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Chapter I
Program Review and Evaluation

Historical Overview

American higher education is facing some of the greatest challenges in its history, challenges that are creating an environment of revolution so profound that it will likely change the face of higher education for decades to come. Colleges and universities are now encountering skepticism about the value of education, threats of reduced appropriations, and pressures for greater institutional accountability. These changes have created an environment in which traditional decision making policies in higher education are now under scrutiny.

Faculty have long claimed exclusive authority over academic decisions relative to the determination of performance and promotion criteria for colleagues, standards for publications and research, and for programmatic content and delivery (Baldridge et al., 1978; Blau, 1973). In the past, faculty largely focused on their individualized and specialized activities and left departmental problems and issues of institutional management to the administrative staff. Academic program evaluation was part of this exclusive domain of faculty who evaluated courses and program content in an informal manner. Changes, as a rule, reflected the philosophy and bias of individual faculty who only
occasionally considered the overall impact of their decisions on the
department or institution.

The concept of shared governance has slowly eroded over the years
and, indeed, in some institutions has seldom been practiced (Keller,
1983, p. 37). Administrators were responsible for the day-to-day
operations of the institution which included budget development, per-
sonnel management, and general operations. They rarely became involved
in curricular issues. In recent years, however, changes in the charac-
ter of the student population and a decline in available resources
altered the balance between faculty autonomy regarding curriculum
decisions and administrative concentration on non-curricular issues.

Colleges and universities, who in the past had been insulated from
external pressures, now found themselves in the position of direct
contact with a variety of external groups. Students demonstrated their
opinions through enrollment patterns, program selection, and faculty
evaluations. Alumni, investors, and other constituencies expressed
their level of approval and satisfaction with the system through alloca-
tion of resources, contributions, acceptance of graduates, and program
accreditation. As a consequence, both faculty and administrators in
colleges and universities found it necessary to develop ways to become
more responsive to the demands of external constituencies.

These demands have changed the way in which institutions view
instructional programs. One response has been to move away from an
informal review of academic offerings to a more systematic approach
which provides data for academic decision making (Munitz & Wright,
1980). This move toward a more formalized scrutiny of instructional
programs eroded faculty autonomy and created a milieu in which they were required to submit their programs to public review by colleagues and other interested groups. As a consequence, faculty who taught the courses became part of a larger group who had a stake in the decision outcomes regarding academic programs.

A variety of methods have been used to conduct instructional reviews. These methods generally fall into three categories. The first was the internal, informal review conducted by program faculty who had no established criteria or process. The only check and balance was colleague support and sanction. As government agencies began to provide funds for academic programs, more formal methods were developed. These second methods were several types of external reviews conducted by a team of experts from outside the institution who used standardized review criteria and procedures developed by the oversight agency. The third category, the structured self-study review, emphasized criteria and procedures developed within the institution. The review process was conducted by a team of participants from within the institution. In recent years the use of this method has increased in post secondary institutions where attempts have been made to determine program priorities and to establish resource allocations based on data from review and evaluation (Anderson & Ball, 1978; Craven, 1980; Weiss, 1972d).

Academic program review and evaluation in higher education in the United States began over 300 years ago. At that time the members of the graduating class of 1642 at Harvard were required to stand before the faculty, trustees, and public to demonstrate their knowledge of the content taught in the common curriculum (Harcleroad, 1980). Virtually
all American colleges in these early days were founded in the tradi-
tion of the English university to serve a small group of aristocratic
families. Their curriculum, which emphasized religion and philosophy,
was intended to develop political and religious leaders. The American
Revolution changed the socioeconomic environment, which was eventually
reflected in the curriculum of the early colleges through the addition
of the sciences and languages (Rudolph, 1962).

The enactment of the Federal Land Grant College Act, sponsored by
Justin Smith Morrill in 1862, led to the inclusion of technical educa-
tion in higher education. The purpose of this act was to promote the
liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in several
pursuits and professions of life (Rudolph, 1962, p. 249). As a result,
69 land grant colleges were chartered during the next 100 years. The
growth of these land grant institutions brought the opportunity for
higher education to the masses of American people. Newly developed
colleges recruited talented farm boys as students, and at the same time,
recruited recognized scholars as faculty. This era marked the begin-
nings of state and federal government commitment to public higher edu-
cation (Rudolph, 1962).

In 1892, William Rainey Harper established within the university a
division which was considered to be a new model in the American univer-
sity. Among other features, it included a senior college for scholarly
activities and a junior college for academic studies. This concept of
the junior college as a preparatory institution eventually evolved into
two-year colleges for those not yet academically prepared for universi-
ties and for the social and intellectual development of young ladies
(Monroe, 1977; Rudolph, 1962). As these institutions broadened their purposes and goals to encapsulate the junior colleges and technical colleges, they became the forerunner of the present-day community college.

In 1921, the California legislature authorized the establishment of a state funded junior college district. That action was one of the first to establish a state supported community college system. During the next 50 years, two-year colleges flourished steadily, but most rapidly during the depression and after World War II. In 1948, public community colleges for the first time outnumbered the private junior colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 10; Monroe, 1977, p. 13). The rising federal concern for educational opportunity for all at this time, coupled with the influx of returning veterans and a multitude of changing societal attitudes, contributed to the steady rapid growth of public two-year colleges. Two-year colleges reached their pinnacle of growth during the late 1960s.

During the 1960s, as the children of the post World War II baby boom reached college age and adults realized the financial benefits of a college education, college and university enrollments increased. In response, colleges and universities expanded their programs and new institutions were developed and chartered. This expansion was encouraged through the support of abundant public and private funds. During this time two-year colleges began to proliferate. Some of these colleges evolved from established junior colleges, while others were newly chartered, publically supported institutions which offered a choice of either a liberal arts or an occupational education.
As legislators and educators became increasingly concerned about the random proliferation of programs and post-secondary institutions, public and private accrediting and coordinating agencies were formed in an effort to regulate the establishment of new colleges and universities, to control the expansion of established institutions, and to restrain the concomitant proliferation and duplication of academic programs within and among institutions (Harcleroad, 1980). These agencies were designed to supervise and coordinate the development of new academic programs, and to review and evaluate programs for accreditation. The purpose was to ensure academic quality, to guide planned change, and to establish institutional accountability. Institutions were required to implement formalized self-assessment procedures in compliance with the regulations imposed by both the public and private agencies.

The course and program proliferation that reached its peak during the 1960s began to subside by the mid-1970s. Programs declined because of changing technology, the loss of available expertise, and a shift from predominately fulltime to parttime enrollment. In recent years, as the average age of college students increased and the number of part-time career oriented students expanded, the demand for job related programs intensified. In addition, spiraling operating costs caused oversight boards and administrators to demand greater cost-effectiveness and accountability. As a result, an orderly means for determining program relevance and worth became a major objective for most colleges and universities. They began to focus on questions about such things as course relevance, program cost, and graduate placement. In an effort to answer these and similar questions, college and
university administrators looked to internal evaluation as an effective and systematic method of collecting information for decision making (Love, 1983).

During the 1960s and 1970s, much of the emphasis in program review and evaluation research centered around federal and state funded programs and the activities of external review agencies. Observers noted serious short-comings in the way that evaluation was being conducted, with much of the criticism directed toward methodological weaknesses. Their concern was that external evaluation focused on cost effectiveness and program duplication, and did not take into account the socio-political context of the program. As the general trend toward retrenchment continued, state agencies began to require performance audits. Final reports from these audits, in many instances, indicated a lack of understanding of program objectives and were based on data that were incongruent with these objectives. At the same time, there was a long standing resistance to formal internal evaluation by faculty who considered these efforts to be a breach of their academic freedom (Stake, 1972).

Since the mid-1970s, with increased demands for curriculum accountability, institutional program evaluation changed to reviews conducted by constituencies involved in the programs and responsible for program results (Weiss, 1983a, pp. 3-9). As this trend continued, colleges and universities developed instructional program review and evaluation policies and procedures. These policies and procedures included institutional self-study committees which involved faculty, administrators, and other special interest groups (Munitz & Wright, 1980). This
expanded formal approach to academic review is, in the total scheme of higher education program evaluation, relatively new and, as a consequence, in the embryonic stage of fact finding and theory development.

Focus of the Study

This investigation described a self-study program review process used in a public two-year college to provide data for programmatic decision making. During the mid 1970s the Ohio Board of Regents, the state higher education oversight agency, in an effort to monitor the occupational programs among Ohio two-year colleges, initiated a structured external review. The two-year college that served as the case study site for this investigation carried this agency mandate one step further and in 1980 implemented an internal self-study review of all courses and programs. Since that time, several programs have undergone review; recommendations about their status have been submitted to the appropriate decision making groups. Several internal and external groups of constituencies were involved in the process. Faculty and administrators conducted the review using data about the curricular program gleaned from students, faculty, and statistical reports. External sources of information were derived from program graduates, advisory committees, and employers. Decisions about program status emerged from the compilation and analysis of these data. Several factors influenced the nature of these decision outcomes. This study identified the nature of the decision outcomes, the factors which influenced these outcomes, and the conditions under which the influence of these factors varied.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to answer three major questions which provided the structure for this investigation. The questions were:

1. What factors influenced the decision outcomes that resulted from a structured self-study program review?
2. What was the nature of the influence of each factor?
3. Under what conditions did the influence vary?

Formalized structured program review is increasingly being implemented to provide data for decision making about academic programs. At this stage, little is known about the effects of this approach on program development and the forces that influence the decision outcomes. The self-study approach seems likely to have diminished the autonomy of faculty and probably has increased the potential power of other groups and factors. This study sought to identify those factors and their influence.

Significance of the Study

This investigation evolved from a curiosity about the types of decisions that were emerging from a newly implemented self-study curriculum review process. These reviews were being conducted by faculty who were responsible for the programs and courses and who had a vested interest in the outcomes. According to Weiss (1983a) and others, involved stakeholders are more likely to contribute to the process and to accept the results of the process.

This study sought to identify the nature of the decision outcomes and the factors which influenced these outcomes that emerged from a process in which there was stakeholder and constituency involvement.
Knowledge about these outcomes, their nature, and the influencing factors will assist institutional decision makers with the development of decision goals and strategies.

This investigation focused on a structured self-study review process whose participants were limited to faculty and instructional administrators. Students were not active participants in the process and as a result were not included in the group as having potential influence on the decision outcomes. As the data were organized and analyzed, five broad categories of influencing factors emerged from this circumscribed setting. These categories were faculty stakeholders, administrative stakeholders, institutional structure, program centrality, and external constituencies. Faculty stakeholders are defined as the several groups of faculty who taught courses which made up the instructional programs. These faculty were divided into three groups. Primary faculty were responsible for the major courses in the program. Secondary faculty taught the courses closely related to the majors. The support faculty were comprised of program counselors and faculty who taught the general courses found in the majority of the programs.

The category of administrative stakeholders was limited to the division administrators and the academic dean. The division administrator was responsible for developing, coordinating, and supervising the instructional programs offered by the division. The academic dean had oversight responsibilities for all the instructional programs, both credit and non-credit. The institutional curriculum committee and faculty politics made up the institutional structure category. Program centrality described the pivotal status of the courses that made up the
programs with regard to their designation as a graduation requirement or as a prerequisite. The fifth and final category, external constituencies, focused on the several external agencies which influenced the development and professional acceptability of the instructional programs.

Each category was examined for its level of influence on the outcomes and the manner in which the category shaped the influence of other categories on the outcomes. These findings contributed to the development of statements about the factors which influence the academic review process and the nature of the outcomes that emerge from the process.

Insights about stakeholder involvement in the review process and the effects of this involvement on the nature of the decision outcomes may add to the emerging body of information about stakeholder-based evaluation. This information will likely lead to more effective participation of stakeholders in the collegial decision process.

The findings reinforced the speculations regarding the nature of external bureaucratic involvement in institutional planning and decision making. The data described the level of influence exerted by advisory committees whose role is mandated as part of the public two-year college charter. And finally, the data contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the influence of the external oversight and accrediting agencies on instructional program development and continuation. Understanding of this influence will assist educational managers with programmatic decision making.

And, in addition, the investigation may add to the body of knowledge about the decision making process in a tightly coupled educational
organization, that is, a system which is highly structured and centralized (Weick, 1976). The interpretation of the findings about professional interdependency and colleague interaction contributed to an understanding of the two-year college organization and the effects of this structure on instructional change. Recommendations from this investigation may lead to the development of strategies which will promote an environment that is conducive to responsive change.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions were used for this study:

**Program**: a course of study leading to an associate degree (LCCC Policy and Procedures, 1980).

**Program evaluation**: the process used to assess the overall effectiveness of a program through systematic collection and analysis of data (LCCC Policy and Procedures, 1980).

**Stakeholders**: those individuals in groups who were responsible in some way for the program, who were involved in the decision process, and who were affected by the decision outcomes (Weiss, 1983a, p. 9).

**Primary faculty stakeholders**: those faculty who were responsible for teaching the major courses in the instructional program.

**Secondary faculty stakeholders**: those faculty who taught the courses which were closely related to the program major.

**Support faculty stakeholders**: the program counselors and the faculty from other academic divisions who taught courses across divisions.

**Constituencies**: all special interest groups who were involved in the program and potentially affected by the decision outcomes.
Incidents/comments: the observations of behavior, reports of proceedings, portions of interviews—in essence, any data that were considered relevant by the investigator.

Decision outcomes: the recommendation made by the program review committee regarding the program under scrutiny.

Influencing factors: those factors that affected the manner in which the review process was conducted and the nature of the decision outcomes.

Overview of the Investigation Methodology

This study was undertaken to investigate the factors which influenced the nature of the decisions that emerged from the self-study academic program review and evaluation process. Data were collected from multiple sources in order to provide for a complete picture of the process. Information about the development of the policy and procedure was used to provide a historical perspective. State oversight agency documents were used to determine the external constraints. And, finally, several data collecting techniques were used to collect information about the review process, the interaction during the process, and the nature of the review committee recommendations. The majority of these data were gathered from observations of program review committees, review of the committee documents, and focused interviews with review committee members.

Data were collected from a variety of sources during a three-year period. Data sources were minutes of meetings, interviews, and observations. Minutes of meetings and observations were of program review
committees, ad hoc committees, planning committees, and the Curriculum Council. Additional documents reviewed included the institutional long range plans and reports from the Office of Planning and Research. Valuable insights and information were provided through interviews of review committee members, academic division chairpersons, the Director of Planning and Research, the Academic Dean, and the College President.

Data were organized and analyzed using procedures suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984). Efforts were made to insure the trustworthiness of the findings of the study using the four major criteria described by Guba and Lincoln (1983): truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality.

This introduction was intended to provide a sense of the direction taken in this investigation. The following chapters will provide more detail with regard to relevant literature, research methods, findings of the study, and an analysis of the data collected. The final chapter will include a summary of the findings and recommendations for further studies. A description and evaluation of the appropriateness and usefulness of the investigative methodology will also be included.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In this age of rapidly changing technology, post-secondary institutions can ill afford to remain insulated and rigid. Institutions must be prepared to respond and to adjust to the changes of a technologic environment. Among these adjustments are expansion of course offerings to meet changing demands of students and employers, the development of a broader institutional mission, and the review of the credentials of tenured faculty (Grubb, 1984). In addition, this expansion frequently requires a considerable investment for new buildings, equipment, and faculty, while at the same time, the institutions are required to expend precious energy in an attempt to protect central resources which are essential for institutional viability. As a result, colleges and universities are forced to make programmatic decisions in an environment of increasing turbulence and uncertainty (Terreberry, 1968; Thompson, 1967).

During the late 1960s and early 1970s as the enrollment patterns shifted, human and financial resources declined, and direct and indirect operating costs increased, educational institutions began to expand their areas of competition. This expanded effort altered the tenuous balance among colleges and universities within the higher
educational environment (McCartan, 1983; Vaughan, 1984). Superimposed on all these stressors were the increased demands of graduates and employers for course relevance and program accountability. As demands for accountability intensified, administrators needed to know what things cost so they could effectively allocate resources, and they needed to know what was being taught so that they could assure employees and students that the educational process was sufficient for entry level employment (Grubb, 1984).

As a result, institutions developed a variety of techniques for collecting information to be used for decision making and planning. One strategy response was to develop procedures for reviewing instructional programs in order to determine relevance and effectiveness (Harcleroad, 1980). Many of these review processes, in an effort to enhance the level of accountability, included a variety of constituencies in the process. These constituencies included faculty, administrators, graduates, students, and employers. Job placement effectiveness was ascertained through advisory committees, who represented employers. Professional credibility was established through the determination of the level of compliance with external accrediting agencies' criteria. Faculty provided the expertise for the determination of course structure and content relevance.

This investigation focused on a structured self-study instructional review process conducted in a public two-year college which included several groups of constituencies—faculty, administrators, advisory committees, and students. The purpose of this investigation was to identify and describe those factors that influenced the nature of the
decision outcomes that emerged from the program review process. This chapter describes the literature about public two-year colleges, the open system environment in which post secondary academic institutions exist, decision making models, program review and evaluation, and the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process.

**Public Two-Year Colleges**

Two-year colleges have been a part of higher education since the early 1800s. One of the earliest two-year college models emerged when William Rainey Harper developed the preparatory junior college as part of the University of Chicago academic structure (Rudolph, 1962). This early model eventually evolved and expanded into two-year institutions which had narrow, clearly defined purposes and missions. Among these were the two-year junior colleges designed for the social and intellectual development of young women. Some of these colleges limited their instructional scope to household management and social graces, while others included preparation in teaching or secretarial services (Rudolph, 1962). Other junior colleges were designed to assist those students not yet academically prepared for university study (Monroe, 1977; Rudolph, 1962). A third model emphasized skills beyond the vocational skills learned at the secondary level. These post secondary technical schools offered job skill preparation which included introductory concepts of theory along with skills development (Cohen & Brewer, 1982; Monroe, 1977; Rudolph, 1962).

While several of these two-year institutions have retained their original structure and mission, many have merged to form the
contemporary two-year college model. In 1921, the California legislature authorized the establishment of a state funded junior college district. This initial action was emulated in some fashion throughout the country during the next 50 years. In 1948, public community colleges outnumbered private junior colleges (Cohen & Brauer, 1982; Monroe, 1977). This growth pattern continued through the 1960s into the early 1970s. During the late 1970s, the growth of the public community college system plateaued (Cross, 1981).

After enjoying the advantages associated with being a growth industry, public two-year colleges are now confronted with making decisions in a non-growth environment. These decisions include not only fiscal viability, but also issues related to institutional goals and mission.

The founding principle of these institutions of the 1960s represented a new form of educational opportunity. They emphasized equal access, innovative humanism, and political and personal freedom (McCartan, 1983; Scigliano, 1981). The premise which undergirded their organizational structure was flexibility, flexibility to respond to the changes in their internal and external environment.

**Governance**

The majority of the public two-year colleges were chartered through state legislative mandate. These mandates regulate the courses and programs, the geographical boundaries, and funding sources for each institution. In Ohio, funding for the public two-year colleges is derived from three major sources: state subsidy based on full-time equivalent student enrollments, student tuition and fees, and a local
tax base (Ohio Revised Code 3354). Additional funds may be available through private sources or state and federal allocations for special programs. The dollars realized from these two sources as a general rule comprise a small percentage of the total institutional budget (Cohen & Brawer, 1982; Garms, 1977; Scigliano, 1981; Vaughn, 1983).

The legislative mandate also regulates the way in which the public two-year college will be organized. Each college is governed by a local oversight group appointed by the governor and a local governing body (Monroe, 1972; Ohio Revised Code 3354). The local oversight group, the board of trustees, holds the legislative authority for the college governance. They have final decision making power for all aspects of the college. The degree to which they delegate this power is dependent upon the nature of the relationship of the board of trustees and the college president (Evans & Neagley, 1973; Moore, 1983).

The majority of the governance in the public two-year colleges is conducted by the administrators who are involved in the day-to-day activities of the institution. The delegation of responsibilities and authority follow the traditional bureaucratic structure. While the final decision making authority rests with the board of trustees, the president is the public symbol of decision making power for the institution (Mintzberg, 1973).

Two-year college presidents, the majority of whom hold a doctorate, are white males in their mid-fifties. These presidents, because of the demands of the several constituencies, walk a fine line in an effort to respond to a variety of expectations (Hooker, 1982; Moore, 1983). Many of the operational decisions are made by the president and the upper
level administrative staff because of their understanding of the political environment that surrounds the various constituencies. At the same time, interest among the faculty in actively participating in governance is limited (Richardson & Rhodes, 1983).

The middle level administrators faced with the daily responsibility of oversight and implementation seem caught in the web of the conflicting goals of upper administration and the philosophies of the faculty. The division administrator is expected to bridge the gap between the institution's operational demands and the faculty's specialized needs (Cohen, Bleha & Olswang, 1981). These middle level administrators are expected to develop the departmental budget, promote faculty participation in curriculum matters, and implement decisions that result from upper level administrative fiat. They have little job security and are the most vulnerable in a climate of uncertainty (Monroe, , 1977; Richardson & Rhodes, 1983).

According to Vaughan (1984), public two-year colleges are at a watershed in their development. The number of students available has declined and, as a consequence, community colleges must compete with four-year colleges for the same student pool (Watkins, 1985). The typical community college student of today is female, 28 years of age, and attends part-time (McCartan, 1983; Templin, Jr., 1983). These students represent both the internal and external environment, and frequently have a proprietary view of the college. As students they are affected by the outcomes of the input and feedback that directs planning and decision making. Consequently, as external constituencies, they are concerned about institutional image and cost
effectiveness, but at the same time, they exert pressure for certain types of courses and attempt to direct the focus of instructional programs. Because of this proximity to several constituencies, community colleges are more susceptible to the changing demands of the population than other post secondary institutions (Knoell, 1983; McCartan, 1983; Vaughan, 1984).

In recent years, several community college leaders have indicated they believe that the era of the egalitarian mission has passed and that the public two-year colleges have become middle class institutions. Enrollment of ethnic minorities has remained at 10-12 percent or declined slightly, while the percentage of middle class students has increased (Templin Jr., 1983). At the same time, the two-year college is viewed as becoming less community oriented and more oriented and responsive to the demands of business and industry. Community college-industry partnerships and high technology are now in vogue (Vaughan, 1984, p. 39).

During the early years of community college growth, there was emphasis on the arts and sciences. In 1971, 49 percent of the community college graduates received associate degrees in the arts or in the sciences; by 1980, this number had declined to 32 percent (Grubb, 1984, p. 441). This movement to career programs, along with the increase in part-time enrollments, has altered the course enrollments and program preferences. As a result, decisions about academic programs have increased in priority. Decisions about program status reflect student preferences and, as a result, have affected the status of the faculty (Cohen & Bråwer, 1982; McCabe, 1984; McCartan, 1983).
Faculty

In the 1960s, the majority of community college faculty came from the secondary schools and business and industry. Their professional preparation ranged from on-the-job experience to the highest academic degree. Most held the master's degree. These faculty viewed teaching, rather than research, as their professional goal (Cohen & Brawe, 1977; Haugen, 1984). In some cases these faculty elected to teach at a community college in order to avoid the pressure of required research and publication. They emphasized the importance of meeting the students' needs and problems. Faculty were characterized as being more willing to work on their teaching and changing courses in response to varying student abilities. This commitment generally led to job satisfaction in which the faculty saw community college teaching as a professional career in its own right (Cohen & Brawe, 1982; Monroe, 1977).

Because of their background in business, industry, or the secondary schools, two-year college instructors of that era tended to be more accepting of a structured organizational hierarchy and were willing to defer decision making (Cohen & Brawe, 1982). These instructors were more conservative than their counterparts in four-year institutions on political and social issues, and more liberal in educational matters. And, at the same time, two-year college faculty were more likely to be in favor of collective bargaining and unionization (Cohen & Brawe, 1982, p. 19). This acceptance of collective bargaining was in part the result of their professional and occupational backgrounds and in part due to their perception of limited professional power. Baldridge et al. (1978) indicate that professional power is derived from professional
uniqueness based upon academic specialization. Without this uniqueness, two-year college faculty lacked the resources for power.

In recent years the number of two-year college faculty with advanced preparation has increased. In 1979, 74 percent of the faculty held a master's degree and 15 percent held a doctorate. This is in contrast to 1957 when 65 percent held a master's and 10 percent held a doctorate (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 77; Monroe, 1977, p. 24). This increase in preparation can be attributed to several factors. One factor has been the decline in jobs available for academically prepared young faculty upon completion of graduate school. In addition, aging faculty have continued their education for a variety of reasons (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 77). This increased preparation has contributed to a sense of professionalism which has resulted in a desire for more involvement in curricular matters. Motivating factors may also be self-preservation, rejuvenation, or a commitment to the discipline (Keller, 1983). Faculty have one area in which they demonstrate ongoing concern and interest about decision making. They view instructional matters as their particular domain. To this end, they have successfully resisted efforts by management, external agencies, and employers to regulate the content of courses and programs. They have succeeded in retaining the right to determine course content and program development (Baldridge et al., 1978; Monroe, 1977). According to Richardson and Rhodes (1983), effective participation in governance, a process that develops, enhances, and sustains commitment to organizational priorities, can be a powerful tool for organizational change (p. 193).
The Open System

Bobbitt et al. (1978) describes the open system as one that has energy exchange with its environment. When human and financial resources are readily available, the technical core of post-secondary institutions are easily buffered from the external environment. In recent years the availability of resources has contracted, which has increased the vulnerability of instructional programs in educational institutions to the external environment. When there is no threat from the environment, the organization goes about its business seeking input and feedback from the environment as necessary. But, as resource availability declines and a threat or constraint to the organization results, the internal environment may become more restrictive (Weick, 1976). Some organizations may view the constraint as a catalyst for change (Keller, 1983).

In a changing environment, the organization develops scanning techniques in order to protect its core technology by detecting feedback signals, interpreting these signals, and adapting. These scanning techniques include monitoring the environment, predicting changes, consulting with outsiders, and buffering against the fluctuations of resources across the organizational boundaries (Hedberg, Nystrom, & Starbuck, 1976; Thompson, 1967). Two-year colleges have traditionally scanned the environment through several means. One frequently used is the advisory committee. Members of these committees provide input to the institution through formalized meetings, one-on-one conversations, and by interpreting changes in the community for the
college. An open organization responds to these feedback signals with flexibility and responsiveness.

Organizational Environment

In the event of a generally undisturbed environment such as the placid random model described by Emery and Trist in Miles (1980a), the organization deals unilaterally with isolated elements. The response is more or less trial and error. The environment is non-threatening and benevolent in nature, but can also be deceptive. This benevolent environment allows large portions of an organization's activities to be standardized and programmed (Hedberg et al., 1976). As this standardization persists, the exchange between the organization and its environment decreases, thus leaving the organization isolated. In recent years, several educational institutions have found themselves in this position. During the period in which applications for enrollment were high and the majority of applicants were the 18-21 year old cohort, colleges and universities developed complex application forms which were time consuming and expensive to complete. As the number of potential applicants lessened, some institutions were forced to simplify their application forms in order to avoid discouraging applicants. This simplification of a process was one strategy used to adapt to a changing environment. When the organization no longer anticipates environmental changes and ceases to develop appropriate strategies for response, institutional stagnation and decline will result (Bobbitt et al., 1978; Hedberg et al., 1976).
According to Emery and Trist (1965), the environment in which organizations exist is constantly changing at an increasing rate and toward increasing complexity. Miles (1980) describes complexity as interconnectedness; that is, the extent to which elements in the external environment are linked. These characteristics of the environment create an exchange process between elements that alter the causal texture. These authors describe causal texture as the character of linkages between environmental elements.

Emery and Trist (1965) describe an environment model of uncertainty in which organizations exist. This typology describes the environment on a continuum from low to high causal texture based upon two dimensions: strength of interconnectedness and rate of movement. Causal texture is made up of relations between components of the external environment (Miles, 1980, p. 203).

The placid-randomized model reflects the lowest level of movement and connectedness between environmental elements. In this environment it is possible for an event to take place without impacting other segments of the environment. Because of limited interaction, an organization can respond to a change without necessarily considering other factors. This was typical of the environment of the 1960s when resources were plentiful and interdependency and interconnectedness were not critical. If one academic institution benefited, another was not necessarily deprived of resources.

During the early stages of economic decline in the late 1960s and the early 1970s when the arbitrary discontinuation of programs and faculty layoffs took place as early retrenchment efforts, the texture
of the environment became less placid (Mix, 1978). Institutions became more interconnected. The action of one college had an effect on others. As one institution gained resources, another had to relinquish resources. Colleges and universities, as a consequence, began to develop strategies in order to protect their technical core (Miles, 1980; Thompson, 1967).

The third typology III describes the complex, disturbed reactive environment in which a number of similar organizations are linked together and in a sense are negatively correlated (Miles, 1980). This is the environment in which colleges and universities now find themselves. In Ohio, public post-secondary educational institutions compete for the same limited resources (Emery & Trist, 1965). In order to cope with an uncertain environmental texture, the organizations responded by developing action plans that included tactical initiatives, calculated responses, and counter actions. An example of this approach among the public colleges in Ohio was evidenced by the change in the philosophy of awarding degrees. During the early 1970s, none of the four-year campuses considered awarding an associate degree; this was left to the two-year colleges and the branch campuses. During the mid-1970s, some four-year campuses began to award two-year degrees which, in effect, disrupted the degree awarding balance among the several public educational institutions. This heightened competition contributed to greater turbulence and a more uncertain environment.

This uncertain setting is described by Emery and Trist as a turbulent field, the fourth typology. As organizations responded to changing elements, the responses often created a chain reaction which created
new elements, distorted old elements, or impacted upon several levels, thus increasing the environmental complexity and altering the nature of change. These reactions increased the turbulence of the environment, compounded the consequences of organizational action, and caused decision making to be more uncertain (Emery & Trist, 1965; Miles, 1980).

Organizations, in an effort to cope with environmental heterogeneity, rapid rate of change, and increased uncertainty, attempt to put into place feedback mechanisms which help them to reflect the past, predict the future, and establish a basis for planning (Bobbitt et al., 1978; Thompson, 1967). One of the feedback mechanisms used by post-secondary educational institutions is instructional program review and evaluation. In this atmosphere evaluation is used as a means of collecting data for decision making (Alkin, 1972). In earlier times under conditions of affluence and certainty, postsecondary educational institutions used program review as a feedback loop only as a symbolic action in order to be viewed as responsible, serious, and well managed organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1984). As a rule, this approach to program review was informal, included faculty responsible for the courses, and did not produce decisions.

Bobbitt et al. (1978) define an open system as one that has a multidirectional energy exchange with its environment. Because of the diversity of its constituencies, public colleges and universities are alert to the feedback signals from all arenas and pattern their responses based upon the nature of these signals. Each time the college tailors its response to input from one source, the institution changes its configuration and takes on the form determined by the environment
The organization attempts to bring some degree of predictability and rationality to this interactive process by programming and planning its responses to given impacts or elements. According to Thompson (1967), organizations seek to smooth out input and output transactions. Two-year colleges in particular are compelled to find ways to smooth external input since their buffering capabilities are limited. One approach has been to develop a comprehensive five-year plan closely aligned with the budget process. Predictions about enrollments provide the basis for determining potential revenues. This anticipated revenue provides the basis for institution plans and development for a given period of time. As a rule, these decisions are made at the upper administrative level based upon input from the sub-system and from the external environment. As these inputs are received and decisions are made, both the organization subsystem as well as the organization suprasystem are in some way influenced or impacted.

The Organizational Structure

To say we live in an organized society is redundant. Organizations can be dynamic and responsive or they can be static and insulated. However, in order for organizations to respond to input and to develop feedback mechanisms, a certain degree of standardization takes place as a means of coordinating this response.

Mintzberg (1979) views organizations as being comprised of five basic parts: Strategic Apex, Middle Line, Operating Core, Tecno Structure, and Support Staff (p. 21). These parts provide the foundation for describing and understanding the interconnectedness and interaction.
that comprises the organizational process. Mintzberg's (1979) conceptual description of the professional bureaucracy provides an appropriate structure for describing the public two-year college and its several interrelationships.

The operating core of the professional bureaucracy is the key element and in community colleges is comprised of the faculty and students. Faculty are the professionals and, as such, they have a certain degree of autonomy and control over their own work. While the autonomy of the two-year college faculty may not be as extensive as their four-year college counterparts, they do control the course content and have professional power within the classroom (Cohen & Brawer, 1982; Mintzberg, 1979). The outputs of the professional cannot be easily measured and also do not lend themselves to standardization (Mintzberg, 1979, p. 352). The professional bureaucracy, as described by Mintzberg (1979), is unique among organizational configurations in that power is disseminated to the workers. This dissemination of power provides the members of the operating core with autonomy, freeing them of the need to coordinate with other groups and allowing them to establish their own professional standards (p. 371). While this autonomy permits professionals to perfect their skills, it also does not impose pressure for change. Professionals tend to control their procedures and also tend to be conservative. As a result, this group is ill prepared to initiate change and reluctantly responds to demands for change (p. 375). Change is best effected by influencing and persuading the members of the operating core.
Mintzberg (1979) goes on to describe the middle line of management as not being highly elaborated in the professional bureaucracy. The purpose of this group is to provide linkage between the operating core and the strategic apex (p. 26). Within the public two-year college this group is comprised of division chairpersons, division/department administrators, and directors. This position has the responsibility for two-way communication and interpretation between the strategic apex and the operating core, that is, upper level administration and faculty. These positions within the two-year college setting are often responsible for transmitting the vision and philosophy of the president into action by the faculty. It is at this level that faculty participation in decision making takes place. Within the professional hierarchy the middle line provides the structure for standardization and coordination of the diverse activities of the individuals.

The strategic apex, the very top of the hierarchy, is comprised of the board of trustees, the president, and the upper level administrative cabinet. The strategic apex is charged with ensuring that the organization adheres to its mission and also serves the needs of the people who have power over the organization. In the case of the two-year college, this is most likely to be the president and the board of trustees. Members of the strategic apex devote a good portion of their time acting as a mediating force between the organization and the environment. They act as figure heads and liaison for the organization (Mintzberg, 1973). These positions have the widest, most abstract perspective of the organization.
The techno-structure of the professional bureaucracy is not highly elaborated. Its chief purpose is to standardize those operations necessary for the smooth functioning of the operating core. This standardization does not include the responsibilities of the professionals. However, the techno-structure of the two-year college is made up of several constituencies. The most pervasive is the state oversight agency which regulates the program offerings, requires program evaluation, and determines the resource allocation. Other groups who make up the techno-structure include community interest groups, business and industry, and other colleges and universities. These groups as a whole or individually influence the nature of the decisions made within the organization.

The highly defined support staff in the professional bureaucracy is designed to serve the professional operating core. This area provides support by providing systems information processing, document storage, intellectual challenges, and biological needs. This area makes it possible for the operating core to achieve its goals and to fulfill the mission of the institution.

Organizational Frames

As the elements or factors that comprise organizations are studied, there is a tendency to compartmentalize them as rational systems, natural systems, or open systems. Bolman and Deal (1984) take the view that all these concepts can be collected into four major theories that, while definable in given circumstances, are for the most part simultaneously ongoing. Bolman and Deal (1984) have consolidated the control
assumptions and propositions of the major organizational theories into
four descriptive frames. These are 1) the structural frame which empha-
sizes the importance of formal roles and relationships, 2) the human
resource frame which addresses the interactive effects created by
people, 3) the political frame which views organizations as arenas of
scarce resources, and finally, 4) the symbolic frame which describes
organizations as being held together by shared values and goals (pp. 4-
6).

Organizations are complex, surprising, deceptive, and ambiguous;
consequently, members are constantly striving to understand and to
predict the responses and reactions within organizations. In order to
cope with the ambiguity, people attempt to put events into a perspec-
tive they can understand. Individuals within organizations look for
formalization of response and workflow, and find reassurance with a
defined structure (Mintzberg, 1979). This formal structure is reflec-
ted most often in organizational charts which depict goals, boundaries,
communication systems, and coordinating mechanisms. This hierarchy of
authority describes and defines the division of labor (Bobbitt et al.,
1978; Bolman & Deal, 1984; Mintzberg, 1979; Scott, 1981).

Structural Frame

Bolman and Deal (1984) describe this formalization of the organi-
zation in the structural frame. Within this frame, organizations are
described as having three organizational levels, each of which has its
own set of functions and constraints. These levels also exist within
educational organizations. Each has its own set of functions and is
loosely tied to the others. This differentiation and loose coupling is further supported through the allocation of roles. Each person has a given set of activities and expectations which are reflected in job titles and descriptions (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Weick, 1976).

When work is divided into specialized tasks, life in an organization becomes increasingly complex and it becomes more difficult to keep together. This differentiation of work leads to increased inter-dependence which increases the demand for coordination. Consequently, linkages are needed in order to provide for coordination (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 37). Within the structural frame this linkage occurs through the formal vertical and lateral hierarchy. The positions within the hierarchy carry out those activities designed to keep the organization well integrated. The structural frame is confined to that part of organizational life that falls within the scope of job descriptions, formalized hierarchies, and established communication routes and does not take into consideration those factors that occur because organizations are comprised of people.

Human Resource Frame

The human resource frame describes organization behavior in terms of people. In this frame, Bolman and Deal (1984) emphasize the impact that human needs have on the overall personality of an organization. Mintzberg (1979) refers to the influence of people on the organization as the socialization process by which a new member learns the value system, norms, and behaviors of the organization (p. 97). This socialization is superimposed on the values and norms the individual brings
to the setting. The human resource frame is based on the theories that organizations exist to serve human needs, that organizations and people need each other, and that a fit between the individual and the organization is a key factor (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 65). These theories have given rise to the concepts of participation management, Theory X, Theory Y, and Theory Z. All these theories describe the relationships between management and the subordinate, and the effects of these relationships on the overall productivity of the organization. In general, there is consensus that the people within the organization can control outcomes. Blau (1973) discusses the process of social integration within the academic setting in which he describes the small academic sub-unit as a substitute for family. This small group provides for face-to-face contact with colleagues and provides the setting for socialization.

In general the human resource frame points out the impact of people working together in groups with mutually agreeable goals and task interdependencies. These groups are self-managing and assume the responsibility for decision making and task completion (Huse, 1980, p. 251). A major characteristic of the human resource frame is that it focuses on the fit between individual and organization. At this point, the knowledge base in organizational behavior is too limited to make valid assumptions about human problems in organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 107). The theories do not take into account the effects that resource allocation and power may have on interaction and communication.
Political Frame

The third frame, the political frame, views the organization as an alive and screaming political arena in which most of the goals and decisions are based on the availability and allocation of scarce resources (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 109). Organizations are viewed as coalitions of individuals and interest groups. The political frame considers the interplay of those factors that ultimately lead to power. Gamson (1964) focuses on two major participants in the process; the authorities and the partisans. The authorities are the people who control the resources and make binding decisions. Their power is exerted through control and direction. The partisans, on the other hand, exert their power through influence and persuasion; while they do not have power per se they have several potential sources of power. These include authority, expertise, control of rewards, coercive power, and personal power (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 116).

According to Scott (1981), no organization ever succeeds in completely controlling all sources of power. There are three reasons for this. First, positions are filled by persons with diverse goals and characteristics. These same persons, although at a lower level of authority, have autonomous power bases (Bardach, 1979, p. 45). Second, the allocation of resources may be used in ways not intended by the organizational authorities. This control of resources can be manifest in a variety of ways and provides the partisan with a powerful tool for control. This occurs more readily if the allocation purposes are not well defined and if there is no recrimination for performance failures (Bardach, 1979, p. 70; Kanter, 1983). And finally, the ability of the
position to deal with uncertainty can influence the source of power. According to Scott (1981) the level of power retained in the position reflects the position holder's ability to cope with the changes in the environment. This reflects the individual's ability to cope with the changes in the organization. A low tolerance for uncertainty may lead to behaviors that will meet individual goals rather than those of the organization (pp. 278-279).

Symbolic Frame

The Bolman & Deal (1984) political frame captures a significant number of organizational dynamics that are not evident in the structural frame or the human resource frame. The political frame says that power and politics are central to organizations and must be considered, but that the attributes of the other frames must not be overlooked. Their final frame, the symbolic frame, provides for the expression of belief, meaning, and faith (p. 144). The symbolic frame focuses on those aspects of the organization that are not readily measured in precise, concrete terms. The myths and beliefs that make up the value system of an organization are an integral part of this frame. These values are enacted in a variety of ways through the use of myths, rituals, stories, and traditions of the institution. All these focus on the meaning of the event, not just that which was seen to have happened. The symbolic frame makes it possible to deal with ambiguity by assuming that organizations are full of questions that cannot be answered, problems that cannot be solved, and events that cannot be explained (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 152).
The tools of the symbolic frame—rituals, myths, and stories—are used to explain events which would otherwise be unexplainable. From these tools emerge organizational heroes, traditions, and philosophy. These heroes, traditions, and philosophy undergird the corporate culture. Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Peters and Waterman (1982) emphasize the importance of symbolic behavior in the development of corporate standards and success. Shared stories, rituals, and myths provide the organization with a sense of direction and cohesiveness (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

The symbolic frame provides interpretation of the activities found in the other three frames to the internal and external audiences of the organization. It is the means of responding to demands and pressures of constituencies in a way that is acceptable to all interested parties. These messages reassure constituencies and stakeholders, foster beliefs, and keep the organization viable even though there may be little similarity between the real events and the symbolic events (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Kanter, 1983).

Long-range plans, planning projects, and PERT charts are symbols of the structural frame that convey the impression of rationality and gain support for the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Kanter, 1983). Integrated into plans for change are the criteria for evaluation. Evaluation is a major activity in any institution, particularly educational institutions. Evaluation is a highly symbolic activity, in that, few decisions are made from the results of evaluations, it fosters belief and faith in the structural process, and it shows that organizations take their goals seriously (Bolman & Deal,
Weiss (1983) views the evaluation process as providing justification for predetermined decisions.

**Decision Making Models**

**Introduction**

While a great deal has been said about decision making, there remains a sense of ambiguity about the process. Authors have posited various methods and models proclaiming their efficacy, yet at the same time disclaiming all but a moderate degree of generalizability to various settings. Allison (1971), in his discussion of the Cuban Missile crisis, described three models: the rational actor or classical model, the organizational process model, and the bureaucratic political model (p. 4). Baldridge et al. (1978), on the other hand, describes the three most common types of models applicable to post secondary institutions as being the bureaucratic, rational, and political models. These models are expanded and interpreted by various authors. John Millett (in Baldridge et al., 1978) describes the collegial decision model, and Cohen et al. (1972) view decision making in a post secondary setting as an organized anarchy in which decision making ebbs and flows.

The rational decision making model, as described by Allison and Baldridge, is based on the assumption that actions can be explained, that is, behavior reflects purpose. And, because behavior is purposeful, decisions can be made through the identification of goals, options, consequence, and choice (Allison, 1971, p. 256). The rational model presupposes a stable, predictable internal and external environment.
Within this setting the problem is identified and data about the problem is available. These data are sufficient so that the decision maker can identify options and predict the consequences and the contingencies. Once the options are identified, the decision choice is made.

Rational decisions are most likely to occur in organizational settings which are insulated from the external environment and which have a high level of integration. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) define integration as the process of achieving unity of effort among the various sub-systems in the accomplishment of the organization's task (p. 4). According to Miles (1980), the external environment creates different degrees of decision making uncertainty (p. 274). In order to use the rational decision model, organizations devise methods to control the impact of the external environment and the interaction of the sub-units of the internal environment.

Today, public post-secondary educational institutions are at a point of crisis. Insulation from the external environment has become a delusion. Colleges and universities are facing problems they never dreamed of a decade ago (Vaughan, 1984). State authorities and institutional managers know that difficult choices about the institutional mission, resource availability, faculty roles, and programmatic needs are necessary for institutional viability and survival (Baldrige et al., 1978; Cargol, 1983; Keller, 1983). In the past, these choices were based on established rules and a stable balance of power. New actors now impinge on colleges and universities. Decisions that traditionally emerged from the rational model are now more complex. College administrators now acknowledge that decisions are no longer simple and
by necessity must now involve several constituencies and a variety of approaches (Newman, 1982).

Collegial Decision Making

Among the various decision models, participative decision making within the higher education institutions is described as the collegial decision model. This model includes faculty as major participants in decision making. John Millett (in Baldridge et al., 1978) describes the conceptual framework of collegial decision making as a dynamic consensus. The collegial decision making model recognizes the professional authority of faculty on the basis of their academic competence and expertise. The more unique and specialized their expertise, the greater power resources they have (Baldridge et al., 1978).

This power base is most evident in decision making about instructional content and programs. In program review and evaluation, faculty are the major stakeholders and primary decision makers. According to Mix (1978), the traditional faculty approach to institutional review has been to bifurcate responsibility; the faculty want responsibility for formulating criteria for decision making, but they do not want to implement the evaluative decision making. Very often they were not willing to work through the differences that preceded consensus, and as a result governance decisions were left unresolved (Baldridge et al., 1978). However, according to Weiss (1983a), when faculty feel they have had a role in the decision making, they are more willing to implement the recommendations that evolve.
Neither the rational model nor the collegial model includes all the factors necessary for the development of academic review and evaluation criteria. These models do not take into account the institutional interaction that takes place during the process. Baldridge et al. describe the political systems model of college governance. This model has several stages, all of which center around the policy-forming process.

**Political Decision Making Model**

The political decision making model reflects the texture of the organization within the open systems environment. Policy decisions within the public post-secondary, two-year colleges are influenced by the relevant external environment as well as the internal stakeholders. The political model has several characteristics. According to Allison (1971), the first characteristic, a diversity of goals and values, must be reconciled before a decision can be reached. Baldridge et al. (1978) describe this as being a state of armed co-existence in which conflict is normal. This first characteristic of the political model reflects the lack of clarity and consensus regarding organizational goals. Because of this diversity, decision making behavior can be misunderstood. This misunderstanding and conflict intensifies in times of diminished resources and, as these resources decline, additional interest groups enter the process (Allison, 1971; Baldridge et al., 1978; Miles, 1980).

As new groups enter the process, the goals and objectives become more fragmented. This second characteristic reflects the differences
found in the organizational subunits. As the organizational subunits become more differentiated, understanding decreases; more energy then is directed toward discussion, negotiating, and compromise (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). Within the academic setting, this process is sometimes described as agenda clarification, turf protection, or brain storming. At this point, there is greater emphasis placed on the power of individuals and groups as the means for achieving a consensus (Miles, 1980).

The third characteristic described by Allison (1971), the relative power of subunits, is as relevant to the final decision outcome as the goals they seek or the wisdom of their arguments. Baldridge et al. (1978) described this process in higher education as being related to the extent of authority in the organization. According to Pfeffer and Salanick (1974), political power may be used to obtain resources and also to establish allocation criteria that will favor the sub-unit. Miles (1980a) emphasizes that the unobtrusive use of power to influence the selection of decision criteria legitimizes the preferred decision outcomes. In essence the political constraint on a decision maker will vary with the power of the decision maker and with the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of potential partisans (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 117).

Organized Anarchy

Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) describe the overall structure of colleges and universities as organized anarchies in which decision making ebbs and flows. They identified three characteristics of the organized anarchy: problematic preferences, unclear technology, and
fluid participation. These three properties are characteristic of organizations, if not all the time, then at least part of the time.

Problematic preferences evolve from a set of circumstances which exist at a given time. The organization then operates from a loose collection of ideas and current preferences which emerge and are in a constant state of flux. Choice of preferences and actions in this environment results from the influence of key persons and the condition of the situation.

Cohen et al. (1972) describe unclear technology as a circumstance of the garbage can model. Often the organization perceives itself as rational with clear-cut goals and objectives and a cause-effect approach to decision making. In reality, these decisions are made on the basis of past experience and trial and error. The decision process in this instance is unclear and is often not understood by the participants.

The third characteristic of an organized anarchy is fluid participation. Fluid participation is best described as the phenomenon in which the self-interest of the actors is the determining factor. Participants will vary the amount of time and attention they devote to an issue according to their personal estimate of the potential impact of the outcome. Consequently, decision making boundaries are fluid and no single participant dominates the outcome. This organizational diversity leads to unpredictable results.
Components of Decision Making

Academic decision making has many components, but not all occur in a campus-bound vacuum. Consequently, the potential influence, impact, and power of external groups is an important factor (Baldrige et al., 1978). Awareness that a decision is needed comes from a variety of sources, such as empirical data, subjective judgment, or situational events (Stufflebeam et al., 1971). Colleges become aware of the need for a decision regarding program viability and effectiveness through several data sources, such as declining enrollment figures, poor job placement percentages for graduates, or judgments made by external coordinating agencies.

The next step is to design the decision situation. If the need is to determine programmatic effectiveness, then program review and evaluation procedures are developed. These procedures describe the criteria and guidelines to be met during the process. Answers to questions in the process should lead to some basis for determining alternatives. The development of alternatives in operational language then can lead to acting upon the chosen alternatives (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

Through the use of the feedback system, decisions can be made with some sense of certainty. Rather than focusing on the decision as an institutional decision, the decision making can be simplified by restricting the ends toward which the activity is directed. This is often done by subdividing responsibilities among participants and making full use of the expertise of faculty and staff. As a result, the necessary resources, information, and time needed for decision making are controlled (Scott, 1981).
Conceptually, decision making becomes more feasible and applicable within a loosely coupled environment. According to Weick (1976), coupled events are responsive, but each event preserves its own identity and some evidence of physical or logical separateness. Loose coupling provides several advantages in that, as the environment shifts, only segments of the institution need to respond and to adapt at any given time, without affecting the whole system. Another advantage of loose coupling is that it may provide a more sensitive sensing mechanism.

A fourth advantage of a loosely coupled system is that community characteristics and idiosyncrasies can be reflected in portions of the organization. Given the two-year college accountability to the community, this ability to reflect the community enables the institution to be more in tune with environmental needs (McCartan, 1983). And finally, when a segment breaks down, it can be sealed off without threatening other portions of the college. Rubin (1979), in her study of retrenchment measures, indicated that when departments were loosely coupled, each department could do its job despite the changes and conflict in other areas. There are indications, however, about the relationship of the size of the institution and its departmental autonomy. Indications are that a smaller institution is more susceptible to changes within its environment, and that these changes are more likely to impact the total organization than, for example, changes in a larger multi-campus college (Baldrige et al., 1978).
Academic Program Review and Evaluation

According to Anderson and Ball (1978), academic review and evaluation has historically been viewed as operations research, institutional research, systems analysis, and policy studies. Recently, however, program evaluation has gained status as a distinctive field of study with its own models and rules. Conceptually, academic program evaluation is viewed within the context of five broad components: 1) program objectives which spell out the expectations of the program to fulfill certain requirements; 2) the human, financial, and physical resources available to the institution; 3) the educational process whereby the faculty and students come together; 4) the results that occur when the resources are applied to the process to achieve the objectives, and finally, 5) the feedback function described as evaluation. Review is an interactive process that incorporates the consequences of prior decisions into the formation of future decisions (Munitz & Wright, 1980). It is concerned with judging the worth of some existing or proposed effort to produce change. That assessment usually leads to a decision to begin, alter, expand, or eliminate a program (Coles, 1978).

Purpose of Evaluation

According to Folger (1980), program review has changed from its traditional purpose of:

self-assessment for improvement initiated within the institution to provide some judgment about the worth and needs of programs . . .
to a new purpose which is:

   to reallocate resources within the institution, and to enable the institution to do more with available resources. (pp. 6-7)

As these purposes have changed in conjunction with the changed environment, the role of evaluation has also changed. Earlier evaluation reaffirmed the value of the courses and programs. Now, in response to increased external environmental scrutiny, colleges use review and evaluation as a means to provide evidence with regard to the exact state of affairs and to suggest the adjustments or changes which are required (Dressel, 1976).

Alkin (1972) defines evaluation as the process of gathering information to be used mainly to make decisions about alternative courses of action. This information, must be presented to the decision makers in a form that can be used effectively and which does not confuse or mislead. And finally, he emphasizes that different kinds of decisions require different kinds of evaluation procedures (p. 106).

Feasley (1980) has summarized several evaluation models that are currently used in public and educational settings. These models vary in complexity and represent a broad range of philosophical concepts. Briefly described, they are:

--Evaluation as measurement

The focus of this approach is on data and formalized instruments for the collection of these data. This model is effective only if the program to be evaluated has measurable characteristics. This model produces comparable and replicable results, but does not necessarily describe factors that may influence program effectiveness.
--Evaluation as professional judgment

Common examples of this model are the use of accrediting teams or oversight teams. In this case the evaluation criteria are predetermined by an outside group which may include both quantitative as well as qualitative variables.

--Evaluation as assessment between performance and objectives

This model emphasizes the measurable consequences between performance and objectives rather than the process used to attain the goals. Personal interaction with program staff and the examination of documents is the basis of this model.

--Evaluation as a basis for decisions

Evaluation of this type is viewed as a continual exchange between the evaluators and the administrators. In this approach information is gathered by reviews which is transmitted to provide information for program decisions by the administrators. The principal criticism of this decision oriented model is that the evaluative criteria are determined by the decision maker. There is no clear-cut evidence that the decision maker has any more proficiency than the evaluators at determining meaningful criteria.

--Evaluation as a goal free process

This approach to evaluation attempts to avoid bias that exists because of a narrow range of goals. In this model the evaluator looks for all outcomes of a program which are possible. These outcomes are examined and summarized in a single ranking of utility. The lack of emphasis on formal measurement methods diminishes the objectivity of the evaluation.

--Evaluation as conflict resolution

The fact that a program is under scrutiny stimulates opposing responses. This approach is identified as the judicial or adversary model of evaluation. Typically this model encompasses issue generation, issue selection, preparation of arguments, argument presentation, and finally, panel deliberation. Three important spinoff effects are noted: better communication between evaluators and decision makers, greater attention to the formulation of key issues, and evaluation of the evaluation process. In general, this evaluation model encourages active participation by interested groups and is a highly visible process.
Evaluation as complacency reduction

The very act of participating in evaluation may stimulate the consideration of new ideas and approaches by the participants.

Evaluation as a change agent

Evaluation often forces the formal documentation of activities that are a part of the informal process. This documentation leads to program scrutiny and the formal implementation of that which is already in place.

Evaluation as a ritual

This model describes evaluation as a means of establishing public accountability and rationality. This image promotes acceptance and security among the external interest groups such as taxpayers, board directors, and oversight agencies.

Instructional Program Review Models

These models provide a framework for program evaluation. The method selected for use within an institution is determined by the purpose of the review and evaluation and the environment in which the review is to be conducted. These methods or approaches include multi-campus reviews, accrediting agency reviews, and institutional reviews.

Multi-campus reviews are most often conducted by a coordinating agency or committee for the purpose of determining the status of new or proposed academic programs. These data reflect statewide or regional concerns, trends, and planning (Feasley, 1980; Smith, 1980). The major portion of the review is conducted at the institutional level either by an outside reviewer or by an internal staff. Much of the data gathered is quantitative and provides information from which general decisions are made. These decisions as a rule focus on: 1) establishing institutional missions, 2) approving new program proposals, 3) institutional
evaluation of existing programs, 4) rejustification of programs, and 5) conducting special planning studies (Dressel, 1976; Smith, 1980).

A second approach to review and evaluation is the accrediting agency review. The purpose of this review method is to ensure that an institution has clearly defined and appropriate educational objectives, has established conditions under which these objectives can be achieved, appears to be accomplishing them, and is organized in such a way so as to be able to continue to do so (Young & Chambers, 1980, p. 91). Reviews are conducted by a team of experts selected from other institutions with similar objectives. In general, the team reviews a self-study report provided by the institution and conducts an on-site visit. During the onsite visit additional documents are reviewed and personnel are interviewed. Most of the data compiled for this form of evaluation is quantitative and focuses on enrollment figures, number of graduates, institutional size, the number of books, etc. This approach to evaluation contributes to the status and legitimacy of the institution and requires the staff preparation of data and appraisal of their program. After the onsite review is completed, the accrediting team reviews the data and observations, drafts a report, and submits these data and recommendations to the over-seeing agency or coordinating board. If the accrediting agency has no oversight power, few changes result (Anderson & Ball, 1978; House, 1982; Stufflebeam et al., 1971). The accrediting agency then makes a decision about the overall merit of the program.

The case study method of evaluation involves an investigator who comes to the institution, participates in, and observes the program.
This approach allows for the use of both quantitative and qualitative data which contribute useful information about the program. At times the results can be biased by the evaluator's orientation (Anderson & Ball, 1978).

Institutional reviews are conducted to provide data for accrediting teams and also to provide data regarding program effectiveness according to institutional criteria. These reviews are conducted at several institutional levels ranging from the department of research to ad hoc faculty committees. A frequent form of evaluation within the institution is the departmental review. Sixty percent of the departments in colleges and universities review their graduate and undergraduate programs (Feasley, 1980, p. 29). These reviews focus on a wide range of topics including faculty characteristics, physical and financial resources, student enrollment, number of degrees conferred, and student ratings of quality and relevance of offerings (Anderson et al., 1976; Dressel, 1976).

More frequently, internal review of programs is conducted to measure program status against institutional criteria and to provide data for decision making about program quality and status, cost effectiveness and budget development, personnel qualifications and retrenchment trends, and current status and long range plans (George, 1982). According to Love (1983), internal evaluation is essential during times of economic turbulence. It provides information that is crucial for planned change. In style and technique, internal evaluation is formative and not summative since summative evaluation assumes that
the environment and the program are stable for the period of the evaluation (Clifford & Sherman, 1983).

According to Anderson et al. (1976), the self-study approach addresses the following questions: 1) what an institution is, 2) what it does, 3) how it does it, and 4) how well it does it. These reviews involve the collection of qualitative and quantitative data through surveys of students and graduates, statistical data regarding enrollment and cost effectiveness, and advisory committee input for the purpose of determining program status (George, 1982). Barak (1980) indicates that coordinated efforts need to be made in order to avoid placing excessive demands on the participants. Care needs to be taken so as to avoid developing procedures that are so complex and involved that they become self defeating. If too many reviews take place simultaneously, review activities become counterproductive. In those institutions where program review is closely tied to the budgeting and planning process, care should be taken not to penalize those departments or institutions for effective review and decision making by redirecting monies saved as a result of the process into other programs. Management decisions of this nature discourage productive review and evaluation. Barak (1980) also emphasizes that there must be a clear cut reason for program review. After time, energy, and money are expended, something more should happen than just placing the report on a shelf.

According to Dressel (1982), more factors are involved with review and evaluation than are generally recognized, and there is impact on an unanticipated number of persons, groups, and programs. Care must
be taken to avoid imposing evaluation, and thus implying criticism. Evaluation must be viewed as an integral part of organizational management. If there is acceptance of evaluation as a management tool at all organizational levels, a positive milieu will result. Cooperation will be enhanced and readiness to study and to act on the findings will be established.

Institutional Approaches to Program Review and Evaluation

Approaches to program review and evaluation implemented in several colleges and universities are described in this section. The following is a discussion of review and evaluation models used by four higher education institution; two are public multiversities, two are public two-year colleges.

University of Michigan. The goals for assessment at the University of Michigan focus on the improvement of the processes by which the institution evaluates its programs and activities, sets and responds to priorities, and acquires and allocates resources. A three-phased planning and evaluation project for the academic affairs division was begun in the fall of 1975.

The first phase of the planning and evaluation project was to develop program objectives, while the second phase was devoted to unit and college self-evaluation. The last phase consisted of cooperative planning for the future between the colleges and the Office of Academic Affairs. Objectives were established that focused on identification of evaluation needs, the implementation of the evaluation, enrollment and
staffing projections, and the incorporation of an agreement that would make evaluation an internal ongoing process. This process cut across several administrative levels within the institution and brought together massive amounts of quantitative data. Qualitative input was included primarily through interviews with deans by the review committee. In general, this project is complete and complex. It cuts across all major facets of planning and budgeting (Munitz & Wright, 1980).

The Ohio State University. Program review and evaluation at the Ohio State University is a comprehensive faculty-based process. All aspects of academic programs are reviewed: teaching, research, and service. There are four major groups involved in the review. The self-study committee is made up of faculty from the program whose major responsibility is to conduct the self-study, determine the meaning of the data, and write a report based on the findings. This report is submitted to the external review committee comprised of academic peers from other universities or the profession who come to the campus, review the program, and then submit a report. These two reports are submitted to the coordinating committee whose task is to coordinate the review and the memorandum of understanding in order to achieve closure (Dibiasio, 1982).

A comparison of the program review and evaluation process used at the Ohio State University and the process at the University of Michigan reveals approaches that are at opposite ends of the pole. The Ohio State University process looks exclusively at the program, with faculty having a key role in determining program effectiveness. Results of the review provide data which contribute to the decision process regarding
program viability and general resource allocation. The University of Michigan process, on the other hand, is highly complex, involves the commitment of several layers of administrative personnel, and is closely tied to resource allocation.

Two other review processes will be described; these are the system at Moraine Valley Community College and the system at Columbus Technical Institute.

MORaine VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE. The review model used at Moraine Valley Community College is comprised of four levels: selection of programs to be evaluated, evaluation of programs, feedback and response, and impact and process evaluation.

Selection of programs to be evaluated is based upon criteria which include placement of graduates, unit cost attraction of students, and retention of students. Once these programs are identified, they are evaluated using the CIPP model. Each program is reviewed in reference to the context of the environment in which it occurs and from which its goals are derived. Input is used to determine the resources which are available or necessary in order to achieve the objectives. The process phase is evaluation, and a determination is made as to whether the implementation of the program is efficient, and finally, the program product is measured (Newman, 1979). According to Baratta (1976), once these data are collected, they are analyzed using the T score. The judgments are made during the feedback and response phase. During this time, written reports are prepared by campus administrators, program administrators, program faculty, and program support staff. The final phase is the impact and process evaluation in which the impact of the
evaluation on program development is assessed. Revisions are made at that time.

Columbus Technical Institute. The evaluation model in use at Columbus Technical Institute combines quantitative measures along with qualitative measures as a basis for program evaluation. Programs are assessed on the basis of retention, program enrollment, placement, cost, and curriculum appropriateness. Each technical program is reviewed annually. A nine-member committee comprised of three members from each instructional department receives quantitative data from the Office of Institutional Research and qualitative reviews from the instructional departments. The committee reviews this information and prepares a report which is forwarded to the Vice President for Education (Miller, 1982b).

The four institutional review procedures have been described in order to provide some understanding regarding the implementation of program review and evaluation programs. All seem to have significant administrative input; the University of Michigan has minimal faculty involvement, while the Ohio State model is strongly faculty oriented. The two community colleges quantify enrollments, cost effectiveness, and graduate placement, and use these data as an evaluative criteria. The approaches were adapted for use in a specific institution and its environment.

Stakeholders

The late 1970s and the early 1980s have been characterized by a resurgence of the demands for accountability within higher education.
According to Love (1983), program evaluation has been identified increasingly as a vehicle for external accountability. This use of evaluation assumes that educators want to improve academic programs and want to make better decisions about program options and the use of scarce resources (p. 7). This view of accountability was manifested early in the 1970s in Ohio when the higher education oversight agency, the Ohio Board of Regents, initiated a policy for external evaluation of occupational programs. These policies altered the external environment of state post-secondary institutions and forced institutional changes in response to the input and feedback of the state agency. As Huse (1980, p. 65) indicates, organizational subsystems are highly interrelated and interdependent. A change in any one subsystem or the supersystem creates changes and modifications throughout the system. These environmental shifts contributed to the development of a new view of program review and evaluation. Within the institution the evaluation process became less oriented to research and data collecting and more geared toward the assessment of program worth and as a basis for organizational decision making and planning (Love, 1983).

By its very nature, academic program review and evaluation is a political process. Weiss (1972b) described the overall purposes of program review to be:

1. Continue or discontinue a program.
2. Improve its practices and procedures.
3. Add or drop specific program strategies. (p. 16)

On the surface it would appear that participants in the institution would support these objectives and act to implement them. However,
Individuals who are involved in achieving a set of goals have differing views as to the overall purpose of academic review. These conflicting purposes become evident when the evaluation process impinges on established territory (Anderson, Ball & Murphy, 1976). Stakeholders will express biases and concerns with regard to desirability, quality, and purposes of the evaluation. These political considerations impact the process at every level starting with the initial question, "Does a program need to be evaluated?" through the final question, "Are the measured benefits of the program worth the costs?" (Anderson et al., 1978; Weiss, 1983b). According to Cochran and Hengstler (1984), the importance of involving key audiences in the evaluation process cannot be overemphasized. Many political problems can be resolved by including the participants (stakeholders) in the process from the beginning and by using, in particular, the informal communication network (p. 186).

**Control Techniques**

As the review process impinges on established turf, efforts may be exerted to control the process. Suchman (in Anderson, 1978) describes six techniques used by stakeholders in order to control the evaluation process:

1. **eye-wash:** selecting those aspects for evaluation that appear to be successful.

2. **white-wash:** covering up program failure by avoiding appraisal and soliciting testimonies from partisans.

3. **submarine:** trying to torpedo or destroy a program because of power interests.
4. **posture:** making gestures toward evaluation which are not carried through and are designed to promote a favorable image.

5. **postponement:** seeking to delay or prolong the evaluation until concern is dissipated.

6. **substitution:** attempting to shift attention from an essential part that has failed to a minor part that has succeeded. (p. 283)

Attempts to thwart the process can be controlled by approaching review as evaluative research, that is collecting data for a specific purpose of determining program effectiveness. This diminishes the subjectiveness of the process and places it more into the realm of scientific inquiry (Anderson et al., 1978). Resistance will also be lessened if faculty and administrators feel they have participated in the development of the criteria and procedure (Smith, 1980). Stakeholders, those individuals affected by the review outcomes, most often participate to protect their interests and to control the direction of the review. Smith goes on to say that faculty have a need to formalize and legitimize their achievements. For years observers have pointed out that a major concern about evaluation practice was the lack of congruence between the evaluation process and the sociopolitical context in which it is conducted. In an attempt to increase the relationship between the process, the program environment, and the decisions, evaluators are giving more attention to the involvement of user groups in the development and implementation of evaluation studies.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

In the late 1970s the National Institute of Education described the stakeholder approach to evaluation. This approach involved the people
most affected by the review in the process (Bryk, 1983, p. 1). Cuba and Lincoln (1983) describe this as responsive evaluation, an emergent form of evaluation that considers the concerns and issues of stakeholding audiences as the organizing issue. In this approach the evaluator is less concerned with the objectives of the evaluation and more concerned about the effects of evaluation in relation to the interests of the relevant publics, that is the stakeholding audiences (p. 23). The stakeholder approach imposes a bureaucratic procedure on fluid, informal participation. Stakeholders are identified, convened, given set tasks, and required to participate in scheduled routinized activities (Weiss, 1983a, p. 12). This application of stakeholder participation can in the long run have positive, lasting effects and ensure adequate implementation of the process.

Stakeholders are defined as those persons who make decisions about programs and also those people who are affected by the program and its evaluation. Stakeholder approach to program evaluation is explicitly designed to increase the use of evaluation results for decision making and to bring a wider variety of people into the process (Weiss, 1983a).

Past criticisms have charged that evaluation is narrow because it focuses only on a small portion of the program, unrealistic because it measures the success of a program against unreasonable standards, irrelevant because it answers questions no one cares about, and unfair because it is often responsive to selected groups (Weiss, 1983a). The stakeholder approach does not guarantee the perfect evaluation. However, fairness can be achieved through the involvement of several groups in the development of criteria and the conduct of the evaluation.
Since stakeholders have a strong voice in deciding information to be collected, relevance is improved.

Stakeholders or program participants who find themselves in the unaccustomed role of evaluator will at times impose unrealistic expectations about program effectiveness. As the stakeholders become more experienced, these expectations become more realistic. Gold (1983) suggests that workable expectations can be negotiated by matching stakeholder expectations with program strategy. The professional evaluator would provide this key function. The issue of narrowness is lessened because of the wide variety of interested groups involved in the development of the criteria and the conduct of the evaluation.

Supporters of the stakeholder approach see it as providing for greater use of evaluation results in decision making. The premise is that if interested parties are involved there is a likelihood that competing interests will be voiced and compromised. In addition, multi-lateral participation in the process will enable different groups to develop mutual understanding and appreciate one to another's viewpoints. They would take the results seriously and could hardly say that the wrong data were used for the decision (Weiss, 1983a).

A second strength of the stakeholder approach is that it represents a recognition of the political nature of the evaluation process. It acknowledges that each program affects many groups, each of which has divergent concerns (Weiss, 1983a). As Cohen (1983) indicates, evaluation is political in several ways. One, it can result in the redistribution of power and resources, and second, it is often established by a political group in an effort to change operating priorities.
The stakeholder approach sought to ameliorate the problems of non-use and misuse of evaluation by incorporating the views of interested parties in the design and conduct of program evaluation (p. 73). The general impression is that by providing a structured arena for discussion among stakeholders, this involvement will increase the use of the information and promote implementation of the decisions.

Bardach (1979) indicates that in the implementation process, politics appears to be primarily defensive. Stakeholders are more concerned with what they might lose than with what they might gain. All might approve changes in the program or support decisions affecting the program, but all would want to alter the terms of implementation in order to assuage their own particular concerns. Implementation involves continuous adjustments between policies and their consequences. Evaluation is an activity designed to narrow the gap between what happens in implementation and what ought to happen (Browne & Wildavsky, 1984). In the stakeholder approach both implementation and evaluation are carried out by the same people—people who have helped to plan and design the program and its evaluation. They are the ones who will take the results seriously (Weiss, 1983b). In times of a turbulent environment and within a political setting, internal stakeholder evaluation is essential for survival. It provides information crucial for decision making, establishes the symbols of accountability, and involves the stakeholders in the planning and implementation process (Love, 1983, p. 5).
Summary

This survey of literature focused on public two-year colleges, the open system in which academic program review and evaluation takes place, decision making models, program review and evaluation, and stakeholder involvement. The next chapter will focus on the research methods used for this investigation.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The previous chapter focused on the literature about factors which influence decision outcomes resulting from an academic program review process. The factors discussed included stakeholder groups, the nature of organizations, the environment of the public two-year college, and a review of three decision-making models. Program review was discussed as a unique process and as a basis for decision making.

This chapter will present an overview of the investigative setting, the data collection techniques, and the data analysis methodology used for this study.

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify those factors that influenced the program decision outcomes derived from a structured self-study program review and evaluation process in a public two-year college. In addition to identifying the factors which influenced the decision outcomes that resulted from a structured self-study program review process, this investigation contributed to the development of statements about factors which affect program decision making.

The variety of credit courses and program offerings available in a public two-year college are limited by the institutional mission and
legislative mandate. The two-year college selected as the case study site is located in a semi-rural area in Northern Ohio. In 1964 at the time of its charter, it was designated as a comprehensive community college, thus allowing it to offer both university parallel transfer programs as well as occupational technical programs. All the two-year programs developed by this institution have been in accordance with the regulations established by the Ohio Board of Regents, the state oversight agency. The programs considered during this investigation were those which led to a transfer degree and to a technical career degree. An academic program was defined as a group of courses required for an associate degree in a technical career major or a liberal arts transfer major. As a general rule, a program leading to an associate degree was comprised of 30 to 36 courses totaling between 93 to 110 quarter credit hours. The courses that comprise a liberal arts transfer program generally parallel the liberal arts requirements of the first two years of a four-year college or university. The courses that make up the technical career program provide the theory and skills necessary for a specific career. The state oversight agency (Ohio Board of Regents) stipulates that 50 percent of the courses in a technical program must be career related, 25 percent must provide background for the career courses, and the remaining 25 percent must be general studies courses such as English, social science, and physical education.

Research Questions

Three questions provided the structure for this investigation. These questions focused on the nature of decision outcomes that
resulted from academic program review and evaluation, and the factors which influenced these outcomes.

1. What factors influenced the decision outcomes that resulted from a structured self-study program review?
2. What was the nature of the influence of each factor?
3. Under what conditions did the influence vary?

These questions provided the conceptual framework for this investigation. This framework focused and organized the data collection while the various committee activities and documents were investigated.

During the early stages, the investigation focused on the nature of the decision outcomes that emerged from the review process. At that point, it appeared that the nature of the outcomes could be classified as status quo, moderate change, or discontinuation of a program; however, as the study progressed, it became evident that the outcomes were more complex. At that point, emphasis focused on the identification of the decision outcomes and the degree of change.

The decision outcomes fell into five categories of changes in program content and structure. These were: 1) status quo, 2) limited change, 3) moderate change, 4) extensive change, 5) program discontinuation. In an effort to establish consistency in the definition of the amount of change that was recommended, the investigator developed the following definitional parameters. A program was said to have remained status quo if the outcome was limited only to rearranging the sequence of three courses or to replacing a single outdated course with one of equivalent content and hours. Programs with fewer than eight course alterations, that is, less than 25 percent of the total program, were identified as having limited change outcomes. Moderate program changes
occurred when 33 percent (9-12 courses) of the program were changed in some way. A 50 percent change in courses, sequence, and content was categorized as an extensive change. The last decision outcome, program discontinuation, included the elimination of a program, putting a program on hold, or deleting all the major's courses and replacing them with new content. These categories of change were loosely based on the required course distribution for programs as established by the state oversight agency, the Ohio Board of Regents. Limited change would not necessarily affect courses outside the major, while extensive change would most certainly include both major courses as well as courses from other divisions.

Once these categories of decision outcomes were identified, the question of which factors influenced these outcomes needed to be answered. Early in the investigation faculty stakeholders emerged as a major influence on the nature of decision outcomes, but as the study progressed other factors became evident and, in some instances, equally as important. Initially, any comment, incident, or situation was listed as a potential influencing factor. Eventually these items were consolidated into similar groups and then into categories. Table 1 illustrates an early matrix used to organize the outcomes and to list the categories of influencing factors.

As these influencing factors emerged, it also became apparent that the level of influence exerted by any given factor varied under different conditions. It became necessary to identify, as nearly as possible, the conditions which affected these influences. For example, primary stakeholders exerted greater influence under certain conditions,
Table 1

Early Matrix Used to Organize Outcomes and Influencing Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that Influence the Decision Outcomes</th>
<th>Decision Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category N...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such as stable enrollments, and lesser influence when enrollments declined. And, finally, because of the complexity of the process that led to the decision outcomes, this investigation also attempted to describe those situations in which a given set of influencing factors affected the way another category influenced the nature of the decision outcome. Under certain conditions individual categories exerted very little influence on an outcome, but this same category when joined with one or more exerted a high level of influence. For example, this study looked at the interrelationship and the influence of external oversight agencies, stakeholders, and program centrality as independent influencing factors, and then as a combined force.

The conceptual framework of program outcomes, the influencing factors, the conditions under which influence varied, and the interrelationship of these influencers provided a bounding structure for data collection and analysis. Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest that some structure is indicated when the researcher has a fairly good idea of the parts of the phenomenon that are not well understood and knows where to look for these things (p. 27). The data sources for this investigation were 20 review committees that were appointed and activated at various times during a three-year period. The preordinate structure for data collection and sorting suggested by Miles and Huberman provided the means for identifying important elements that were characteristic of certain groups or situations. In addition, the preordinate structure avoided the dilemma of data overload, established parameters for data usability, and provided the basis for comparison between and among the several review committees. Focusing
and bounding the data collection also contributed toward some early
data reduction and analysis.

In 1980 the state oversight agency for higher education in Ohio
mandated that all two-year colleges would conduct five-year reviews of
career programs. The purpose of this regulation was to ensure career
program quality and relevance. Additional factors considered were
program cost effectiveness and the number of program graduates. This
policy was implemented in 1980. The purpose of the institutional
academic program review as stated in the policy was to provide faculty,
administration, and the board of trustees with information about how
well the program functions in relation to its objectives and the needs
of the community (Appendix A).

The procedure listed the steps to be followed, established the
membership of the review committees, and described the criteria against
which programs were to be reviewed. As each academic program review
committee was appointed, the members were given a packet of documents
which outlined the policy and the steps to be followed. The committees
were also oriented to the process by a member of the Office of Planning
and Research, the department responsible for coordinating the review
process and for providing data about the programs. A five-year sched-
ule listing the year and the programs to be reviewed was included in
the policy and procedure statement.

The policy also described the make up of the review committee:

Upon recommendation of the chairperson (division admin-
istrator), the dean will appoint a self-study committee that
will include the division chairperson, program faculty, and
other individuals as appropriate (Appendix A, p. 2).
The other individuals usually included faculty who taught support courses. In some cases these faculty were from the program division, and in some cases they were from other divisions. Program counselors were generally included as a member of the committee. The membership distribution and the divisions represented are described in Table 2.

Twenty academic program review committees were selected for this investigation. Some had completed the review and were in the final stages of report writing, some were newly appointed, and the remainder were in varying stages of progress. Fifty faculty, five counselors, and seven division administrators took part in the structured interviews. Observations of committee activities, and informal discussion involved the interviewees and other review committee participants. All of the counselors and division administrators had been involved with more than one review committee, and about 40 percent of the faculty had served on two or more committees.

The president and academic dean, division administrators, and the Director of Planning and Research were interviewed and contacted as resource persons. Their views and opinions provided insights which added a necessary dimension to the data. In addition, their level of influence was identified and later checked against the perceptions of committee members.

All of the academic divisions were required by policy to participate in the institutional program review. Only the health career programs were exempted from conducting reviews using the institutional criteria. At the time of the policy development and implementation, the division administrator sought and received exemption based on the
## Table 2
### Instructional Division Representation on Program Review Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Division</th>
<th>Business Division</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Language &amp; Literature</th>
<th>Science &amp; Math</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Health Careers</th>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>Division Chair</th>
<th>Total Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Merchandising</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Phys. Educ. &amp; Rec.</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science &amp; History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Careers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lab. Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The number in parentheses indicates a committee member from the Instructional division, but who is not responsible for courses in the program major.
argument that health career programs must meet review standards and
timetables set by external accrediting agencies; therefore, compliance
with the institutional criteria would be redundant and would place an
unnecessary workload on the division faculty. A final argument stated
that the criteria established by the external accrediting agencies were
more rigorous than the institutional criteria. The health career pro-
grams had consistently received agency approval for several years so
that to the faculty the review process was viewed as routine. Changes
were generally made to ensure continued relevance and to comply with
changed agency standards. Two review committees from the health
careers division were included in the investigation in order to pro-
vide a broader data base.

Data Collection Methodology

At any given time during the course of this investigation at least
five academic review committees were underway. These committees pro-
vided multiple data sources which helped to clarify data and to estab-
lish data utility.

Data utility was a primary issue. In order to be useful and to be
used, data had to be obtained from a reliable source and had to have
contextual appropriateness (Conrad, 1978; Guba, 1981). For example,
data collected during an interview with a primary stakeholder was con-
sidered usable if it was consistent with information obtained from
other primary stakeholders on the committee. Single observations were
noted and held in reserve for possible support from a primary stake-
holder from another committee. The reliability of data sources was
established through one-on-one member checks, such as other committee members, and by comparing responses from other committees as a whole. It was not uncommon to note similar patterns of participation and reaction among members of several different committees. This use of member checks and triangulation throughout the investigation contributed to the determination of data utility and data trustworthiness (Guba & Lincoln, 1981).

The graduate students who were assigned to the Office of Planning and Research as administrative interns were a valuable source of data. This group was responsible for gathering the statistical data about the programs undergoing review and providing these data to the committees. They served as ex-officio members of the review committees and as resource persons. Their association with the institution was temporary and generally part-time. They had no vested interest in the outcomes and were not a part of the political arena; therefore, they provided an excellent resource for checking data and enhancing investigator objectivity.

Data were collected through focused interviews, document reviews, participant-observation, and informal discussion. Initially, the concept for this study evolved from the investigator's involvement in the development of the early stages of the institutional policy. The notes from that early exposure led to the development of the framework of the study and the focused interview questions.

Early data were collected through participation/observation of several review committees. During this period field notes were kept of planning activities, for the implementation of the review process,
and the initial meetings of the review committees. These data were later reviewed for trends and consistencies. As data continued to be collected, they were sorted and coded using the techniques described by Miles and Huberman (1984). Miles and Huberman emphasize the need for a guiding conceptual framework. The focus of this investigation emerged from lengthy discussion between the investigator and the director of planning and research which took place during the early phases of the implementation of the policy and procedure. Questions were raised about stakeholder/constituency understanding of the process, the amount of involvement that would take place, and the types of decisions about programs that would result from the process. These and other questions were developed and eventually used during a series of focused interviews. The concept of stakeholder/constituency understanding, involvement, and cooperation, along with the types of decision outcomes, provided the early framework for data coding. Both data analysis models (flow or interactive) include data collection, data reduction, data displays, and conclusion drawing/verification (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 21-23). These data collection and analysis techniques used throughout this investigation tended to be more interactive, but components of both models were used. These approaches were used to code and analyze the results of the focused interviews.

Participants selected for the focused interviews were faculty who served on the review committees, and the seven division administrators. Each participant was invited by letter to be interviewed (Appendix B). Approximately 50 percent of the faculty asked to participate agreed to do so. All but one agreed to permit taping during the interview. Each
interviewee was given the set of questions in advance in order to provide the opportunity to formulate and organize responses. The interview questions (Appendix C) served to focus the context of the interview (Yin, 1981). The conduct of each interview differed according to the personality and response patterns of each interviewee. The interviews were transcribed verbatim, and the content was coded and analyzed.

The results from the interviews brought out data which led to the formulation of additional questions and the identification of areas that needed further clarification. As additional data were collected, they were analyzed and coded using an interactive approach going between the data and analysis. These data provided the basis for including additional participants in the study, for going back to informally review earlier data, and for analysis and clarification of early document reviews. While the conceptual framework provided the basic structure for the investigation, the study expanded and contracted in response to the available data. Throughout the investigation an open exploratory stance in keeping with the expansionistic concept of naturalistic inquiry was maintained (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Miles & Huberman, 1984).

As a participant observer, the investigator had the opportunity to observe committee meetings, read reports, and to informally interact with the participants. This opportunity was used to add new data and to clarify earlier data. According to Lofland (1971), a known observer enjoys the enormous advantage of being able to move about, to observe, and to ask questions for clarification.
This ability to move about and to clarify at will served a greater purpose. Information gathered during informal discussion, and the opportunity to recheck sources, provided the means for establishing trustworthiness. As in all inquiry, meeting tests of rigor to establish trust in the outcomes of the inquiry was imperative. Guba and Lincoln (Guba, 1981, p. 79) suggest four major concerns related to trustworthiness: truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality.

Truth value, or internal validity, was established by testing the credibility of findings primarily through structural corroboration. In many cases the data were known to be valid, in part, because of historical consistency and, in part, because of inter-committee consistency. When data were inconsistent, these facts were checked through a variety of sources and methods. If the data were a matter of institutional policy, corroboration was sought from upper level administrators or staff in planning and research. If, however, the data were a matter of interpretation, several committee members or colleagues were contacted. Triangulation, as it was used in this instance, was a most useful approach to countervailing or reinforcing investigator observation and analysis (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). For example, an early observation indicated that certain courses were included in certain programs. A check with administrative policy indicated that when the programs were first developed these courses were required by one of the external agencies. Since that time, although the programs were no longer designed to meet that agency's criteria, the courses continued to be
offered. Further checks with faculty revealed that these courses remained because they had always been there.

The study of several review committees as part of the case study enhanced the applicability or generalizability of the findings. Early in the investigation, it became apparent that certain factors often elicited similar responses among members of different committees. For example, on all committees the faculty who were responsible for the major courses in the program were given the final vote in the case of a tie. This similarity among several units served to strengthen the applicability of findings. Throughout this investigation, patterns of behavior were a key factor that eventually led to conclusions.

In addition, consistency of findings was an important factor. Consistency was established through the observation of several committees over a three-year span of time. Responses noted in the actions of early committees were noted among later committees comprised of different members. For example, audit of several committee reports and a review of the minutes revealed a consistent pattern related to the involvement of the division administrator and the nature of the decision outcomes. Few changes in program offerings took place if the committee was comprised of major faculty and the division administrator did not exert influence. Consistency of findings was also verified through triangulation. The major sources used for triangulation in this instance were the division administrators and the review committee chairpersons. Both groups were closely associated with the committee
process and the outcomes. The dynamics of this outcome will be elabo-
rated on in the following chapter.

The last category in the test for rigor, neutrality, was perhaps
the most difficult for the investigator. The case study has been
described as revealing only a slice of time in a small segment of the
environment; however, this microcosmic view had several advantages.
It provided the researcher with the opportunity to look at relation-
ships and determine whether a pattern existed. It provided a close
look at a process and took into account the overall impact of variables
(VanDalen, 1979, pp. 193-196). These advantages were also the disad-
vantages. Because the investigator looked at a small segment of the
institution and was part of the environment, objectivity was difficult
to maintain. Neutrality was achieved through member checks and trian-
gulation. Research interns and colleagues assisted with data inter-
pretation when there was a question of investigator neutrality. Inves-
tigator neutrality was reinforced when similar findings about the
program review process and outcomes emerged from an institutional study
conducted for another purpose.

Throughout the investigation, the data were continuously subjected
to tests of rigor as described by Guba and Lincoln (1984) in order to
ensure trustworthiness and to enhance data utility. Data were collec-
ted over several years through several sources, thus providing for data
richness.
Data Analysis Method

Data were organized and analyzed using the collection and analysis methods described by Miles and Huberman (1984). Miles and Huberman suggest that analysis should begin during data collection, in that way, the investigator has the opportunity to cycle back and forth between thinking about the existing data and collecting new data (p. 9). Figure 1 is a schematic description of the data flow and the data interaction.

Data analysis first began by comparing observations and incidents with each other. Initially these were organized into simple lists, but as the categories increased and patterns emerged, a simple matrix, as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984, p. 213), was developed. The review committees (X axis) formed one organizing element, and similarities found in the data formed the Y axis (see Table 3). This matrix was expanded until the investigator was satisfied with the richness of data and that the questions underlying the conceptual framework were answered. Coding symbols were developed by the investigator to serve as quick references or trigger mechanisms. An asterisk indicated that there was variation within the committee and to review the notes. Yes and No were indicated by Y and N, and generally noted whether these groups were involved with the review process. Whenever appropriate, numbers were used to indicate status such as the number of graduates, course changes, percentage of graduates placed, etc. Table 3 represents the manner in which data were sorted and coded. Its form evolved and changed throughout the investigation.
Figure 1. Schematic description of data flow and interaction (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 23).
Table 3
Illustration of Early Data Sorting and Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Findings</th>
<th>Review Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Changes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Assignments</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting Requirements</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Chairperson</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Chairperson</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Interest</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Y axis data elements were then reduced to form the first set of categories. One of the first categories to emerge was the nature of the decision outcomes. Data had been collected during interviews of committee members and these data were confirmed by document review. This category was set aside to be further verified and defined. The remaining data elements were consolidated into more precise categories with sub-categories. Throughout this process, cross checks for accuracy and trustworthiness were conducted as necessary.

Limitations

There were two limitations to this study: generalizability and neutrality. The data for this investigation were collected from several review committees at a single case study site. While the use of multiple sub-sites enhanced the consistency of findings, other institutions in which reviews are conducted may not have similar influencing factors impinging on curriculum decision outcomes. If the findings are viewed in terms of applicability, then the usefulness of this investigation is enhanced. Similar responses could be elicited from similar situations, for example a medium size two-year college in a relatively stable environment.

Maintaining neutrality was a continual concern for the investigator. Because of the length of time in which the investigation took place and the researcher's association with the institution, several measures had to be used to maintain objectivity. In any participation/observation of this nature, the researcher must be constantly aware of the potential for becoming involved in the situation.
The purpose of this study, the research methodology, and the analysis techniques were described in this chapter. The following chapter discusses the results of the investigation, the categories that influence academic decision making, and the nature of the decision outcomes.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this investigation was to describe those factors which influenced the program decision outcomes that emerged from a self-study review process. The investigation focused on the data derived from the activities and recommendations of 20 program review and evaluation committees comprised of faculty, counselors, and administrators. These data were gathered through participation/observation, interviews, and document reviews.

All organizations have institutional factors which influence the manner in which decision procedures are implemented and the nature of decision outcomes. The degree to which these factors interrelate varies with the nature and mission of the institution. The two-year college which served as the site for this investigation was a moderate size institution comprised of three major administrative areas: business services, student services, and instructional services. The focal groups of this study were the faculty and administrators who make up the instructional services area. This portion of the organization included an academic dean, seven credit academic divisions, and several non-credit areas. The seven credit divisions were tightly coupled in that all credit instructional programs included courses from three or more divisions.
A change in a given program potentially caused change in other divisions. As a result, when change was contemplated, a variety of constituencies became involved in the process in an effort to influence the nature of that change. Data were collected from the proceedings and reports of 20 instructional program review committees comprised of interested stakeholders and constituents. These data were analyzed to determine the nature of the decision outcomes recommended by these committees. In addition this review process studied and analyzed those factors which influenced the nature of these outcomes.

**Decision Outcomes**

Five types of decision outcomes centering on five categories of change in program content and structure were identified. These were: 1) status quo, 2) limited change, 3) moderate change, 4) extensive change, 5) program discontinuation. In order to provide for consistent interpretation of the outcomes throughout the investigation, each outcome category was defined. A program was said to have maintained status quo if the outcome was limited only to rearranging the sequence of three courses or to replacing a single outdated course with one of equivalent content and hours. Programs with fewer than eight course alterations, that is, less than 25 percent of the total program, were identified as having limited change outcomes. Moderate program changes occurred when 33 percent (9-12 courses) of the program were changed in some way. A 50 percent change in courses, sequence, and content was categorized as an extensive change. The last decision outcome, program discontinuation, included the elimination of a program, putting a
program on hold, or deleting all the major's courses and replacing them with new content.

The majority of the program changes that evolved from the review process were incremental in that alterations were primarily program adjustments rather than a sweeping change. In the perception of the interviewed participants, 32 percent of the time there was either no change or limited change, while extensive program change occurred 8 percent of the time. Document reviews indicated that 30 percent of the time the status quo had been maintained. The summary below illustrates these perceptions and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Decision</th>
<th>Participant Perceptions</th>
<th>Document Indications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Change</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Change</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Change</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued Program</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of program discontinuation, faculty participants did not view these outcomes as being substantially different from the outcomes that had previously emerged from a traditional, informal approach to program review. They indicated that the review process had provided a method for documenting intended outcomes. Comments from interviews of this group illustrates these views.

... using the process to validate our course structure ... (Faculty Participant 20)

... to update the program ... (Faculty Participant 12)

I think someone needs to have this information down on paper. We've made changes before without this supra structure. (Faculty Participant 20)
On the other hand, the administrative group involved in program review comprised of upper level administrative staff and the division administrators indicated that the structured self-study had created change that would not have occurred otherwise.

... faculty say they conduct informal review, but I don't believe them. (Administrator E)

It's [program review and evaluation] not going to originate from the faculty, but the faculty are needed to do it. (Administrator G)

The administrative group indicated that the structured review process had provided the mechanisms for effecting change. While these changes were for the most part limited and incremental in nature, pressure could be exerted for extensive change when necessary.

Influencing Factors

Five categories of factors which influenced the nature of decision outcomes that resulted from an instructional review process were identified in this study. These five categories were 1) faculty stakeholders, 2) administrative stakeholders, 3) organizational structure, 4) program centrality, and 5) external constituencies. The level of influence exerted by each factor and the effect of this influence on the nature of the decision outcomes were identified and described.

Part 1 of this chapter addresses the humanistic factors which affect decision outcomes. Faculty and administrative stakeholders and their political and professional relationships are examined. In this section, the activities and actions of faculty as individual groups and as coalitions are described. Administrative roles as they are influenced by the hierarchy and by interrelationships with faculty are
identified. In this segment, the methods used by administrators to control the process are described.

Part 2 of Chapter IV will present a discussion of the influence exerted by factors which evolve from institutional bureaucracy and technology. In this segment, the impact exerted by organizational procedures and the centrality of courses and programs is examined. The influence of the external constituencies on the bureaucratic process and the decision outcomes is described.

The conclusions emerging from this study will appear at the end of each section. These conclusions are applicable to this setting and cannot be considered universal.
In an educational organization, faculty have a major part in determining the quality and direction of instruction. The data indicated that faculty were a major factor which influenced the nature of the programmatic decision outcomes. The degree and nature of this influence varied with the type of faculty group and their relationship to the program. Faculty groups were identified as: 1) primary faculty divided into two sub-groups--Group A, Group B; 2) secondary faculty; and 3) support faculty. The following is a summary of the distribution of the various faculty groups on the review committees. The size of the committee and the distribution of the faculty was directly related to the size of the program. The largest number of primary faculty to serve on a review committee was five and the lowest number was two. Primary faculty participation was mandatory, while support and secondary faculty could choose whether they wanted to be on the review committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Category</th>
<th>Membership Distribution</th>
<th>Membership Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Faculty</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Faculty</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 provides an overview of the review committees and the make-up of each committee.

The review process was viewed by faculty as their professional domain. When questioned during the focused interview as to who should
be on the review committee, the majority of respondents indicated program faculty as their first choice for membership. The following data summary reflects the percentage of respondents who indicated their preference of groups to be included as part of the committee membership. Respondents were encouraged to list their three preferences; therefore, these categories are not mutually exclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program faculty</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division administrators</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary faculty</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support faculty</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Faculty**

Faculty stakeholders responsible for teaching the major courses, which comprised over 50 percent of the program, were categorized as primary faculty. Primary faculty were required by institutional policy to serve on the committees when their program was being reviewed. These faculty were appointed by the academic dean upon the recommendation of the division administrator.

As a rule, these faculty had been with the college for at least seven years, held the rank of assistant professor, and were tenured. A small minority of the primary faculty were instructors who were not tenured. Although the primary faculty were required to serve on the review committee and had the greatest stake in the outcomes, not all concurred with the concept of program review, nor were they always willing to participate. Two groups of primary faculty were identified. Group A primary faculty participated in the process, while the Group B primary faculty used a variety of strategies to avoid the process.
Primary faculty: Group A. The majority of faculty made up Group A. While these primary faculty at times questioned the value of the process and indicated it was time consuming, they also indicated that since their membership was mandated, it was in their best interest to participate and to be involved. Many Group A faculty viewed their involvement in the review process as part of their professional responsibility.

The work requires faculty expertise . . . they provide the analysis. (Faculty Participant 8)

Faculty who are identified with the major area . . . (Faculty Participant 28)

Certainly, the faculty whose programs are being evaluated . . . they have the opportunity to make some real good, effective changes. (Faculty Participant 18)

In addition, they also indicated that by participating in the process they were in a position to control the review process and to influence the decisions.

Conclusion:

Full time faculty view instructional review as their professional responsibility. If the process is mandated, they will participate in the process in order to influence the decisions.

Primary faculty: Group B. The second sub-group of primary faculty (Group B) openly resisted the concept of a structured self-study review and also resisted being involved in the process. This group comprised only 8 percent of the total faculty, but because of their areas of expertise and their longevity with the college, they very often were primary faculty in programs undergoing review and, consequently, were required to serve on the review committees. A review of documents indicated that each committee had at least one Group B faculty. In
general, these faculty were fully tenured, held an upper level academic rank, and had been with the college for more than 15 years.

Although the number of Group B primary faculty was small, their mandated membership on the review committees influenced the process and, in some cases, the outcomes. This group had been involved in the course and program development during the early years of the college. In general, they were typical of the community college faculty of the early-to-mid-1960s in that they viewed community college teaching as a stepping stone to a four-year institution. They were focused on their discipline and not interested in becoming a generalist. To them the technical career programs and the liberal arts transfer programs had separate goals and, as a consequence, different course content and expectations. In addition, they attributed greater academic value and status to the liberal arts transfer courses. These faculty, during an institutional reorganization during the mid-1970s, protested strongly when the differentiation between faculty teaching the transfer courses and the technical programs was eliminated. They viewed this as a lowering of their professional position. A series of similar events during the past several years served to heighten their concerns about change and their distrust of the administrative staff.

I think every faculty member was opposed to that change, but we had no input whatsoever. I did everything I could to prevent it. (Faculty Participant 17)

We thought nobody was listening to our not liking it. (Faculty Participant 13)

... it happened to be during the reorganization. It was not a clean experience ... there was more to it. (Faculty Participant 45)
My confusion is that several things were happening at the same time. We were evaluating the program, we were transferring the program from division to division . . . (Faculty Participant 29)

If you go to a one track system, something is being eliminated. I'm for a two track system . . . (Faculty Participant 26)

If the right opportunity had come I would have gone to a university. But, there's no reason they couldn't operate that way. (Faculty Participant 29)

Over the years comments of this nature have been reinforced through letters and petitions to the upper level administrative staff. When the program review policy was initiated, they saw this as another effort on the part of administration to diminish their academic freedom and faculty autonomy.

Conclusions:

If two-year college faculty derive their professional status from the courses they teach, they will actively resist any process that threatens their courses.

In any mandated program review a small minority of faculty will voice suspicion regarding institutional changes.

These primary faculty, Groups A and Group B, made up the first part of the Faculty Stakeholder category. The second group identified were the secondary faculty.

Secondary and Support Faculty

Secondary faculty taught the courses which were closely related to the major courses and made up approximately 30 percent of the program content. In most instances, these courses provided the prerequisite background necessary for entry into the major courses. Any change in the content of a course taught by a secondary faculty could conceivably
alter the courses taught by the primary faculty. For example, changes in a physics sequence which was prerequisite to certain engineering courses affected the student's level of preparation. The converse was also true. A change in the content of an engineering program required changes in a prerequisite physics course. This symbiotic relationship between primary and secondary faculty was illustrative of the tight coupling which was characteristic of the instructional services area. The majority of the secondary faculty were members of the division that provided the program, and the remainder were from closely associated divisions.

Each committee had one or two secondary faculty among its membership. The secondary faculty were selected for membership by the program division administrator upon the recommendation of the program faculty.

The third group of faculty, the program counselors and faculty from other divisions who taught the general courses found in all the programs, were identified as support faculty. Secondary and support faculty contributed a broader base of information to the review process. The support faculty contributed a more general perspective of the program, while the counselors provided views about program effects on the students and other institutions.

Like the secondary faculty, these participants could choose whether to participate on the committee. As a self-selected group with the least amount of vested interest in the outcomes, these support faculty provided a check and balance for the committee.
Conclusion:

Secondary and support faculty contribute to the review process by adding data and perceptions from outside the program.

The influence exerted by the faculty stakeholders was demonstrated by their attendance patterns, position within the program, and professional credibility.

Attendance Patterns

Attendance patterns recorded from participant/observation and document reviews indicate that the primary faculty Group A, the secondary faculty, and the support faculty attended most of the committee meetings, arrived on time, and stayed for the entire meeting. When a member of this group was unable to attend, the chairperson of the committee was usually notified. On the other hand, the attendance patterns of primary faculty Group B were sporadic. Most refused to attend the meetings and, when they did attend, they were often late or left the session early. Table 4 provides a summary of the attendance patterns of faculty groups, the level of influence, and the decision outcomes.

Dominance of Group A primary faculty. The attendance and committee participation patterns of the primary faculty established the tone of the process. When the primary faculty attended meetings regularly, support faculty and secondary faculty also attended regularly. When Group A primary faculty attendance patterns were regular, other committee members followed their lead. The Group A faculty also reinforced their position by demonstrating an interest in the process and a concern for other committee members. When they were unable to attend
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Category</th>
<th>Attendance Patterns</th>
<th>Level of Influence</th>
<th>Nature of Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A Primary Faculty</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Status Quo to Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B Primary Faculty</td>
<td>No Attendance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coalition:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A Primary and Secondary/Support</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Status Quo to Limited for Coalition Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>versus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B Primary</td>
<td>Lack of Attendance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extensive Change for Group B Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a meeting, they notified the committee chairperson. They checked back later for an up-date on the proceedings. This approach was frequently emulated by other committee members.

This demonstration of interest in the process served to establish the position of the Group A primary faculty.

If he can make the meetings even though this has been going on for a year, I guess I can be here too . . . (Faculty Participant 11)

It's time consuming but if _____ wants to change _____, I'll do what I can to help. (Faculty Participant 33)

All the people in our department are involved. (Faculty Participant 10)

When evidence of Group A primary faculty commitment to the review process and to the achievement of some decision outcome was apparent, both the secondary faculty and the support faculty tended to support their recommendations. These changes recommended by the primary faculty were usually limited in nature and tended to maintain the status quo. When moderate change was recommended, courses were altered to reflect an emerging technology and, in some cases, a new academic interest of the Group A primary faculty. The following comments illustrate this concern about current technology.

The high technology has come out of it . . . (Faculty Participant 24)

. . . to meet the needs of industry, to update technological changes that industry needed. (Faculty Participant 24)

. . . the first thing to do is to make sure we are current and make sure our programs are what the community needs. (Faculty Participant 1)

Faculty special areas of interest were incorporated more subtly. These areas were often introduced to the group as an advisory
committee recommendation or as a prerequisite for an emerging technology.

Conclusions:

When primary faculty regularly attend program review meetings, they exert a high level of influence on the nature of the decision outcomes. The nature of the outcomes will be to maintain the status quo or to enact limited to moderate change.

When evidence of Group A primary faculty commitment to the review process and to the achievement of some decision outcome was evident, both the secondary faculty and support faculty tended to support their recommendations. The nature of the decision outcomes was to maintain status quo or to limit change.

Group B primary faculty dominance. This effect of regular attendance by primary faculty was more clearly evidenced in the instance of two review committees which were dominated by Group B primary faculty who did not endorse the review process. In an effort to subvert the process, these Group B primary faculty refused to attend the review meetings. The self-study review process was based on faculty involvement and, therefore, could only be effective if there was active participation. The Group A faculty on the committee were relatively new and non-tenured. Consequently, they did not have the influence resources necessary to counteract the Group B inaction.

During the early stages of the review process members of the committee contacted the Group B primary faculty in an effort to encourage them to come to the meeting or at least provide input. In one instance, the faculty continued to refuse to attend the meetings. The Group B faculty on the second committee did agree to attend. However, during the meetings they required a recapitulation of previous meetings,
called for a revote of settled issues, and questioned the accuracy of the data used for the review process. These techniques for control of the process closely paralleled some of the six techniques described by Suchman in Anderson (1978):

Submarine and postponement techniques were most frequently used to affect the process. Submarining is used to torpedo or destroy a program because of power interests, and postponement involves seeking to delay or prolong the evaluation until concern is dissipated. (p. 283)

Variations of these techniques occurred during ensuing meetings.

In these two program reviews, the Group B faculty successfully interfered with the process. Eventually the other members of the committee stopped coming to the meetings.

Nothing was happening, so I stopped coming . . . (Faculty Participant 36)

It was obvious that [the division administrator] couldn't control [faculty]. (Administrative Intern)

I got tired of voting on old issues every time ______ showed up. (Faculty Participant 3)

Both committees were finally dissolved and, as a result, the decision outcome was in effect to maintain the status quo. When the Group B faculty were questioned, they indicated that, since they were close to retirement they saw no need for change, and if administration wanted the program changed, they should do it. Eventually, both programs were discontinued by administrative fiat after the primary faculty retired.

Conclusion:

If faculty refuse to participate in the review process and no action is taken either by colleagues or the administration to counteract the effect, they will succeed in subverting the process. All things being equal, they will exert a high level of influence to maintain the status quo.
Coalition: Group A primary faculty and secondary/support faculty.

On the other hand, in those instances when review committees were comprised of several primary faculty, and carefully selected secondary and support faculty, the results were different. During the early stages of these committee meetings, members of the committee met with the absent primary faculty to keep them informed and to encourage them to attend. Although the Group B faculty continued to refuse to participate, the committees moved ahead with the process. They did indicate concern about the possible decisions that would emerge and the effects of these outcomes on the Group B faculty.

... people are beginning to know where everybody stands on an issue. (Faculty Participant 30)

... well, if he comes we'll just review last week's meeting. (Faculty Participant 3)

If we recommend that a program be eliminated, what happens to those faculty? (Faculty Participant 24)

... protect our courses ... (Faculty Participant 14)

When it became apparent that Group B primary faculty did not plan to participate, the review committee moved on with the task of reviewing the program. At this juncture the coalition of Group A primary faculty and the secondary/support faculty opted to make decisions about the program and all the courses which comprised the program. Bardach (1979, p. 99) and Miles (1980, p. 158) describe this joining forces of several faculty groups as a consolidation of the decision making power so that it was greater than the power of the primary faculty. As a result, courses taught by the attending Group A primary faculty and secondary and support faculty were generally untouched or changed to
reflect faculty interest, while the courses taught by Group B primary faculty were recommended for extensive change or discontinuation. However, in general, the overall programmatic changes were either limited or moderate.

The Group B primary faculty expressed surprise with the outcomes and indicated that they believed that, because of their tenure and faculty position, their areas would remain unchanged.

I went from five courses to two. (Faculty Participant 12)

All my courses were eliminated. I felt they couldn't do anything if I wasn't there. (Faculty Participant 17)

There's nothing wrong with the way we've done it in the past. (Faculty Participant 29)

I'm the responsible faculty; I should decide if change is necessary. (Faculty Participant 14)

When the committee recommended deletion of all the courses taught by the absent stakeholders, some Group B faculty rejoined the group and were able to get some of their courses reinstated in the program. In those cases when the stakeholders continued to refuse to attend the meetings, their special interest courses were deleted and their teaching loads were made up of introductory survey courses.

In one instance when a particular Group B faculty realized that his program would be recommended for discontinuation, he tried to circumvent the process by requesting that his program be exempted from the process. When asked later when the decision outcomes revealed that his program was among those eliminated, he indicated that he believed his long-standing political influence would protect him. When asked about their lack of attendance, these stakeholders indicated they had believed
that their political influence with their colleagues was enough to protect their interests. A recent interview of these stakeholders indicated that they had not realized that their political influence had resulted from collegial participation and compromise over the years, and as their involvement in institutional activities declined, their base of support eroded. As Pettigrew (1975) indicates, most actors have power only in certain domains, and power is not possessed in isolation but is maintained in the context of others (p. 194).

Conclusions:

If a group of primary faculty refuse to participate in the review process, a dominant coalition of Group A primary faculty and secondary and/or support faculty may serve to counteract this effect. This coalition will have a high level of influence on the decision outcomes which will range from status quo to moderate.

The dominant coalition will exert influence which will provide support for the members of the coalition and withdraw support from the dissident group.

Position Within the Program

Faculty position within the program was determined by longevity, the types of courses taught, the teaching load, and teaching schedule. In general, senior faculty were tenured and held the rank of associate professor; however, they were not necessarily the most expert in the discipline. Junior faculty who held a lesser rank, in some instances, were more expert in the discipline but, because of a lack of longevity and tenure, they exerted less influence individually. Secondary faculty were the faculty who taught courses in the programs which were either prerequisite or co-requisite to the major courses. Some
secondary faculty were also faculty during the review of a different program. Support faculty were committee participants who were program counselors or faculty who taught the general courses found in the majority of programs. Rank and tenure varied among the secondary faculty and support faculty.

Each review committee was comprised of at least two to five primary faculty, one of whom was recognized as the senior faculty. If the review process was routine, the senior faculty was most likely to be selected as the chairperson of the committee and through this position set the tone of the process. The general consensus was that the senior faculty had been around for some time and had seen the program evolve; therefore, by virtue of their senior position, they were entitled the greatest influence regarding final decisions about program changes. This precedent provided the basis for decision making in other program review committees.

I want to control the results when my courses are reviewed ... (Faculty Participant 19)

He seemed to know what he was talking about; after all these years he should have some expertise. (Faculty Participant 4)

A document review of committee minutes indicates that the senior faculty were selected as committee chairperson for 10 out of 20 committees. These senior faculty tended to have a slightly higher level of influence than the other primary faculty. As a result of this influence, the decision outcomes tended to favor the senior faculty preferences.

One of the factors that influenced the selection of secondary and support faculty for membership on a review committee was the perception of their credibility by both the primary faculty groups and the
division administrator. This credibility was established long before their appointment to the committee. When faculty were perceived as having been cooperative, compliant, and fair, they were seen as having high credibility. The following comments illustrate how credibility was earned.

I agreed to be on the committee because ______ and ______ were the program faculty. (Faculty Participant 27)

When ______ is on a committee I know things will get done. (Faculty Participant 25)

We've been on a couple of committees. We make a good team. (Faculty Participant 39)

Faculty credibility during the review process was the sum total of the several factors which included attendance, participation, seniority, position in the program, and professional/personal relationships. There was a direct relationship between the perceived credibility of a stakeholder and her/his effectiveness in protecting interests. Figure 2 illustrates the position of the four faculty groups and the relationship of their credibility to their level of effectiveness.

Secondary faculty influence occurred when the courses taught by this group were pivotal, in that they provided prerequisite knowledge for the courses which made up the program major. In addition, these faculty were often members of the program division. This established an environment in which informal discussion and compromise could take place. This informal interaction contributed to the development of compromise positions which were later formally enacted during the committee meetings. The influence level of the secondary faculty emerged from their independent position as the provider of prerequisites and also as a result of their relationship with primary faculty. This use
Figure 2. The relationship between credibility and effectiveness.
of the informal communication network among several groups of faculty stakeholders resolved many political problems and avoided a compromise of the process. Cochran and Hengstler (1984) emphasize that by involving key audiences in the process many problems can be resolved (p. 186).

Support faculty appointed to the committees were expected to bring a degree of objectivity to the proceedings. Committee members and division administrators believed that the contributions made by this group provided a necessary balance and insured input from outside the division. However, at times the reason for appointment was not apparent even to the support faculty.

I'm not sure how I got involved. I get the impression our role is going to be to review what they come up with to see how it impacts on our areas. (Faculty Participant 20)

I was teaching one course in the program. (Faculty Participant 40)

My colleagues have been sprinkled throughout the committees. (Faculty Participant 20)

Observations during committee sessions indicated that some support faculty were appointed because they could be persuaded to support the changes suggested by a strong primary faculty. However, other observations and comments indicated that, in the case of two committee appointments, the support faculty were selected by the division administrator because of their position on certain academic issues and their known resistance to certain primary faculty. In addition, these support faculty were considered to have a high degree of credibility among colleagues. As a result of this professional position and personal influence, they were able to forestall the development of a coalition of senior faculty among Group B faculty who wanted to preserve the status quo.
The ability of these support faculty to control the process was further enhanced when they were appointed as chairperson of the review committee. As committee chairpersons they controlled the review process by establishing the agenda, determining the criteria to be used as the basis for evaluation, and selecting the data to be used for decision making. This potential power was used to an advantage by the division administrator to establish a coalition in order to achieve a preferred outcome.

The findings indicate that the influence of secondary faculty groups and support faculty groups was dependent upon the reasons they were appointed to the committee. If the review was routine, their role was primarily to provide input from outside the program and to support the primary faculty. As a result their level of influence was low. In those instances, however, when there was potential conflict regarding the desired review outcomes, secondary faculty and support faculty were often selected because of their ability to influence committee members and to counteract dissenting primary faculty views. Consequently, in a low conflict environment their level of influence was low and the decision outcomes were status quo or limited. On the other hand, if there was a high level of conflict among the committee members, their level of influence was potentially high. The decision outcomes in these situations varied from limited to extensive and varied with the nature of the coalitions formed to bring about specific outcomes. These will be elaborated upon in the section entitled "Coalition: Division administrator/secondary and/or support faculty."
Conclusions:

There is a direct relationship between the perceived credibility of faculty stakeholders and their effectiveness in protecting their interests.

Secondary faculty exerted greatest influence when the courses they taught were pivotal, in that they provided prerequisite knowledge for the courses which made up the program major.

If a review process is routine and few changes are necessary, secondary and support faculty will provide information and will exert little influence on the decision outcomes.

If the review is routine, senior faculty will exert a high level of influence to maintain the status quo. Secondary and support faculty will support the position of the senior faculty.

If a review process has a high conflict level and support and secondary faculty are carefully selected, then as members of the dominant coalition they will exert a high level of influence to support the decision outcomes preferred by the coalition.

The level of influence exerted by the faculty dominant coalition will be dependent upon the demonstrated support of the division administrator.

Summary

Descriptions by Weiss and others in Byrk (1983) of stakeholder involvement in instructional program review and evaluation and decision making emphasize the technical expertise of faculty and how this expertise contributes to the fairness of the process and the improvement of course relevance (p. 8). The findings of this investigation support the value of the expertise of the faculty stakeholders, but indicate that the review process is highly political. Faculty stakeholders are generally issue specific and are concerned about their instructional domain. Their efforts are directed toward regulating
the extent of change. The majority of the decision outcomes that emerged from a faculty dominated review process limited programmatic and course change or maintained the status quo. Decision outcomes which encompassed more extensive change as a rule emerged from a review process orchestrated by instructional administrators.

Conclusions:

The majority of decision outcomes which emerge from a faculty dominated instructional review process will be to limit change or maintain the status quo.

Faculty stakeholder involvement will be issue specific and will take precedence over the good of the institution.

Administrative Stakeholders

The influence exerted by the academic administrators varied among the committees. The basis of power for these groups was derived from their institutional position, their perceived relationship with their colleagues, and the faculty perception of their power. This study focused on instructional program review; therefore, the administrative staff included in the investigation was limited to the academic dean and the division administrators responsible for the divisions which offer credit programs. Figure 3 illustrates the boundaries of the organizational structure within which the academic review was conducted. The institutional organization chart is found in Appendix D.

Division Administrator

The division administrator is responsible for supervising and coordinating the short-term and long-term activities of the division which include curriculum development, faculty assignment, course scheduling,
Figure 3. Organizational chart of the instructional area within the total institution.
and budget supervision. Alterations in the instructional programs potentially affected these prescribed duties. And, since success of the instructional program as measured by enrollment and relevance was a contributing factor to the division administrator's perceived level of performance, the potential impact of the process on the administrator's responsibilities established the division administrator as a significant stakeholder in the review process. Much of the division administrator's effort during the review was designed to monitor and control the process. As a result, several strategies were used to control the review process and the nature of the outcomes. These strategies included the control of review committee appointments, actively serving on the committee as a participant or as chairperson, or by influencing committee activities as a consultant.

Committee appointments. One strategy used by the divisional administrators to regulate the outcomes of the review process was through the appointment of the members of the program review committee. The policy states that the primary faculty and the division administrator are required to be members of the committee. Beyond that, the division administrators had the freedom to select the additional members.

In 1980, during the early stages of the implementation of the review committee policy, the division administrators asked for recommendations for committee membership from the program faculty. This action in effect resulted in the development of powerful faculty sub-units intent on maintaining the status quo. In addition, there was a concomitant loss of control by the division administrators over the process. Bardach (1979) describes this phenomenon as the leakage of
authority which occurs when sub-units have an autonomous power base and when subordinate goals differ from the goals established further up the hierarchy.

Since the division administrators were responsible for the programs and the decision outcomes, they soon changed their approach to the appointment of the review committee members. They selected secondary and support faculty on the basis of their level of credibility, their perceived level of cooperation, and their understanding of the program. If few changes in the program were necessary, the division administrator selected secondary and support faculty who had the discipline expertise which supported the program. Others were selected because of their ability to analyze the results of surveys and program enrollment data. These appointments were made in collaboration with program faculty.

However, in those instances when substantive program change was necessary, the division administrator was careful to select co-opted faculty who had the expertise and background to counteract program stakeholder attempts to limit change. Two division administrators indicated that they had maintained a semblance of primary faculty input by giving them a choice of pre-selected faculty to recommend for committee appointment. This strategy contributed a level of trust between the administrator and the faculty, a key factor in the concept of collegial management and in stakeholder based evaluation process, but it also ensured administrative control over the review process.

Primary faculty viewed participation on the review committee as part of their teaching responsibility. Secondary and support faculty
participated because of interest and in general understood why they had been appointed to the committee. These secondary and support faculty, appointed for a specific reason, understood their purpose. Some were hesitant to describe their role. This selective withholding of information is described as a powerful control technique which enhances the potential for influencing the outcomes (Gamson, 1968, p. 126; Miles, 1980, p. 163).

Conclusions:

Instructional administrators will attempt to control the review process through selective committee appointments.

If predetermined decision outcomes are the goal, the administrator will select co-opted faculty for appointment to the committee.

Committee membership will reflect a balance of power which will produce outcomes congruent with the intent of the power holders.

Review Committee Chairperson

When the review policy and procedure was first implemented in 1980, the division administrators interpreted the policy as stating that they were required to participate actively in the process. Because of the multiplicity of responsibilities of the division administrator, it soon became obvious that this method was not highly efficient. This problem was compounded when the administrator also took on the responsibility of serving as committee chairperson. These two factors established a setting in which committee members often waited for the division administrator to take the lead. As a result, the review process became long and drawn out with infrequent meetings.
It gets put off when people become involved in other projects. (Faculty Participant 8)

We haven't done much lately; [division administrator] has been busy. We're waiting for him. (Faculty Participant 7)

I think there are some difficulties that have to do with the extent to which a division administrator can be involved. (Faculty Participant 22)

... if the division administrator had to accept the role of chair every time, 30 percent or more of your time would become that of a program reviewer. (Administrator G)

I started out chairing the committee, but ... we were not very fruitful. (Administrator B)

When the duration of the process exceeded two academic years, faculty lost interest. In some instances Group B faculty took advantage of these delays to covertly influence other program faculty that the division administrator was not committed to closure of the process. As a result, any impetus for change was dissipated and the process lost its momentum. The decision outcomes which emerged generally maintained the status quo or were limited in nature.

Conclusions:

When division administrators are directly involved in the review process as participants or committee chairpersons, other commitments will delay progress and their level of influence will be diminished. The decision outcomes will retain the status quo.

If the review process is delayed and exceeds two academic years, participants will lose interest. The decision outcomes will be to maintain the status quo.

Advisory/Consultant

A more recent approach used by the division administrator has been to serve as a member of the committee in an advisory capacity. Most division administrators and faculty seemed to prefer this arrangement.
Faculty were able to demonstrate power during the meetings while the
administrator retained covert control. A Group B primary faculty
expressed concern that the committee recommendations might be rejected
by the division administrator.

We need administrative guidance so we don't go
off . . . (Faculty Participant 26)

What happens if [division administrator] doesn't like what
we did? Do we start over? (Faculty Participant 29)

A review of committee meetings and documents indicated that there was
no basis for this concern. When the division administrator attended
the meetings occasionally, met with the committee chairperson regularly,
and discussed the issues with members of the committee informally,
enough information was exchanged so that the outcomes were mutually
agreeable.

By using the strategy of serving as consultant, the division adminis-
trator kept up to date with the proceedings and directed the focus of
the committee, but at the same time avoided the faculty turf battles.
By avoiding the role of referee during open meetings, the division
administrator could negotiate compromise privately and on a one-to-one
basis. Faculty, who were threatened by the process, met with the divi-
sion administrators in private to discuss program status and to deter-
mine mutually agreeable options. In this way, faculty could compromise
their positions without losing face among peers. All faculty were
concerned at one time or another about the threat to their expertise
and the loss of their turf.

If I propose dropping a course, what happens to me? (Faculty
Participant 30)
If I make a change, I want a commitment that they'll give it a real trial. (Faculty Participant 26)

In general, this indirect approach proved to be effective in achieving the level of change desired by the division administrator. The majority of the decision outcomes that emerged from the process were moderate, but in those cases where change was perceived necessary by the administrator, the recommendations were for extensive change or program discontinuation.

Conclusion:

When division administrators participate in the review process in a consulting advisory role, their level of influence will be moderate to high and the decision outcomes will reflect their preferences.

In the majority of programs, division administrators were able to elicit cooperation. However, in four cases Group B primary faculty were recalcitrant throughout the process. When this occurred, a coalition of faculty headed by the division administrator was developed. While all division administrators had equal potential power derived from their position within the hierarchy, the personal power exerted by each one varied. The most successful coalitions which involved division administrators were those which were spearheaded by those perceived to be the most powerful and part of the inner circle. Miles (1980) states that sub-unit power will vary with the importance of its resources to the organization (p. 167). This concept of first among equals, "primus inter pares," contributed to a consistent achievement of desired outcomes by certain division administrators.

Miles describes an organization as a coalition of interest groups with a shared resource base, commitment to a common mission, and
dependent upon a larger context for legitimacy (p. 5). These three facets of an organization combine to create tension, tension which must be reduced and used for specific gain. As a result, these interest groups will strive to amass power in an effort to achieve personal goals (p. 154).

As the investigation progressed, it became evident that coalitions of this nature were being formed. These coalitions were comprised of various faculty groups, and administrators and faculty groups.

Coalition: Division Administrator/
Secondary and/or Support Faculty

In some cases, the involvement of the division administrator in the review process was limited to participation as a committee member or as an ad hoc advisor. This form of involvement served to remove the division administrator from the discussion and debate that took place during the meetings. By doing this, the division administrator avoided the intensity of turf battles and could maintain a position of equitable concern for all faculty stakeholders. In this way they were able to direct the outcomes of the review process and, yet at the same time, avoid a direct confrontation with primary faculty stakeholders.

I found that in his case it's better to talk to him on a one-to-one level. (Administrator C)

It's important to him to save face . . . (Administrator D)

The changes had to be made . . . I gave him a chance, but did it privately. (Administrator H)

One division administrator indicated that this approach had been effective in the past with this faculty on other issues, so he opted to use it during the review process.
The establishment of a dominant coalition by the division administrator was not a requirement for all review committees. If no major program changes were warranted, a faculty controlled review committee was adequate to achieve the desired outcomes. If moderate to major change was necessary, division administrators controlled the makeup of the committee.

Influence on the process by the division administrator was exerted through the selection of secondary and support faculty for membership on the review committee. The criteria for selection was based on their loyalty to the division administrator, their level of cooperation, and their credibility among peers. Secondary and support faculty, when asked why they had been appointed to a certain committee, generally commented that:

... he and I agree on the way the program should be. (Faculty Participant 27)

I was on another division review committee. I guess she liked what I did. (Faculty Participant 37)

We were hired at the same time; we've been friends ever since. (Faculty Participant 32)

I want to see some real changes in the program ... (Faculty Participant 40)

I get along with the ________ faculty ... (Faculty Participant 2)

These views were tacitly reinforced during conversation with the division administrators. While none openly admitted they were directing the process through a certain faculty member, they did acknowledge they were careful to select the "right" people.

The selection of the right people most notably influenced the outcomes of four program reviews. All four programs had changed very
little during the past ten years. The primary faculty were mostly Group B primary faculty who had resisted suggestions for program change despite obvious changes in the occupational technology and the transfer requirements. Other primary faculty were relatively new and non-tenured and had few power resources. In addition, program enrollments, the percentage of career placements, and successful upper division transfers were low. When the institutional self-study policy was enacted, the division administrators elected to schedule reviews for these programs early in the process.

Secondary and support faculty selected for these four review committees were senior faculty from disciplines closely related to the program major under review who had institutional credibility. In each case secondary or support faculty were named committee chairperson by the division administrator. The overall effect of these appointments was to diminish the control of the primary faculty over the review meeting schedule and agenda. There was close collaboration between the division administrator and the committee chairpersons in the development of the agenda and the methodology to be used in collecting data for review. This unobtrusive use of power to influence the agenda and the nature of the data served to legitimize the preferred decision outcome and also neutralized the opposition faculty (Miles, 1980, p. 162).

In addition, the division administrator supported the committee chairperson when the Group B primary faculty attempted to subvert the process through lack of attendance and other diversionary tactics. In two cases, the committee chairperson was directed by the division administrator to continue the meetings despite a prolonged absence by
the senior faculty. When it became evident that the process would go on, other committee members increased their level of activity on the review committee.

The overall effect of this collaborative effort resulted in a variety of decision outcomes that were congruent with the desires of the division administrator. The nature of these outcomes was moderate to extensive. In all four cases, the courses controlled by Group B faculty were changed radically, and in one case, several were deleted to be replaced with new courses.

Conclusion:

If a coalition of the division administrator and selected faculty is formed, influence upon the review process will be high. The decisions will reflect preferred outcomes and will most likely result in moderate to extensive change.

Academic Dean

The academic dean is one of three members of the president's cabinet. In this position he has the authority and the responsibility for both the credit and non-credit instructional offerings. Figure 3 illustrates the relationship of this position within the organizational hierarchy and its span of control. A detailed organizational chart can be found in Appendix D.

For the most part, the academic dean was not directly involved in the instructional review process other than to transact the recommendations for committee membership and to receive the final committee recommendations. When involvement was necessary, it was through the usual bureaucratic channels. His influence on the outcomes of the
The involvement of the upper level administrative staff in the review process will be limited and direct influence on the outcomes will be low. The nature of the outcomes will reflect the intent of the review committee.

Coalition: Academic Dean/Division Administrator

At one point during this investigation it became necessary for the academic dean to become actively involved in the review process. This involvement was limited to one instructional division and included five programs. Previous efforts by the dean to bring about programmatic change through the division administrator had not been successful. This division administrator had not been viewed as potentially powerful either by the division faculty, his colleagues, or his administrative supervisor. When the division administrator resigned, the academic dean opted to use this interim period to appoint an acting division administrator who had the power to bring about needed change in the program.

The administrative philosophy of the institution was strongly committed to adherence to the organizational procedure. Consequently, at the point at which it became necessary to change the five programs
in one division, the academic dean used the established program review policy and procedure in order to achieve the desired outcomes. While administrative fiat was an option, he was concerned about faculty support of the changes and felt that involvement in the process would encourage their acceptance of the results.

The review committee membership was made up of program faculty and the members of the curriculum council. Several division administrators were appointed as review committee chairpersons. These chairpersons met regularly as a group and with the administrative dean to share progress reports, develop strategies, and establish agendas. A review of these memberships indicated that some of the most influential individuals in the organization were in key positions. Care had been taken to establish a dominant coalition so that the desired outcomes could be achieved.

By appointing members of the curriculum council to the various review committees, the academic dean increased the likelihood that the review outcomes would be approved by the curriculum council since the majority of the council members were involved in the process. This co-optation laid the groundwork for the consolidation of the majority of votes which was necessary to prevent a last minute attempt by division faculty to subvert the process during the open council meeting.

Throughout the process, attempts by faculty and division administrators to gain additional territory were thwarted by the academic dean or a member of the inner circle if the recommendations brought forth did not comply with the preconceived direction for the programs. Division faculty who attempted to subvert the process were bypassed
by their colleagues and the committee chairpersons. Strict adherence
to a timetable established by the academic dean was required.

Throughout the review process the institutional policies and pro-
cedures for curriculum revision were closely followed. This legitimate
use of decision procedures, Miles (1980) indicates, lends credibility
to the process and the outcomes (p. 162). The desired outcomes of the
academic dean and the division administrator were achieved. The major
courses in the programs were discontinued and replaced with new courses,
and support courses were revised to comply with the new curricular
philosophy. This coalition of the academic dean, the division adminis-
trators, and the use of organizational procedures resulted in decision
outcomes that led to program discontinuation.

Conclusion:

If all other processes fail, the academic dean will
become involved in the review process. The level of
influence exerted by the academic dean will be high and
the decision outcomes will be for extensive change or
program discontinuation.

Summary

Indications are that the program division administrator exerts the
highest level of influence on the decision outcomes. This influence
is exerted by controlling the makeup of the review committee, providing
administrative support, and developing dominant coalitions. Most of
these influencing actions take place in the political arena. The
effectiveness of each division administrator was based upon a combina-
tion of position power and personal power. This group, as a whole, was
able to determine outcomes and then orchestrate the process in order to
achieve these outcomes. The preferred outcomes varied with each pro-
gram reviewed.

Conclusions:

The division administrator (academic middle management) holds a pivotal position in the instructional review process. This position exerts a high level of influence throughout the process and on the decision outcomes.

Administrative stakeholder actions during the review process are political in nature and are based on perceptions of the total institution.

This investigation revealed that faculty stakeholders are willing to conduct instructional program reviews, but prefer to implement the review as an informal process. They focus on their areas of interest and prefer not to become involved in issues outside their discipline. Public two-year college faculty are by nature conservatives and as a consequence are reluctant to change from familiar teaching methods and instructional content. Middle management administrators, by virtue of their position, were required to view the instructional programs within the context of the total institution. In general, they were more cognizant of changes in the external and internal environment. In addition, they were empowered through delegation to make changes in response to environmental fluctuations. As a result when significant program changes were necessary, the impetus came from middle management rather than the faculty.

Conclusion:

If instructional program review is to be conducted, the impetus will come from the division administrator. Faculty stakeholders will strive to maintain the status quo and to protect their interests. Instructional middle managers will strive to reach decision outcomes which reflect the institutional position and the environmental status.
Chapter IV, Part 1, focused on the strategies used by the stakeholder groups to influence the decision outcomes that emerged from a review process. The second part of this chapter will describe the categories of influencing factors that were bounded by the institutional framework.
Part 2 of Chapter IV examines the second group of categories comprised of factors which influence the nature of the decision outcomes which emerged from an academic review process. This section will describe how the organizational structure, program centrality, and external constituencies influenced the decision process and the nature of the outcomes.

**Organizational Structure**

In any decision making process, multiple factors created by the nature of the formal organizational structure and informal organization impinge upon and affect the nature of the decisions. In some instances, the formal organization and the informal act independently, while in other instances these factors may work either in concert or in disharmony. During this investigation several elements in the organizational structure that influenced the review process were noted. This investigation focused on the two which were more pervasive: organizational structure and faculty politics.

Although components of a liberal education were present in the early curricula of the community college, the early organizational tendency of the college resembled that of the public secondary school. In the institution that served as the site for this investigation, this organizational tendency became more structured through the implementation of a management by objectives philosophy during the mid-1970s. Over the years this approach has been reinforced and
strengthened through the coupling of management objectives with institutional policy and procedure. Institutional planning is based on a five-year cycle of short-term and long-term objectives. These objectives also undergird the budgeting process.

The instructional program review and evaluation policies and procedures emerged, in part, in response to external oversight agency requirements, but primarily as a means for validating instructional program goals and providing data for budget development (Interviews: Administrators G and H). The instructional review process paralleled the five-year, long-range plan. Each instructional program was to be reviewed every five years using predetermined criteria and following established procedures (Appendix A). After the institutional program was reviewed, the committee recommendations were submitted to the division faculty for approval. Once consensus was reached by the division faculty, the recommendations were then submitted to the curriculum council (Appendix E). Figure 4 depicts the process followed from the time the review committee makes their recommendations to the final approval by the administrative cabinet or the board of trustees.

**Curriculum Council**

Like many colleges and universities, the two-year college which served as the site for this investigation had a formal procedure and committee established for the purpose of reviewing curriculum proposals. In this institution the curriculum council is charged with this responsibility.
Figure 4. Formal institutional sequence for the approval of an instructional program.
The curriculum council is an instructional committee comprised of division administrators, representative division faculty, the director of counseling services, and two student representatives. The academic dean serves as chairperson. This group is empowered to review and to make final recommendations regarding instructional matters which include program development, program content, course content, and course sequencing.

The academic program review and evaluation policy and procedure requires that all review committee recommendations are to be submitted to the curriculum council for endorsement. The process is highly structured. Committee recommendations are submitted to the division faculty by the committee chairperson and the division administrators for their approval. After the division faculty endorse the recommendations, the division administrator then submits them to the academic dean who places the decision outcomes on the curriculum council agenda. These recommendations and supporting documents are distributed to the members of the curriculum council at least ten days prior to the meeting. During this time, the council members then review the recommendations to determine the effects, if any, these changes will have on their division. During this ten-day period the division administrators discuss among themselves the potential impact these review recommendations will have on the program, their respective divisions, and the institution as a whole. Minor concerns are discussed and solved during the open council meeting. However, major objections that are unresolved can result in withdrawing the recommendations from the agenda. Usually the recommendations and objections are returned to the
committee for reconsideration. Once the issues and objections are eliminated and consensus by the majority of stakeholder and constituencies is achieved, the recommendations are submitted to the council for deposition. When the council approves the recommendations for change, the academic dean submits them to the administrative cabinet for endorsement. Only new programs are submitted to the board of trustees for approval.

The data indicate that the majority of committee participants viewed the curriculum council as having a high degree of influence. Concern about curriculum council action was expressed at least once by every review committee.

It's necessary to see whether you're meeting all the criteria required by the council. (Faculty Participant 20)

Someone needs to have the information down on paper. It needs to be documented in curriculum council. (Faculty Participant 20)

The whole program review was initiated by the curriculum council. (Faculty Participant 36)

Will the curriculum council let us do that? (Faculty Participant 11)

... build a new curriculum. If we can't justify it, we'll just not run it through the curriculum process ... (Faculty Participant 49)

We'll not submit it to the curriculum council without the supporting data ... would be suicide ... (Faculty Participant 30)

With the membership of the council being partly made up of division administrators ... opposition was low key and more a matter of questions about procedure rather than substance of the issue. (Administrator H)

These comments derived from the focused interviews with review committee participants were reinforced during informal discussions. In
addition, the potential influence of the council was reinforced through the behind-the-scenes activities that take place when a review committee recommendation is coming up.

One of the purposes for a representative membership on the review committee was to ensure input from the various program constituencies. Secondary and support stakeholders frequently delayed action on a recommended change in order to discuss it with the support instructional division. If the primary stakeholders objected to these tactics during committee discussion, they were reminded by the other members that the recommendations might not make it through the curriculum council process if consensus was not reached.

The institutional policy provided for a public review of curricular changes. This public scrutiny by administrators and faculty took place in a structured environment in which the power of the division administrators was distributed equally. The potential for influence was derived from the position rather than from personal power. Because of this equal distribution of power and the organizational tight coupling, changes in programs had to be agreed to by the majority of the division administrators. As a consequence, tradeoffs and compromises were an integral part of decision making. This quid pro quo atmosphere provided a check and balance system which served to control the extent of change.

It was difficult to determine the extent to which the formal curriculum council process exerted influence on the outcomes as compared with the informal process. Review committee documents indicate that during early discussions attempts were made to reduce or eliminate the
requirement for certain courses, for example, physical education, psychology, and sociology. In several cases, motions were made by committee members to eliminate physical education as a program requirement, but at some later point in the committee deliberations, for no discernible reason, these courses were included as a program requirement. When this occurred, the comment was made that the other committee recommendations would not have an easy time in curriculum council. These observations by the investigator were checked with observations made by research interns who were committee resource persons. Similar observations were made in several of the committees.

Division administrators responsible for the courses such as sociology, psychology, and physical education in response to questions about a stance stated that they were committed to maintaining a breadth of learning, especially in some of the specialized technical curricula, and that this breadth could only be achieved by including the courses under question. They also indicated that they would have questioned the deletion of these courses during an open discussion at the curriculum council meeting but, since these courses were reinstated, the need for that discussion was unnecessary.

These events imply the extent to which informal influence was covertly exercised. These actions illustrate uses of unobtrusive political behavior, as described by Miles (1980). Minority groups, those faculty and division administrators who stood to lose courses in programs, were able to use legitimate decision procedures to reinforce their position. In addition, they were able to convince other participants that their support was an important resource. Most groups
protected their interests through persuasion and through the potential effect of a public discussion of the review committee recommendations. As each group struggled to maintain their territory in this tightly coupled structure, compromises among several groups were made.

The influence of the curriculum council on the outcomes was more evident during the preliminary committee discussion than during the council meeting itself. Its greatest influence was its presence and its potential power. As a result, review committees tended to recommend changes they believed would be endorsed by the curriculum council. These outcomes emerged from compromise and reflected a consensus among the various stakeholders. The majority of these outcomes reinforced the status quo or limited change. In two instances moderate change was supported.

Conclusion:

Decision outcomes are influenced by the presence and potential power of an institutional curriculum committee. The influence of this body is high. The decision outcomes that result will be to maintain the status quo or to limit change.

Faculty Politics

The political interaction of the faculty provided the second element in the institutional factors.

Four types of faculty stakeholders have been described earlier. Primary faculty who taught the major courses were comprised of two groups: Group A, who participated in the process, and Group B, who resisted the process and refused to participate. Secondary faculty were the faculty who taught courses related to the major. The final
group, the support faculty, were faculty from other divisions and the program counselors.

These groups of faculty stakeholders exerted influence on the decision making process through their participation on the review committees, by their position in the program, and through their informal relationships. According to Miles (1980), organizational politics is the process by which differentiated but interdependent individuals and groups use whatever power they can muster to influence the goals, criteria, or processes used in organizational decision making (p. 154). The purpose of these behaviors is to protect their position and to advance their interests. The greatest professional resources of community college faculty are their teaching assignments and their area of academic expertise. The institutional program review and evaluation threatened their professional core; consequently, various techniques were employed by these groups to influence the decision making process in order to protect their professional position.

Faculty used a variety of techniques in order to control the process. Faculty influence varied in different situations. The influence of attendance patterns, participation, and credibility were discussed earlier. Overt strategies included open confrontation and objections to the process and questions regarding the appropriateness of the evaluation criteria. Unobtrusive techniques used were more subtle, but effectively achieved the objective. The overall objective behind these strategies used by faculty was to protect their position.

Subsumed within these efforts to protect their position was the issue of faculty perceptions of turf, that is, those areas that had
traditionally been set aside for specific groups or faculty. This issue of turf influenced faculty responses and participation throughout the program review process.

It's a big cloud . . . (Faculty Participant 26)

If I go along with the changes in my program, what's going to become of me? (Faculty Participant 14)

I see it as a turf issue . . . (Faculty Participant 39)

Many realized, too, that the curriculum council process was primarily the political arena for the division administrators and the academic dean. As a result, any influence by the faculty had to be exerted during the review committee process prior to submitting the recommendations to the council for review.

... the politics of that group are one step outside the faculty. (Faculty Participant 21)

... once it goes to curriculum council, I don't have any say so. (Faculty Participant 22)

Once the committee recommendations were submitted to the division faculty and the curriculum council, faculty potential for influence was diminished. As a consequence, faculty efforts to control the outcomes were focused on the committee process.

Throughout the committee process there was an ongoing competition for resources and autonomy. Some of this competition was expressed openly, while in other instances it was more covert. Turf in the form of teaching responsibilities was the driving force behind much of the faculty participation in decision making. Coalitions and compromises were based on this underlying premise. Faculty, who had barely spoken to each other for years, teamed up to vote against suggestions that
could potentially erode the enrollment in their courses. Coalitions of this nature occurred with regularity among a majority of the committees, most notably during the review of the physical education and English courses. These coalitions presented their views within the committee structure. As a result, they were perceived as legitimate concerns and were supported by other members of the committee.

Some open hostility was noted regarding the review and evaluation process. Some respondents were suspicious about the reasons for the policy and would often begin their statements about the review process with something like, "Change is necessary, but . . .," and then go on to talk about the threat to their expertise brought about by the review process. Primary Group B faculty expressed the greatest concern and suspicion. Comments by these faculty indicated that many considered the process to be a threat to their status quo and to their academic turf.

... we've got to protect this area. (Faculty Participant 3)

A common core has value, but not as direct value as I could have had in the old curriculum. (Faculty Participant 17)

People were satisfied . . . . there wasn't much motivation to make change. (Faculty Participant 25)

It's not always an easy process because one is defending turf. (Faculty Participant 37)

Change is threatening. (Faculty Participant 20)

It's like a pill; you hate to swallow it . . . . I ended up with one [class]--it's a bitter pill. (Faculty Participant 12)

... need to keep the traditional approach . . . (Faculty Participant 30)
And, finally, the comment that seemed to sum up the feelings regarding change:

If you've taught a particular class for ten years, and especially if you've developed that class, it's hard to give it up. (Faculty Participant 24)

During the review process the first efforts at political control focused on the selection and appropriateness of the evaluation criteria. The two criteria questioned most frequently were the enrollment levels and the percentage of graduates placed. The raising of these questions in some ways was an effort to subvert the process by shifting attention away from the issue of review to alternative issues (Anderson, 1978). Failing that, faculty groups then used these criteria to legitimize their preferred decision outcomes. In some cases, low enrollment in a course was used as the reason for deleting it from the program. For example, personal typing was eliminated from a program because few students opted to take it. The information that was not revealed was that a large percentage of the students in the program had taken typing in high school and had successfully challenged out of it. Each review committee at some point had to be reminded these were institutional criteria and were also part of the oversight agency requirements and, therefore, were not designed to impact specific programs. The following comments illustrate committee participant concerns:

To make a judgment based only on enrollment would be poor. (Faculty Participant 22)

In this time of slow economy, I can't guarantee every person a job. (Faculty Participant 15)

The internship helps . . . (Faculty Participant 1)
We don't have numbers about our transfer students. (Faculty Participant 26)

I can't go out and drag people in to raise my enrollments. (Faculty Participant 17)

If enrollment is indeed a problem, is it due to improper counseling, admissions people, and the process of getting out there and beating the bushes. (Faculty Participant 26)

Concern about job placement of graduates varied within the programs. Faculty in programs primarily intended as transfer programs were less concerned than the faculty involved in career programs. Initial discussion among most of the committees focused on the role of the institutional placement office. After the results of employer surveys were tabulated, the discussion focused on the preparation of the graduates and strategies to be used to encourage local businesses and industries to hire program graduates. Some programs were revised to include practicums and internships. Others chose to broaden the community representation on advisory committees.

A most unobtrusive faculty political maneuver became apparent as the analysis of data progressed. A few faculty, who were not necessarily on the review committees, were effective in in their efforts to have courses in their major included as a program requirement. This small group of faculty were similar in that they were highly visible on campus, respected by administration and peers alike and were viewed as having a high level of expertise in their discipline. There was no record of their involvement in the committee proceedings and yet a review of the outcomes indicates that one to three courses in their discipline either went through the review untouched or at least one was added during the revision process.
This effect was opposite from the impact of the verbal, openly hostile Group B primary faculty. The more they objected, the more other faculty moved away from their political camp to a more moderate stance. The dissident group in the long run lost their status quo and all they hoped to gain. On the other hand, the quietly discreet, more politically astute faculty were able to protect their turf and to expand their territory.

**Conclusion:**

In order to influence the outcomes, faculty will use strategies such as questioning the value of program review and the appropriateness of the criteria to diminish the credibility of the process.

**Summary**

The organizational structure of the two-year college was comprised of formal and informal networks. The formal network was characterized by a curriculum coordinating and oversight body. This committee influenced the decision outcomes as a result of its delegated formal power and its potential power. Both the delegated and potential power established a quid pro quo milieu in which compromise was reached. The faculty stakeholders exerted influence on the decision outcomes through a sophisticated informal network in which they used the review process in order to protect their professional status and academic boundaries.

**Conclusion:**

The organization structure will establish the boundaries within which formal and informal networks effect change.
Program Centrality

Two-year college programs are comprised of three categories of courses which combine to provide the student with the necessary background for a career or upper division college studies. These courses are defined by criteria established by the state oversight agency as technical, basic, and general. Technical courses make up approximately 50 percent of the program content and provide the content for the career major; the basic courses serve as the prerequisite for the major; and the third category, general courses, which make up the remaining 25 percent of the program content, include English, physical education, social sciences, and humanities (OBOR Operating Manual, 1979). In general, the categories for most courses are fixed but some may fit two or more categories. For example, a course in psychology defined as technical in childhood education, could be defined as a basic course in nursing, and as a general course in the Associate of Arts program.

As a general rule, the technical courses were career specific and were developed for certain programs. These courses were taught by the faculty in the division which offered the program. The basic and general courses, on the other hand, were offered by one division but included in programs from other divisions. Table 5 illustrates the distribution of these courses among the programs reviewed during this investigation. Division enrollment levels were one of the criteria used to determine the effectiveness of the division administrator. Faculty teaching loads were also dependent upon these enrollment levels. As a result, division stakeholders constantly sought ways
## TABLE 5
Distribution of Non-Major Courses Among the Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Committees</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
<th>Sociology</th>
<th>HPER</th>
<th>Math.</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Merchandising</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Phys. Ed. &amp; Rec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language and Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science/Math</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science/History</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Careers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lab Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to expand enrollments and to protect their current status. Two strategies used to ensure consistent enrollment levels were to have courses designated as a requirement for graduation or as a prerequisite.

Graduation Requirements

At the time this investigation was initiated, a nine credit hour English sequence and a three credit hour physical education sequence were listed as graduation requirements.

Observations of several review committees revealed that, since the English sequence had been designated as an institutional requirement for graduation by the curriculum council several years ago, it was generally untouched during the review process. Discussion about the English requirements centered on the type of courses in the sequence. Two English sequences were offered. The sequence designed for technical programs emphasized technical writing and speech, while the other, intended for the transfer student, was similar to the English requirement in upper division academic institutions.

Over the years, as the number of graduates from technical programs who have gone on for baccalaureate degrees has increased, enrollments in the transfer English sequence have increased, while enrollments in the technical sequence have declined. Some review committees included a recommendation to replace the technical English sequence with the transfer English sequence. In some cases the committee recommended the students be given the option of selecting the preferred sequence.

We are looking at all 100 level English courses . . . (Faculty Participant 21)
For instance, in reviewing the English courses in Developmental Education ... those have direct impact on our courses. (Faculty Participant 20)

Our review is a little less formal ... we settled for looking at strengths and weaknesses. (Faculty Participant 22)

The question is really, "Is this a good English course for LCCC students?" (Faculty Participant 36)

These options were specified at a time when the English division administrator was among the more influential division administrators. He was able to convince other division administrators and review committee members that it was in the best interest of the students to provide them with a choice of sequences. When this administrator left, he was replaced by an acting administrator, a faculty member whose teaching load was comprised primarily of courses in the transfer sequence. The technical programs reviewed during this period of time list only the transfer sequence as the English option. Since that time, enrollments in the transfer English sequence have increased, while enrollments in technical English have declined. The overall result has been to force the English faculty to review both English sequences and to come up with an alternative set of options.

The centrality of the English sequence and its institutional endorsement as a graduation requirement has insulated it from deletion from programs. Consequently, the nature of the decision outcomes based on this centrality has been to retain the status quo or to make limited changes in the courses.

The centrality of the English sequence as a requirement for graduation that insulated it from extensive change is in sharp contrast with the loss of centrality suffered by the physical education sequence.
During the early stages of the implementation of the review policy and procedure, a three-course physical education sequence was a graduation requirement. Document review and observations of early committee proceedings indicate that physical education was an accepted requirement and was virtually untouched by committee decisions. However, at some point during this investigation, the curriculum council deleted physical education as a requirement for graduation.

At the point which physical education was no longer required and inclusion was at the discretion of the program faculty, document reviews indicate discussion about its status began to take place. Some interest groups took advantage of this opportunity to replace the three credit physical education hours with their courses, others maintained the physical education requirements, while others deleted the requirement entirely. This latter group was primarily made up of health careers faculty and engineering technology faculty whose programs, developed according to external accrediting agency criteria, contained credit hours that far exceeded the institutional minimum for graduation. Later reviews indicated decision outcomes ranged from retention of the original 3 hours to the elimination of all the physical education requirement.

Efforts to retain the status quo were most successful when review committee members were approached by physical education faculty who had a high level of credibility. On two occasions review committees responded to the approaches negatively. Follow-up indicated that members of these committees had served on a previous review committee which had involved two physical education faculty who were viewed as
Group B primary faculty and, as a result, did not feel obligated to support them. Only because of the intervention of the division administrator was a compromise made and two physical education courses were retained as part of the program requirements.

The most sweeping change occurred in the health careers programs and the engineering technology programs. These review committees, with the support of their division administrators, deleted the physical education requirements from their programs. The basis for these recommendations was that there were too many credit hours in the programs and, since physical education was no longer an institutional requirement for graduation, this was a means to reduce hours.

Conclusions:

When courses have institutional centrality derived from a designation as a graduation requirement, there will be a high level of influence exerted to maintain the status quo.

If a course has been insulated as a graduation requirement and that designation is eliminated, other factors such as the type of program, faculty credibility, and division administrator power, will influence the outcomes. The decision outcomes regarding the course will vary from maintaining the status quo to deleting the course.

Prerequisite Courses

The state oversight agency requires that 25 percent of the courses that comprise a career program should be basic and provide a foundation for the technical courses. Each instructional division provided at least one prerequisite course, while the majority of enrollments in other divisions were dependent upon courses defined as prerequisites.
As a result, a change in a program or course could affect several programs and divisions.

This interdependence evolved as a result of management philosophy and an organizational distribution of courses designed to equalize enrollments among the seven instructional divisions. This tight coupling contributed to an organizational environment which promoted the formation of quid pro quo coalitions designed to control decision outcomes. The development of these coalitions was a powerful tool used by review committee support faculty who taught the prerequisite courses to control the decision outcomes.

A second approach used by division stakeholders to control the decision outcomes regarding prerequisite courses was to influence the review committee appointments. Division administrators often agreed among themselves as to who would be most appropriate for a specific committee. Care was taken by all stakeholders to conform to the undefined rules of the informal network.

Two division administrators breached the agreements and failed to protect the status of some prerequisite courses. The following comments illustrate the responses to these events:

... I would like to include his course but he won't reduce the hours. (Administrator F)

The only reason he wants to increase the hours is to make it easier to assign his faculty. (Administrator D)

They don't want my course. (Faculty Participant 50)

The course isn't college caliber. (Administrator E)

Once the sanctions were imposed and the value placed on prerequisites became apparent, some compromises were made. These efforts to
retain certain courses as prerequisite limited the extent of decision outcomes and, in addition, prevented the development of decision outcomes which would include new courses as prerequisites.

Conclusions:

The level of influence exerted by faculty and administrative stakeholders to retain specific courses as prerequisite will be high. If the strategies for influencing are effective, the decision outcomes will be to maintain the status quo.

These same factors will prevent the inclusion of different courses as prerequisite.

Summary

The effect of program centrality on decision outcomes was in some respects subtle, yet pervasive. When a course was designated as a graduation requirement or as a prerequisite in a popular program, enrollment levels were predictable and the course achieved a degree of status. These patterns changed drastically if a course lost either of these designations. Consequently, both faculty and administrative stakeholders developed strategies to retain these designations. Of all the factors which influenced decision outcomes, program centrality influenced maintaining the status quo more than any other.

Conclusion:

When a course has program centrality, faculty and administrative stakeholders will exert a high level of influence in order to maintain the status quo.

External Constituencies

The final category of influencing factors on program decision outcomes was external constituencies. The data from this investigation
indicated that four external groups: transfer institutions, accreditation agencies, the state oversight agency, and advisory committees, exerted influence on the nature of decision outcomes. Table 6 illustrates the level of influence exerted by each group and the nature of the decision outcomes.

Transfer Institutions

The influence of the transfer institution on the nature of the decision outcomes regarding programs was subtle, but significant. Courses developed for transfer programs were closely aligned with the courses offered during the first two years at a four-year college or university. During the committee process the catalogs of the institutions where students most frequently transferred were reviewed. Faculty were contacted with requests for course outlines and lecture samples. This input from the upper division institutions provided the basis for course and program change. The reviews indicated that the courses continued to be similar to those offered by the four-year institutions. In addition, agreements for transfer had been made in previous years and no one wanted to upset that balance. As a result, the courses and programs retained status quo.

Conclusion:

If no other factors impinge, the level of influence exerted by the transfer institutions will be high and the decision outcomes will be to maintain the status quo or limited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Level of Influence</th>
<th>Nature of Decision Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Institutions</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditng Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Program Development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate to Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Review</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Status Quo to Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Non-existent to Low</td>
<td>None Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Oversight Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Program Development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Review</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Status Quo to Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting/Oversight Agencies and Academic Administrator</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Extensive to Discontinuation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accreditation Agencies

Several programs have been developed according to the criteria established by oversight agencies. All the health careers programs comply with the program and course content determined by their respective accreditation agencies. Early during the program review policy development these programs were exempted from using the institutional criteria as the basis for program review. The argument presented at that time and eventually substantiated was that the agency requirements were more stringent than the institutional criteria.

When the changes in the health careers programs were in compliance with accreditation criteria, the recommendations were submitted to the curriculum council for institutional endorsement. In order to ensure council approval, the health careers division administrator discussed the recommended changes informally with the division administrators who were potentially affected. Changes that emerged from this process have been for the most part limited. One program recommended moderate changes in order to comply with revised accreditation agency regulations. A review of committee documents and informal interviews with division administrators verified that, once a health careers program has been established and has received accreditation agency approval, the majority of changes made were limited to moderate. Similar findings indicated that programs which were developed under the direction of professional accrediting agencies, but are not necessarily subjected to periodic stringent review, also over the years underwent limited change. Programs in engineering, banking, and childhood education, developed according to professionally-based criteria in order to
increase professional credibility, when reviewed either maintained their status quo or recommended limited change. Consequently, if the initial program was developed according to professional criteria and received professional approval, ensuing change will be limited. Therefore, the influence of the accrediting agency on decision outcomes is high and the nature of the outcome is to maintain the status quo or limit the change.

Conclusion:

During the developmental stage of a professional program the influence exerted by the accrediting body will be high and the decision outcomes will be extensive change. However, once the program is established, the influence of the accrediting body will continue to be high, but the decision outcomes will be limited in nature.

Coalition: Division Administrator/Accrediting Agency

Very often the criteria established by the professional accrediting agency or the state oversight agency provided the impetus for changes preferred by the division administrators. In four cases the division administrator used the standards established by the agencies to bring about decision outcomes that reflected a moderate change in the program.

These programs had virtually been unchanged since they were developed at the time of the college charter. Technical courses were developed according to oversight agency regulations at that time. Since that time, the courses were unchanged although the regulatory criteria had changed. Primary faculty had resisted the development and implementation of any changes.

In an effort to overcome this resistance, the division administrators selected these programs for early review. Part of the criteria
for review included current standards and regulations enacted by the oversight agencies. At times it was necessary for the division administrators to use the oversight agency criteria as the basis for rejecting early committee proposals.

As review committee members recognized that the agency standards had to be met, they began to review the program courses according to these criteria. The overall input of the division administrator, using the oversight agency criteria, resulted in limited to moderate outcomes.

Conclusion:

If the division administrator uses the oversight agency criteria as a part of the criteria for review and evaluation, the influence level will be high and the nature of the decision outcomes will be limited to moderate.

Advisory Committees

One of the unique characteristics of the community college has been its relationship and contact with the community through regular meetings of advisory committees. Data from this investigation revealed that advisory committees had seldom been consulted prior to the review process.

While approximately one-half of the interview respondents indicated that advisory committees should provide input into the review and evaluation process, data from the interviews and committee meeting minutes revealed that only two committees had active advisory committee input. One committee indicated that there had been some contact with members of the advisory group, but there was no combined meeting of the advisory committee and the review committee. Another committee
discovered that half the members were no longer in the area, so a new committee was formed.

The following comments illustrate the responses to a question during the focused interview regarding advisory committee involvement:

I don't even know who they are, to tell the truth ... (Faculty Participant 31)

I wasn't even aware of any input from any advisory committee. I think there is one in _____, but I don't remember hearing any input from them. _____, I don't believe there is. (Faculty Participant 29)

I know we got advisory committee input; I'm not sure in what form ... I can remember that many of the recommendations that were made were couched as relating to satisfying the concerns of the advisory committee. But, I don't have a real sense of whether or not that is accurate. (Faculty Participant 2)

I think it's one or two years since we've had an advisory committee meeting. (Faculty Participant 1)

In _____ we had an advisory committee meeting, interestingly enough--the first and only one I've ever seen on this campus. (Administrator C)

It's unfortunate it wasn't an active advisory committee ... (Administrator C)

Follow-up interviews with various faculty and administrators reinforced the evidence that advisory committees are seldom contacted. As a consequence, advisory committee input and influence are negligible. When advisory committees are involved, their input is usually limited to information about job opportunities and to listing skills they believe entry level graduates should have. However, no orderly manner for eliciting these data exists. The influence of advisory committees on decision outcomes regarding instructional programs is nonexistent to low.
Conclusion:

If a program advisory committee is invited to meet with program faculty on a regular basis, their input will be interpreted to support desired outcomes.

In general, advisory committee involvement in program development and review will be limited.

Although stakeholders indicate that program advisory committees should be included in the process, there is no evidence of active effort to include them.

Overall, program advisory committees exert little or no influence on the program decision outcomes.

State Oversight Agency

The state oversight agency perhaps was the singularly most influential factor among the external constituencies in shaping the decision outcomes with regard to instructional programs. Its influence is derived from its power to allocate funds, to endorse newly developed programs, and to judge on-going programs. A mandate from the state oversight agency resulted in the development of an institutional self-study review process. The criteria for the review process mirrors the agency regulations for course distribution, enrollment levels, and placement percentages.

Focused interviews with committee participants indicated that division administrators were acutely aware of the level of influence, while the faculty were vaguely to moderately aware of the level of influence. About one-half of the respondents listed the state oversight agency mandate as the reason for conducting program review.

My understanding is that it's required by the OBOR ... (Faculty Participant 10)
If I'm not mistaken, there is some kind of a requirement in Columbus for that. (Faculty Participant 11)

The remainder thought the requirement had come from the office of planning and research.

Review committee chairpersons and the division administrators were aware of oversight agency regulations regarding course distribution in a program. These regulations provided a baseline for all program changes. Some programs required only the minimum number of mandated credits for graduation. In these cases the distribution of credits among the three types of courses: technical, basic, and non-technical, was so balanced that any change would disrupt the distribution. Very often program faculty used this credit balance as the basis for maintaining the status quo, claiming any change would produce a long, drawn out review process. These agency regulations stipulating the course credit distribution contributed to decision outcomes which recommended maintaining the status quo.

As programs were reviewed, it was discovered that several programs no longer met the state oversight agency requirement for minimum enrollments and the annual number of graduates. One program was extensively revised in order to increase its relevance for students. Another program had outlived its effectiveness and was discontinued.

The most notable changes occurred in the engineering programs which had had a history of low enrollments, and a low placement percentage. These oversight agency regulations were used by the academic dean as the basis for initiating program review by administrative fiat. The combined influence of the academic dean and the oversight agency resulted in an extensive modification of the programs. The old programs
were discontinued and replaced with programs bearing new names and containing revised, contemporary content.

Conclusion:

If the state oversight agency is empowered to allocate funds and to endorse programs, the level of influence exerted by this body will be high and the decision outcomes will be in compliance with their criteria and standards.

Summary

The influence exerted by external constituencies will vary according to the nature of the agency. This section focused on those external constituencies which influence the nature of the programs. In general, it was found that the greatest influence was evident during the program development stage. Beyond that, constituency influence served to retain and maintain the status quo. Their greatest contribution to program decision making was to provide input and feedback from outside the organization.

Conclusion:

External constituencies perform a necessary function by providing data from outside the organization. These data then are interpreted and used to influence decision outcomes.

This chapter presented the findings of an investigation initiated for the purpose of identifying those factors which influence program review outcomes and the nature of the outcomes that emerge from the review process. Five categories of influencing factors and five decision outcomes were identified in this study. The conclusions derived from these findings are summarized in the next chapter. The methods used for data collection, analysis, and display will be summarized and
critiqued. And, finally, considerations for future research will be recommended.
For many years post secondary educational institutions, and in particular two-year colleges, enjoyed the luxury of plentiful resources. During this period of affluence, decision making focused on growth. There were few constraints and resources seemed boundless. In recent years resources have stabilized or contracted and the number of constraints placed on institutions has grown. Public two-year colleges are now confronted with choices. And, these choices now must be made in the context of an evolving uncertain environment.

Students' professional interests have changed, faculty are older and more stable, funding for programmatic experimentation is less available. Public two-year colleges now have to view instructional programs in terms of constituency preferences and stakeholder capabilities. A variety of measures have been used to determine instructional program relevance, among these is institutional self-study program review. Self-study reviews are intended to promote active participation by a variety of stakeholders and constituencies in the review of programs and the determination of decision outcomes regarding these instructional programs.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe those factors which influenced the nature of the decision outcomes that emerged from a self-study instructional program review and evaluation process. Three research questions guided this investigation and provided the conceptual framework for the collection and coding of data.

1. What factors influenced the decision outcomes that resulted from a structured self-study program review?
2. What was the nature of the influence of each factor?
3. Under what conditions did the influence vary?

This investigation focused on an institutional self-study instructional program review being conducted in a public two-year college. Data were obtained through focused interviews, document reviews, participant-observations, and informal discussions of 20 self-study review committees. These data were coded and analyzed using techniques described by Miles and Huberman (1984). Tests of rigor suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1981) were employed in order to ensure trustworthiness of the data and the findings.

Analysis of the data revealed five types of decision outcomes regarding program status. These were 1) to maintain the status quo, 2) to limit the program change to alterations of a few courses, 3) to conduct moderate change by changing several courses, 4) to extensively change the program by altering over 50 percent of the program, and finally, 5) to discontinue the program altogether. The majority of decision outcomes were to maintain the status quo or to limit change. These decision outcomes were based on data regarding the program status
such as enrollments, number of graduates, and successful placement of graduates in careers or upper division educational institutions. As these data were evaluated by the review committees, other factors impinged on the interpretations and influenced the decision outcomes.

It was found that there were five categories of factors which influenced decision outcomes about instructional programs. These categories were described under two broad frameworks: human relations framework and institutional framework.

The human relations framework included the faculty stakeholders and the administrative stakeholders. Three types of faculty comprised the faculty stakeholder category. These were the primary faculty, the instructors responsible for the major courses in the program; secondary faculty which were the faculty responsible for the prerequisite courses; and finally, the support faculty who consisted of counselors and the instructors who taught the general studies courses. Administrative stakeholders were limited to the division administrators and the academic dean.

The second major area, the institutional framework, was comprised of the organizational structure, program centrality, and external constituencies. The two factors which provided the focus for the description of the organizational structure were the institutional curriculum council made up of faculty and administrative staff, and the faculty political system. In this section the influence of the potential power of the curriculum council on the nature of the decision outcomes was identified. Both formal and informal faculty political power were described in relation to decision outcomes.
Within a tightly coupled organizational structure, a change in one area potentially affects another. During this investigation, it was found that certain courses and programs were pivotal for other programs. The effect of this centrality of courses and programs was described in relation to institutional requirements for graduation and prerequisite support courses.

The final category described as an institutional influencing factor were the external constituencies. The descriptions focused on the impact of the transfer institutions, the state oversite agencies, advisory committees, and professional accrediting bodies on the development and ongoing status of instructional programs.

**Summary of Conclusions**

Conclusions about the factors which influenced decision outcomes that resulted from a self-study review process were derived from an organization and analysis of the data. These conclusions were determined to be applicable within the investigative setting, but cannot be considered as universal. The following is a listing of the conclusions found within the human relations framework and the institutional framework.

**Human Relations Framework**

The human relations framework focused on the political and professional relationships of faculty and middle level management and how these relationships influence the decision outcomes.
Faculty Stakeholders

The following conclusions reflect the level and nature of the influence exerted by faculty stakeholders on the review process and the decision outcomes.

Conclusions

Fulltime faculty view instructional review as their professional responsibility. If the process is mandated, they will participate in the process in order to influence the decisions.

If two-year college faculty derive their professional status from the courses they teach, they will actively resist any process that threatens their courses.

In any mandated program review a small minority of faculty will voice suspicion regarding institutional changes.

Secondary and support faculty contribute to the review process by adding data and perceptions from outside the program.

When primary faculty regularly attend program review meetings, they exert a high level of influence on the nature of the decision outcomes. The nature of the outcomes will be to maintain the status quo or to enact limited to moderate change.

When evidence of Group A primary faculty commitment to the review process and to the achievement of some decision outcome was evident, both the secondary faculty and support faculty tended to support their recommendations. The nature of the decision outcomes was to maintain status quo or to limit change.

If faculty refuse to participate in the review process and no action is taken either by colleagues or the administration to counteract the effect, they will succeed in subverting the process. All things being equal, they will exert a high level of influence to maintain the status quo.

If a group of primary faculty refuse to participate in the review process, a dominant coalition of Group A primary faculty and secondary and/or support faculty may act to counteract this effect. This coalition will have a high level of influence on the decision outcomes which will range from status quo to moderate.
The dominant coalition will exert influence which will provide support for the members of the coalition and withdraw support from the dissident group.

There is a direct relationship between the perceived credibility of faculty stakeholders and their effectiveness in protecting their interests.

Secondary faculty exerted greatest influence when the courses they taught were pivotal, in that they provided prerequisite knowledge for the courses which made up the program major.

If a review process is routine and few changes are necessary, secondary and support faculty will provide information and will exert little influence on the decision outcomes.

If the review is routine, senior faculty will exert a high level of influence to maintain the status quo. Secondary and support faculty will support the position of the senior faculty.

If a review process has a high conflict level and support and secondary faculty are carefully selected, then as members of the dominant coalition they will exert a high level of influence to support the decision outcomes preferred by the coalition.

The level of influence exerted by the faculty dominant coalition will be dependent upon the demonstrated support of the division administrator.

The majority of decision outcomes which emerge from a faculty dominated instructional review process will be to limit change or maintain the status quo.

Faculty stakeholder involvement will be issue specific and will take precedence over the good of the institution.

Conclusions derived from the data indicate that the majority of faculty stakeholders view the instructional review process as a part of their professional responsibility. Consequently, most elected to actively participate in the process. The underlying motivation was, however, to monitor and to control the process. All faculty stakeholders viewed the process as a threat to their professional expertise
and territory. Most faculty efforts to guide the process and outcomes were proactive. There was, however, a small group of faculty stakeholders who were dissident and attempted to subvert the process. All efforts by faculty stakeholders, both proactive and dissident, were directed toward influencing decision outcomes that either maintained the status quo or reflected their emerging interests.

Administrative Stakeholders

The influence of the administrative stakeholders centered on directing the process so that outcomes which benefited the institution could be achieved. The following summary of conclusions describe the strategies which were employed and the nature of the decision outcomes.

Conclusions

Instructional administrators will attempt to control the review process through selective committee appointments.

If predetermined decision outcomes are the goal, the administrator will select co-opted faculty for appointment to the committee.

Committee membership will reflect a balance of power which will produce outcomes congruent with the intent of the power holders.

When division administrators are directly involved in the review process as participants or committee chairpersons, other commitments will delay progress and their level of influence will be diminished. The decision outcomes will be to maintain the status quo.

If the review process is delayed and exceeds two academic years, participants will lose interest. The decision outcomes will be to maintain the status quo.

When division administrators participate in the review process in a consulting advisory role, their level of influence will be moderate to high and the decision outcomes will reflect their preferences.
If a coalition of the division administrator and selected faculty is formed, influence upon the review process will be high. The decisions will reflect preferred outcomes and will most likely result in moderate to extensive change.

The involvement of the upper level administrative staff in the review process will be limited and direct influence on the outcomes will be low. The nature of the outcomes will reflect the intent of the review committee.

If all other processes fail, the academic dean will become involved in the review process. The level of influence exerted by the academic dean will be high and the decision outcomes will be for extensive change or program discontinuation.

The division administrator (academic middle management) holds a pivotal position in the instructional review process. This position exerts a high level of influence throughout the process and on the decision outcomes.

Administrative stakeholder actions during the review process are political in nature and are based on achieving outcomes which benefit the total institution.

Division administrators, academic middle managers, effected widespread decision outcomes. They had access to multiple resources in order to bring about change. In general, the desired outcomes were achieved through influencing the faculty stakeholders. In those instances when the desired outcomes were not forthcoming, coalitions were formed with upper level management or with selected faculty stakeholders. Decision outcomes that emerged from the review process influenced by the division administrator were moderate to extensive.

When significant program changes were necessary, the division administrators provided the impetus and the oversight for the changes. Faculty stakeholders, on the other hand, attempted to maintain the status quo throughout the process.
Conclusion

If instructional program review is to be conducted, the impetus will come from the division administrator. Faculty stakeholders will strive to maintain the status quo and to protect their interests. Instructional middle managers will strive to reach decision outcomes which reflect the institutional position and the environmental status.

Institutional Framework

The institutional framework focused on influencing factors which resulted from the structure of the institution. These encompassed the organizational structure, the pivotal status of courses and programs, and the effects of outside agencies.

Organizational Structure

All organizations contain internal elements which establish formal and informal networks and boundaries. The following summary of conclusions reflects the nature of the influence exerted by the formal process, the curriculum council, and the informal network of faculty politics.

Conclusions

Decision outcomes are influenced by the presence and potential power of an institutional curriculum committee. The influence of this body is high. The decision outcomes that result will be to maintain the status quo or to limit change.

In order to influence the outcomes, faculty will use strategies such as questioning the value of program review and the appropriateness of the criteria to diminish the credibility of the process.

The organization structure will establish the boundaries within which formal and informal networks effect change.
Established institutional procedures exerted a moderate to high level of influence on programmatic decision outcomes. A curriculum oversight body provided a checkpoint for change, which was further reinforced by a tightly coupled bureaucratic organizational structure. These factors contributed to the development of an institutional environment that encouraged limited change or maintaining the status quo.

Faculty politics within this tightly coupled environment was influenced by the availability of resources. Efforts were directed toward protecting turf and expanding territory. The decision outcomes focused on maintaining the status quo and limiting change to include their areas of interest. Faculty who were most successful in protecting their area of expertise understood the institutional political structure and used this knowledge for their benefit.

Program Centrality

Courses defined as graduation requirements or as prerequisites were a valuable resource to both faculty and administrative stakeholders. These groups sought to retain this status for those courses which were defined as prerequisites or graduation requirements. These conclusions reflect the nature of the influence this designation had on the decision outcomes.

Conclusions

When courses have institutional centrality derived from a designation as a graduation requirement, there will be a high level of influence exerted to maintain the status quo.

If a course has been insulated as a graduation requirement and that designation is eliminated, other factors such as the type of program, faculty credibility, and division
administrator power, will influence the outcomes. The decision outcomes regarding the course will vary from maintaining the status quo to deleting the course.

The level of influence exerted by faculty and administrative stakeholders to retain specific courses as prerequisite will be high. If the strategies for influencing are effective, the decision outcomes will be to maintain the status quo.

These factors will prevent the inclusion of different courses as prerequisite.

When a course has program centrality, faculty and administrative stakeholders will exert a high level of influence in order to maintain the status quo.

The institutional centrality of a course was established by an institutional definition of the course as a graduation requirement or as a prerequisite. Both these definitions determined its inclusion in a variety of programs. Faculty and administrative stakeholders associated with these courses endeavored to retain this designation. Efforts were made to achieve decision outcomes which maintained the status quo or expanded the centrality of a course.

**External Constituencies**

Public two-year colleges are closely associated with their external environment. Several groups in this environment were found to have influence over programmatic change. Four groups of external agencies—transfer institutions, accreditation agencies, the state oversight agency, and advisory committees—exerted influence on the nature of decision outcomes. The following conclusions provide a summary of the nature of this influence.
Conclusions

If no other factors impinge, the level of influence exerted by the transfer institutions will be high and the decision outcomes will be to maintain the status quo or limited.

During the developmental stage of a professional program the influence exerted by the accrediting body will be high and the decision outcomes will be extensive change. However, once the program is established, the influence of the accrediting body will continue to be high, but the decision outcomes will be limited in nature.

If the division administrator uses the oversight agency criteria as a part of the criteria for review and evaluation, the influence level will be high and the nature of the decision outcomes will be limited to moderate.

If a program advisory committee is invited to meet with program faculty on a regular basis, their input will be interpreted to support desired outcomes.

In general, advisory committee involvement in program development and review will be limited.

Although stakeholders indicate that program advisory committees should be included in the process, there is no evidence of active effort to include them.

Overall, program advisory committees exert little or no influence on the program decision outcomes.

If the state oversight agency is empowered to allocate funds and to endorse programs, the level of influence exerted by this body will be high and the decision outcomes will be in compliance with their criteria and standards.

External constituencies perform a necessary function by providing data from outside the organization. These data then are interpreted and used to influence decision outcomes.

Transfer institutions, accrediting agencies and state oversight agencies exerted moderate to high levels of influence to establish initial levels of professional standards. Once these professional standards were established, there was a high level of influence to maintain the status quo. Local advisory committees exerted virtually
no influence on the decision outcomes. Findings strongly suggest that their role was primarily symbolic.

Implications

Throughout this investigation it became apparent that multiple factors influenced the nature of decision outcomes about instructional programs, and the influence of these factors varied in relation to the changing texture of the environment. As a consequence, the ability to scan the environment and to estimate its nature was an important skill which contributed to the level of influence exerted by the stakeholders and constituencies. In some cases, the level of influence was established through mandate, but the most pervasive element was the understanding of the formal and informal political process.

Stakeholders and constituencies who understood the dynamics of the political environment and were able to develop strategies based on the dynamics were successful in achieving their desired outcomes. These findings conceivably have broad implications regarding public two-year colleges' governance and the preparation of college administrators.

Implications for Public Two-Year College Governance

1. Two-year college faculty view curriculum review and development as part of their professional responsibility. Therefore, they should be included in all phases of developing the instructional review policy, criteria, and procedures.
2. Faculty staff development should include ongoing seminars about the nature of program review and how to go about achieving useful results.

3. Resistance to change by stakeholders is an anticipated phenomenon. Administrators need to determine stakeholder motivation and then develop strategies to promote change or to strengthen the status quo as necessary.

4. College middle managers need to have an understanding of the factors within the institutional environment which impinge on the decision making process and which affect the decision outcomes.

5. Most changes will be limited and incremental in nature; therefore, college administrators must recognize that major change is best achieved through the development of strategies which promote change in phases.

6. In a stable environment major change will most likely take place as a result of a coalition of powerful influence groups.

7. Decision outcomes have greater credibility when they result from established policies and procedures. Therefore, when major change is desired, managers should use established policies and procedures to effect desired outcomes.

8. Educational administrators must recognize that tenure and stability contribute to a desire to maintain the status quo. Strategic efforts should be developed to counteract rigidity and to promote intellectual curiosity and involvement among faculty.
9. Collaboration between instructional managers and the oversight agencies will result in programs with professional credibility.

10. Advisory committee involvement is limited. Community college administrators should clarify the role of the advisory committee and act accordingly.

Stakeholders participate in the instructional review process if decision outcomes affect their areas of expertise. Two-year college administrators can take advantage of this behavior by including stakeholders in several aspects of the decision making process. These aspects include collaboration in the development of review guidelines and criteria. In addition, administrators can use stakeholder skills to develop strategies for scanning the environment. This ability to scan the environment and to develop responsive strategies is not intuitive, but can be learned. This has implications for the training of higher education administrators.

**Implications for the Preparation of College Administrators**

1. It must be recognized that college administration is not an extension of teaching, but requires a unique set of skills.

2. Graduate programs should emphasize management theories which focus on general systems approaches, open system theories, and contingency theories.

3. Emphasis should be given to decision making models and theories followed by strategy development which emphasizes the human dimension. Administrators would derive greatest benefit from an understanding of and practice with the political decision
making model and decision making models which describe the political process in an open, ever-changing organization.

4. On-going continuing education programs for administrators should be offered at the graduate level in order to provide this group with the opportunity to review management theory and to develop strategies based on experience. These continuing education sessions should be offered in a series of four three-day sessions. Emphasis should be placed on the identification of the needs of academic managers, attitudes and personality profiles of managers, and how to identify and prioritize management issues. Strategy development skills should be incorporated throughout the sessions.

5. Internships would provide a valuable component in the preparation of a college administrator. The internship should include experience in budget development, the development of management objectives, and personnel interaction. This experience should take place in a structured setting under the supervision of an upper level administrator. Additional experiences could include observation of and/or participation in meetings with faculty, middle management, and oversight agencies.

It must be recognized that decision making does not take place in a vacuum, but involves both technology and humanistic elements. Over the past decade there is the sense that these elements have changed. The extent and the nature of these changes have been documented, but more information is needed. Consequently, there are several implications for further study.
Implications for Further Research

1. Further study regarding stakeholder and constituency influence on decision outcomes would contribute to the expansion of the body of knowledge. These studies would best be conducted using qualitative strategies as described by Miles and Huberman (1984). This approach provides for a conceptual framework which makes replication possible.

2. An understanding of the characteristics, attitudes, and skills of middle management college administrators would be helpful in the selection and development of college administrators. These could be determined through several investigative approaches. A general demographic study of present-day middle management college administrators would provide a general profile. Studies which replicate those conducted by Hooker (1982) and Moore (1983) would provide insights regarding the perceptions these administrators have of their responsibilities.

3. An in-depth quantitative survey of public two-year faculty would provide valuable information about their attitudes and characteristics. Of interest would be the age range, their longevity, and their declared teaching discipline. These data would provide academic managers with clues as to the age groups in specific disciplines and point out the disciplines for which there are no prepared faculty.

4. An qualitative in-depth study of the makeup of advisory committees, their expectations, and their involvement in academic
planning is needed in order to determine their contribution to the two-year college instructional programs.

Conclusion

This study addressed decision making and change in a relatively stable public two-year college. The management approach was structured and based on long-range planning undergirded by objectives. A self-study program review and evaluation process provided the focal point for decision making. This investigation identified those factors which influenced the decision outcomes which ultimately led to changes in instructional programs.

This investigation, a case study, was conducted over a three-year period of time. Data were gathered through structured interviews, participation observations, and document reviews. A predetermined conceptual framework provided the structure for the data collection, coding, and analysis. This conceptual framework avoided the problem of informational overload sometimes seen in long-term case investigations. This investigative approach provided for some numerical data, but at the same time ensured the flexibility necessary when attempting to identify subtle influencing factors. This approach is recommended for studies intended to provide descriptions regarding organizational processes.

Community colleges need to devise an integrated system for decision making and strategy development. An understanding of the factors that are involved in the decision making process will enable managers in making choices. As external and internal factors impinge on the
Institution, prepared managers will be able to confront these issues, recognize the political and personal factors that influence these issues, and then develop strategies to best use these factors.

Naisbitt (1982) believes that we are living in a time of parentheticals, the period between the industrial and the informational eras (p. 252). Community colleges reflect this transitional era. Familiar instructional goals are approaching obsolescence and new instructional vistas have not yet become clear. The key concern of the next decade will not be whether community colleges are to survive, but whether they can continue to be vital to students, communities, and employers (Myran, 1983, p. 18).
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[Diagram of a logo with the text "FCC" and "LORAIN COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE"]
Definition
A program is a course of study leading to a certificate or a degree. Program evaluation is a process to assess the overall effectiveness of a program through systematic collection and analysis of data.

Purpose
Evaluation of each program of the college should be undertaken periodically to provide faculty, administration, and the board of trustees with information about how well the program functions in relation to its objectives and the needs of the community. It may provide justification for actions of the following kinds:

1. Confirmation of the validity of the program.
2. Reconsideration and possible redefinition of the goals, purposes, and objectives of the program.
3. Review and alteration of the content and structure of the program.
4. Reconsideration of priorities and allocation of resources and/or personnel.

Policy
Each credit program will be evaluated at least once every five years, using procedures developed by the dean of instruction with the assistance of the college curriculum council. Programs with more frequent review mandated by appropriate agencies will be evaluated more often. In addition, the dean of instruction may require review of any program whenever a serious problem is indicated. Although formal review may occur only once every five years, data will be collected in an on-going process to provide a continuous means for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of programs.

Procedures
A. The dean of instruction will publish a five-year schedule for the routine evaluation of the programs of the college. In addition, the dean will determine when a program will be evaluated out of turn. In doing so, the dean may consider such matters as the following: the history and current status of the program, including its size; the quality of its administration; and external factors affecting it, such as licensing requirements, accrediting agencies, etc.

"Lorain County Community College Policies and Procedures. 3354:3--IT-57.01, 57.01 A, effective July 31, 1980."
B. Normally the dean will notify the division chairperson one year in advance that a program will be reviewed.

C. Upon recommendation of the chairperson, the dean will appoint a self-study committee that will include the division chairperson, program faculty, and other individuals as appropriate.

D. The self-study committee will develop an evaluation plan. The plan will identify questions to be answered, data that will help answer them, and criteria or evaluations, as well as the resources necessary, including outside assistance. The plan will be substantially based on the program evaluation guide. However, it may omit items in the guide that are inappropriate and add items that are appropriate to the program being evaluated.

E. The plan will be submitted to the dean of instruction for review and approval before the self-study is begun.

F. The division chairperson will coordinate the program review and supervise the preparation by the self-study committee of a written report. The report should include:

1. A summary of the major strengths of the program.

2. A description of any problems related to the program, including a description of how each is being addressed within the college, or if it is not being addressed, a description of potential solutions or suggested processes that might eliminate it.

3. A summary of major conclusions concerning program goals and objectives, content and structure, enrollments, faculty, facilities and equipment, support services, revenues and costs, student achievement, and the program review and development process.

4. Specific recommendations for the future of the program.

G. The completed report will be submitted to the dean of instruction for presentation to the college curriculum council. The report will be given to the members of the college curriculum council at least one month before the council reviews and discusses it.

H. After studying the report and obtaining clarification from program faculty, the council will present its recommendations to the dean of instruction. Recommendations may include the following:

1. Continue the program as presently offered.

2. Revise or modify the program in specific ways.

3. Phase out or terminate the program.

I. The procedures for program evaluation will be reviewed and modified by the president and dean of instruction with the assistance of the college curriculum council as appropriate.
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LETTER INVITING COMMITTEE TO PARTICIPATE
On June 1, 1978, the Ad Hoc Committee on Standards for Curriculum Review was appointed by Dean Edling. On October 10, 1979, the final report was submitted by the committee for institutional approval by the Curriculum Council. Since that time several curriculum programs have been reviewed by divisional committees.

While I was serving as an administrative intern in 1980-81, I participated in the development of the program review and evaluation rating instrument and was also involved in providing information to the various committees through the Office of Planning and Research. Since that time I have continued my involvement in program review and evaluation.

As a doctoral candidate in Higher Education Administration at Ohio State University, I have chosen as a dissertation topic the program review and evaluation process at Lorain County Community College. While several studies have surveyed two-year colleges with regard to program review and evaluation, none have been noted that have conducted an intensive in-depth study of the process. Consequently, my dissertation will focus on a case study of the process here at Lorain County Community College.

Part of the case study methodology includes interviews of principle participants; therefore, I would like to interview those of you who have served on program review and evaluation committees. Your experiences will contribute valid and reliable knowledge regarding program review at LCCC. I anticipate a 30-45 minute interview which will focus on the attached questions. In addition, I would also like to tape the interview so that a double source of data will be available. All statements during the interview will be kept confidential.

I will contact you at the beginning of next week to determine whether you are willing to participate in the study and to set up a time for the interview. I look forward to your participation and to discussing program review with you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Stevenson
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. In your view what was the purpose for the development and implementation of an institutional program review and evaluation policy and procedure?

2. Who in the college initiates the review and sees it through to closure?

3. How are the members of the review committees chosen?

4. Who do you think should make up the membership of the committee?

5. What has been the extent of your involvement in the program review?
   A. Has your program been reviewed?
   B. How many committees have you been on?
   C. Have you ever been chairman of a committee?

6. Were any program changes made? If so, what kind of changes were recommended?

7. How long did the review process take? How often did you meet?

8. Who was the chairman of the committee?

9. Did you have the changes approved by the curriculum council as a final report or as they were recommended by the committee?

10. What do you see as the benefits and disadvantages of the review process?

11. Who were the three most effective members of the committee? Why?

12. Did you meet with the advisory committee?

13. What methods did you use to get input from students, graduates, and employers?

14. Did the program review committee have to consider criteria in addition to the college criteria?

15. Do you have any questions?
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The internal operations of the College Curriculum Council will be conducted within the framework of the following procedure statements:

I. Meetings
   A. The Council will establish regular meeting days and times.
   B. The chairman will call the meetings of the Council as deemed desirable by distributing the agenda and all supporting materials to all members at least one week in advance of the meeting.
   C. All meetings will begin promptly and adjourn at the predetermined time.
   D. If any member of the Council is unable to attend, he or she will notify the Dean's office in advance of the meeting.
   E. All meetings are open to visitors and guests.

II. Action by the Council
   A. A quorum will consist of a majority of the members of Council.
   B. An affirmative vote of 2/3 of the members voting "aye" or "nay" is required to approve an item. Abstentions do not count. Proxies count on vote and towards a quorum.
   C. Only items on the agenda will be formally acted on by the Council.

III. Routing of Curriculum Council Business
   A. Curriculum items will normally be introduced within the divisions. If the division deems the proposal desirable, the division through its chairperson will submit the proposal to the Dean for placement on the College Curriculum Council agenda.
   B. In the case of inter-divisional proposals, an appropriate body as determined by the Council will replace division in Item III-A.
   C. If any member of the College wishes to submit a proposal and is unsure of where to introduce it, he or she may submit the proposal directly to the Dean of Instruction, who will determine the proper routing.
   D. The division (appropriate body) will provide the Dean's office with thirty (30) copies of the proposal and support documents for distribution to the Council.

IV. Proposal requirements
   A. Items concerning PROGRAMS can not be acted on by the Council until the following information is available:

*Consult current Curriculum Responsibility List
1. **Purpose:** The purpose of the proposed program of study or change should be described in terms of one or more of these goals:

   a. occupational competence
   b. academic effectiveness
   c. community service
   d. personal satisfaction

2. **Need:** The need for the proposed program of study or change should be described in terms of one or more values to the student:

   a. employment opportunities
   b. transfer utility
   c. community service
   d. personal value

3. **Special admissions requirements:** Any special admissions requirements should be explained.

4. **Tentative outline:** The proposed program of study should be outlined showing the arrangement of courses including the number of credit and contact hours for each course and the total requirements for completion.

5. **Service courses:** Evidence of concurrence from the Division Chairperson as to the specific service courses offered by the institution that best meet the educational objectives of the proposed program of study.

6. **New courses:** Tentative short paragraph descriptions of all new courses should accompany the proposed program of study.

7. **Content breakdown:** A breakdown should be furnished indicating the number of courses and hours in the following categories: occupational education, related education, and general education.

8. **Estimation:** Of the number of students to be enrolled for the first year for the proposed program of study, and the impact on current programs with supporting evidence.

9. **Estimation:** Of additional and/or special faculty and staff needs for proposed programs of study.

10. **Estimation:** Of the cost of the proposed program of study excluding faculty and staff needs.

11. **Action** by concerned divisions including results of divisional vote (including number for, number opposed).

B. Items concerning **COURSES** can not be acted on by the Council until documents providing the following information are available:

1. **Need:** The need for the proposed action should be described in terms of one or more values to the students.

   a. employment and opportunities
   b. transfer utility
   c. community service
   d. personal value
2. Special admissions requirements.
3. Implementation plan and date(s).
4. Course outline and catalog description, including credit/contact, lecture/lab hours, short title, and prerequisite, if needed.
5. Evidence of concurrence from divisions using the course in question as a service course.
6. Any new courses required by proposal.
7. Estimation of enrollment and impact on current course offerings.
8. Estimation of additional and/or special faculty and staff needs.
9. Estimation of the cost excluding faculty and staff needs.
10. Result of supporting divisional vote.

V. Minutes

A. Minutes of the previous meeting will be reviewed, corrected and approved at each meeting.

B. Copies of minutes will be distributed to all divisions, Student Services, Learning Resources, Student Senate, and Administration.

VI. Disposition of items acted on by the Council