discussion and debate could explain why the time element seemed to be inadequate. Further explanation for this situation was uncovered in the Model III explanation.
1. Any policy outcome is less dependent on proposal quality or external factors than it is on organizational variables within the college. Those variables include organizational structure, patterns of interaction within the structure, and the degree of diversity in approach to the activities of various organizational units. A policy outcome will not be chosen from a wide array of options.

2. A policy outcome will require approval of the important policy making bodies. The proposed policy will be amended until it can be accepted by the unit with the most influence, and will, in its approved form, differ only slightly from the previous policy. Thus, the new policy will not require organizational units to vary their activities to any significant degree.

The specific propositions were supported. Since the approach of each unit in the structure was based on routines and procedures which were standard through the Faculty, a radical casting of the issue and solution was not likely. Those groups that were, in important ways, tangentially related to the structure—Planning Council and CIR—were not bound by routine approaches to the problem. But the constraints in approach from past practice severely curtailed the remainder of the faculty committees. The Proposal was also amended to the expectations of the Faculty. Whether it was amended so that the Faculty would have had to vary their activities, or whether what caused the Faculty to amend the proposals were matters of principle was not demonstrated in the data.

The data which served to illuminate this analysis were archival insofar as information about the committee structure and the flow of the issue through the structure was concerned. The interviews, however, added immeasurably toward enriching the basic chronological framework. They provided valuable insights into why committees responded as they did, even if such a rationale appeared in the records.

Analysis D - Allison III: Bureaucratic Politics

The basis for the fourth and final analysis of the Hartwick College Case was Allison's Model III, Bureaucratic Politics. The logic of this approach rested on the multiple roles that people play in an organization, their perceptions and interests, and the means they have for affecting their own desired ends. This analytic strategy examines the ways individual participants affect policy outcomes (Allison, 1971, pp. 162-181). The operational questions, as with the other Allison analyses,
are the ones Allison suggested that an analyst using this approach would ask (Allison, 1971, p. 257). Based on Model III, the specific propositions represent assumptions about how the decision was reached.

Specific Propositions for Model III:

1. It is less likely that radically different statements of educational objectives and graduation criteria will be adopted when the faculty has relatively more influence on the outcome than do the President or other college leaders.

2. The probability that a radical proposal will be adopted increases with the number of faculty leaders whose general propensities are for radical change. The members of the following groups would be counted as faculty leaders:
   - Faculty Council
   - Senior Faculty members
   - Department Chairs
   - The President and Dean

3. For such an issue the decision would be made in ad hoc, informal discussion settings rather than in formal committee settings. Included in those informal discussions would be members of the following groups:
   - Faculty Council
   - Senior Faculty members
   - Department Chairs
   - The President, Dean and other administrative leaders

4. The perceptions each discussant has about the issue will be markedly different. Differences in perception will be predictable based on the demands of position and personality.

5. Action or closure on a decision will be delayed while proponents try to get those who are reluctant to agree.

6. Major decisions are not made by small numbers. Instead, at the time a decision is reached, it receives a large plurality.

7. No educational decision is cast by the participation of a large number of faculty. No decision is made until all who desired a chance to participate have had that opportunity.
The operational questions related to this strategy focus on the roles participants have in the process, and the interrelationships they have amongst themselves. The operational questions examine those roles and relationships by asking a) where participation occurs, b) about participants' positions relative to the issue, and c) about deadlines and possible foul ups.

1. What are the existing action channels for producing actions of this kind?

The action channels created by President Anderson in 1969 involved the Faculty in the decision-making process. Anderson saw it as his job to change the milieu of the college. Those changes included Faculty participation, a world view (i.e., the Faculty having some sense of current trends and issues in American Higher Education), and primary attention to students and their development; he came to call this "handcrafted education." To achieve these goals he used an approach that forced others to define problems and suggest alternative solutions. He termed his role to be that of a gadfly or a provocateur, raising questions, pointing out contradictions, creating controversy but not providing authoritative decisions. His invitation to nationally-known figures in higher education did bring to campus different viewpoints that affected some members of the Faculty and provided news of the world beyond to all (Lindquist, 1978, p. 89).

Anderson and the Dean of the College together decided to accept Chickering's invitation to join the "Strategies for Change and Knowledge Utilization Project." Anderson then appointed the Vice President
for Institutional Research and several faculty members to serve on the liaison committee. Lindquist's Chapter V details what happened with this committee (1978, pp. 87-127). He pointed out that it took several years before the committee—and by extension the faculty—learned how to work an issue through to closure. The first such college-wide issue worked through was the conflict over salary increases (March, 1973), the proposed collegium (a wholly different governance system proposed in the summer, 1973) and the resultant Planning Council (December, 1973). Lindquist reported that Anderson favored the collegium, the Dean of the College opposed it in favor of his own idea of the Planning Council. The latter was approved (1978). The second issue that the Faculty worked through was the changed educational objectives and graduation criteria. This second issue arose from the newly established Planning Council's need for an overall goal statement. It also arose from the perception that Faculty had that this was an important question for Anderson, one that he continually raised (survey).

In 1973-74 the CIR was concerned with a number of issues related to educational policy. Two of the most important were the nature of the freshman year and academic advising. Because of "who played" on this committee, the broad educational concerns of those issues moved to the Planning Council when it began to work in the spring of 1974. The rules of the Faculty then moved the issue to Faculty Council in February, 1975, and to the floor of the Faculty the next month.

The action channels developed during Anderson's first years as President. Formally, they included an emboldened Faculty more involved with, interested in, and attuned to the issues. The committee structure was vitalized to deal with issues that arose. Informally, there
were various groups which wielded differential amounts of power and participated in issues as they chose. The informal groups had more to say about what happened, and the timing of what happened, than did the official structure. The informal action channel resided mainly in the Faculty Lounge, where perhaps up to six senior faculty members had their lunches on an almost regular basis. There faculty discussed issues and consolidated their approach in this setting (interviews). Others, in equally informal settings, had similar activities. Members of CIR would meet for lunch on an informal basis and discuss the issues (interview). The senior Biology Professor would routinely visit with people across campus to hear what they had to say and inform them of what was occurring elsewhere on campus (interview). Thus, the action channels were both formal and informal; open and, in a sense, intimate; used for information and strategizing. Interview data suggested that the activity in and caused by these action channels was welcomed, since it seemed to suggest that the sense of community was high.

2. Which players in what position were centrally involved?

The minutes of the various committees record the names of the members. Those lists were not particularly relevant because interview data suggested that far fewer people were central to this issue of educational policy. Not only was the number of people directly involved in this issue small, but their roles changed during the time span the issue was alive. The other notable aspect about the faculty involved in this issue was the breadth of experience they represented. Included were senior and junior faculty from all academic divisions and with a variety of involvement in college activities. Below find Table 5 which shows the players and their formal roles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON (BY TITLE)</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
<th>1974-75</th>
<th>1975-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Biology (Senior)</td>
<td>CIR Chair</td>
<td>Planning Council Chair</td>
<td>Faculty Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Institutional Research</td>
<td>½ Coordinator</td>
<td>Secretary CIR</td>
<td>Secretary CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the College - ex officio of all committees</td>
<td>Last year - did not participate except for establishment of Planning Council</td>
<td>Acting Dean</td>
<td>CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President - ex officio of all committees</td>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>Planning Council Faculty Council</td>
<td>CIR Planning Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of History (Senior)</td>
<td>Planning Council</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Dean for Off-Campus Programs</td>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Religion (Senior)</td>
<td>Prime mover of collegium Planning Council</td>
<td>Planning Council Drafted many proposals</td>
<td>Planning Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Spanish (Junior)</td>
<td>CIR Planning Council</td>
<td>CIR Faculty Development Planning Council</td>
<td>CIR Faculty Development Planning Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>CIR Attended Planning Council Served as Acting Dean</td>
<td>CIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Religion (Senior)</td>
<td>Prime mover of collegium Planning Council</td>
<td>Planning Council Drafted many proposals</td>
<td>Planning Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Spanish (Junior)</td>
<td>CIR Planning Council</td>
<td>CIR Faculty Development Planning Council</td>
<td>CIR Faculty Development Planning Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above played major roles in the issue. Those listed in Table 5 met frequently to discuss this issue and were for moving it through the governance machinery. The Biology Professor and the Coordinator of Institutional Research served as effective liaisons as they took this issue with them from committee to committee. This was possible because the biology professor had legitimate authority in the governance structure and because he was widely respected by all constituencies (interviews).

The history and religion professors drafted many intermediate proposals along with the assistant professor of Spanish. The documents suggest that this group met informally and made modified recommendations to the Planning Council membership. But the two senior professors also made recommendations, amendments and modifications from October, 1974, through February, 1975, as individuals. The roles of the two senior professors were interesting and will be explored further.

The Dean(s) of the college were not consistently involved. The Dean that resigned in 1974 had no interest in the issue since his resignation had been forced and he and the President were barely communicating (interview). The Dean's contribution had been Planning Council, which he had proposed almost in defiance of the President's support of the Collegium. The Acting Dean was committed to CIR and the concepts of the change. He and the President worked closely (interview). When he was not asked to become the permanent dean, he went on leave in May, 1975. The new dean arrived on campus in June, 1975, and participated heavily in the final stages of the process through the autumn of
1975. She had the President's confidence and enjoyed the typical "honeymoon"-period with the faculty during that time. She played a major role in developing the statement of graduation criteria.

The Associate Dean for Off-Campus Programs and the President were supportive of the concept of change. The Associate Dean had come from Goddard, an experimental college, and started two programs at Hartwick which were viewed as non-traditional. Both programs gained respect and acceptance: off-campus study and Individual Student Programs. The President desired few specific outcomes. He wanted students to do a senior project and understand various areas in depth, demonstrated by competence, but was more happy to see the Faculty dealing with an issue than he was committed to any specific policy.

These were the major proponents for change. Several issues swirled around them, before and during this decision, and part of what was carried into the discussion of educational objectives was the aftermath of earlier issues. For example, the Professors of Biology and Religion had been two of seven Hartwick faculty who participated in the first faculty development workshop in 1973. They were enthusiastic and interested in their roles as teachers. Both of them were also involved in examining the college's governance structure and the possibility of a long range planning committee in that same summer. They were caught up in faculty governance and were anxious for the faculty to play a continuing role in policy making.

For those involved with CIR, there were several related issues to which the educational objectives and graduation criteria issue was
a natural outcome: issues about advising, administration of IGI and the sense that the committee had, by hard work, led the college to consideration of this issue. The college had also had two important resignations in 1974: the Vice President for Institutional Research and the Dean of the College. With these two people gone, both perceived as obstacles to change, the feeling that change was possible increased (Lindquist, 1978, pp. 109 and 112).

There were those not so happy about change, however. There was concern that the President would remake Hartwick into New York State's Goddard College. Evidence that this was possible was particularly strong (for them). Anderson's friendship with Pitkin, then President of Goddard, the hiring of the associate dean who had been Pitkin's assistant and the visitation of the other known experimentalists created a fear that the traditional and comfortable Hartwick would be transformed. This group was much harder to identify with certainty for three reasons: 1) there was no formal organized opposition, 2) little overt behavior characterized their opposition and 3) they opposed pieces of the proposal changes in objectives and graduation criteria and incorporated their modifications in subtle, gradual and nameless ways.

This group included, based on evidence derived from interviews and archival material, the following positions:

Professor of Psychology: Chair of the Department; Member of Faculty Council, 1974-75; Salary and Budget, 1974-76; Individual Student Programs, 1974-75; consistently voted no on most items at Faculty Council and never offered reasons for so doing even when asked.
Associate Professor of Art: Chair of the Department; member of no standing committees

Associate Professor of Psychology: Chair of Academic Standards Committee, 1974-76

Professor of Comparative Literature: Member of Faculty Council, 1974-76; interested in Individual Student Program

Professor of Philosophy: Member of Academic Standards, 1974-76; ATP, 1975-76; Vice Chair of Humanities Division, 1974-75

Professor of History: Department Chair, Member of Planning Council, 1974-76; Chair, Planning Council, 1975-76; Member of COIN, 1974-75*

Associate Professor of Chemistry: Member of Convocation Committee, 1974-76; involved in issue in February, 1975, with recommendations to the Planning Council and in final discussion in the Faculty

Professor of English: Chair of Library Committee; concerned that library circulation had gone down; Ad hoc Committee on Style

Professor of Religion: Chair of Committee on Interdisciplinary and Nondepartmental Study (admin. appt.); Member of Planning Council, 1974-76; member of ad hoc Committee on Style, 1975*

Associate Professor of French: Member of Faculty Council, 1974-75; ISP, 1975

Professor of Philosophy: Department chair; Admissions Committee, 1974-76

The above people were recorded in the Faculty Minutes as speaking to various points concerning the statements of objectives and/or graduation criteria. Their comments served to remove the innovation from the statements and make them conform to the current policy. For example,

*These are the same actors which appear on the list of proponents.
the Professor of Art wished to retain an interdisciplinary course requirement. The Philosophy Professor was concerned that "students be capable." Perhaps most telling was the remark of the English Professor who "emphasized that the Committee (on style) was expected to consider substance as well as style within the limits of the faculty's guidance so far, in fact some substantive items have been left out of the statement which need to be added" (Minutes, October 20, 1975).

There were other actors, too, who did not play roles as central as those listed above. Either their committee or organizational positions were inappropriate or they were on the fringes for other reasons, e.g. they were non-tenured, mildly interested, returning from or departing for sabbatical leave. Those included:

Professor of Nursing: Chair of Department; Member of CIR since its inception; Chair, CIR, 1974-75

Assistant Professor of Psychology: Member CIR, active in faculty development

Associate Professor of English: Member CIR, Chair, 1975-76; Director of faculty development program

Associate Dean of Student Services: Member CIR; offered two documents to Planning Council concerning student development

Assistant Professor of Education: Department Chair; Member CIR; Chair, Committee on Teacher Education; concerned at the time with NYS Education Department's teacher competency requirements.

Assistant Professor of History: CCFL Deputy Director (for Hartwick campus); Member CIR; involved in faculty development.
Undoubtedly there were others who played some role in this decision. Those roles are not recorded in the records and were inaccessible to the memories of those interviewed. The next research question calls for explanation of the factors underlying the actions that people took.

3. **How did pressures of jobs, past stances and personality affect the players' stances on this issue?**

At least two informal coalitions were at work in the college during the period of the educational objectives graduation criteria decision. Those interviewed indicated that the two coalitions predated this issue and essentially were identifiable by 1971, when the Strategies Project came to campus. One coalition was formalized (around CIR) and included the President and other administrators interested in his style of leadership and educational values. This group also included junior faculty members who found interesting the President's educational ideas and also felt politically ennobled since the President encouraged faculty participation. The junior faculty, including the Assistant Professor of Psychology, and junior members in history and political science suggested that the President's desire for participation in some ways allowed them to do things that otherwise they might not have felt comfortable doing. The President had tenured some junior faculty who some perceived were non-tenurable in the view of the senior faculty who controlled the ATP Committee.

There were some highly respected senior faculty members on CIR as well. They included the Biology Professor who became faculty chair and two other biology professors interested not in policy making but instructional effectiveness. A Professor of English and member of the
Committee on Style was also interested in making his instruction more effective. Thus, there were separable groups even within CIR; one group interested in policy making and another more interested in teaching, advising and student-related issues.

The President had as a top priority faculty participation and awareness. People were encouraged to be active and to use what they learned in the classroom and in governance settings. They viewed the CIR as a supportive setting where such exploration, participation and learning occurred openly without fear of ostracism. The theme of support and personal experimentation in the variety of issues runs through all the interview data. It is subtly demonstrated in the archival material; people were encouraged to put ideas out, even if they never reached fruition. For example, the idea of evaluation of faculty and administration was discussed in CIR for three years without being implemented across campus (1974-77).

The other coalition possessed some interesting characteristics. With the exception of the Dean who resigned in 1974, there were no administrators in the group. This coalition was composed of senior and generally conservative faculty members. This group was concerned lest Hartwick become something other than the traditional, regional college it had been. Most of this group of faculty emanated from the most conservative, least student-oriented departments in the college. Psychology and Philosophy/Religion had among the smallest numbers of majors, and student enrollments (except in introductory psychology courses) were small. Thus, this group was opposed to the changes Anderson was
trying to effect. During the collegium—planning council issue, this group subtly expressed concern that a collegium, essentially a unicameral campus senate composed of faculty, administration, students and trustees, would curtail sharply faculty power (Lindquist, 1978, pp. 107-108).

The Professor of History in an interview expressed feelings opposed to Anderson's idea of breadth, and so worked to see that his own contrasting ideas were put forth. Yet he also indicated that he was intrigued with the intellectual exercises involved in exploring new objectives. He felt compromise to be important and did not want too much specificity. The same was true of the Religion Professor. He had been involved in a major change in governance, had participated in a variety of innovative activities, e.g. Strategies workshops and the faculty development workshop. Each felt to some degree the burden of leadership and responded. These two, in particular, were identified as being in each coalition, and they probably represented the glue or bridge connecting two disparate camps of faculty. In low-keyed, background conversations they both molded and heard the sense of the faculty and managed the proposals in directions the faculty would accept.

4. What deadlines forced the issue to resolution?

The only deadline that affected the outcome was that imposed by frustration. In April, 1975, when the educational objectives were approved, there had been discussion of the issue for over a year. First it was on the agenda of CIR and then became the agenda for Planning
Council. It was six months later that the educational objectives were approved. One person said, when the graduation criteria went to the Committee on Style, "I no longer had any interest in it"; another said, "My feeling was one of tremendous relief to get it off the floor of the Faculty" (interviews). Because this was a faculty decision, there was no particular impetus to hurry the decision. One logical deadline would have been the catalog publication. But one person said, "The catalog would be published the next year," and so since students currently in college would be unaffected by the new requirements, it made little difference to which entering class the new statements applied.

The President was more interested in the process than the outcome. That the faculty took long to discuss, debate and decide an issue he took as a good sign. It showed that as a group they were taking their responsibility seriously. Furthermore, in May, 1975, he was ill and not fully recovered in the fall; he had some difficulty attending to detail during that time. Also there was a new dean who had not established herself fully during the period from June to November.

The way the issue proceeded was more sensitive to needs of various faculty groups than it was to a pre-set series of deadlines. The schedule set by Planning Council was an example of this. In September, 1974, responses were requested, due back from standing committees by the end of October. The last written committee response was dated December. Comments were made by individual faculty members into
February, 1975. In effect, what shaped the timing was the ability of the faculty individually and by units to respond.

To a degree, the new Dean did move the final stages more quickly than otherwise might have been done. She convened the Committee on Style in early November, 1975, and their report was ready for the Faculty less than two weeks later. Several reasons were given for this relatively speedy action: 1) the committee was small, interested and intimately acquainted with the issue; 2) the convenor was the new Dean, somewhat objective, because she was not involved in all of the early discussion. There was a desire on the part of the four faculty members on the committee to please the Dean, and the Dean probably had greater clarity and objectivity about the issues than did others who were mired in them.

5. Where were foul ups likely?

Foul ups undoubtedly occurred throughout the process. Some members of Planning Council knew in February, 1975, that the formal proposals that the Faculty would consider were "emasculated" in terms of what had originally been intended. The subcommittee assigned to write the draft proposals by Planning Council for the Faculty included the Professors of History and Religion and the Assistant Professor of Spanish. The Subcommittee turned out not to be as strongly in favor of change as others. Thus, some would interpret that as a foul up, others as a blessing.

Were the stakes perceived as being higher, a clear perspective on those stakes would allow for the identification of foul ups. Since
the issue in this case was not perceived as a life or death matter, identifying disappointment that the subcommittee did not write proposal requiring as much change as had been originally desired by some. The foul up, if there was one, was in the appointment of the subcommittee, which consisted of the History Professor and Religion Professor (both senior), and an untenured assistant Professor of Spanish. The two senior members were the compromisers; the junior member was active in CIR and preferred more radical change, but was powerless relative to his subcommittee colleagues (interview). Viewed from the other perspective, i.e., that of those opposed to radical change, the appointment of the subcommittee represented no foul up at all, since two key members of the subcommittee were disinterested in radical change.

A statesmanlike approach would also hold with the view that the appointed subcommittee was no foul up, but an astute move. Since all the members of the subcommittee had access throughout the Faculty, the subcommittee membership was most able to draft a proposal which the Faculty would accept.

Conclusions:

This analysis focussed on the roles of individuals in the policy making process. This analysis also offered some explanations of why this particular decision took so long to make. Those who participated were engaged in listening to their colleagues and in finding ways of expressing the proposed policy so that all ideas were drawn out. Furthermore, those involved also worked to achieve consensus. Interview data indicated that there was substantial time given to hallway
conversation. That type of conversation then led to a modified proposal. From that issue, there remain twenty-two separate documents proposing or criticizing aspects of the policy proposal. Those documents were exclusive of official proposals, committee memoranda and the like. Most of the twenty-two memoranda, proposals, etc., were written during the period between December, 1974, and April, 1975. They were the direct result of "a conversation with another person who had suggested another idea" (interview). Thus, the care with which Planning Council members and others involved in the issue undertook the process assured that it would be lengthy.

This analysis offered three conclusions. One conclusion deals with the distinctive approach that this analytic strategy offers; the other two deal with observations made possible by the approach. This strategy for analysis demonstrated the way in which the informal structure worked to affect policy making. As such, the strategy is designed to focus almost entirely on data that bring out the informal, casual workings of people as they deal with a policy issue. For this particular case, the full power of the analytic model was not needed, since the nature of the issue was not extremely complex. Another reason why the full power was not used was because bureaucratic machinations, which cause people to communicate horizontally and vertically, were minimal. In many respects, this was a collegial decision.
In the conclusions to the preceding analysis, the importance of community was discussed. There is another way to explain that, and it can be embodied in the second conclusion for this analysis. The key actors, it could be argued, were not those who sought change, i.e., the Biology Professor and the Coordinator of Institutional Research, but those who sought compromise, i.e., the Professors of History and Religion. In this view, community or collegiality were unimportant. What was important is that those concerned about a radical shift in policy positioned themselves masterfully in order to 1) appear to help those seeking change, and 2) to unobtrusively emasculate the changes that otherwise would have been proposed. In this less than kind characterization, the identified goal of community, then, was used to mask a way to avoid change. Analysis using a model of bureaucratic politics made this possible interpretation emerge as it could not have using the logic of the other models.

Yet another conclusion that was reached using this analytic model was the importance of the compromisers. The role that the Professors of History and Religion played clearly helped to avert open conflict and hostility. The communications links that were forged by them through the Faculty were important not only for this issue, but for the way the Faculty has continued to work since. Likewise, the communications that the Biology Professor, subsequently Faculty Chairman and Acting President (after the conclusion of this issue), developed were critical to the college. The other analytic models did not demonstrate these aspects so neatly.
Specific Propositions were supported. In fact, the analysis demonstrated that relatively few people were directly involved in the management and substance of the issue, even though many did participate from time to time. The President and administration played only a minor role in the issue. The decision was delayed while consensus was sought. After consensus was achieved, the decision was adopted by a large majority of the Faculty.

Specific Propositions:

1. It is less likely that radically different statements of educational objectives and graduation criteria will be adopted when the faculty has relatively more influence on the outcome than do the President or other college leaders.

This proposition was supported. Faculty members managed to modify the proposals and thereby reduce change.

2. The probability that a radical proposal will be adopted increases with the number of faculty leaders whose general propensities are for radical change. The members of the following groups would be counted as faculty leaders:

   Faculty Council
   Senior Faculty members
   Department Chairs
   The President and Dean

This proposition was supported. There was not a critical mass of people who desired radical change. In fact, some campus leaders in these groupings worked to reduce the amount of change.

3. For such an issue the decision would be made in ad hoc, informal discussion settings rather than in formal committee settings. Included in those informal discussions would be members of the following groups:

   Faculty Council
   Senior Faculty members
   Department Chairs
   The President, Dean and other administrative leaders

Interview data supported this proposition.
4. The perceptions each discussant has about the issue will be markedly different. Differences in perception will be predictable based on the demands of position and personality.

Interview data supported this proposition.

5. Action or closure on a decision will be delayed while proponents try to get those who are reluctant to agree.

The time taken to reach closure on this decision was lengthy, discussion frequent. In order for the reluctant to agree, changes were amended to the proposals. This took time. The proposition was supported.

6. Major decisions are not made by small numbers. Instead, at the time a decision is reached, it receives a large plurality.

The final vote was large—by voice; many people supported what was passed. Proposition supported.

7. No educational decision is cast by the participation of a large number of faculty. No decision is made until all who desired a chance to participate have had that opportunity.

A large number of faculty did not participate in framing the decision, although many faculty discussed it. As a result of the need for discussion and agreement, no decision was reached until all who wanted to could speak to the issue.

Data used:

The data which were most useful for this analysis were gleaned from the interviews. Often interview data suggested other questions, which were put to respondents on a less formal basis (hallway conversations). This analysis could not have been undertaken without interview data.
Chapter IV
Findings, Summary, Conclusions and Implications

Introduction:

Academic governance has been a matter of interest to scholars. This study focused on developing a method for determining how policy decisions are made in higher education institutions. To do that, four analytic strategies were developed and applied and thus provided an enriched description of the policy making process. The subject case for analysis was a policy decision made at Hartwick College in 1975. The research questions which were central to this study were designed to examine whether and how each of the four analytic strategies showed different aspects and facets of the policy making process.

The purpose of the present chapter is to present the findings of this study. The chapter is composed of five major sections. Following the introduction is an overview of the study. Second are the findings concerning the research questions. Third are the findings relevant to the Specific Propositions associated with each analytic strategy. Fourth is the Summary of Findings and Conclusions about the study. Finally, a section including implications of the findings is presented. This section offers suggestions for practitioners and implications for theoreticians and recommendations for future study.
Overview:

The conceptual framework of this study was developed from several ideas: (1) There are models of academic governance which imply but do not specify policy analysis strategies; (2) the bases of the strategies for policy analysis are found in the research and literature of organization theory; (3) from this body of knowledge the works of Schneier and Allison were selected as the most appropriate sources for developing analytic strategies for the present problem; and (4) a methodology was devised to implement those analytic strategies by examining the Hartwick College case. The four models of academic governance which were reviewed included the bureaucratic, collegial, political and garbage can. Each offers a distinctive description of how decisions are made in an academic setting. Yet none of the four models is designed specifically as a means of policy analysis. In order to use any of the models for analytic purposes, inferences must be made which would only then permit a researcher to analyze a policy decision. A review of research and the literature of organization theory yielded similar information: There was little that could be used for analytic purposes without inference. Thus, the researcher turned to work of a political scientist, Graham Allison, who had developed analytic strategies for examining an international relations problem. Allison had synthesized paradigms (Allison, 1971, p. 32) from political and organizational theory, and he used those paradigms as his means of
analyzing the Cuban Missile Crisis. This researcher used paradigms to focus on an educational policy decision and added to them a paradigm derived from the work of Edward Schneier (1969).

The methodology for this study began with an adaptation of Allison's three models and the development of Schneier's work into four analytic strategies. These strategies, when used to analyze a policy case, provided an enriched description of the policy making process. The research questions for this study were intended to help examine this approach to policy analysis. The research questions were:

1) How did each analytic strategy show off or emphasize distinctive facets of the policy case?

2) What are the data requirements of each analytic strategy and how were the data used in each analysis?

These questions were designed to explore the usefulness of such an approach to policy analysis.

The research methodology used was the case study approach. Data were collected from archival material, interviews—both group and individual—and from a survey. Of particular interest was other research published by Lindquist (1978) which was the result of a National Institute for Mental Health grant in which Hartwick College was a participant. That research provided additional insights about the college preceding the decision under scrutiny in the present study.

The study was built upon an explicit framework for analysis. Following Allison's paradigms, each of the four analytic strategies consisted of (1) the basic unit of analysis, (2) organizing concepts, and (3) dominant inference pattern. From those elements, specific propositions were derived relative to each analytic strategy. The
propositions, therefore, are developed based on the logic, approach, and framework of each of the analytic strategies. To perform each analysis of the case, operational questions were asked. Those questions were ones which emerged from the logic of the analytic strategy being employed. It was by using four different approaches and their operational questions that a description of the decision could be constructed. The four analytic strategies included three developed by Allison, Model I—the Rational Actor (1971, pp. 32-35); Model II—Organizational Process (1971, pp. 79-90); Model III—Bureaucratic Politics (1971, pp. 162-181). The fourth, Schneier's functional stage approach (longitudinal) (1969), offered the organizing concepts for an analytic strategy. Using Schneier's four functional stages as the organizing concepts, an analytic strategy similar to those of Allison was developed.

Chapter II included a review of literature relevant to the study. In this chapter, the links between the analytic strategies and the relevant ideas in higher education governance literature were explored. Thus, one purpose of that chapter was to demonstrate relationships between policy analysis and analysis of the decision process in higher education.

This chapter also reviewed the literature relevant to the four analytic approaches. Thus reviewed was literature concerning the procedural nature of the longitudinal approach. Analogs for Schneier's notion that decisions are made in stages were found in the literature of political science, organization theory, and higher education governance. The remainder of the chapter focussed Allison's three conceptual frameworks for analysis to their application in a higher
education governance setting. Thus, the three original models (Rational Actor, Organizational Process, and Bureaucratic Politics) were refined to fit this study by using the literature from which they were derived.

Model I, the Rational Actor, was cast, in this study, to focus more clearly on the content or substance of the issue, than on the choices available in a two-player international relations policy question. Model II, Organizational Process, dealt with the functions of organizational structure in seeking certainty and avoiding possible decisions that units in the structure would prefer not to implement. Conflict theory, present in both Allison Models II and III was included as a bridge between the two. Of importance was the recognition that conflict results from shared and few resources, desire for autonomy and bifurcated goals within units. Model III, Bureaucratic Politics, focussed on the literature which examined how individual actors in the policy process behaved.

Chapter III was composed of the four separate case studies of the selected policy situation at Hartwick College. The chapter included a brief background description of the milieu at the college during the time period in which the decision was made. Immediately following the background statement began the four separate analyses of the case. Each analysis was prepared using one of the four distinctive analytic approaches.

To remain faithful to the analytic models, each analysis was performed using the operational questions Schneier and Allison associated with each analytic strategy. As those questions were
answered in each analysis, conclusions were drawn. Those conclusions were related to the specific propositions that pertained to each analytic strategy. The conclusions also contained summary statements of the findings of that analytic model, clarified questions that were raised or left unanswered by the analysis, and commented on the data which were most useful for that analysis. In addition, specific propositions relevant to the analytic strategy and the policy case under scrutiny were either supported or not supported.

The following sections of this chapter present the Findings and Conclusions related to the research questions and the Specific Propositions. The research questions focus on 1) the capability of each analytic strategy to demonstrate distinctive facets of the policy case, and 2) the data requirements and use in each analysis. The next section of the chapter contains a discussion of those questions. Following that section is a discussion of findings relative to the specific propositions. This section offers specific findings about the Hartwick case relative to the four analytic strategies.

The Research Questions: Findings and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to use four analytic strategies to examine a policy decision at Hartwick College. To that end two research questions were raised, and responses to them are found in this section.

1. How did each analytic strategy show off or emphasize distinctive facets of the policy case?

The logic of each strategy for analysis was distinct from the others. Each was designed to explore "what happened" from a different
perspective. Thus, it was not surprising that explanations of and emphases on what happened should be different. A general conclusion was that three of the analyses appeared to confirm that collegiality was evident in this case.

**Analysis A – Schneier (Four Functional Stage Model)** helped the analyst sort out the antecedent conditions for the decision. This analytic strategy provided a means of understanding the issues which were important on campus prior to the identification of the Educational Objective/Graduation Criteria issue. This approach made it possible to determine how various antecedent conditions e.g. faculty governance, nature of education, student evaluation, became strands in considering the case in point.

A second distinctive feature of Analysis A was the way in which the faculty at Hartwick College shaped the decision process. The analytic strategy suggested that the process would happen in four sequential steps. It was discovered that in this case two of those steps were combined; proposals formulation and support mobilization occurred simultaneously. Initial proposals made in September, 1974, were not the same as the proposals formally presented to the faculty for approval in February, 1975. The result of the strategy on the part of proponents for change was to provide a talking point. Thus, with some trial balloons, formal proposal formulation moved along at the same time as support for elements of the formal proposals was generated.
Analysis B - Allison I (Rational Actor) was originally intended to explore rational action the college would take in reaction to similar external stimulus. The logic of Allison Model I suggests two rational actors taking action relative to a mutual concern. When there is only one actor, however, the focus of the analysis shifts from what each actor does to the rational action taken relative to the central concern. Analysis focuses, therefore, not only on rational action, but also on the central concern or issue. Thus, the focus of this analysis in this study was on the proposals, past policies, alternative proposals, and the final approved versions of the educational objectives and graduation criteria.

In this case the change was small. The two policies, old and new, when compared, show the change in objective to be slightly more explicit in terms of expectations of students and the change in graduation requirements to be minimal.

Analysis C - Allison II (Organizational Process) examined aspects of organizational structure, in particular the flow of information, the types of alternatives and the way implementation was handled. What emerged from this analysis was that the committee structure did, on the whole, take a parochial or turf-oriented view toward the issue. This was especially true in those committees where more extensive changes would affect committee activity. For example, the Committee on Academic Standards was concerned that new requirements be specifically measurable. This Committee was resistant to change that would make rules less specific or more judgmental. Conversely, in committees where
there was little responsibility for daily educational operations, e.g. the Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion, there was evidence that the early proposals for change were supported. These committee positions seemed to be related both to the functions of the committees and to the job-related interests of some of the committee members. For example, the Registrar voiced his concerns in the ASC Committee; the Acting Dean voiced his support in the ATP Committee. The former was concerned about protecting the college by having explicit rules; the latter was concerned that the college become more innovative.

This model raised two notable issues. First, it was demonstrated that what Allison suggested did indeed occur: that change is finally not very great. What happens in the future is largely similar to what happened in the past. This supports a similar finding from Analysis B (Rational Actor) which showed only modest change in the substance of the policy from beginning to end. Second, Analysis C confirmed that the decision process within an organization is fraught with the same parochialism as occurs in larger, governmental organizations.

There was evident in this analysis, however, another side to the process. The questions which were used to analyze the case from this perspective were designed to elicit information about large bureaucratic fiefdoms working as independent organizations. Thus, in some degree, the questions were less appropriate for an organization whose structure, communication system and operations are essentially intimate rather than bureaucratic. Most committees in a small college are no comparison to large operating governmental enterprises. In some
ways, then, the questions were mismatched to the case. They nonetheless demonstrated an interesting facet about the case. In the Hartwick case, for example, the organizational structure was used to disseminate information about the issue, and as a forum or series of local meetings to discuss the implications of various proposals. The elements of the structure were not viewed as important decision making or implementing bodies; rather they were viewed as places where colleagues would meet to discuss the proposals. Thus, this particular analytic approach demonstrated that a kind of collegiality was at work. The formal structure was used to elicit feelings and positions from faculty members, using not the departmental or disciplinary context, but the context of the college's governance system. This aspect of what happened would not have emerged from either of the first two analyses.

**Analysis D - Allison III** (Bureaucratic Politics) characterized the function which the informal organizational structure played. The questions of this analytic strategy focussed on the actors who played key roles, how they played them, and the positions they held relative to the issue. It was concluded that two senior faculty members played the critical roles which encouraged the compromise between those who wanted more and those who wanted less change. They did this by means of personal contact and informal discussion. Also, those who provided leadership in identifying the issue and formulating the proposal, while involved through the whole process, were not effective in successfully bringing off the proposed changes. This was largely due to their formal positions, but also due to their failure to be involved in the same
way as the compromisers, i.e. informal persuasion and ability to retain the meat of the proposal while finding other ways to state them.

The issue of collegiality again comes up in this analysis. The focus of this analytic strategy is, in Allison, unabashedly political and cognizant of conflict. Yet the data showed little evidence of overt political maneuvering or manifest conflict. Thus, it was concluded that a form of collegiality was in evidence. This will be discussed further later in this chapter.

In conclusion, then, it can be said that each analytic strategy showed a distinctive facet of the policy making process. The first strategy (Schneier—the Four Functional Stage Process) provided the context from which the issue emerged and provided a walk through the process by which decision was reached. This analysis focussed on not only what happened during the process from inception to conclusion, but also provided an understanding on the antecedent conditions which caused the issue to arise. Notable findings about this strategy included the discovery of the antecedent conditions which affected the case; and the discovery that the decision process, while conceptually occurring in four separable logical steps, in this case had two of the steps occur simultaneously.

The second strategy (Allison I—the Rational Actor) concentrated analysis on the way the issue was substantively structured. Examined in this section was the content of the old policies, new policies and various proposals. By looking at the differences, the degree of change in the substance of the policy could be determined. Findings about
this strategy reflected the change in the focus of analysis when no external actor is present. Also this analysis, because of its focus on issue content, demonstrated that changes in policy statements were minimal.

The third examination (Allison II—Organizational Processes) revealed the way the organizational structure worked in this case. The analysis showed that the de jure organizational governance structure was used. The analysis also showed that the interests of the college committees tended to be parochial and in relationship to committee function. The analysis yielded information beyond structural concerns, in that it appeared that the structure was used purposively for achieving what the college desired—a greater sense of community. That finding was supported by the fourth and final analysis.

The fourth analysis (Allison III—Bureaucratic Politics) demonstrated the way in which the informal organizational structure worked to affect decision. Rather than concentrating on participants as part of a formal organizational structure, this approach focussed on the actual roles played by participants in the process. It was determined that there was a set of actors who held leadership positions on each side of the question. The set of actors who proposed radical change were ineffective in achieving their goal. The set of actors who were in favor of more limited change were effective in modifying the proposed changes and ultimately assured approval of policies which were minimally different from the original policies.

2. What are the data requirements of each analytic strategy and how were the data used in each analysis?
Data were collected from the college archival records, committee and faculty minutes, and written proposed changes in educational objectives and graduation criteria. Data were also collected in a focused group interview. The principals in the decision, as many as were available on campus, were brought together, and their conversation, based on an interview instrument, is recorded in Appendix B. Individual interviews were also conducted. The interview instrument is appended, but as such served only as a rudimentary vehicle for data collection. Much more information came, however, from follow-up questions that were raised during the initial conversations or subsequent less formal conversations. Finally, data were collected through a survey instrument, also appended. This data provided some new information, but for the most part, corroborated information which had been provided by the interviews.

The purpose of collecting data was two-fold: 1) to discover, and 2) to corroborate what happened. A chronology of events was constructed from the archival materials.

In one sense, the focused group interview, the individual interviews and the survey all served to corroborate that chronology. But more than that, the succeeding steps in data collection provided a much more complete and enriched view of what happened. This strategy for data collection was similar to that used by Allison in researching the Cuban Missile Crisis (1971). Presumably, however, he did no surveys or focus group interviews.
The research question, however, focussed on the data requirements and uses for each of the analytic strategies. The descriptions of the data required for each analytic strategy follow in this section.

Schneier (The Four Functional Stage Approach)

The data required for this analysis were, to start with, the archival material, minutes, reports, committee correspondence. This material provided a time line or chronology for the event which then could be measured against the parameters of the analytic strategy. The report of Lindquist (1978) was also a necessary source of data for this first analysis. The data concerning the event and the objective report of the conditions preceding the event together provided needed information. This information was useful because it provided an overview of the context in which the event occurred, set the chronology of the event, identified the key actors in the event, and, to a lesser degree, identified the divergent positions taken on the issue.

There is no question that this data would have been necessary in any analysis. The advantage of collecting it in the way required for this analysis was that a means was provided for the basic structuring of the data which provided leads for the other analyses.

The focus group interview was also useful because it provided corroborating data for that which was archival and historical, and further enriched understanding of what happened. As memories in the group were joggled, recollections of the positions actors took occurred and offered leads for further conversation with them relative to their roles and what happened.
Allison I - The Rational Actor

The logic of this model required specific archival data including the proposed changes that were suggested from the beginning of the process to its conclusion. Interview data were required to inform the researcher about meanings behind some of the proposals. In addition, the Lindquist chapter (1978) was also useful in pointing out specific agenda items which subsequently appeared in the proposals.

Allison II - Organizational Process

The data required for this analysis were archival, insofar as an explanation of the committee structure for faculty committees was concerned. Further, the records of committee activity were also useful in that they provided data about what the committees did and what positions they took on the issue. Interview data were required, however, to flush out committee responses. Interviews gave more depth of understanding to positions of turf which committees took. The interviews did not necessarily reflect personal positions that committee members took.

Allison III - Bureaucratic Politics

For this analysis interview data were most necessary and useful. Further, the interview instrument provided only a springboard for the discussions which followed and in which most of the useful information was gleaned.

What general conclusions can be drawn about the data used to analyze the case from each strategic viewpoint?

1. The data collection process was a step-by-step accumulation of information. Thus, archival data provided the foundation which was
corroborated and enriched by the focus group interview. Individual interviews followed. Nonetheless, it was necessary to return to the written records repeatedly. The accumulation of data provided an overview of what happened. Each analytic strategy forced a different structuring of the data and an examination of the data from a different perspective.

2. For this study the survey instrument was not particularly useful. While it did provide evidence of approximately 40 per cent of the faculty's view of what happened and who made it happen, it provided little information specific enough to be useful.

3. The focus group interview provided an excellent means for enriching the researcher's understanding of what happened. By bringing key actors together and structuring an interview, new information not in the record was brought to light, and a discussion of various nuances and interpretations of what happened was possible in ways not possible by individual interviews.

4. An individual interview schedule for this kind of multiple analysis was useful only as a means of garnering much more information in an open-ended format. Precise questions caused the interviewee to want to remember, and the discussion which often ensued would provide a richness of information not approached by the formal questions.

Findings Relative to the Specific Propositions:

The specific propositions which begin and end each analysis in Chapter III were derived from the logic of each analytic strategy.
The propositions are suggestive of what one would expect to find in the Hartwick case if the decision occurred according to the logic of each strategy. By performing the four analyses, determining what happened using the logic of each strategy, and comparing that analysis with the propositions, greater insight was gained about the Educational Objectives/Graduation Requirement case at Hartwick College. The specific propositions and findings are presented below.

Schneier Proposition 1:

It is likely that proposals to radically alter the college's educational objectives and graduation criteria would be met with resistance. The nature of the issue definition-proposal formulation stages is to identify a problem and develop a range of alternative solutions. This is achieved through the work of various groups with differing perspectives.

It was found that radical alteration of the existing educational objectives and graduation criteria was resisted early on, as soon as the issue was publicly announced, along with a series of proposals, which were perceived as suggesting too much change. It was also found that alternative generation was not done by committee; instead, individuals were required to develop alternative proposals.

Proposition 1, parts 1 and 2 were supported; part 3 was not supported.

Schneier Proposition 2:

Those groups not involved in the issue definition stage will be involved in the proposal formulation stage. There will be unit interest in framing the problem in ways relevant to each unit's mission and goals. Proposal formulations will link the issue from the group perspective to an alternative.

It was found that this situation was engineered so that committees not involved in issue definition were involved in, if not proposal
formulation, then proposal review. There is evidence that the same thing would have occurred in any case, since the review process at minimum would have had to include other committees. Further, the committees did address the issue from the perspectives of their own turf.

**Proposition 2, parts 1 and 2 were supported; part 3 was not supported.**

**Schneier Proposition 3:**

Radical policy proposals for educational objectives and graduation requirements will be leveled or made less radical in the support mobilization and enactment stages. Mobilization will serve to bring people aboard, but at a price—a compromise in the proposals to what those being asked to support the proposal can live with. Enactment is the point where consensus and substantive compromise meet and decision is reached. Since the stages are organizational as opposed to unit-related, positions will be isolated and determined during these stages of the process.

It was found that the radical proposals were leveled in the latter stages of the process, although leveling began early on. So did the support mobilization stage which was discussed elsewhere. The support mobilization stage served as a filter, identifying those interested and those not, and separating elements of the proposals which were acceptable from those which were not. Finally, support was gained for the proposals by changing the proposals and making them more moderate.

**Proposition 3 was supported in all parts.**

**Allison I Proposition 1:**

The college would reject those proposed educational objectives and graduation criteria which would create the greatest uncertainty for the college. That is, alternatives posing uncertainty about what the college would do differently compared to what it had been doing would be rejected.
Also rejected would be alternatives which would have created uncertainty about the perception the clientele would have about the college.

Thus, the college would reject any alternative which it perceived it in a different way, e.g. as an experimental college in the mold of Goddard or Sarah Lawrence.

It was found that while the college moved away from any radically different proposals, it is unclear that it did so because of issues of environmental uncertainty or position.

Proposition 1 was supported, but not necessarily for the reason suggested.

Proposition 2:

The college would accept those proposed educational objectives and graduation criteria which would serve to clarify perceived unfocussed or conflictful objectives and criteria, but would not alter radically the operations of the college or the perception of the clientele. In other words, the college would seek solutions which kept change as minimal as possible in order not to disrupt operations and to retain a known clientele base.

Thus, the college would seek to refine its statements of educational objectives marginally in order to increase its share of potential clientele.

It was found that the changes that were made to the educational objectives and graduation requirements reflected an awareness on the part of the college that it was endeavoring to educate students differently from its practices of preceding years. As with Proposition 1, there is no evidence that this was done for the purpose of attracting potential clientele.

Proposition 2 was supported.
Allison II Proposition 1:

Any policy outcome is less dependent on proposal quality or external factors than it is on organizational variables within the college. Those variables include organizational structure, patterns of interaction within the structure, and the degree of diversity in approach to the activities of various organizational units. A policy outcome will not be chosen from a wide array of options.

Organizational units—committees, offices, and departments—proved to be more important in determining the outcome than were either external factors or the quality of the proposals. The reason for this was that the process was designed to expose problems with the proposals that committees, etc., would have and to work those out prior to approval. Thus, unit primacy was assured.

Proposition 1 was supported.

Allison II Proposition 2:

A policy outcome will require approval of the important policy making bodies. The proposed policy will be amended until it can be accepted by the unit with the most influence, and will, in its approved form, differ only slightly from the previous policy. Thus, the new policy will not require organizational units to vary their activities to any significant degree.

Proposals were amended until they could be accepted by the important policy making bodies. Since such important bodies are interested in continuity, there was little in the approved changes that required departments or offices implementing changes to do things differently in the future.

Proposition 2 was supported.

Allison III Proposition 1:

It is less likely that radically different statements of educational objectives and graduation criteria will be adopted when the faculty has relatively more influence on the outcome than do the President or other college leaders.
It was found that the faculty had authority over the issue, and the President had little influence on the outcome.

Proposition 1 was supported.

Allison III Proposition 2:

The probability that a radical proposal will be adopted increases with the number of faculty leaders whose general propensities are for radical change. The members of the following groups would be counted as faculty leaders:

- Faculty Council
- Senior Faculty members
- Department Chairs
- The President and Dean

It was found that with the exception of the Biology Professor, there was little interest on the part of other faculty leaders for a change which would effect the way things were done.

Proposition 2 was supported.

Allison III Proposition 3:

For such an issue the decision would be made in ad hoc, informal discussion settings rather than in formal committee settings. Included in those informal discussions would be members of the following groups:

- Faculty Council
- Senior Faculty members
- Department Chairs
- The President, Dean and other administrative leaders

Data showed that the substance of decision was reached on an ad hoc basis informally and that confirmation and legitimization occurred in the formal committee structure.

Proposition 3 was supported.

Allison III Proposition 4:

The perceptions each discussant has about the issue will be markedly different. Differences in perception will be predictable based on the demands of position and personality.
It was found that positions taken by individuals on the issue were affected by the person's place in the college (departmentally and in terms of governance) and on his/her philosophical position on the kind of issue.

Proposition 4 was supported.

Allison III Proposition 5:

Action or closure on a decision will be delayed while proponents try to get those who are reluctant to agree.

It was found that the decision took eighteen months to reach. There appeared to be little manifest conflict at any point in the process. This would suggest that no closure on the issue was suggested until people were ready to do so. The decision was delayed while agreement was reached.

Proposition 5 was supported.

Allison III Proposition 6:

Major decisions are not made by small numbers. Instead, at the time a decision is reached, it receives a large plurality.

It was found that the voice vote in faculty meetings was heavily in the affirmative. Interview data suggested that the reasons for this were twofold: 1) the majority of faculty believed that the proposal on which they were voting represented the best compromise that could be worked out, and 2) the majority of the faculty were more interested in reaching closure than they were in determining if some other approach might not have been more appealing.

Proposition 6 was supported.
Allison III Proposition 7:

No educational decision is cast by the participation of a large number of faculty. No decision is made until all who desired a chance to participate have had that opportunity.

It was found that part of the reason for the issue taking so long was that there had to be time for those only marginally interested to participate briefly before turning to other matters. Thus, the time it took for all who wanted to participate was long. The key actors, however, were few. The key actors, including the Professor of Biology, History, Religion, and Spanish and the Coordinator of Institutional Research were the ones who managed the issue from the beginning to end.

Proposition 7 was supported.

Summary of Findings:

The following seven findings represent observations made or conclusions reached in the process of the research. As such, these findings relate to other research, to observations about the analytic strategy and to the case which was examined.

1. As Lindblom (1980, p. 4) suggested, the functional stages of the policy process can be collapsed.

Lindblom was critical of analysis based only on a procedural approach. He suggested that one shortcoming of an approach based on artificially defined stages in the process, e.g. Schneier's stages (issue definition, proposal formulation, support mobilization, and enactment) was that those stages might collapse as the analyst worked with the data.
In this case study the only two stages which were clearly visible as discrete entities were the issue definition stage and the decision enactment stage. The proposal formulation stage and the support mobilization stage were much more difficult to separate. As proposals were developed, discussed and debated, support was generated for them. By the time a single proposal was presented officially to the faculty, the original proposal had been moderated substantially, and support for the moderated proposal was at that time basically in place.

Support mobilization was generated from the time the issue was defined, but not for a specific proposal. Rather support was sought for changing the statements of Educational Objectives and Graduation Criteria. There was as much concern for the process of change as there was for any substantive content. It seemed in this case as though support mobilization had been a stage designed by those proposing change to be part of the process from beginning to end. Thus, while it may be useful to think of a functional stage analytic strategy, there is no support from this study that a clear-cut stage by stage analysis is possible. Perhaps due to the particular circumstances of this case, it is more appropriate to suggest that a clearly defined support mobilization stage is not as large a factor as it would be in a larger, more complex legislative setting.

2. In the absence of interactions between two organizations, the analyst using Allison Model I will tend to focus on the content of the issue rather than on the rational choice each organization would make.
The logic of the Rational Actor model requires value maximizing behavior, and assumes that each organization behaves as if it were guided by a single decision maker. When two organizations are interactive, the variables to be examined include value maximizing choices for each, in light of the issue. When asking questions that an analyst using Model I would ask, i.e., what is the problem, what are the alternatives, the focus turns to the substance of the issue rather than to how the substance would be modified by the presence of an external organization.

Because analysis in this situation was more concerned with issue substance than the interaction between organizations should not imply that value maximization was sought by the college. There was little evidence, however, that the college examined alternative proposals for their congruence with stated goals or with desired states of affairs.

3. The changes to the statement of Educational Objectives and Graduation Criteria did reflect what the college had determined was important, based on work in prior years.

Using the analytic strategy of Model I, it was demonstrated that emergent goals were included in the new statements. Those emergent goals included: 1) greater reliance on student personal development, and were reflected in a wording which placed more responsibility on students; 2) an attempt to make the educational objectives measurable, that is, to be able to measure whether or not the college achieved its objectives using as a gauge the graduation criteria. Since there was causal linkage designed between the graduation criteria and educational objectives, the latter would be achieved by students satisfying the criteria for graduation. The data suggests that this policy decision
was the culmination of several conscious thrusts to affect change in the college since 1970. Thus, the efforts of those involved with the strategies for the change project, those involved in CIR, and the President served to move the college toward the change which was reflected in the new policy.

4. The substantive changes to the statements, especially the graduation criteria statement, were minimal, and reflected little of the change discussed in Finding 3.

   The changes to the graduation criteria included addition of a senior project, minimum performance requirements in the area of concentration, and deletion of an interdisciplinary requirement. These changes were made in lieu of more radical changes that had been proposed. Other proposed changes were rejected primarily because the faculty were unwilling to accept change when they perceived change to be unnecessary.

5. The policy outcomes resulted in few operational changes for academic departments, faculty or students.

   One prediction in Allison's Organizational Process Model (Model II) is that the situation concerning any given issue in the near future will be only marginally different from the situation in the present. In other words, change is small and incremental.

   The data showed that the procedures for graduating seniors used after the new policy was adopted were changed marginally from the procedures used to evaluate seniors under the new policy. The primary difference was the need to calculate the percentage of courses at the grade of C or better in the area of concentration; if that percentage was less than 80%, the student could not graduate. Since those calculations
were made by the Registrar's Office, the academic departments had nothing new to do. The change that most affected what departments did was the requirement that seniors prepare a thesis or some appropriate project which demonstrated their comprehension and mastery of the field in which they had majored. This meant, for most departments, the creation of a new course, although some departments used the independent study number for that purpose. Not only was a curricular change required, but the change meant a change in staffing, since faculty would routinely be required to teach the new course. The change meant the reallocation of one-eighth of one faculty member's load in a department which had created a new course. In departments where the senior project was treated as an independent study, faculty added those without decreasing their loads.

Finally, the only other noticeable effect the new policy had on the curriculum was to depress enrollment in interdisciplinary courses. Students had been required to do interdisciplinary study since the mid-1960's. This policy change established the requirement and the enrollment in such courses offered under the auspices of the Committee on Interdisciplinary and Non-Departmental Study languished.

6. The college demonstrated in this situation a collegial decision style similar to that described by Millett.

The Professor of Biology and Coordinator of Institutional Research, leaders in the process to adopt new statements of educational objectives and graduation criteria, had also been part of the CIR and had adopted from the strategies consultants an open style which included the involvement
of others in discussion and decision. Further, others who had also learned this style meant that there was a group of faculty committed to making the style work. President Anderson had spoken often in support of a community of scholars. Finally, the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) had demonstrated that there was a strong feeling in much of the permanent part of the college—faculty, administration, and trustees—that "community" was an aspiration. With a commitment to collegial style, the faculty committee structure was a natural way to involve many faculty, to demonstrate that the governance system worked, and to demonstrate that the system was open. There were some faculty who were convinced that the strategies groups and the CIR were designed by the President to create massive change in the college. Some believed that the President would engineer these changes in spite of what some—perhaps the majority—of faculty wanted. The process used for making the decision about Educational Objectives and Graduation Criteria was an open process, and the governance structure was fully utilized to help make the decision.

7. Allison's Model III analysis showed in detail, how the informal organization worked.

The Professor of Biology and the Coordinator of Institutional Research, as well as some others, were very much committed to the proposed change of policy. It turned out, however, that while these were the key actors in support of change, they were not the key actors in making the decision. Key to the actual decision were the Professors of History and Religion, who effectively worked to change the proposals. This
particular analytic approach was useful in demonstrating their roles in modifying the proposals. This was so because the focus of the model was on the activity of participants. Thus, what was not shown in the analysis of the organizational structure, and was not evidenced in the analysis of the issue content or of the longitudinal process, was brought out in this analytic approach. The Professors of History and Religion were involved in the issue by submitting proposed changes to the original proposals. Their submissions resulted from campus conversations held informally with a number of faculty. They served as an important communications link between and among faculty who were mildly interested, but not enough so to become involved themselves. They also served as a link between those who were proponents of change and those who opposed it. Both were members of Planning Council; therefore they were a part of the formal structure. It was the casual contacts these professors had, in addition to their formal place in the governance structure, which assured that information was shared between and among those involved on various sides of the issue.

Implications for practitioners, theory and future research:

This final section explores the implications of this study. First to be considered are the ways in which administrators and faculty in higher education institutions might find this study useful. Particularly considered are ways in which greater attentiveness during the policy development process can lead to outcomes that are different from those outcomes which would have been achieved without watchfulness. Second are considered those implications for the body of theory
concerned with decision making. Of interest here is an evaluation of the analytic strategies, originally designed to be used for international and national level policy analysis. Thus examined are issues of applicability of these approaches at the institutional level, and in higher education rather than outright political systems. Finally listed are the implications for future research, including hypotheses that the findings of this study suggest.

Implications for Practitioners:

The decision to modify the statements of educational objectives and graduation criteria was in some ways a lesson in gentle politics—"gentle" because there was no overt conflict, no strenuous political maneuvering. The proposals, more radical than the faculty would accept, were gradually modified and shaped into changes that were acceptable. By the time discussion was held in faculty meeting, the original proposals were not part of the discussion. The reasons for this appeared to be the two-pronged interests of the proposers: 1) change in educational policy and 2) a desire to involve everyone in order to achieve a sense of collegiality. Since clarity of purpose was uncertain, it was possible for those interested in reducing the potential amount of change to do so under the rubric of collegiality, thereby reducing the change proponents' effectiveness. One implication, therefore, must be that those involved in decision making must be clear on the outcome they seek. Goals which require what many perceive to be significant change and which require collegiality as outcome seem to suggest that change will be sacrificed to collegiality or vice versa. Perrow
(1970, p. 135) suggested that the decision examined in this study was a conflict over two kinds of goals: Product goals, referring to the characteristics of Hartwick's education, versus System goals, the way in which the college went about making decisions. Those who proposed the original change in educational policy at Hartwick were proposing to change the product goals. Those resistant to a radical policy change suggested that such a change would have implications on the way the college conducted its day-to-day business. The concerns of the latter group prevailed.

A second implication for practitioners is that strategic analysis for the purpose of predicting policy outcomes can be a useful activity. By examining the issue from the four perspectives used in this study, a policy maker can early on develop tactics which will help assure a desired outcome. By plotting the sequence of a decision, key moments in the process can be identified and attended to in the four stages. By examining issue content possibilities, warning cues can be established which may prevent the content from changing dramatically. An analysis of the decision making structure will offer the opportunity to prepare that structure for the decision. Identification of potential active participants in the process, or those who are likely to become involved, will ensure the opportunity for communication and persuasion, thus enhancing the chance that the decision will stay on track.

By making assumptions about chronological and sequential stages in the process, an administrator can move the decision along by identifying times when the process should change from stage to stage. Put
another way, one can assess when it is appropriate to concentrate on proposal formulation or support mobilization. Understanding the process at some conceptual level can help a participant to know the propitious time to act.

Similarly, understanding possible changes in the proposal content, or possible options for modifying the proposal, can afford the practitioner greater power and perhaps more likelihood of reaching desired outcomes. By taking time to analyze possible outcomes, the practitioner can become more aware of potential areas that may affect the decision.

Decisions are made by individuals or groups who find themselves participating in the process of making the decision. Thus, knowledge of sequence and issue content is not enough. Consideration must also be given to the participants and the structure in which they work. This point is similar to one made by March and Olsen (1976), that participation in the decision process is fluid, that actors enter and exit from decision situations dependent on their personal needs and job-related responsibilities. Thus, if another more pressing or more intriguing issue comes along, actors are likely to shift their attention to different issues. The astute practitioner will examine which players are likely to be in what part of the organization and in which decision making structures they are likely to participate. When identification is made of who will be interested in the issue and participate in it, then the practicing administrator can develop a strategy and tactics for dealing with the situation.
The implications of this study for the practitioner are action oriented. Suggested are ways in which the analytic strategies might be used for predictive purposes. In order to do that an assessment of the operational questions will provide necessary focus for each of the strategies. For example, such questions as "What is the problem?" or "What are the action channels?" serve to bring amorphous information into more specific focus. Also suggested, however, by implication is that a practitioner would use this analytic approach for political purposes, that is, to further the chances that his/her desired outcome would be more likely successful. This approach is also political because it implies that purposeful activity may not be rational, organizationally value maximizing, but instead be undertaken to further one's personal goal. Without arguing the virtues of the approach, it seems that clearly one implication of this study for practitioners is the ability to use its strategies to offer assistance in predicting outcomes and in devising means to shape them.

Implications for Theorists and Future Research:

The purpose of this study was to describe the application of four analytic strategies in explaining a policy making situation in a college. The four analytic strategies were grounded in theories of organization, conflict and models of academic governance. There are five implications of this study that should be considered:

1. This study should be replicated in colleges similar to Hartwick and in other size and types of institutions using the same analytic strategies.
In order to learn more about policy making, the study should be replicated at institutions similar to Hartwick, i.e. small, independent colleges, in order to determine whether the analytic strategies yield lucid explanations about how policy was made. Additionally, the study should be replicated at institutions of different size and type, e.g. large independent universities, small and large public institutions, to determine whether the numbers of units and different lines of accountability effect the internal policy process, and if so, how.

2. This study should be replicated, using the same analytic strategies to determine whether policy making outcomes are affected by different types of issues.

By examining different substantive issues, for example, problems of budget or hiring/firing policy, it would be possible to determine whether the kind of issue under consideration affects the decision process.

By replicating this study it would be possible to determine whether policy analysis using the analytic strategies applied in this study yield increased knowledge about policy making in different kinds of institutions and for different kinds of policy issues. There is another order of implication, however, which should be explored: it deals with the style of decision making on campus.

3. To what degree is the possibility for change in organizational policy limited by a collegial approach to policy making?

The present study showed that change was limited by a collegial approach to the process of decision. It would be useful to know if a collegial style generally limits the degree of change that is possible.
4. **To what degree is the collegial process of decision making, rather than the substance of the issue under consideration, the determinant of a policy outcome?**

To be examined is whether the issue under consideration is a matter of policy determination compared to the process of decision. Information about whether there are substantive issues that are resolved and unaffected by a collegial process would increase understanding of under what conditions that process is used.

5. **To what degree does collegiality allow for the play of campus politics and rational action in policy making?**

The present study suggested that rational action and political considerations were operative in the process, yet within the context of a collegial style. Further research in the analysis of policy making would contribute to understanding how the various styles of decision making interact.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Dror, Ychezkel, Public Policy Re-examined, as quoted in Dye, 1972.


Easton, David, as quoted in Dye, 1972.


Filstead, William, Qualitative Methodology: Firsthand Involvement with the Social World. Chicago: Markham, 1970.


Appendix A
Policy - Process - Paradigm

This paradigm was developed by the researcher based on Schneier's functional stage approach to policy making. The paradigm follows in format those designed by Allison, who in turn credited their design to Merton (1971, p. 32). The purpose for generating this paradigm was to construct a framework similar to the three Allison frameworks so that research questions parallel to Allison's could be asked. In order to do that, the assumptions had to be set forth. The questions, then, are framed in the same context as all other research questions, i.e., "An analyst viewing the situation from the perspective of this model would ask these questions" (Allison, 1971, p. 258).

I. Basic Unit of Analysis: organizational action is the result of a multi-stage process.

Policy making occurs as the result of a process that spans identifiable stages of development. Central to this analytic model is that decisions are not the sole result of a process whereby problems are identified, alternative solutions generated and evaluated, resulting in a decision; rather, decisions result from the active participation and support of organizational units and members at all stages of the process.

II. Organizing Concepts:

A. Issue Definition. Conditions in the organization or environment of interest to organizational units and members which are translated into issues for the purpose of organizational action.

B. Proposal Formulation. Issues are scrutinized and specific proposals for changed policy or for maintenance of the status quo are developed by units or members involved in the issue.

C. Support Mobilization. Organizational units and members are induced by each other to decide for or against alternate policy proposals.

D. Decision Enactment. Authoritative choice made legitimately among alternative policy recommendations.
III. Dominant Inference Pattern:

For an organization to reach policy decision there must have been an awareness of and consensus for the need to examine the status quo. Proposal must have been put forward which would meet the objectives of various organizational units and members. Subsequent discussion perhaps would have resulted in the modification or adjustment of alternative proposals so that greater support for some proposals could be generated. Choice of any policy would be legitimate, is recognized as official, but would result from bargaining wherein units with greater power or influence were more persuasive.

IV. General Propositions:

Policy decisions are based on goals and objectives of organizations, their sub-units and members. Those goals and objectives are applied to identified problems in the context of a multi-stage process. Decision results only after there is sufficient support for one alternative solution, and then the decision is made by legitimate authority. This yields three propositions:

1) The first stages of the process, issue definition and proposal formulation are of particular interest to organizational units and/or actors, since they apply to the relationship between goals and objectives and the nature of the issue at hand. Units and actors have stakes in defining problems and generating alternatives. Thus, activity in the first two stages of this process is centered in units and actors in the organization.

2) The choice of policy is an organizational event rather than a lower level event. Support for a proposed policy must be governed from a broader range of units and actors than would be true of a unit policy decision. Consumers must be established and held until an authoritative choice is made. Therefore, the stages of support mobilization and decision enactment are times when the organization units and actors are involved in political bargaining and negotiation. These two stages involve the use of power and influence on all relevant constituencies.

3) The stages of issue definition and proposal formulation are political only insofar as units or actors work to place the issue or proposal into what they perceive to be a stronger bargaining position. In other words, issues will first be viewed as unit related, therefore evaluated in terms of unit goals and objectives, free of political consideration. The same is true of proposals. Only when the issue is worked out in the context of its relationship to the unit will political positioning occur. Political positioning is an activity a unit or individual will take to strengthen his unit's problem statement or proposed alternative vis a vis other possible statements or alternatives.
Appendix B

Research Interview
January 22, 1980

The following tape is the result of a focused group interview with the Dewar Professor of History, the Coordinator of Institutional Research, a Professor of Biology, an Assistant Professor of Spanish, and an O’Connor Professor of Nursing. All those interviewed are currently employed at Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York. All those interviewed were involved in the decision which is the subject of this case study.

The interview was held on January 22, 1980, and concerns the decision to amend educational objectives and graduation requirements. The decision was made in 1975.

The following is an introductory statement and questions. Each question is followed by discussion.

Researcher: from the minutes of the various committees. Lindquist's book was clearly helpful in giving a general picture.

Professor of History: Tim, I remember you, Jack and I were on a subcommittee together, but I can’t remember when it was. We drafted.

Ass't Professor of Spanish: It would have been, I guess, between something like March and June of '74, because when Earl came to the Chairmanship of the Planning Council we decided to go after graduation requirements and educational objectives.

Professor of History: It was after spring term of '74, because I was on sabbatical then.

Ass't Professor of Spanish: Could it have been before that? Between January and March?
Professor of History: Don't think so. I was away two springs, '73 and '74, so I have these gaps in my knowledge. One spring I came back and the library tried to burn down.

Coordinator of Inst. Research: Oh, you missed that, Dan!
(To Earl:) You became faculty chair in 1974?

Professor of Biology: In November of '74.

Coordinator: Well, how were you ever chair of Planning Council then?

Ass't Professor of Spanish: Right at its very beginning. From December, 73, to November, 74.

Researcher: Maybe we could start back a little bit for a moment. How did the whole issue start? It must have been first articulated in 1972, I think in CIR. Who started it rolling? Who initially articulated it?

Coordinator: My recollection is that it was Earl. That when the CIR was trying to figure out what it ought to do, and other people might have contributed, and we were also in the Strategies for Change... and I lose the chronology on that... where there was lots of talk of goals and objectives. But my recollection is that it started with the talk about goals and objectives. That you didn't really know what a planning council could do until you knew what you were in business for, what you were trying to produce, and that that was where we needed to start.

Ass't Professor of Spanish: Well, so now you're pulling it together out of CIR and into Planning Council, which moves it ahead; that's where my first recollection of it was, but then again, I didn't have as much contact with CIR prior to that.

Professor of Nursing: Remember that we were trying to determine how you measure what our educational objectives and goals were, and we decided that we couldn't measure it because we really didn't have well-defined goals and objectives... that they were nice philosophical kinds of terms, but weren't really measurable and it was at that point that we began to say, "Hey, if we're really going to get a handle on whether students achieve these, we need objectives written in such a way that they are measurable." And I think that's what started initiating them.

Ass't Professor of Spanish: So that was the CIR concern.

Coordinator: And I may identify it with Earl, because you were chairman, weren't you? CIR.

Professor of Biology: I can't remember.
Coordinator: Yeah, cause once... when did Max (Vice President for Institutional Research) leave?

Researcher: He never made the charts.

Coordinator: Yeah, because once he was gone, you were chairman (Earl). When I went into that job part time, that was part of what got worked out, that I didn't like the role of staff and chair, so we split it; I was staff and you were chair.

So my identification may be with you because the CIR was fussing with this how did you measure your educational attainment if you're not clear on what your objectives are. And then in the Planning Council, you were clearly the one, when that started, I couldn't swear whether it was in the board room or Thornwood, but in one or the other place, I can see you saying the Planning Council has to start is the definition of what we're in business for. Probably a Sunday night, too!

Professor of Biology: And it was at that time I think, that the people serving on Planning Council had a sense that although it really wasn't their province to try to establish educational criteria, etc., it was important to act as a catalyst in that regard... to get more appropriate bodies weighing this problem.

Professor of History: There was some point or other when, Tim and Jack and I were put on committee to... this was after... the thing I remember is the place where I began to become involved in this thing is I remember than Andy felt very strongly that graduation requirements shouldn't be just a collection of things that you place together, but some sort of coherent whole. And I remember I had some philosophical difficulties with that, and this was before we had this committee.

Asst Professor of Spanish: That was a subcommittee of the Council. I remember that.

Coordinator: Yeah! You actually drafted the proposal, didn't you?

Researcher: To what degree did the Strategies Project trigger all this?

Professor of Nursing: I suspect it made us conscious to look at what was in the wind.

Coordinator: Yeah, one, the statements I remember somebody making about the contribution of Strategies was that it provided an occasion for people who were already concerned to get together to talk about some of these things. So how much was Strategies really starting it and how much was Strategies being the opportunity for people from various parts of the community who were concerned to come together? It certainly did provide the occasions, although there were sure times when we wondered!
Professor of Nursing: That's why initially I think Strategies brought together groups of people. I think eventually the nucleus of people who continued with it were people who were interested in what was happening and so on. And then it allowed it to really begin to raise these questions that eventually got to asking these kinds of questions. But I'm not sure that when Strategies first started that it necessarily brought people together who were interested.

Researcher: Planning Council, though, grew out of a different set of issues and another conflict, as I understand it.

Professor of Biology: Yeah, that grew out of the racetrack at Saratoga. A group of us got together at Saratoga and as a diversion on at least one occasion we went to the racetrack. This was a Professor of Psychology, myself, Nursing, Religion, an Assistant Professor of History and the Dean of Students.

Coordinator: But wasn't that a Strategies event?

Professor of Biology: Yeah, right—it was associated with Strategies. Looking at the governance structure.

Professor of History: This was a sequel to the union movement back in 73?

Professor of Biology: I think this was an outgrowth of the faculty concern at that time. . .there was a resolution of concern that. . .thrown up.

Professor of History: I remember; I was junketing the Societ Union at that time.

Professor of Biology: You weren't here for that exciting event?

Professor of History: I remember there was a meeting just before I left up in Eaton Lounge, where the question was whether or not there should be a union. And then I sailed off into workers' paradise.

Professor of Nursing: It was the Collegium that actually was the thing that was developed at Saratoga. And when the faculty turned that down, it was the Planning Council.

Ass't Professor of Spanish: It seems to me that the Dean of the College had a big role in that in suggesting the Planning Council as an alternative to the Collegium.

Coordinator: He pulled together the things people could agree on.

Professor of Biology: Hmm; I recall that pretty clearly.

Ass't Professor of Spanish: I recall a meeting that was in the Music Circle. One of the few times we ever had a meeting. . .that's where it was.
Researcher: What was the relationship between the Planning Council and the CIR?

Asst Professor of Spanish: Overlapping membership.

Coordinator: Oh, the membership was overlapping incredible. Not complete, no, and not on either side.

Professor of Nursing: Common concerns, but I think no direct input, certainly from CIR to Planning Council. I think overlapping membership allowed the same kinds of concerns to be expressed.

Professor of Biology: I think that the CIR was really the most effective informal body that existed during this period of time in that many good ideas were developed there that were ultimately pushed into various formal components.

Professor of Nursing: Interesting and no part of your tape, but I suspect that if we had CIR today that some of the problems we're having would be resolved in a more effective way.

Professor of Biology: But again, it impressed me that this represented a kind of parallel structure which was looked at askance in terms of not having that type of administrative control that's necessary or required.

Coordinator: Not at this point in our history.

Professor of Biology: No, but at some point.

Coordinator: Not anywhere after 1976.

Professor of History: There were people who felt that the difficulty with CIR sort of thing was that too much influence. You had to invest more time in going to meetings than lots of us had, so that there were people who preferred a more formal kind of committee structure, and not the dual kind.

Professor of Nursing: That was always felt though I think more by people who had not participated in CIR, in terms of being outside and didn't want to extend that kind of energy.

Researcher: Was it your sense that the non-CIR'ers were jealous and sensed that CIR had more power than maybe it had?

Professor of History: Yeah. No, that was the way a lot of people felt. Well, not jealous exactly, but it seemed as though that the locus of activity came from the formal committees.
Coordinator: And yet this was a time in the college's history where at least it was tolerated to have the two, and it was important that the informal one at least attempt to behave itself to some point in terms of channelling things. And of course this is one of the things I remember most from Mary—she was very sensitive to this issue—that it was important, I mean CIR could do some background work and come up with some ideas, but that we needed to exercise some care that things then got fed through the official structure. But I'm sure we didn't always do that, and I'm sure not everybody understood all that, but there was a lot more tolerance of having a formal and an informal thing side by side.

Researcher: But I seem to remember, after I came in 75, a growing awareness of the need to more closely coordinate the activities of the informal like CIR with the established campus committees, and the indication that I had, or that I maybe grew inappropriately, was that CIR all of a sudden was perceived to be powerful and that this was a conscious movement on your part, Mary, to essentially let committees think that they had more say than they did.

Professor of Biology: They always had say.

Researcher: OK, so you don't perceive that the normal governance structure was ever cut out of the action.

Coordinator: No, I certainly don't.

Professor of Biology: No. There was a concerted effort at each stage in the development of CIR to maintain an appropriate contact with the formal governance structure.

Professor of Nursing: Yup. We were constantly tuned in to feelings that Dan was saying and trying to offset them, trying to say is that what we were really doing were tasks that no one else seemed to be interested in doing on campus that needed to be done, but that we were really not a decision making body that we would get the background work stirred up and see if it could get into the system. I don't think we ever considered bypassing the system.

Coordinator: And the major difference at least from where I set is that in one administration (Anderson's) the style of operating, was that all the members of the Dean's staff and the President enjoyed participating in the kind of discussion that went on in CIR, threw out their ideas as well as heard the other peoples' ideas and then it was these same bodies who met with various standing committees so that there was that kind of cross pollination. With the change in administration (Wilder), this was no longer true, and this was not the kind of thing that the new administration was comfortable with. And so then CIR was no
longer appropriate, because if it couldn't be a kind of
group that served some purpose to standing committees and
to administration, it really had no place, because just to be
a gadfly completely outside the structure isn't a very satis-
fying way to behave which is why essentially we went out of
business. But a lot of what we did was deeply involved with
the President and particularly with the Associate Deans, not so
much the Dean, although he was never in any kind of opposition
to what we were doing.

Professor of Nursing: And the Dean used to participate at times.

Coordinator: Yeah, we even had some meetings at his home. So it was
very much an informal group that the administration enjoyed
talking to and that just made a world of difference in terms
of what happened with the new administration.

Researcher: One of the things that I sense, is that for faculty
who weren't involved in CIR— didn't want to be—or felt they
didn't have time to be—to what degree were the issues that
CIR raised issues that a portion of the faculty didn't want
to have raised?

Professor of History: Well, yeah. I think there were a variety of
points of view and shifting things. Some people perceived a
kind of ideological theme running throughout things that a lot
of people didn't agree with. And I guess some people were
sure that it all was Andy's Machievellian way of getting things
in the hopper. The thing that seemed bothersome was that if
you wanted any input through the CIR that you had to invest an
inordinate amount of time, and if you were already teaching
courses, and on Faculty Council and things, you didn't have the
time. So I guess there was a certain amount of self-selection—
I guess those people who didn't find themselves particularly
soulmates with the strategies bunch, that set up a sort of label
that perhaps turned some people off too. Of course, I found
some of the Saratoga bunch interesting to talk to individually,
But as a bunch, we weren't quite on the same wavelength.

Coordinator: Even that title I remember, because the title being
"Strategies for Change and Knowledge Utilization" is not the
kind of thing you use every day over coffee, so it became
"Strategies" or "Strategies for Change," which on the face of
it, if it wasn't your slogan could be pretty objectionable,
because it sounded as if...

Ass't Professor of Spanish: It was an attack on the status quo.

Coordinator: Right, without even being terribly concerned about why.
Professor of History: The term "Strategies for Change" seemed to beg some questions that we thought ought to be examined.

Coordinator: And we were floating out these "Institutional Function Inventories" and the experiential college questionnaires, and all this kind of stuff floating around the campus that isn't some peoples' cup of tea.

Professor of History: The occasion to respond to memoranda ad nauseum.

Researcher: Earl, by the summer of '74, I think you were Chairman of the Planning Council, if not Chairman of the Faculty, but you were—at least the minutes record that you were—quite insistent that a strategy for managing these proposed changes through the governance system was as important as whatever it was that was proposed.

Professor of Biology: Yeah, well that was simply a continuation of long-standing philosophy, which I don't think was a departure from what had existed before.

Researcher: Your philosophy, college philosophy, Planning Council philosophy?

Professor of Biology: That was a way of attempting to move things.

Ass't Professor of Spanish: Modus operandi.

Professor of Biology: I think one overriding concern of everyone involved—equally that were involved in CIR and outside of CIR—was the cumbersomeness of the governance structure that we had in terms of standing committees of the faculty which really couldn't move—the perception was—with enough movement over a period of time to keep up with the college's needs per se. There was a groping, a searching for different ways to try to get stuff done without destroying the structure, but hopefully streamlining that structure in the process. People were attacking it from different ways.

Again if you get to '74 there were earlier attempts beyond what we have here on the board to move toward a more collegial type of informal exchange of...what the hell was that called?

Professor of History: What was that thing?

Professor of Biology: But that flopped; it just didn't work at all.

Coordinator: Are you talking about the informal thing Andy had Sunday nights?
Professor of History: No, it wasn't informal; people were elected to it. I can't remember the name of it.

Professor of Biology: It had students, faculty, administrators. But it had no clout because it didn't belong in the formal structure anywhere. All College Council!

Researcher: Did you feel there was particular value in sharing the Educational Objectives and Graduation requirements with the standing committees. Obviously, you're saying it was part of the way you did things, but did that enrich the proposals in any way or did it simply coalesce support?

Ass't Professor of Spanish: My opinion is that what ... I think it took a lot of the teeth out of it, because the democratic process tends to do that. I think to make things acceptable to so many people is to water it down somewhat, and I think the original proposal was a nice one. Nobody would live with it at all, you know, unless they do support, so you trade those kinds of things off—support for the proposal and losing some of its thrust, I think, by trying to satisfy as many groups as you have to satisfy to be able to get it through all the different levels of the structure. Well, I guess what shows for that is that I guess there isn't a real narrow sense on the part of the college community as to what the objectives are. They can't be narrowly defined, they have to be defined pretty broadly so that people accept them and buy into them.

Professor of History: You got a collection of people with somewhat different objectives. And the things to do—you know, compromise is a great thing.

Ass't Professor of Spanish: You find a common ground.

Professor of History: Yeah, you find a common ground and I think this is the process.

Coordinator: I can remember kind of consoling ourselves afterwards that while the language was a bit different there were some minor changes in terms of the statement of objectives, but that the great accomplishment was that everybody had been involved in talking about it: what are we in business for, what are our goals and what are our objectives, and what's a liberal education all about and this in itself was a very good thing. I don't know how much of that is really a sense of accomplishment and how much was an attempt to keep from being too disappointed that the thing had gotten broader and broader and broader before it ever got into the catalog.
Professor of Nursing: I guess I was in that opposite group. I thought that when the process finally got done that it wasn't any better than what we originally had, that if I went back to CIR and went back to try to say let us sit down and see how we evaluate it that the end product of what we had after all the time and every and talking about it and etc. was not one bit better product for the evaluation process than we had before. We might as well have lived with what we originally had. I guess I felt the frustration not the reward that we all talked about but the frustration that "Hell, I spent a lot of time talking about it and what have we got?"

Professor of Biology: That happened consistently along the way; the collegium, for example, a beautiful idea, didn't get beyond the first vote of the faculty. It was knocked down and modified. I think that one overriding thing that impressed me about all of this ferment that went on is that it indeed did establish a closer sense of meaningful relationship among people. They may have been in disagreement with each other, but they were disagreeing with some degree of civility, exchanging ideas, and on an individual basis felt important in that regard, trying to establish direction for the institution knowing that it was a muddy process all along the way. I certainly got a sense during this time that I got to know a lot of people better, where they were coming from, etc., and very importantly and in retrospect—it sure came out of the milieu of the time—it sure prepared the institution to weather some of the very severe days after that because people did know each other better as a result. I'm thinking in all of this processing that we went through with regard to graduation requirements there was never any real critical examination of the fiscal posture of the institution as it continued to go. That seemed to be information that was essentially privy between the Board and the President and we ran into some hard times there. We ran into also the death of a President. All of these things could have been really quite debilitating, far more debilitating than they were, had it not been for the types of interchanges and actions that we took along the way. I think that was a very great advantage.

Professor of History: I'd like to go one step further than that though. Since I've known the place the system of governance has been evolving very rapidly. And that the governance the machinery just about gets competent to deal with the problems that come up. We didn't have a faculty council until Fred Binder (President, 1959-1969) waved his magic wand and, lo, we had one. Individual faculty members learned the techniques of doing things. This business here was an important part of the growth process. But, I disagree with you, Mary. I think it was
terribly important to get language and I think ideas that were the product of discussions in the 70's and not the 50's where just a few old timers who remember where the bodies were buried. For my money, it seems to me a narrow statement of college objectives which is coherent and with a clear-cut rationale would be appropriate in a very small, highly specialized kind of college, but when you've got a lot of diversity, it seems to me this won't work unless your things are stated in general terms. I like compromise.

Coordinator: Well, I think this is a major difference in some peoples' minds because as we were saying earlier, CIR started out that if we're supposed to be involved in the business of how do you really assess whether or not students have achieved the college's objectives, the objectives have to be stated in such a way that you can tell that. And from that standpoint, the new statement is no better than the old. In terms of their language and the way they were put together and their coherency that might be true, but we still are, with the exception of physical education and writing competency, we're still at the point where we assume that exposure equals attainment of objective, and there were a group of people and still are who aren't satisfied with that as a method for assessing what happens to students as a result of a Hartwick education. And it just occurred to me that I don't know where that kind of thing gets worried about any more because that's the very kind of thing a CIR would be worrying about. It's a different kind of job from standing committees' jobs, and I guess technically belongs in a staff job, but it can't just be done by staff alone.

Researcher: I have one last question. An ad hoc Committee on Style was appointed to finally word the requirements. What was your reaction? You were the makers of the original proposal. What was your reaction to the committee on style and what it did?

Professor of History: Well, my reaction was that this was not only a committee on style but to some extent on substance to make. I remember the thing was perceived as somewhat wooly, idealistic, acceptable to the south end of the parking lot. (Laughter.)

Professor of Nursing: I guess my feeling is that at that point I was so disappointed in what the final product would be that had really been produced and thought that it really wasn't any better, and I didn't care whether they had a committee on whatever they wanted to have. I no longer had any interest in it, and I thought they hadn't done anything better than what we were worrying about (pre-1970), and therefore they could have a committee on anything they wanted to.
Ass't Professor of Spanish: For me, I went to Spain that fall, so I missed that final stuff. . . and it was, thinking back on it the previous spring, I can remember it was just constant going to meetings as people were deliberating on the proposals so that it could be talked to. And even getting on the radio. I remember sitting down on the radio so that students would hear about it. All the time, Student Senate Faculty Council trying to shepherd this thing through and monitoring it somehow and seeing what was happening and trying to answer questions about it. When fall came around, I went to Spain, it was with such a sense of gratitude.

Professor of Biology: My feeling was one of tremendous relief. To get it off the floor of the Faculty at that point, and sharing some of the frustration certainly that Mary shared, but if there were to recover anything from it, it seemed to me it would not be done at that point in the faculty itself, but rather taking the sense of the faculty as a group.

Researcher: You have answered all the questions I wrote down, some even before I asked them. Thank you.
Appendix C
Interview Schedule

1. When the discussion was held to change the statement of Educational Objectives and Graduation Requirements (1974-75), who do you remember as being most involved?

2. Who did you talk to about the issue?

3. Would you characterize your view of the proposed change? (Were you in favor of the changes proposed?)

4. What were your reasons for the approach you took to the issue, insofar as you can remember?

5. How did the issue arise?

6. Do you think the Strategies Project affected the issue? If so, how?

7. Why did Planning Council ask for comments about the proposal from all the other faculty committees and other constituencies?

8. Was the college ready for the degree of change embodied in the September, 1974, proposals?
Appendix D
Survey Instrument

April 16, 1980

To: Members of the Faculty and Administration at Hartwick in 1973-75
From: Doug Mayer

Attached please find a brief survey instrument which will provide data for my dissertation. In fact these are the last bits of data I need. The survey will provide me with a profile of participation in governance and a reflection of faculty perception of who influenced the educational objectives/graduation criteria policy decision of 1975.

The challenge for you is that you will likely have to dredge your memory in order to recall the committees to which you belonged and the positions you took relative to the issues.

I hope you are able to complete the survey and return it to me quickly. You should know that I have paid for this myself; college funds were not used. Thank you for your help.
1. Did you consider yourself to be active in governance from 1972-75?

____ very
____ somewhat
____ very little

2. Were you a member of one of the faculty standing committees? If so, which one?

a) Planning Council  ____ e) Academic Standards  ____
b) Faculty Council  ____ f) Student Life  ____
c) ATP  ____ g) Other  ____
d) Salary & Budget  ____

h) None  ____

3. Did you participate in the Committee on Institutional Research?

____ Yes  ____ No

4. What person or persons do you remember as identifying the issue of educational objectives and graduation criteria:

a) "Andy"  ____ f) Len Pudelka  ____
b) Les Rude  ____ g) Dan Allen  ____
c) Howard Maxwell  ____ h) Jim Lawrence  ____
d) Mary Sees  ____ i) Edith Daly  ____
e) Earl Deubler  ____

5. What committee do you associate with identifying the issue first?

a) Planning Council  ____ c) CIR  ____
b) Faculty Council  ____ d) All College Council  ____
6. Did you favor the establishment of the first Planning Council (1973)?

Yes; why ______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

No; why not ____________________________________________________

7. In your opinion, who was most influential in establishing a Planning Council?

a) Les Rude _______ c) Jim Lawrence _________

b) Earl Deubler _______ d) Jack Garhart _______

8. Planning Council chose reassessing college goals and objectives as its first priority. In your opinion, why was that the issue?

9. In your opinion, what role did "the strategies project" play in leading up to this educational issue?

10. In your opinion, what role did President Anderson play in the educational issue?

11. The faculty spent much time in the fall of 1975 agreeing to the language of the graduation criteria. The language was finally prepared by a "Committee on Style." In your opinion, why was this?
### Appendix E
Policy Proposals
Autumn, 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New York State Minimum Requirements</th>
<th>Professor of Religion</th>
<th>Professor of History</th>
<th>Assoc. Dean for Special Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . At least 120 credits or the equivalent.</td>
<td>. . Complete successfully four years of academic study, or 120 credit hours, or 40 credit courses or the equivalent.</td>
<td>. . Successful completion of 120 semester credits, or the equivalent, exclusive of physical education credits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Education or Distribution
The following objectives which are common to a liberal arts education at Hartwick:
- an understanding of:
  - a. history
  - b. the natural environment
  - c. human communities

Satisfactorily completing courses (amounting to a quarter of his total academic program) in at least six of the following fields:
- literature, philosophy, religion, biological sciences, physical science, mathematics, psychology, sociology, economics, political science, history, art, music, physical education, interdisciplinary studies.

#### Critical Thinking and Analysis
The ability to:
- a. organize, criticize and communicate ideas
- b. solve problems effectively
- c. engage in creative self-expression.

. . demonstrating participation (both active and passive) in some of the extra curricular activities of the college.
. . exhibiting in his work an awareness of the relationship between the parts and the whole, and between his field of study and other areas of scholarship and life.
. . mastering to the extent appropriate to his field of study whatever mathematical, linguistic or other skills may be required for his course of specialization.
. . demonstration (of) the ability to talk and write effectively about his field.

Completion of the Undergraduate Record Examination Area Test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor of Religion</th>
<th>Professor of History</th>
<th>Assoc. Dean for Special Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration of Competence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Successful completion under the supervision of an approved committee, department or division.</strong></td>
<td>Planning in consultation with members of an academic dept. or the Committee on Individual Programs the program of specialization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The knowledge and skills appropriate to his chosen area of specialization.</td>
<td>Completing the courses in the program of specialization.</td>
<td>Completion of a departmental program under the sponsorship of a department in which the student chooses to undertake an in depth study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of the final year of the program as a full time, matriculated Hartwick College student.</td>
<td>Completing during his final year, either individually, or in cooperation with another student or with a faculty member, a project of research, scholarly investigation or artistic creation.</td>
<td>Completion of an individually designed program under the sponsorship of a faculty committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of a program sponsored by a special interest group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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