The role of the Community College President can be identified from his activities. The manner in which these roles and responsibilities are handled vary with the setting and the individual performing the activity. This study was made to explore the activities that comprise the role of the Iowa Community College President.

The problem. The problems investigated in this study were:

1) How much time does the president spend in performance of certain activities during the school year?
2) How much time do the presidents feel should be spent in each of these activities?
3) What activities do presidents feel are most important to their roles?
4) How do presidents perceive their role in each of the activities?

Procedure. A questionnaire identifying sixteen activities of the president was designed and administered to fourteen community college presidents in Iowa. This questionnaire asked for percent of time spent in each activity, percent of time that would be desirable to spend in each activity, the rank in order of importance of each activity, and personal data on training and experience. A taped interview with each of the presidents to discuss perceptions and performance of each of the sixteen activities identified in the study was made.

Findings. Findings included:

1) A majority of the presidents had community college experience prior to assuming the presidency, but had more administrative experience in the public school system.
2) Board-President relationship is a most important task and occupies a considerable amount of the presidents' time.
3) The presidents are highly involved in community affairs.
4) The presidents recognize the importance of institutional planning and are aware that they are not spending a desirable amount of time in this activity.
5) There is a moderate positive relationship between time spent and time desirable, indicating that there is a tendency to spend more time on functions where more time is desirable for their performance.

6) There is a moderate positive relationship between the perceived importance of various roles and the time desired for performance.

7) Activities that are viewed as more important are usually performed primarily by the president and activities that are ranked of lesser importance are shared or delegated.

Conclusions. Conclusions were:

1) Although there are many similarities in the actual and the perceived role of the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges, there are also significant differences. The similarities can be viewed as the result of the initial state structure and the differences can be viewed as a result of individual differences in the persons and the settings.

2) The roles as determined by the presidents as being more important are not necessarily the roles that occupy the larger amounts of the presidents' time.

3) The most important presidential role, as perceived by the president, is the development and maintenance of a good president-board relationship.

Recommendations for Further Study.

1) Several of the individual roles included in this study encompass areas of such breadth that an investigation of a singular role would be quite significant.

2) If a more broad role-function research would be desired, desired, an approach similar to the delphi technique would appear to be desirable.

3) The personal and professional characteristics of the occupants of the presidential chair in given area, or of the total United States, would provide important data.

4) A study using roles similar to those used in this investigation, but encompassing a larger geographic area, would be quite useful in determining to what extent the individual and the setting contribute to the overall presidential role function.

5) A study encompassing the managerial skills, with explicit attention to leadership and decision-making, has never been done relative to the community college presidency, to the knowledge of the investigator. Within such a topic area, innumerable opportunities exist for research involving these managerial skills in a broad sense, or with segments of these characteristics involving very specific application.
AN INQUIRY INTO THE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE
IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT

A Dissertation
Presented to
The School of Graduate Studies
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Lyle Adrian Hellyer
April 1975
AN INQUIRY INTO THE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE
IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT

by

Lyle Adrian Hellyer

Approved by Committee:

Robert B. White
Chairman

Michael F. Bracca

Larry W. Landis

Howard Seiden

Dean of the School of Graduate Studies
TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .......................................................... viii
LIST OF FIGURES .......................................................... ix

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION ......................................................... 1
   Purposes and Objectives of the Community College ................. 2
   Purposes of the Investigation ......................................... 7
   Assumptions and Limitations ......................................... 9
   Methods of Research .................................................. 10
   Organization of the Report ........................................... 11

2. A REVIEW OF LITERATURE .......................................... 13
   History of the Community College .................................. 14
   The Community College, 1920 to the Present ...................... 22
   History, Community College Movement in Iowa .................... 26
   Role of the Community College President--
       A Review of Literature ........................................... 39
   The President as an Innovator ...................................... 49
   Other Views ........................................................... 51
   Related Literature Specific to the Sixteen
       Role Categories .................................................. 57
   Question I. Please Describe Your Role as President and its Relationship to Your Board of Trustees ............. 57
   Question II. What is Your Role in the Budgeting Process of Your Institution? .................................. 65
CHAPTER PAGE

Question III. What is Your Role in Staff Salary Discussions, Decisions, or Recommendations? 69

Question IV. What is Your Role in the Intra-Institutional Communications Program of Your College? 74

Question V. What is Your Role in the Institutional-Community Relations Program? 76

Question VI. Please Describe Your Role in Institutional Development 82

Question VII. Please Describe the Role you Play in the Legislative Matters Concerning the Area Community Colleges of Your State and Legislative Matters that Specifically Affect Your Institution 84

Question VIII. Please Describe Your Role in the Organization of the Institution if You were the Original President. If You are not the Original President, Your Role in Revisions and Changes in the Organizational Structure would be Appreciated. 87

Question IX. Please Discuss Your Role as it Relates to the Physical Facilities of Your Institution 90

Question X. Discuss Your Role in Planning, Both Long Run and Short Run, and Roles and Objectives of Your Institution 92

Question XI. Please Discuss Institutional Policies and Procedures, How They Were Developed, How They Were Updated, How They Are Used, Their Availability to Staff and Their Actual Influence on the Operation of the Institution. 97

Question XII. Discuss Your Role in Resource Development at Your Institution. 99

Question XIII. Please Discuss Your Role in the Selection of Total Staff 101
Question XIV. Please Discuss Your Role in the Evaluation, Placement, Promotion, and Dismissal of Staff. 104

Question XV. Please Discuss Your Role in Maintaining Contact With the State Department of Public Instruction and the Iowa Council of Area School Boards. 107

Question XVI. Discuss Your Contact with Students, Formally and Informally, How Students are Used in Campus Governments and Decision Making, the Student Government in Your Institution, Student Activities and Student Recruitment. 108

3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY 113
   Sources of Data 113
   The Study 114
   Procedure 114
   Other Study Data 117
   Preparation of the Project Report 118

4. THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT: AN ANALYSIS OF DATA 119
   The Community College President--Background and Experience 119
   Information About the Presidents 120
   Total Number of Months in Present Position 120
   Previous Position 120
   Academic Preparation of the Presidents 122
   Experience of the Area College President 124
   The Interviews 125
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>QUESTION I.</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>125</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Structure</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Concerns</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lay Committees</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUESTION III.</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Approaches</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Information Office</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION IV.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Influence</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Influence</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Influence</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Areas of Concern</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION VI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION VII.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION VIII.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION IX.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION XI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION XII.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION XIII.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION XIV.</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Staff</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION XV.</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Instruction</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Council of Area School Boards</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION XVI.</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Involvement</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Role and Contact with Students</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for Further Study</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GROWTH OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES IN IOWA 1918-1953</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ROLES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS, THEIR RANKS BY TIME CURRENTLY SPENT IN THEIR PERFORMANCE, (IS), THEIR RANKS BY TIME CONSIDERED DESIRABLE BY THE PRESIDENTS, (OUGHT), AND THE RANK-ORDER CORRELATION</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ROLE TITLES AND RANKS BY IMPORTANCE AS SPECIFIED BY IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ROLES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS, THEIR RANKS BY IMPORTANCE AND BY TIME DESIRABLE FOR THEIR PERFORMANCE, AND THE CORRESPONDING RANK-ORDER CORRELATION</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ACTIVITIES OF THE IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS RANKED BY IMPORTANCE, NATURE OF RESPONSIBILITY, AND PERCENT OF TIME INDICATED AS NECESSARY FOR ADEQUATE PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Area Community Colleges (ACC) and Area Vocational Schools (AVS) Showing Administrative Centers</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community College Organizational Chart as Proposed by Bogue</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

"Nothing that has happened in education in the past half century can surpass the recent flowering of the uniquely American junior and community college."¹

The community college has been described by many writers in many ways; however, most seem to conclude that it is perhaps the most exciting movement in education today. The community college is the fastest growing segment of higher education.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in 1971, acknowledged this educational explosion thus:

It may be hard to believe, but the facts speak for themselves: more than fifty new community colleges—an average of one per week—are established each year. In 1968 more than 1.8 million students were enrolled in 739 of these institutions. And the end is not in sight.²

The staff of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education estimates that, by 1980, 3.6 to 4.3 million students will be enrolled in these colleges, and it projects the need


for 230 to 280 new community colleges within a ten year time period.

Such is the story of the fastest growing educational institution in the United States. An analysis of the community junior college movement in America will indicate that it began modestly, developed slowly, and then surged into the twentieth century. There were a few private two year post-secondary schools in operation in the middle 1800's. Harvard University was originally established as a two-year school for the purpose of training ministers. The curricula in the early two-year schools were designed to provide traditional lower educational division offerings.

The first junior college in the State of Iowa was established in Mason City in 1918 as an extension of the public school program.

Thirty-five more public junior colleges were started in Iowa between the years 1918 and 1965, the date when the legal framework was established that would permit the development of the Iowa Area Community Colleges and the Iowa Area Vocational-Technical Institutes.

**Purposes and Objectives of the Community College**

Crawford has identified the comprehensive view of the educational missions of today's community college in terms of the purposes it should serve.
It is appropriate for community colleges to provide, for all persons above the twelfth grade age levels, education consistent with the purposes of the individuals and the society of which they are a part, subject only to the restrictions in the state statutes.... The educational needs appropriate for community colleges to fulfill at this time include:

1. The need for programs of liberal arts and science courses, usually to the first and second years of college, which will provide sound general and professional education of such quality that credits may be transferred to a nationally or regionally accredited four year college or university, and applied toward degrees of the baccalaureate level or higher.

2. The need for vocational-technical programs in the trades, industrial, agricultural and semi-professional fields. Such programs may be of long or short duration, depending on the amount of time needed by the student to complete the requirements for the entrance into the occupation.

3. The need for programs of courses for adults and other community college students for which credit may or may not be given, designed to provide general education or to improve self-government, healthful living, understanding of civic and public affairs, avocational growth, constructive use of leisure time, personal family living satisfactions, cultural depth, and to facilitate occupational advancement.

4. The need for individual services to students including guidance and counseling, assistance in career selection, removal of deficiencies in preparation for college programs, personality and health improvements, and

5. The need for programs and services for individuals and groups interested in cultural, civic, recreational or other community betterment projects.  

---

As one considers the potential tasks of the community college as outlined by Crawford, and reviews the official Iowa state policy that specifies the educational opportunities and services that the area community college institution shall offer, it becomes easily recognizable that it must be an unusual institution that can effectively accomplish these kinds of tasks. A more full discussion of the official state policy and the Code of Iowa as it relates to the area community college is discussed in detail in Chapter 2 of this study. Just as the Iowa community college is a most unique institution, so must the chief executive officer, the president, be unique in ability if he or she is to provide the necessary leadership to enable the college to fulfill this type of mission. Dr. William Moore, Jr., formerly president of Seattle Central Community College, and now a professor of education at Ohio State University, defined some of the abilities needed by the community college president in his book, *Blind Man on a Freeway*. They are as follows:

The administrative leadership must be strong, reflective, decisive, honest and flexible because it cannot--and will not--be insulated from the dilemmas of action. Because of stresses, pressures, frustrations, and conflicts of the job, the community college leader cannot expect to earn his pension on one assignment. In addition, he must be sensitive to the social issues which defy simple explanation; he must understand that these issues are a definite part of his institution and community. Among the implications for him is that even though he is an academician, he must rediscover the working man. He must also have a tolerance for the country estates, rat-infested slum dwellings, and dirty houses with crawling
cockroaches. These are the homes that send him his students. Finally, in an environment symbolized by the anonymous IBM card, expect to encounter the seething and simmering discontent of students and have to negotiate with faculty.

Moore's description of the characteristics that a community college president must possess, though not applying to each and every community college president throughout the United States or the State of Iowa, clearly indicates his vision of the complexity of the community college itself and, moreover, that complexity that extends into the office of the president.

One of the first steps in the development of the area community college after the preliminary organization steps have been followed and the charter awarded and the governing board elected, was the employment of the educational leader of that area who was at that time identified by law as the area school superintendent. The superintendent functions professionally as the president of the institution and will be referred to throughout this report as the president.

In almost every case, the president of the area schools in Iowa was a professional educator without benefit of administrative experience in an institution of higher education. Thus, each college developed as the individual administrator perceived himself, and as his administrative

---

style so enabled. The very newness of the institutions, the diversity of the programs, the diversity of the needs of the people in rural, suburban and urban Iowa, and, more primarily, because of the diversity of the backgrounds of the educational leaders of the institutions, there has been to date no written nor stated definition, nor any specific or general consensus of the role of the Iowa Area Community College President. Roles have been described in different manners by different authors appropriate to a specific illustration or thesis.

The literal definition of role is, "1. a part, or character, that an actor plays in a performance; hence, 2. a function or office assumed by someone; as, an advisory role."¹

Paul F. Secord and Carl W. Backman, in their book Social Psychology, emphasize that the manner in which like roles are performed will vary considerably when handled by different individuals.² Recognizing the ambiguity found in identifying roles in a generic sense, roles in this study can also be viewed as functions and/or activities.

Don Morgan, in an article entitled, The Junior College


President, Role and Responsibilities, states, "In part, the president's principle role and responsibilities can be deduced from his activity." ¹

Purposes of the Investigation

The manner in which a community college president conducts the affairs of the institution will be determined for the most part by the perception he has of his role as chief administrator of the college. This study is designed to provide baseline information about the role of the president in the area community colleges in Iowa as seen through the eyes of the presidents themselves.

Because this is a baseline study, the study should have relevance for the presidents themselves, for comparative purposes of their role with other presidents in the state, for the governing boards of the fifteen institutions in the area community college system in Iowa, for students who are aspiring to be community college administrators, or who are involved in classwork studying administration of the community colleges, and for any others who might have a specific interest in the role of the community college president in Iowa.

Specifically this study proposes to accomplish the

following:

1. Describe the present presidents' perceptions of their roles in Iowa community colleges as they are currently being performed and their perception of the percentage of time spent annually by these individuals in each of sixteen specified major categories of activity.

2. Identify how the presidents would allot their time in the sixteen major categories if they were free to adjust their time as they saw fit.

3. Ascertain to what extent there is agreement between what they are doing and what they say they should be doing.

4. Identify the sixteen specified major categories of activity in rank order of importance.

5. Ascertain to what extent there is agreement between what the presidents say they ought to be doing and the rank order of importance.

6. Identify the academic and professional backgrounds of the presidents of the Iowa Area Community Colleges.

7. Gather comparable information from selected presidents in Missouri and Illinois in an attempt to provide a higher degree of validity for this study.
Assumptions and Limitations

1. Assumptions:
   a. The sixteen major categories adequately describe the role of the community college presidents.
   b. The responses received are unbiased and as accurate as possible to obtain in this type of study.

2. Limitations:
   a. Fifteen area community college presidents in Iowa
   b. Two selected community college presidents in Missouri
   c. Two selected community college presidents in Illinois

This study is designed to obtain information concerning the president's actual role and time spent in his current job, and how he would prefer to be involved on a percentage time basis in these particular roles. No attempt will be made to determine the role or responsibility of the president beyond the sixteen major categories selected for this study.

This study can be perceived as the initial attempt to assimilate role perceptions from the incumbents of the office of president in Iowa Area Community Colleges. Future investigations will have to be undertaken for updating and for answers to other specific and general questions and to areas that were not dealt with in this study.
Methods of Research

The sequence of steps and methods used in this study included:

1. Search and review of pertinent literature in the field with specific emphasis on:
   a. History of the junior and community college movement
   b. Literature dealing with the sixteen major role categories identified in the study questionnaire
   c. Literature concerning national and regional influences in community college development
   d. Literature concerning state influences in community college development
   e. Literature concerning local influences in community college development
   f. Literature concerning the role of the community college president

2. Preparation of a structured interview form that asks for responses to questions about:
   a. The role of the president in each of the sixteen major administrative categories
   b. The percentage of time spent in each of the sixteen activities
   c. The percentage of time they perceive as "should be spent" in each area
d. Specifics with regard to the incumbent and the institution

3. Review of the proposal for this study and the interview device with the community college presidents

4. A schedule for the interviews with the participants in this study

5. The interviews and the collection of the personal and institutional characteristic forms

6. The collection and the organization of the data acquired in the interviews

7. Organization, review and interpretation of the data and findings

8. Preparation of the report

**Organization of the Report**

Chapter 1 of this project contains introductory information about the growth of the community college in the United States and the State of Iowa and the subsequent development of the community college movement in Iowa, a statement of the problem, the purposes and objectives and importance of the study, the limitations of the study, and the methods used for the completion of this report.

Chapter 2, the research and review of pertinent literature, is a report of the findings of literature describing the history of the community college movement on a national, state and local level. Literature concerning the sixteen
major categories in the interview form, general literature about the college presidents, and literature about the role and expectations of the community college presidents was searched.

Chapter 3, the design of the study, describes in detail the procedures and methodology used in the study and preparation of this report.

Chapter 4, an analysis of the data and findings, contains the instruments used in collecting data for this study, a tabulation of the percentage of time spent in the performance of the president's role as identified by the sixteen major categories, a percentage of the time needed to be spent in each of the major categories as perceived by the president of the institutions surveyed, the ranking of the sixteen major categories in order of importance, and, narrative taken from the interviews with each of the college presidents.

Chapter 5 is a summary with some conclusions made as a result of a review of the study with some recommendations for additional research and a model of the presidential role that is supported by the data collected.

Following Chapter 5 is a bibliography identifying the source of the research materials and an appendix.
Chapter 2

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Very little has been written about the role of the junior community college presidents and their interpretations of their particular roles. Despite the fact that there are now over twelve hundred institutions classified as junior or community colleges in the United States, the newness and the impact of the community college concept is just at this point in time manifesting itself in such a manner as to attract attention from educational writers and publishers.

It is also a fact that almost no literature appeared concerning the junior college presidency prior to World War II and that it takes a certain period of time after any great movement, such as has been the community college movement, to develop accomplished and experienced writers discussing a field in which they have had practicum.

To illustrate the point of absence of literature concerning the junior college president, the ERIC Clearing House for Junior College Information has published a specialized bibliography entitled, The College President. Part one of this report lists seventy sources of articles dealing with various aspects of the college presidency. Even though this material might be quite relevant to the community college presidency, not one title speaks specifically to the junior college president. Part two of the same report entitled,
The Junior College President--An Annotated Bibliography, contains twenty-four titles relevant to the junior college presidency with annotations of the report. Only two of these articles speak to the role of the community college president and those in a most circuitous manner.

In a review of general literature concerning the junior and community college presidency, it became apparent that in order to understand the task and the role, it would be expedient to understand the very nature of the institution. It is for this reason that this section, A Review of Literature, will contain literature concerning the history of the junior community college movement, speaking to the national, regional, state and local influences, literature concerning the role of the community college president, and literature addressing itself to the sixteen categorical roles that were used in this study.

History of the Community College

The public community college, in its development, can be compared in a parallel manner with the development of the public school system in that the principles and traditions on which the public schools were built are the same principles and traditions which guided the foundation of the public community college. Three orientations originated early in public school development, these orientations being (1) universal opportunity for free public education for all
people without distinction based on social class, family income, and ethnic, racial, or religious background, (2) local control and support of free, non-tuition educational systems, and (3) a relevant curriculum designed to meet both the needs of the individual and those of our country.¹

Charles R. Monroe further expands the three orientations of public education as he reviews the group of students who are most likely to go on to college, these being students from middle and upper class homes. The estimated percentage of college enrollees from students in this social strata could be considered to be from 80 to 90 percent. Contrasting this group with lower and middle working classes of American people who live at or near the poverty level, we find that students from this social strata who attend college represent a much smaller percentage. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education publicized information in which it was stated that 48 percent of college and university graduates came from the top quarter of the family income scale, while only 7 percent came from the bottom quarter of the income scale.²

The Commission also estimated that if financial


barriers were removed, an additional one million students would be enrolled in higher education by 1975.

The establishment of community colleges has greatly enhanced chances for lower income high school graduates to attend college, but universal education for at least two years beyond high school is still far away. In a survey of high school graduates, Medsker and Trent, in 1965, reported that in communities where no local college facilities were available, only about 20 percent of the high ability, low socio-economic group high school graduates attend a college, but in communities which had a community college, 53 percent of the same socio-economic group attended college.¹

The Medsker and Trent study, if conducted today, would no doubt indicate that more than 20 percent of the high ability, low socio-economic group would attend college due to the federal student assistance program such as the basic economic opportunity grants, but the figure of 53 percent of the same group attending college near their home would probably also be greatly increased.

It is felt by many people in the community college field that by the end of the 1970's the community colleges will be the institution in which the majority of the high

school graduates will enroll for their first college experience.

What was the origin and what was the birth date of this segment of higher education that has had such an impact and such an influence on the lives of so many people? The fact that you receive multiple answers to this question might indicate the small regard felt for this new institution or new concept at whatever point it was first introduced. The very first use of the term "junior college" has not been clearly established. However, several institutions have been described as the first junior college. Ralph R. Fields, in his book, *The Community College Movement*, speaks as precisely to the initial junior college as has any author this writer has had the opportunity to review. He states:

While this subject would constitute an interesting historical research, it has not occupied to date the serious efforts of an historian. Leonard V. Koos mentions Lewis Institute as the first private junior college in a brief statement, "Rise of the People's College," in *School Review*, March, 1947. James M. Wood had made the same statement about Lewis in an article, "Twenty Years' Progress," in *Junior College Journal*, May, 1940. Joliet, Ill., is generally spoken of as the first public junior college; its development has been fully detailed by Elbert K. Fretwell, Jr., in *Founding Public Junior Colleges* (Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1954). Goshen, Ind., undertook postgraduate high school work at about the same time as Joliet, but terminated the effort. Theodore C. Burgess, in the U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin no. 19, 1922, claims that Bradley Polytechnic Institute of Peoria, Ill., started the first junior college as a part of the Institute in 1896. There is no doubt that the University of Chicago labeled its lower division the "Junior College" in 1896; the University of
California in the same year instituted a "junior certificate" as an admission requirement for upper-division work. Monticello Seminary at Godfrey, Ill., according to F. L. Whitney, in The Junior College in America (Colorado State Teachers College Education Series, no. 5, 1928), has the earliest founding date of all the institutions in his listing.1

Even though the belief for universal educational opportunity came to this country with the early puritan settlers, there was very little done to insure public education for all at the high school level. Most of the education at that time was basic education through grammar school and any education beyond that point was usually taken at a tuition charging private academy or institute. Monroe states:

The landmark court decision for the American high school was the Kalamazoo decision of 1872, which ruled that public high schools in Michigan were to be supported by public taxation. A similar decision was made by the courts of Illinois in 1878. By 1900, the principle of a free, tax-supported high school was accepted throughout the nation. Since the community colleges were destined to grow out of the local high schools, the principle of tax-supported secondary education was a vital step in the development of local community colleges.2

It is not the intent to spend unnecessary effort in establishing the actual father of American junior and community colleges, but it is germane to speak to some of the leaders who influenced the initial development. Henry P.


2Monroe, op. cit., p. 6.
Tappen, president of the University of Michigan from 1825 to 1863, is credited with being the first American educator to recommend the transferral of the first two years of college to the secondary schools.¹

It is also noted that in his inaugural address of 1825, President Tappen predicted that large American cities would soon offer the first two years of college work in their high schools. Other American college presidents, according to the literature, who joined Tappen in an effort to "rid the university of its first two years of non-university instruction" were W. W. Folwell of the University of Minnesota, Edmund J. James, University of Illinois, and William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago. All of these men believed that the first two years of the university could be best handled by the high schools as the students were, in their expression, more "adolescent than adults." This idea was expressed even more clearly by President Richard H. Jesse of the University of Missouri in 1896 when he referred to the first two years of college as an extension of the secondary school years.²

It appears that even though these recommendations


were made by some of the giants in higher education at that point in time, only President Harper at the University of Chicago had success in developing his concept of the junior college. President Harper had succeeded at the University of Chicago in dividing the institution into two segments that he classified as the "academic college" and the "university college." Four years later these titles were changed to "junior college" and "senior college." Perhaps this was the first use of these terms.

As per earlier references, President Harper was successful in obtaining the addition of two years to the high school program in Joliet, Illinois in 1901, thus making Joliet Junior College the oldest existing public junior college in the United States. President Harper's plan of the junior college being a continuation of high school, even though suffering opposition from many of the other leading educators of the nation, did gain support throughout various areas of the United States, the strongest coming from the west coast. President David Star Jordan of Stanford University reviewed the Chicago developments and ventured this prophesy and recommendation:

It is safe to prophesy that before many years the American University will abandon its junior college, relegating its work to the college on one hand and to the graduate courses of the secondary school on the other. I ask your board to consider the project of the immediate separation of the junior college from the university, or the university college, and to consider the possibility of requiring the work of junior college as a requisite for
admission to the university on or after the year 1913, or as soon as a number of the best equipped high schools of the state are prepared to undertake this work.¹

Even though the plan as proposed by President Jordan was not accepted in toto and the prophecy was proved not to be totally accurate, California, as a result of leadership of people of the stature of President Jordan, was the first state to pass legislation which authorized the establishment of local junior and community colleges.

In 1907 a law was passed that permitted high school boards of education to provide the first two years of college work by offering post-graduate courses in high school. In 1910 Fresno, California was the first city in that state to have a public junior college.²

In 1921, the California legislature authorized the establishment of independent junior college districts if the districts had a minimum high school population of 400 students and a minimum assessed evaluation of ten million dollars. As this law was passed, California was placed in a good position to move to the front as a leader in the junior college movement. By 1930, California had enrolled 15,000 students in 34 community colleges, or about half of


the total community college enrollment throughout the nation, and about half of the total college enrollment in California institutions of higher education.\(^1\) By 1920 community junior colleges and high school districts were not only found in California and Illinois, but also in Michigan (1914), Minnesota (1915), Kansas (1917), Iowa (1918), Missouri (1915), and Texas (1920).\(^2\)

The Community College, 1920 to the Present

By 1920 the community college had begun to find its place in the public education system of this country, and even though it was originally conceived as carrying out a number of educational functions, its development up to this time tended to be a duplication of the first two years of college education that could be found at any four year college or university. It was in the early 20's that the occupational programs in the junior college were first developed, these being the result of: (1) a realization of the need for specialized training in occupational areas, (2) the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education legislation that was passed, and (3) as a reaction to the pressing economic needs growing out of the great depression.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 11. \(^2\)Ibid., p. 12. 

It was these three major events that were the precursor of the comprehensive community college. The literature indicates that the Chaffey Junior College of California holds the probable distinction of offering the first occupational courses in a public junior college, thereby making it the first comprehensive community college. In 1916, terminal vocational courses in art, manual training, home economics, commerce, music, library training, general agriculture, farm mechanics, and soils were offered.¹

The literature on the history of the community college moves rapidly from the 20's into the depression and into the pre-war period. Even though the public junior college has been referred to many times as a "depression baby" the depression of the late 20's and early 30's took its toll on many of the public junior colleges.

Toward the end of the depression and in the pre-war period, it is estimated that less than 200,000 full time students were enrolled in public junior community colleges on a national basis. These enrollments remained low during the 40's and prior to the conclusion of World War II.

The public junior community college became alive again after world hostilities ceased in 1946. Several factors were responsible for this growth but were primarily

¹Murton E. Hill, "History of Terminal Courses in California," Junior College Journal, XII (February, 1942), 311-313.
recognized as (1) an expanding job market--particularly in the broad area of industrial technology--required new training programs of varied intensity and scope, (2) the passage of public law 16--the so-called GI Bill of Rights--heavily augmented the enrollments of the existing colleges and (3) an increased interest for enlightened comprehensive education brought about by the global aspect of the war that had been fought on many fronts in many countries. Returning veterans, who had never before considered education, now looked at the local college as a community center that could provide educational and cultural activities. Junior college enrollment, in 1946, was approximately 10 percent of the total national enrollment for institutions of higher education--a new high.¹

At some point during the post war growth of the two year college, it became tagged as the "people's college" and with this title came the inherent responsibility to bring the local public junior college in concert with the needs and desires of the local community.

The multiple needs and desires of the local community, and the commitment from the community college, in essence, to be "all things to all people" constitutes the major challenge to the community college of today. In order for the modern day community college to meet the challenge of being

¹Medsker and Tillary, op. cit., p. 15.
all things to all people, Cohen and Associates have deduced that it is necessary for the college to develop what they classify as an "institutional personality." This idea is based on the theory that the personality of the junior college is determined by the perceptions of the people who make up the institution and that the perceptions, in turn, are heavily influenced by the attitudes and the values of the people concerned.¹

Getzels supports this concept with the observation that each individual stamps the particular role he plays with the "unique style of his own characteristic pattern of expressive behavior."²

As one views the historical perspective of the community college and touches superficially some of the problems that appear eminent in such a dynamic, changing institution, one cannot help but muse that the public community colleges have come a long way in a very short time. Medsker and Tillary speak to this when they say:

It may be too soon to say that they have the potential for giving the twentieth century an updated version of the American dream--unrestricted opportunity for higher education for all citizens. Yet with a flair for brash endeavor as refreshing


and inspiring as it is often abrasive, the community colleges have touched the spirit of tomorrow.¹

History, Community College Movement in Iowa

In reviewing the history of the community college movement in Iowa, one finds that this history covers an expanse of 54 years with the first public junior college in the state being founded in Mason City in 1918.² At that time there was no legal framework in Iowa for the development of post-high school programs so the initial public junior college was established without the benefit of legal basis. The first enabling legislation permitting establishment of public junior colleges was passed by the 42nd Iowa General Assembly in 1927. This enabling legislation was written as follows:

The board, upon approval of the state superintendent of public instruction, and when duly authorized by the voters, shall have the power to establish and maintain in each district one or more schools of higher order than an approved four year high school course. Said schools of higher order shall be known as public junior colleges and may include courses of study covering one or two years of work in advance of that offered by an accredited four year high school. The state superintendent of public instruction shall prepare and publish from time to time standards for junior colleges, provide adequate inspection for junior colleges, and recommend for accrediting

¹Medsker and Tillary, op. cit., p. 16.

²Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, "Education Beyond High School Age - The Community College," (Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1962), p. 1.
such courses of study offered by junior colleges as may meet the standards determined.¹

From that enabling legislation in 1927, various actions by the Iowa State Legislature added to the initial legislation and demonstrated slow but fairly substantial support for this new institution that would someday evolve into a state-wide system of community colleges. In 1931 the 44th General Assembly passed the following amendment to the original code of 1927: "Providing, however, that after the taking effect of this act no public junior college shall be established in any school district having a population of less than 20,000."²

It is interesting to note that no new junior colleges were established even though the provision mandating a district of 20,000 was amended by the 49th General Assembly in 1941, reducing the population requirement from 20,000 to 5,000.³

¹Iowa, Acts and Joint Resolutions Passed at the Regular Session of the 42nd General Assembly of the State of Iowa (Des Moines: Iowa State Printing Office, 1927), Chapter 86, Sec. 2, p. 82.

²Iowa, Acts and Joint Resolutions Passed at the Regular Session of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Iowa (Des Moines: Iowa State Printing Office, 1931), Chapter 93, Sec. 1, p. 60.

³Iowa, Acts and Joint Resolutions Passed at the Regular Session of the 49th General Assembly of the State of Iowa (Des Moines: Iowa State Printing Office, 1941), Chapter 160, p. 190.
By the time the population restriction was amended, World War II had begun and many existing junior colleges were facing closure in the near future. Table 1 identifies the junior community colleges that existed in Iowa as well as the closing dates for those who faced closure prior to the area college law.

As was the case in the public junior colleges throughout the United States, the two year college in Iowa was an extension of the local public school system, and in most cases, not only the facilities but the staff were shared with the local high school, thereby giving the college very little identity as an institution of higher education.

The financial picture for the junior colleges prior to enactment of area college legislation was a bleak one indeed as financial support for these colleges came from local tax monies suffering from evaluation decline as a result of the depression. Student tuition was very low and in many cases not paid by the student but rather his tuition being, "worked out" in lieu of payment.

The first state aid for the community colleges was introduced in 1949. It was in these years immediately after World War II that enrollments grew substantially as a result of the veterans returning. This factor is believed to have had a very influential part in getting the initial
TABLE 1
GROWTH OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES IN IOWA 1918-1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Reopened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mason City</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fort Dodge</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grundy Center</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarinda</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Waukon</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Estherville</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sheldon</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Creston</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Webster City</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Albia</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chariton</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cresco</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Marshalltown</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20*</td>
<td>Sioux City</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Maquoketa</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Eagle Grove</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Earlham</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Clarion</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ellsworth</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Elkader</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Muscatine</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Emmetsburg</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Keokuk</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Record is not clear as to whether the Sioux City Junior College was a public junior college. [Iowa Coordinating Council for Post High School Education, A Paper Developing Pattern for Area Schools, A paper developed by the Department of Public Instruction with an attached statement by the Area School Superintendent, December, 1968, Revised, pp. 30-32].
The initial state aid legislation provided twenty-five cents per day per student enrolled for twelve or more semester hours of college work.\textsuperscript{2}

Further increases in community college aid came in the form of one dollar per day per student in 1957\textsuperscript{3} and one dollar, fifty cents per day for out-of-district students in 1961.\textsuperscript{4}

The early 50's brought with them concern by various legislators and educators about the lack of planning for the future development of the junior colleges. Several reports were written to speak to the new structure perceived for Iowa junior colleges, the first being a plan developed by Starrak and Hughes proposing thirty-five college districts within the State of Iowa. An informal plan developed by the state junior college deans at a workshop in Iowa City prepared a plan for the future development of the junior

\footnotesize{
\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 34.

\textsuperscript{2}Iowa, Acts and Joint Resolutions Passed at the Regular Session of the 53rd General Assembly of the State of Iowa (Des Moines: Iowa State Printing Office, 1949), Chapter 117, Sec. 2, pp. 167-168.

\textsuperscript{3}Iowa, Acts and Joint Resolutions Passed at the Regular Session of the 57th General Assembly of the State of Iowa (Des Moines: Iowa State Printing Office, 1957), Chapter 10, Sec. 2, p. 37.

\textsuperscript{4}Iowa, Acts and Joint Resolutions Passed at the Regular Session of the 59th General Assembly of the State of Iowa (Des Moines: Iowa State Printing Office, 1961), Chapter 11, Sec. 3, p. 44.
}
colleges in Iowa.¹ Neither of these or other informal plans prepared attracted much public attention, nor received much consideration from the Iowa Legislature.

In 1955 the Iowa Study Committee on Higher Education was organized and this committee, in its initial work, was instrumental in establishing a recognition of the problems that would be facing higher education in the future. The 58th General Assembly appropriated $25,000 to the Iowa Legislative Research Bureau to make a policy study of the needs of higher education in Iowa. The legislature intended that this study should apply to private colleges of the state as well as other public institutions, including the junior colleges. To assist in conducting this study, the legislative research bureau employed Raymond C. Gibson, a professor of higher education at Indiana University to direct the project.²

Even though the Gibson report and the recommendations contained therein were given no action by the General Assembly, the legislature did direct the Department of Public Instruction to begin work on a two year study for a state wide plan for development of public area community colleges.

Literature indicates that the 60th General Assembly

¹Iowa's Developing Pattern for Area Schools, op. cit., p. 35.
²Ibid., p. 41.
established an interim committee designed to study the problems of providing adequate programs of vocational education. The committee's first inclination was to reject the concept of putting the vocational-technical and the junior colleges together in a single comprehensive system. However, this feeling was changed as a result of the study.

The Department of Public Instruction also worked closely with educational groups representing all facets of higher education throughout the state and their recommendations were similar to those of the legislative interim committee.¹

During the 61st General Assembly, major legislation was passed, allowing the development of the area school programs. The legislation passed was identified as Senate File 550, Acts of the Iowa 61st General Assembly, which became Chapter 280A, Code of Iowa, and contained the following major provisions:

1. Provided for, by concurrent action of the concerned county boards, the merger of total or partial county school systems into a new body politic as a school corporation for the specific purpose of operating an area vocational school or an area community college.

2. Designated to the State Board of Public Instruction the responsibility for receiving and approving, or rejecting, all proposals for such merger action so as to carry out the policy of the state that not more than 20 such areas, including all the territory

¹Ibid., pp. 56-57.
of the state, shall be established for operating area vocational schools or area community colleges.

3. Outlined the criteria by which a proposed merged area could formulate a plan for submission to the State Board.

4. Provided for the creation and election of a board of directors, elected from elector districts within the area, to administer the area vocational school or community college.

5. Authorized the board of directors to levy a tax on the property of the merged area not to exceed three-quarters mill for operational costs. Also authorized, by vote of the people, an additional "site levy tax" not to exceed three-quarters mill in any one year for the purchase of grounds, construction of buildings, payment of debts contracted for construction of buildings, purchase of and equipment for buildings, and the acquisition of libraries. Such a three-quarter mill levy could not be authorized for a period to exceed five years without being revoted. The board of directors, when authorized by a vote of the people of the area, could also acquire sites and erect and equip buildings and contract indebtedness and issue bonds to raise funds for such purposes.

6. Created the payment, for residents of the state, of general school aid funds determined on the basis of $2.25 a day calculated on the average daily enrollment of full-time and full-time equivalent students.

7. Made allowances for the charging of tuition and the acceptance of additional state and federal funds allocated for the construction or operation of area vocational schools or area community colleges.

8. Provided for the continued operation of existing community-junior colleges supported by the base of a single school district and also established an equitable means for the transfer, and reimbursement, for such facilities to the merged board of directors where such action was desired.

9. Created the establishment and provisions for enforcement of approval standards for public and area community and junior colleges and area vocational schools.
10. Established a division of community and junior colleges within the State Department of Public Instruction and created an advisory committee to the State Board of Public Instruction, parallel to the already established advisory committee on vocational education, for public and area community or junior colleges.¹

Legislation, as identified in Senate File 550, became effective July 4, 1965, and by July of 1966, all of the counties in the state had been involved in some form of study or planning for the development of the area school concept. The map on the following page (Figure 1) will identify the original boundaries as designated by original legislation.

The Selected School Laws and Standards, as prepared by the Area Schools Division, Department of Public Instruction, State of Iowa, is a summary containing specific school laws relating to the area schools and standards for area community colleges and area vocational schools. This document speaks in detail to the provisions of the operation of the area vocational school and community college system and is used as a handbook by all who are involved in administration and governance of the area schools of Iowa.

Succinctly, the institution to which the college president must administer can best be described by 280A.1, Statement of Policy:

¹Ibid., pp. 59-60.
Figure 1.

AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGES (ACC) AND AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (AVS) SHOWING ADMINISTRATIVE CENTERS
280A.1 Statement of policy. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of this chapter to provide for the establishment of not more than seventeen areas which shall include all of the area of the state and which may operate either area vocational schools or area community colleges offering to the greatest extent possible, educational opportunities and services in each of the following, when applicable, but not necessarily limited to:

1. The first two years of college work including preprofessional education.
2. Vocational and technical training.
3. Programs for in-service training and retraining of workers.
4. Programs for high school completion for students of post-high school age.
5. Programs for all students of high school age who may best serve themselves by enrolling for vocational and technical training while also enrolled in a local high school, public or private.
6. Student personnel services.
7. Community services.
8. Vocational education for persons who have academic, socio-economic, or other handicaps which prevent succeeding in regular vocational education programs.
9. Training, retraining, and all necessary preparation for productive employment of all citizens.
10. Vocational and technical training for persons who are not enrolled in a high school and who have not completed high school.

It is further declared to be the policy of the state that all of the area of the state shall be in a merged area by July 1, 1971. If any area of this state is not within one of the existing merged areas of this state by April 1, 1971, or is not included in a plan pending before the state board of public instruction under the provisions of this chapter on or before that date, the state board of public instruction shall attach all such areas to an existing merged area or shall form such areas into new merged areas. Such attachment or formation shall become effective by resolution of the board, and by filing notice, if applicable, with the secretary of the school board of the merged areas to which such area is to be attached. Any area included in a merged area plan filed with the state board on or before April 1, 1971, and not becoming a part of a merged area because of the subsequent failure of the plan, shall be attached to an existing merged area by the state board of public instruction. The state board shall, where possible, carry out the provisions of this Act by July 1, 1971, but may defer action as may be necessary. The state board, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, shall investigate the desires of the
residents of the area affected, and obtain the advice and recommendation of the advisory committee. All actions made by the state board shall be accomplished by resolution of the board. Such resolution shall be adopted by roll call vote entered in the minutes of the board and the action of the board shall be final.

At any time before April 1, 1971, any school district not included in a merged area may join any adjacent merged area in the following manner:

The school district board of directors shall publish notice of the proposal to join a specific adjacent merged area, in a newspaper of general circulation within the school district. The notice shall be published at least twice, no oftener than once a week.

The school district shall become part of the adjacent merged area, as proposed in the notice, thirty days after second publication of the notice, unless a petition requesting an election on the proposal and signed by electors equal to ten percent of those voting in the last regular school election in the district is filed with the school board.

If such a petition is filed, the school board shall submit the question of whether the district shall join the adjacent merged area as proposed, or shall join another adjacent merged area, at the next regular school election, or at a special election. If a special election is called, notice shall be published at least three times, no oftener than once a week, in a newspaper of general circulation within the district.

Upon receiving notification from a school board that it is proceeding under the above provisions to join an adjacent merged area, the state board shall stay its attachment proceedings until the procedures are completed. If a majority of those voting favor joining any adjacent merged area, the state board shall proceed to attach the district to that merged area. (C66, 280A.1; Ch. 244 (S.F. 616), Sec. 10, 62 G.A.; Ch. 1118 (H.F. 333), Sec. 1, 63 G.A. (2).)

In summary, it can be said that Iowa's area schools are now a complete state-wide system of public institutions that offer a comprehensive program of educational opportunities

1 Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Area Schools Division, Selected School Laws and Standards, Specific School Laws Relating to Area Schools (Revised; Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1972), p. 1.
to Iowans of all ages. The area community colleges have an open door admissions policy which grants Iowans an opportunity for educational assistance and career development regardless of previous educational attainment. In order to implement this policy all area schools offer assistance in attaining minimal development of skills that are a prerequisite for entrance to the programs; opportunities for remedial and developmental assistance; and supplementary services to handicapped and disadvantaged students.¹

Instructional programs in the area schools are offered by three major divisions, (1) Adult education division, a unit that provides programs for the great majority of part time students offering adult basic education, supplementary career education, and short term preparatory career education. Also, continuing education programs for adults who desire instruction for pre-occupational training or other needs. (2) Career education division. This unit provides preparation for immediate employment in many careers ordinarily requiring full time instruction ranging in length up to two years of preparation, and (3) The College parallel division. This is the unit that provides courses that may be transferred to other colleges and universities as equivalent of the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program.

¹Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Area Schools Division, Progress in Iowa Area Schools (Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1973), p. 1.
as well as career option programs that lead to immediate employment opportunities.¹

Role of the Community College President--A Review of Literature

The community college, with its relatively short history, its inauspicious beginning, and its rather recent but galvanic entry into the field of higher education, has generated surprising amounts of literature speaking to the dynamics of the institution. However, it becomes rapidly apparent, in the review of this literature, that there is a glaring absence of literature that speaks in a specific manner to the role of the president of the community college.

In an attempt to establish a reasonably acceptable definition of the general role of the president of the community junior college, one finds that certain descriptive words constantly appear, the most prominent being leadership. Clyde E. Blocker, president of Harrisburg area community college, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, has identified other writers of community college education as taking the stance that:

The president of a two year college must be an educational leader, not a mere manager or institutional custodian, if his institution is to be successful in achieving its goals. In this context they mention an obvious but very often overlooked fact--the college exists for the education of

¹Ibid., pp. 1-2.
students, not for the satisfaction of the needs and aspirations of the trustees, administrators, or faculty.¹

A somewhat antipodal view is expressed by Selden when he holds that the image of the college president as an educational leader is outdated and, like all executive positions, the presidency has undergone a change. He reports:

The principle job of the college president in the 1920's and earlier was the educational concern, the operation of curriculum. Now the president spends little time on that. A fair share of his time is spent on relations with government and the public, in concern with the attitudes of faculty and other employees, alumni and students.²

Rourke and Brooks express that in their opinion presidents are no longer required to be innovators, but effective managers of very complex institutions. They warn against comparing contemporary presidents with their nineteenth century predecessors who were in a very different position of influence than those of men today.³


²William K. Selden, "How Long is a College President?", Liberal Education, XLVI (March, 1960), 12.

One then can readily ascertain that there is anything but complete agreement concerning the components that could be interpreted as activities that make up the job of the community college president. It is with this understanding that various expressions of writers and their view of the role of the community college president is further discussed:

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his capacity for institutional leadership. He shares the responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communication system which links the components of the academic community. He represents his institution to many publics. His leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.¹

In further discussion of presidential activities as described by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, it is pointed out that the president must fill the role as the planning officer of the institution and inherent in this role is a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The magnitude to which the president can create new vision for his institution and can portray this vision with sufficient clarity to understand and work toward the end, many times is the chief measure of his administration.

The president must also at many times work with, or without, support in the infusion of new life into a

department or initiating the most difficult of all objectives, change.

It is further clearly stated that it is the obligation of the president to see that the standards and procedures operational within the college conform precisely with the policy established by the board of trustees as well as meeting all criteria of sound academic practice.

The responsibility of the president to present views of faculty and constituency, including dissenting views, to the board, is referred to as an important function of the chief administrator.

In non academic areas, the president is primarily responsible for institutional resources and the maintenance thereof. The creation of new resources, of course, has long been an important role of the incumbent president.

He is, by the nature of his office, the chief spokesman of his institution, and is responsible for public understanding.

In these and other areas, unique or specific to that institution, the president is expected to plan, organize, direct, and represent, and in this endeavor, the presidential function should receive general support of the board and the faculty.¹

¹Ibid., pp. 211-212.
Jesse Parker Bogue, past executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges, in his book, The Community College, analyzed the role of the community college president as not being a standard list of roles and functions, but as being developed from a chart of organization and administration that speaks to all persons connected with the college so that they may understand the lines of responsibility and the specifications of duty. Parker emphasizes that two questions should be readily answered by all staff members, instructors and employees. These questions are, "To whom am I directly responsible and what are my duties and opportunities?"

A proposed organization chart clarifying the questions that were posed by Bogue, Figure 2, was drawn by the administrative committee of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Bogue states:

It (the organization chart) is offered as a suggestion only. It will have to be adapted to the size, resources, type, and functions of the college. Effective administration, however, requires the adoption of a workable system for each major aspect of the institution.¹

Bogue further states of the chief executive:

The kingpin is the chief executive. His acumen in financial affairs, his ability to recognize and select the right kind of associates, delegate authority to them, his character, attitudes, and personality that create confidence in all the publics of

¹Bogue, op. cit., p. 285.
Proposed organizational chart for a junior college.

Figure 2.
Community College Organizational Chart as Proposed by Bogue

1Ibid., p. 286.
the college naturally give to him the leading role. If he plays his part well, he will have the wholehearted support of his entire cast and the applause of the audience. It is essential, therefore, to give full recognition and esteem to all staff members, the faculty, and the students whereby each group may be motivated by the same incentives and objectives which a chief executive may have.

As in earlier review, literature by Thornton contrasted traditional administrative practices with a more contemporary view in this manner:

In its beginnings, the American college administrator was considered to be in loco parentis to some extent for the faculty as well as for the students. He referred to past administrative right, very similarly as that as the parent, to inquire into the activities of the youth and to forbid or chastise without various personal rights of the student. In his reference to faculty members he alluded to the close subjection of direction and control by the president. This type of practice was exhibited well into the twentieth century by the typical college president who was completely autocratic, who decided unilaterally on appointments, tenure, salaries, budgets, and conditions of work without much consultation with or consideration for individual faculty members. The presidents in that day were benevolent, scholarly, well-intentioned men of principle; it had not occurred to them that colleges were very different from businesses.

The contemporary view of administration was compared by Thornton to the role of the hospital administrator who cares for the managerial aspects of the hospital and establishes

---

1Ibid., p. 299.

conditions that permits the physicians and the surgeons to treat their patients. Controls are established with the help of the staff as a protective measure to the patient, and in somewhat the same way, the college administrator recognizes that his faculty are not simply employees in the classical sense, but are experts whose training and confidence in their field is comparable to his own field.¹

Thornton is in high agreement with Bogue in the emphasis for the president of the community college to interpret as one of his major roles that of clearly outlining duties for all personnel within the structure.

As one reviews the literature, it becomes fairly apparent that the president's role and responsibilities can, in part, be deduced from his activity. It is also assumed that there are two other major factors that contribute greatly to the individual president's role, that being (1) his own style, and (2) unique conditions of his own institution or community that it serves.

For the most part, however, the literature describing the role and responsibility of the president is general in nature and even though there might appear to be juxtapositions in some instances, the literature in the main comes back to some degree of conformity.

¹Ibid., p. 115.
Henderson is quoted in Blocker, Plumber and Richardson as follows:

What (i.e. the junior college presidency) formerly was a job as a principal of a preparatory program, has become the role of the educational leader, as a community leader, and as the executive of a complex enterprise with many facets of management relating to personnel, program, plant, finance and public relations. It has become highly important that this educational leadership shall be exercised with the social vision and the professional understanding needed to implement this new concept.\(^1\)

Supportive of the assumption that the role of the chief administrator manifests some of the unique qualities of the incumbent as well as the community is expressed by Blocker and associates when they add:

The president is the central link between the college and the community, as well as the director and coordinator of the organization's activities. A very brief examination of the activities of two presidents, one a public college president, and the other a private college president, with the difference demonstrating, to the authors, the "pervasiveness of situational factors in shaping the activities of the chief executive."\(^2\)

Further discussion of the responsibilities for the administration and governance of the community college indicates that typically this ultimate responsibility is vested in a lay board:


\(^2\)Ibid.
In practice, however, the board engages the services of a full time professional--usually designated president--to serve as chief administrator.\textsuperscript{1}

In a slightly different manner and with a statement that is one of the most commonly agreed upon roles for the president, that of a leader, was recently expressed by Gleazer:

The president must lead in the interpretation of the character of the comprehensive community institution, especially if it is new. He must see to it that the board, administration, faculty, students, and community have a working understanding of what the role of the college is.\textsuperscript{2}

Supporting the position that the junior college president's principal role is that as a leader and therefore the responsibility is to offer leadership is found in Cohen and Rouche's description:

The junior college presidency is recognized in a formal way as being a leadership position. The title, "leader" is accorded to the person ascending to the office. However, in practice, the very nature of this position in the organizational hierarchy may be such that the president is thrust only into a headman role. Mere occupancy of a position is no guarantee that its incumbent will actually be a functional educational leader. He may very well be a president and not lead at all.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1}Don A. Morgan, Perspectives of the Community College Presidency, The Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report #14, The Regents of the University of California, 1970, p. 19

\textsuperscript{2}Edmund J. Gleazer, This is the Community College (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 109.

\textsuperscript{3}Cohen and Rouche, op. cit., p. 10.
The President as an Innovator

In earlier portions of this chapter, some of the works and accomplishments of the great innovators in the community college field were discussed, among them, Harper, Bogue, and Jordan. Innovator is another term alluding to a characteristic of the community college president that appears quite frequently in the review of literature pertaining to the role of the community college president.

Innovators in the community college field may have been few in numbers by virtue of the lack of clout exhibited by the early community college movement. In view of this fact, one might surmise that innovative giants in the form of community college presidents might appear with more frequency in this day of the meteoric rise of community colleges and the continuance of this thrust in the future.

One can easily understand, in reviewing the history of higher education per se that it would not be at all difficult, in a non-growth, non-dynamic situation, to turn the president into a bureaucratic caretaker unless he firmly and precisely operated from an objective base and controlled his time, in order to accomplish these objectives. Of course social and economic conditions surrounding the nation in the early days of the community college would no doubt be a factor. The autocratic, omnipotent chief administrator that was much in evidence in the non-innovative era of higher education are now hardly to be found.
Without singular dominance by administration and the sometimes slow and arduous committee-type structure that exists in so many institutions of higher education, is it possible to revive an innovator in the form of a college president? Clark Kerr does not think that it is impossible to be an innovator in today's college administrative scene. He does believe that the role of today's president must be that of a mediator in order to hold the elements of the institution together. He also recognizes that the president must accept the responsibilities of the initiator in order to, "move the whole enterprise another foot ahead in what often seems an unequal race with history."¹

Earl McGrath identifies David Riesman as contending:

That the president must assume an even more active role than that of a mere mediator-initiator. Although agreeing with Kerr that, "great men are no longer necessary in most parts of the United States to mobilize support for rigorous standards of teaching and scholarship in the universities," he believes that the president as an educational leader and innovator is as important as ever if one seeks to depart from the going model of what the big universities should be and to start something more experimental and untried.²

Although McGrath, Riesman and Kerr probably spoke to the presidency of a four year institution, the comments


would appear to be more than appropriate for the institution that must face constant change and innovation, the community college. McGrath summarizes in a manner that would be apropos to the community college presidency thusly:

Let me repeat the means that may be necessary for most presidential innovators to be successful today. The president must spade, plant, and water; he must prepare the ground for the consideration of change; he must then help initiate the process by dropping ideas throughout the campus; and finally he must nourish and encourage new ideas wherever they appear, both among faculty and among students.¹

Other Views

The above authors spoke to innovation as the responsibility of the president, yet Thompson views the organization that results in innovative practices as he states, "The innovative organization will provide or allow that diversity of inputs, or variety of experience and stimulation, needed for the creative generation of ideas."²

A fairly unique function of the chief executive officer, though not speaking to the community college presidency per se, has been identified by Simon as:

Raising money, balancing the budget, participating in the establishment of institutional goals, working with faculty to create an

¹Ibid., p. 15.

environment that encourages learning, and recruiting, and maintaining a high quality of faculty.¹

Simon also parallels the responsibilities of the college president and top executives in other types of concerns, giving particular and strong attention to the concept of accountability.²

Some differences in roles and as they relate to the uniqueness of the institution and the individual, were discussed earlier in this review by Moore who indicated that:

In general, the public community college presidents spend more time than do private college presidents in meeting with members of the board, in coordination with other educational programs and institutions, in recruiting and selecting faculty, and in relations with the state legislature and state agencies. Private college presidents spend more time than public community college presidents in public relations, in coordination with other community programs and organizations, in fund raising, and in student programs and problems. Both presidents spend about equal amounts of time in general administration and in dealing with educational organizations.³

Moore, with his inimitable writing style, brings to light another dimension that was not alluded to by any of the authors in this writer's exhaustive search of literature,


²Ibid.

when he approaches from this direction:

Finally, the community college administrator must accept the reality that he is usually either the villain or the scapegoat. He can be both. Depending upon where he is in the hierarchy, he must be prepared to deal with angry students, assorted demands, racism, tradition, budget cuts, unions, faculty senate, board of trustees, the public, the press, the legislature, and other administrators. In spite of the sometimes adversarial components, he must keep uppermost in his mind, that the improvement of the quality of education is his main objective. This is difficult. When one is up to his ass in alligators, it is easy to forget that his original objective was to drain the swamp.¹

To those presidents experienced in the demands and responsibility of the office, the list of presidential virtues that are many times expected by constituency in the broadest sense, is a long and illusive list. The administrator that can mesh these virtues and characteristics with the demands and responsibilities of the office, is indeed a very talented person.

McGrath speaks of some of the characteristics that he feels are essential in successful college administration. He perceives that communication in a personal manner will help, but acknowledges that the most severe critics with whom the presidents must work—and they will be found among the trustees, alumni, student body, the general public, as well as within the faculty:

... will be more impressed by the accuracy and logic of his words than by rhetorical or vocal

¹Ibid., p. 32.
embellishments. He must meet adverse criticism calmly and honestly with the humility which permits him to know and admit when there are gaps in his information or thinking. Looking at another side of the character of this ideal academic leader, one suspects that he will be able to thread his way through strenuous academic mazes.  

While Moore and McGrath speak to some of the specific impediments that might occur in route to a successful administrative experience, much of the other literature generalizes the president's role. It has been mentioned earlier that the president must assume leadership for the development of resources and programs and for the execution of the board's policies. It is inherent in this role that the president then becomes a symbol of the community college board and its powers. This, then, implies that the president, even in a most autocratic role, is a part of a team effort as the board can be no better than its agent, the president and his administrative staff. Moreover, it is essential that the administrator of any public body realizes that administration is not an end in itself and he will no doubt be judged on his ability to function efficiently, effectively, and harmoniously.

Most administration, unfortunately, has been aligned with the much despised bureaucrats and administration from

\[1\] McGrath, op. cit., p. 37.
the top governmental level on down is regarded by most of the public as superfluous, parasitic, and obstructive to whatever process is desired within the institution. Recent developments at the national level, unanswered demands for accountability, tax scandals involving some of our nation's leaders, an anemic economic picture, and numerous publications such as Parkinson's Law by C. Northcoat Parkinson, and the Peter Principle by Peter Lawrence, have not helped to smooth the situation. Both of these books attack the bureaucratic structure, with Parkinson generalizing that bureaucratic expenditures always rise to meet income, and Lawrence expressing that eventually all bureaucrats rise to their destined level of incompetency. It would appear to this writer that the president must be as much aware of these national characterizations of administrators as he must be with the onus as described by Moore and McGrath. Therefore, he must treat his institution in a manner unique and compatible with his style and in consideration of the influencing forces within the college district.

Monroe supports this position as he points up that one of the basic weaknesses of the administrative structure of a community college is the imitation of another college system. Each college should develop a form fitting structure for that district. He further states:

Although the administrative pattern may and should differ from college to college, there can be no doubt of the significance of the administration
function. The prime function of the administration is to coordinate and balance the diverse activities of the college. The administration must be able to view the total operation, to see the *gestalt* and how all of the parts fit together.

Following with support of the role discussed many times in this chapter:

Closely related to this basic function of general management and control is the function of leadership and also of giving impetus to reform and change. If there is a spark of creativity in the total college body, then it needs to be found most strongly, and often is, in the administration. Seldom does the faculty, either individually or collectively, take the leadership in college innovation.¹

In summary it can be said that the junior community college president's principle role and responsibility is to offer leadership. He is responsible for leading an increasingly important institution, one that is developing rapidly and has solidified its position in the American educational system.

That leader can never fail to recognize that if both the leader and leadership are to be effective, they must be acceptable to the society supporting them. In order for this to be, the president must understand, support, and accurately interpret educational philosophy. This educational philosophy must be in concert with the desires of the community and result in goals and purposes for the institution. The

effectiveness of this president will be influenced to no little degree by the amount of resources available to the college. The attraction and use of these resources, both financial and human, is a valid indicator of the effectiveness of the president. To meet the needs of this multifaceted, protean institution, the president must not be myopic or suffer from hemianopsia. "He must keep the last man in line clearly in focus."\textsuperscript{1}

Related Literature Specific to the Sixteen Role Categories

In an effort to further document the community college presidential role, literature was thoroughly reviewed, placing emphasis on material that was felicitous with the sixteen role category questions that were used in this study. The material found typically illustrates some difference of opinion, conforming to the theory of the writer, but these differences tend to be that of a theoretical nature with not much evidence of a completely diametric view.

QUESTION I. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE AS PRESIDENT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO YOUR BOARD OF TRUSTEES

A general feeling of the responsibility for administration and governance was expressed by Morgan:

Typically, the ultimate responsibility for administration and governance of the community

\textsuperscript{1}Don A. Morgan, The Junior College President, Role and Responsibilities, The Junior College President, Occasional Report from UCLA Junior College Leadership Program #13, The Regents of the University of California, 1969, p. 30.
college are vested in a lay board. In practice, however, the board engages the services of a full-time professional--usually designated president--to serve as chief administrator.\(^1\)

It is then, this president that must take the primary responsibility of the interpretation of board policies to the public, to the students, and to the faculty. It is this president who must assume leadership for the development of the programs and for the final execution of the board's policies. It could be said that, in a sense, the president becomes the symbol of the community college board and all of its inherent powers.

The dependency relationship between the board and the president is one that cannot be minimized with any degree of safety, for the educational program desired by the board will be no better than its agents, the president and his administrative staff, as it is they who speak for the board and are the visible representatives of the board to the general public. Board members are frequently busy community leaders and are usually unpaid for their services and are unseen and many times unknown by students and faculty of the college.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Morgan, *Perspectives of the Community College Presidency*, op. cit., p. 19.

\(^2\) Monroe, op. cit., p. 309.
It is necessary for the president to interpret the board's action as a reflection of the feelings of the college community. Richardson et al., speaks to this point when they indicate:

The board of trustees represents a microcosm of the publics to which the institution must be interpreted and with which effective interaction must occur. Substantial board reaction against a specific recommendation should alert the president to the probability that similar reactions can be expected from the community.¹

It is necessary for the president to interpret this potential community reaction and work with the board in resolving the issues in the best interests of the college by careful and deep analysis in favor of the inclination of an administrator to gain a favorable unanimous vote from the board, one that might well not be the best solution for the college.

The board also looks to the president for guidance in foreseeing consequences of specific courses of action in terms of attitudes of community groups. This guidance must be strong and accurate as the board does not have to be mislead often before losing confidence in the administrator's judgment.²


²Ibid.
William P. Tolley is more direct in his observation that, "No one can survive as a college president if he is not skilled in the direction and management of trustees."

Tolley's position appears to be that of board leadership by the college president. He cautions repeatedly that problems are created by trustees with special interests or by a president of the board who maintains a too close relationship with the institutional president. He acknowledges also that many trustees have a mistaken notion of their role and have propensity for meddling in administrative affairs. He does, however, acknowledge that the proper degree of administrative-governance relationship cannot always be attained, regardless of the strength of the president and alludes that the best condition is one in which there is administrator-board cooperation.¹

Harry Wells supports a cooperative involvement between board and administrators and encourages team and committee functions. He feels that committee work, for all of its uneven quality, is what trustees do best:

The most efficient relationship between the administration and trustees prevails when a task is made a joint venture of cooperation. The university officials represent the research team to study, organize and effectuate the assignments delegated

by the committees. Trustee committee meetings can be among the most valuable and interesting seminars in a university, and it is at this point that the administration is well done and the trusteeship well carried out.¹

Laird Bell, former chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Chicago, had this to say of the role and responsibility of board members that indicates a slightly stronger trustee position when he says:

Trustees had best bear in mind that they could not be a college faculty and that they should keep their hands off education. This is sound doctrine, but it must be asserted with discretion. Every man thinks he is an educator. By hypothesis your trustee joined the board because he thought he was interested in education. He will resent being told to keep hands off the most interesting part of the activity . . . . Trustees cannot abdicate all concern with educational matters. Logically the trustees as a controlling body have the right--and in fact the duty--to determine what kind of education shall be offered. As custodians of the property and funds they are bound to see that they are devoted to the purposes for which they were given. . . . but once overall policy is decided, it ought to be true that the educational experts should determine how the policy is to be implemented.²

It appears that with increased awareness of the educational process, the day of the benevolent autocrat is most assuredly finished and that trustees are quite likely not only better informed of actual college matters but are


²Laird Bell, "From the Trustees Corner," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, XLII, 3 (October, 1956), 354.
assuming more responsibility for balancing the roles of governance and administration.

Dr. Fred L. Mathews, chairman of the board of trustees, Southwestern Michigan College, decries complete separation of administration and governance and advocates cooperative involvement between the president and the board of trustees. He indicates that most assuredly there have been situations where the trustees were administering the academic programs of the college with the other extreme being a situation where almost no control is exerted by the board, and the position of the trustee could be considered honorary at the most. Dr. Mathews encourages new trustees to view either of these situations as being detrimental to the institution and to work toward reasonable middle ground:

I personally reject the stereotype position on board-administration duties and relationships where a wall divides responsibilities of each. For an administrator to insist on administering within a trustee-sterile environment is as wrong as a board of trustees adopting policies in an administration-sterile environment. To justly protest our separate domains, in my opinion, represents an insecurity on the part of one or both of the parties involved.¹

Cohen and Rouche hold that governing boards have a much greater responsibility than they realize or will accept. He maintains that the governing board not only holds the

responsibility for the total educational program and performance of the college, but that they could provide impetus for changed educational practices in the junior college.¹

Griffiths supports this position as he observes that, "The major impetus for change in organizations comes from the outside and that the degree and duration of change is directly proportional to the intensity of the stimulus from the supra-system."²

All of the literature, notwithstanding some slight differences in points of view, recognizes that it is a must for a compatible working relationship between trustees and college presidents. Hillway, in a study of college trustees, found that:

What they value most highly in a president is leadership in maintaining academic standards and skill and honesty in dealing with other people. Effectiveness as a business manager would appear less important.³

He indicates that this statement is not to mean that


practical business sense is not important, but that skills in human management are more important.¹

Harmonious working relationships are referred to as being a key ingredient for board-administrative relationships as referred to by Sechler as he states:

The relationships between a college board and its administrator, the president of the college, like most relationships in the affairs of men, are first of all a matter of human relations. This is a plain fact, but it is sometimes forgotten with unhappy consequences. In the best interests of students and the total community that the colleges are designed to serve, it is essential that there be a friendly goodwill and mutual respect between the board and the administrator which make possible complete frankness, confidence, and understanding concerning the conduct of the college. He recognizes that this relationship and its stability will undergo hazards, quite possibly brought about by the fact that there is a group of people who must act as a single unit in dealing with a single individual. Moreover, the fact that a college is, in essence, a public business, the board and its president must live in a glass house with all of their actions and interactions in complete and open view of the whole district. Whether these relationships are harmonious or not is immediately apparent to everybody on the outside. Board-administrator relationships are always changing for better or for worse. Board make-up is constantly changing and, of course, there is an average turnover of administrators, and finally, there is a basic principle that the college board makes the policy and the administrator executes the policy, which is not as clearcut as it may sound. But if harmonious relationships are to exist between the two, the policy must be agreed to and mutually understood.²

¹Ibid.

QUESTION II. WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE BUDGETING PROCESS OF YOUR INSTITUTION?

The study indicated that the presidents of the area community colleges, even though each of them had an administrative staff member directly responsible for the preparation and administration of the budget, felt that absolute responsibility for the fiscal affairs of his college were his and his alone.

The financing of the community college programs, as well as budgeting and supervision of expenditures, is an area that many of the staff members as well as most of the constituency may take for granted. However, the administrator must spend a sizable part of his time in this endeavor. The financial operation of any community college is a responsibility which the administrator will delegate at the earliest possible moment in his college growth. Thornton, in discussing the financial operation of the community college, states:

The detailed and time consuming work required in gathering data for budgets and accounting for receipts and disbursements would interfere with other necessary work of the president. He will need to keep constantly informed of the state of the finances of the college; he will devote considerable attention to the development and presentation of the budget as an instrument of educational policy; and he cannot abdicate his ultimate responsibility to see that the financial affairs of the college are capably and honestly managed. Nevertheless, the day to day accounting for income from tax sources, from tuition fees, from the several enterprises of the colleges for the student body and their disbursement according to law and the policies of the board will be the
responsibility of a comptroller or a bursar, who will prepare periodic reports on all financial matters for information of the president.¹

One can ascertain from the literature that the president is then responsible for much, much more than the details, or the mechanical segment of the budget and that the chief administrator must constantly assess the institution in financial terms with the unit cost and program budget analysis. Fredrick Bolman, in discussing administrative responsibility for finances, says that we must:

Learn something that has grown up in industry and government called, cost-benefit accounting and analysis. This is an educator's task, not just a bookkeeper's. In Pentagon language, how are we to get the biggest bang for our buck, and therefore, what hard evidences have we to present to federal governments, state legislatures, corporations, foundations, and individuals that we are really effective and efficient? Such cost-effectiveness analyses are indispensable for the analysis of decision making, which is just beginning at some institutions.²

The challenge flung by Bolman for greater budget program analysis is being echoed by educators throughout the country with much of the recommended solution coming in the form of program-planning budget systems (PPBS). New budget procedures such as simulated budget models and wider

¹Thornton, op. cit., pp. 128-129.

participation by staffs are joining PPBS in the attempt by administrators to find a new method for stretching the dollar and not tearing the educational program. Administrators and business officials are involving various levels of college constituency in an effort to disseminate and receive budget information:

Administrators are beginning to concentrate on strategies for budget balancing and ways of making budget cutting a more acceptable style of life on campus. Wider participation by faculty and students, more information and discussion, and the greater use of guidelines form important components of budget-making processes today.¹

Fiscal matters of the college are recognized as not only being one of the most important functions of the president but also one of the most realistic tests of his administrative and leadership ability as conflict many times settles around questions involving finances. The problem of effectively managing the institution within financial limitations and effectively carrying out the objects of the institutions provides a real challenge for the educational manager.

Literature revealed several interesting attitudes on financing and budgeting as well as some potential pitfalls. Richardson, et al., described a budgeting process that will be familiar to most community college administrators thusly:

There is a great temptation for state systems in multi-college units which receive allocations based on projected enrollments, to work this process backward. The available funds are calculated and then distributed to operating units on some kind of formula basis. This is a poor practice for at least two reasons. The process of budgeting should always be preceded by a clear statement of objectives arranged according to priority. The absence of such a statement invites over financing of special interests or pet projects. In addition, the budgetary process is a prime source of intra-institutional conflict. The absence of clear and acceptable basis for decision making invites suspicion of unfair practices, even where none exist.¹

As the interviews with the Iowa community college presidents indicated, even though they assume total responsibility, there is, in all cases, another person assigned with direct budget administration responsibility. Moore cautions of another problem that can arise for the president of the community college, that of dealing with the business manager. Moore states:

The business manager is a key person in transactions between the college and architects, auditors, state and government officers, vendors, and chancellors or district presidents, as well as all the other people who have business with the college. This is one of the most important areas in the college, and he is an essential person in the organization. But college business managers are notorious for not confining their talents and influence within the parameters of their position. A weak president and a strong business manager have ruined many an education program.²

¹Richardson et al., op. cit., p. 149.
²Moore, op. cit., pp. 131-132.
QUESTION III. WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN STAFF SALARY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS, OR RECOMMENDATIONS?

The literature concerning this role, as did the respondents to this role discussion, hardly recognizes the chief administrator's role in salary discussion other than that as a representative of the board, and primarily significant only in the aspect of budget control. It is recognized that central to education is the instructor and that many times the two are synonymous: "Since instructors hold such a vital place in the educational process, a high salary schedule is considered among the best indicators of the quality of an educational institution."¹

Whether or not this belief is valid, it is a fact that teachers' salaries are the fastest growing items in school budgets, bringing about a condition that the chief administrator cannot fail to recognize. The old lock-step salary schedules of the past and those still in existence, allow everyone to advance automatically from year to year.

There have been other measures of determining instructor position on a salary scale allowing them to advance to higher salaries by taking courses, doing independent study, etc. Additional increases were awarded for further degrees and professional licenses. The whole structure is based on

time in service and effort outside the classroom, not on merit in instruction.1

James W. Popson, in discussing faculty salary and salary schedules, declared:

One important thing about any salary schedules developed as a part of this program is the absolute necessity for flexibility. An administrator, in order to recruit the highest qualified staff, cannot be tied in by rigid lock-step salary schedules which demand minimum-level entrance requirements. Some guidelines and the mechanism for obtaining exception to these guidelines will provide the flexibility and the control necessary to do the best recruitment while affording quality to all employees.2

Fringe benefits have tremendous effect on budgets and increase salary expenditures by at least 8 to 12 percent. The increase in salaries and fringe benefits is part of the new style in business, industry and government with which educators are attempting to keep pace. A conservative estimate is that faculty salary and fringe benefits account for 60 percent of the budget, making the instructor, "The most expensive input of the educational enterprise and ... .

1Lombardi, op. cit., p. 9.

the heart of the financial crisis."\textsuperscript{1}

This is true, especially where collective bargaining is employed and faculty salaries rise quickly and teaching loads are lightened. Collective bargaining is spreading at a modest rate among community colleges and other two year post-secondary institutions.\textsuperscript{2}

While discussing salaries with the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges, it was evident that they felt their role would change greatly with the inception of the collective bargaining law, Senate File 531.

It goes without saying that feelings run high and misconceptions abound when the subject of collective bargaining is discussed. Ray Howe, in discussing the subject in the \textit{Community and Junior College Journal}, expresses the perceptions of many of the presidents when he says:

Far too many college administrators tend to regard the onset of collective bargaining sessions as the issuance to faculty of a license to steal. Faculty, in many cases, respond to the same event as an opportunity to create heaven on earth without the necessity of the second coming.\textsuperscript{3}


\textsuperscript{2}Lombardi, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education advises administrators thusly:

Administrators in many institutions of higher education—especially in the large public systems of higher education—will need to prepare themselves to establish successful collective bargaining relationships.¹

Richardson, et al., discuss in more detail the role for which the president must prepare as they indicate that most authorities advise the president to remain aloof from the actual bargaining process, delegating responsibility for administrative participation around the bargaining table to a staff officer.²

Although there is some question as to the implication of the collective bargaining process as it affects both the staff and the administration-governance segments of the institution, it is apparent that the administrator's role in the staff-salary discussion vis-a-vis collective bargaining, is an important one.

There is now a lively debate underway as to whether the collective bargaining process will make or break our campuses. What is doubtless, however, is that administrators of the colleges of today must know what bargaining


²Richardson et al., op. cit., p. 129.
really is and how they must handle themselves and their institutions productively. "Ignorance and unpreparedness here can lead to disaster in short order."¹

It was felt by some of the administrators and supported by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, that the passage of a collective bargaining law for the public employees of Iowa by the legislature, in essence, commits the legislature to a much higher degree of responsibility in salary setting. Gleazer states:

Politicians are much more interested in education than they used to be. The smoke on the campuses has had something to do with that. This has had a dramatic effect upon the legislators. Also, there is the effect of negotiations. At the present time, only at the local level do teacher organizations have negotiation rights and there is fear in the local school boards about the future.²

He also indicates that he looks for state-wide salary negotiations and that negotiations would not be conducted on a local level with local boards but on a state-wide basis between teachers and state-level agencies.³

It can be assumed, as a result of the conversations

¹Bolman, op. cit., p. 181.


³Ibid.
with the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges and a review of the literature concerning the role of the president in staff salary negotiations, particularly with a prominent collective bargaining bill, that although the president will be highly involved in the administration of the budget and strategy sessions for reconciling salaries, he will have considerably less influence on final salary outcome.

QUESTION IV. WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE INTRA-INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM OF YOUR COLLEGE?

Simon defines communications as, "Any process whereby decisional premises are transmitted from one member of an organization to another."¹

He further indicates that communication is a two-way process, including both the transmittal to a decisional center and a transmittal of the decision reached from the center to other parts of the organization. This process moves, "upward, downward, and laterally throughout the organization."²

Placing much less emphasis than Barnard upon the formal network of communications, Simon finds that informal


²Ibid.
75

channels are much more important in the transmission of information.¹

Simon then defines the media of formal communication as oral communication, memoranda and letters, paper flow, records, reports, and manuals.²

Each of those interviewed, in their expression of concern for intra-institutional communications, did not attempt to describe the theory of communication as did Simon and others. They, however, could not have been more sincere in their desire to improve the total communications network throughout their institution. To the man, there was a feeling that, "We can do better" with many expressing a real concern for the effectiveness and efficiency of their intra-institutional communication system. Blau and Scott summarized their findings of research in the field of communications and perceptively define communications as an, "Institutional dilemma" supporting the presidential feeling that communications must be one of the prime concerns of the chief administrator.³


The presidents realized that as with most of the role descriptions, they hold the final responsibility for a clear, ungarbled institutional network of communications. This responsibility role is supported by Richardson and others:

The role of the chief executive officer, while obviously altered by the participational structure, still retains significant influence because of centrality within the communications net and because of the continuing responsibilities for relating the needs of internal constituents to the board of control and to the larger community. The same statement cannot be made about mid-level administrators who may be bypassed whenever issues of serious consequences arise.¹

The reasons for communications are many but could be succinctly described as being necessary for total educational improvement. It is felt that proper communications in a multi directional pattern is necessary for efficiency in a hierarchical organization if the organization is to move and prosper.

Leavett observes, "Communication is a primary tool for effecting behavior change."²

QUESTION V. WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE INSTITUTIONAL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM?

The Iowa community college presidents, in the discussion of this particular role, illustrated their feeling of

¹Richardson et al., Governance for the Two Year College, op. cit., pp. 156-157.

necessity for a strong institutional-community relations program in many ways. They belong to and participate in many organizations. They indicated a real awareness of the need to keep the public informed as to not only what they are doing but why they are doing it, and there was indication that most of the presidents were seriously considering a staff member assigned to the task of keeping the community informed about their community college.

Of course the public media has been a most influential contributor to the image developed by an institution. It is the day-to-day activities of the institution that are described to the public that mirror the college in the eyes of the public.

It is the feeling of writers in the field that a successful public information program must have the cohesion and can only be attained through the direction of a single individual who has the primary responsibility in this area. Most writers indicate that it is quite important that the president be accessible and closely attuned to the workings of this information office:

A failure of the chief executive officer to make himself available, to provide information concerning his position on relevant issues, will lead to speculation which can be far worse than any information he might have provided.¹

¹Richardson et al., op. cit., p. 43.
Supporting Richardson's position that an administrator, even though an information office and staff does exist, must coordinate and again provide leadership in such a program, Brawer indicates, "A liaison between administration and some public relations office must exist so that the community and outside sources related to the college are distinctly aware of the precise institutional goals."\(^1\)

Richardson again speaks to the importance of a public information office by pointing out that it is essential that the institution provide information about what it does in the context designed to present its purpose. Far too many institutions run the risk of misinterpretation because they provide too much information about what they do and not enough about why it is being done. Many times animosity between the college and other agencies exists because of a lack of foresight to explain the reasons for procedures being carried out and the relationship of these procedures toward the fulfillment of the institutional goals.\(^2\)

The active participation by the president in community activities and organizations provides a good feedback loop through which the college can see and hear their institution

---


\(^2\) Richardson *et al.*, op. cit., p. 44.
through the senses of others. The local chamber of commerce and the various service organizations tend to provide a cross section of the leaders and middle class segment of the community but many times the public media is the only contact other than students the group that is not active in community affairs will have.

The president can never overlook the tremendous force that the staff can exert in keeping the public informed as they, too, touch different sections of the community. Again, the president is called upon to come forth with positive leadership in the intra-institutional communications program in order to gain optimum benefits and effectiveness in the institutional community information program.

It is highly unlikely that the president can perform poorly in one area and be successful in the other. Thornton encourages the use of members of the faculty when he asks the president to:

Encourage all members of the faculty to consider themselves as interpreters of the college to the community; he may request subordinate officers and staff members to attend board meetings as resource persons and observers. In the final analysis, however, the president himself represents the community junior college to the board and to the public.¹

There seemed to be agreement by the authors in not only the importance of the community relations role of the

¹Thornton, op. cit., p. 128.
president, but also in the manner in which such a role should be conducted. Monroe states:

The administration must always seek to bring the message of the college to the public in such a way that the public will support the college. A positive image is very necessary if the college is to attract students and public financial support. Therefore, administrators need skills in meeting with and speaking to the public. As in working with students and faculty members, personal charm and attractive appearance are definite assets for administrators. Often, the only contact the public has with the community college is through the meetings and conversations of the administrative staff.

Monroe's statement was unknowingly paraphrased by one of the presidents interviewed for the study as he stated in part:

I think that when I appear in public, whether or not I am officially representing the school, I am still viewed as the president. I believe our conduct, both formally and informally, is indicative and reflective of the kind of image that people form of us. In other words, if our appearance is sloppy, they think of the institution as being sloppy.

Hefferlin and Phillips are more pointed in their review of the need for adequate information in communication when they say:

One reason for administrative troubles lies in inadequate information and communication. Without communication, coordination is impossible; without information, institutions are inconceivable. And with the growth of colleges and universities into

\[1\] Monroe, op. cit., p. 312.
huge organizations, their need for information and communication has become urgent.\textsuperscript{1}

They further discuss channels of information useful for the institution and point up a very interesting observation about informal communication channels. They maintain that informal communication channels are unavoidably parochial but that most formal channels are unnecessarily impersonal to the point of being unresponsive.\textsuperscript{2}

None of the authors or the respondents deny that communication is imperative for organization. Without communication, organizations cannot function. They require an organized means of collecting and sharing information concerning the specific institution. Hefferlin and Phillips again speak to the responsibility of communications in the institution thusly:

\begin{quote}
But above all, it demands the example and attention of the college president himself. Of necessity, he must exemplify the pattern of communication for the institution. He himself affects its operation more directly than anyone else. Increasingly, his is the responsibility for assuring that communications take place.\textsuperscript{3}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1}J. B. Lon Hefferlin and Ellis L. Phillips, Jr., Information Services for Academic Administration (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971), p. 2.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 5.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., pp. 31-32.
\end{flushright}
QUESTION VI. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE IN INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

Leadership and change agent could best describe the feeling the presidents had of their role in institutional development. It is recognized that, "The president must ultimately accept responsibility and be accountable for bringing about educational changes in his institution. The setting is right for him to be the leader."¹

Griffiths supports the change agent concept of the chief administrator. His research has shown that change in organizations frequently comes from the top down.²

Christopher Jencks has also observed that most college administrators are extremely sympathetic to curricular innovation. However, it will not happen itself.³

The president must be seriously and actively concerned with the educational efforts of his college and will no doubt so organize the institution so that trusted experts can assist in fulfilling the educational objectives of the institution. There must be a direct relationship between the teaching and learning process, thereby necessitating the involvement of an instructional staff member. However, the process of establishing this relationship lies largely with

¹Cohen and Rouche, op. cit., p. 24.
²Griffiths, op. cit., pp. 524-536.
the college president.¹

It befalls the president to accomplish this end according to his expertise, style, internal and external influences. It is his responsibility to move and develop the institution and task oriented administrators would justify the means by the end. A memorandum written by William Raney Harper in 1904 and which was found after his death illustrates his keen perception of the need for developing the institution, but also deals with the human relation aspect of institutional development long before some of the human relation experts published their theory. Harper reflected:

When all has been said, the limitations of the college president, even when he has the greatest freedom of action, are very great... in educational policy he must be in accord with his colleagues. If he cannot persuade them to adopt his views, he must go along with them. It is absurd to suppose that any president, however strong or wilful he may be, can force a faculty made up of great leaders of thought to do his will. The president, if he has the power of veto, may stand in the way of progress, but he cannot secure forward movement except with the cooperation of those with whom he is associated.²

¹Brawer, op. cit., p. 68.
QUESTION VII. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ROLE YOU PLAY IN THE LEGISLATIVE MATTERS CONCERNING THE AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF YOUR STATE AND LEGISLATIVE MATTERS THAT SPECIFICALLY AFFECT YOUR INSTITUTION.

Very little literature was found that spoke specifically to this question. However, it is almost a certainty that with increased participation of the financial support of the community college by the legislature, with the total state-wide public employees bargaining law, with state offices for affirmative action and civil rights established, and with the need for legislative action concerning a plan for higher education within the state, interaction between community college constituents, legislators, and other politically powerful groups will increase.

An example of the legislative attention the community college is attracting is illustrated in the 1970 session of the California legislature. The office of the Chancellor of the California community colleges prepared an analysis for more than eight hundred bills which concern education and other subjects that were of special interest to community colleges. Some two hundred of these measures received close attention and were supported or opposed with testimony and efforts to voice community college concern. With this kind of attention, it is obvious that state legislators will be getting into the nitty-gritty of college operations, and this participation is no doubt justified. Many feel like they should call the shots as representatives of the people
on all issues. As to how far this legislative input will penetrate is only a matter of speculation. Will it be salaries, will it be determining faculty load, will it be describing curriculum?¹

One can only guess, but it is inherent that with increased legislative attention, the president again must come forward with the leadership that is required of his institution, or of the group of institutions in the state, to provide the proper information to his board, or in many cases to legislative committees that will enable them to make a proper determination on the vital issues.

Richardson does not speak to the specific role of the president, but he does state that it is naive to assume that higher education is non-political. All public education has become fair game in the political arena, even the community college districts have highly charged political elections for trustees, and in most cases the trustees, and many times even the president, is selected on political rather than educational grounds. It is essential that elected officials form a vital link between the college, the community and state and national agencies, as frequently the college will need assistance of political figures if it is to achieve objectives. Moreover, one cannot ignore another facet of

¹Gleazer, Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges, op. cit., pp. 128-129.
political affairs, that of a tendency to use power tactics to achieve political, economic or educational advantage.¹

Moore speaks a little more precisely to the role of the chief administrator in the political arena. He acknowledges that a community college does exist in a public and a political environment. He advises presidents to have immediately available such items as number of registered voters in his district, a political district and precinct list comprising the college service area, the names of the senators and congressmen, the state senators and representatives, the city council members or aldermen, committee men and committee women, precinct captains, and other political participants. He also suggests that the president should develop a handbook with not only the above information but names, political parties, office and home addresses and telephone numbers, occupations prior to election, and any people who might act as contact persons to the politically powerful. The administrator should be knowledgeable of the community by being aware where the political headquarters are located, where meetings take place, and make notes of any facts that might be used to an advantage at a later date.²

¹Richardson et al., op. cit., pp. 40-41.

²Moore, op. cit., pp. 150-151.
It would appear that as one reviews literature on this subject in the next few years, one would find more specific role responsibilities of the administrator and how they apply to the legislative and political forces within his institutional district and state.

QUESTION VIII. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INSTITUTION IF YOU WERE THE ORIGINAL PRESIDENT. IF YOU ARE NOT THE ORIGINAL PRESIDENT, YOUR ROLE IN REVISIONS AND CHANGES IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE WOULD BE APPRECIATED.

This question was asked in an attempt to determine the president's role in determining the administrative structure of their institution. The administrative organization is a most important element in determining the clarity of the division of labor as well as the clarity of the flow of communications.

The administrative organizational structure, as outlined by the State Department Rules and Regulations, expresses a bureaucracy with a hierarchical framework very similar to the traditional educational institution. The bureaucracy, according to many administrative theorists, is the most efficient form of administration:

Because experts with experience are usually best qualified to make technically correct decisions, and because disciplined performance governed by rules and coordinated by the authority
hierarchy fosters a rational and persistent pursuit of organizational objectives.

It is the responsibility of the chief administrator to so organize and administer this structure so that the central purposes, goals and objectives of the organization may be fulfilled to the optimum. It is leadership in this dimension that Peter Drucker identifies as the most important quality of management needed to improve efficiency:

One of the things we know is that when the chief executive is not able or willing to give his main attention to the central purposes of the organization, but is either forced or willing to spend most of his energies on something that is not the main goal, then the organization is not viable. It will decay because it will lose its creative energies. It will lose leadership. It will lose its abilities to seize opportunities. An educational institution is not under quite the same market pressures as business, but that only means that its death is slower and more painful, yet just as inevitable.

The clarity of the organizational structure will allow the executive to spend his energies on the main goal and not create a situation such as the one described by Drucker. Gray speaks to the absolute necessity of clarity in organization as he says:

\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
The administrator should see to it that all members of the faculty and staff know exactly what their duties and responsibilities are. Often there is a vague understanding with the consequence that there is overlapping and duplication of effort. He should be sure that each member of the staff and faculty knows the person to whom he is responsible. This involves clear-cut understanding of the administrative lines of authority and responsibility.¹

Bogue echoes Gray as he indicates that a chart of organization and administration should be made and widely published so that all persons in the hierarchy understand with a high degree of clarity their responsibilities and duties.²

Bogue, in speaking of the sample administrative chart found earlier in this chapter, indicates that it is offered as a suggestion only and will have to be adapted to the uniqueness of the specific institution. This statement is supportive of the hypothesis that most organizations reflect strongly the characteristics of the organizational manager as well as the internal and external influences that are powerful relators to the organization.

The manner in which the administrative function is organized and staffed may be quite different from one institution to another, but all colleges must have administration,


according to Monroe. He further states:

One of the weaknesses of the administrative structure of a particular community college is often the imitation of some other college's administrative system. Each college should develop a tailor-made structure to fit its needs. Such details as the titles of administrators, the number of administrators, and the division of labor among the administrators, should be decided by the local college and its board.¹

Griffiths, in his discussion of the organization, states that:

All administration takes place within the context of an organization—the organization is construed to mean an ensemble of individuals who perform distinct but inter-related and coordinated functions in order that one or more tasks can be completed.²

QUESTION IX. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE AS IT RELATES TO THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES OF YOUR INSTITUTION.

There is very little written concerning the role of the president as it relates to the physical facilities of the institution.

It would appear that the situation and the person in this situation might be the biggest factor in determining the amount of time spent in the support function involving lands and buildings.

Thornton, discussing lands and buildings, states

¹Monroe, op. cit., p. 310.

that school administrators, particularly in growing cities, must plan ahead to provide adequate sites for educational endeavors. This is particularly difficult in a city where the acreages are subdivided and where land costs are skyrocketing at a fantastic rate. The problem is also intensified by the fact that there are minimal land requirements as designated by state legislature or the state governing branch of education. The community college parking space for student, staff and visitor parking is always a critical issue. The utmost foresight is required on the part of the president and the board if the building and land facilities of the community college district are designed and constructed to conform to the educational needs.¹

After land is acquired and buildings are built, it is the unique situation indeed where the chief administrator has direct responsibility to the physical aspects of the community college. In most cases it will be delegated to a business manager or a superintendent of buildings and grounds. This person will be responsible for preliminary analysis of new site needs, building requirements, for the maintenance of existing buildings and equipment, for the procurement of supplies and equipment needed in the instructional program, and for the transportation of students and faculty, if any is

¹Thornton, op. cit., p. 125.
needed.\(^1\)

Although the literature was quite limited specific to this question, one would assume there was a high degree of correlation in the thinking of practicing administrators as well as the writers in educational administration as to their actual role as it relates to the physical facilities of a particular institution.

**QUESTION X. DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN PLANNING, BOTH LONG RUN AND SHORT RUN, AND ROLES AND OBJECTIVES OF YOUR INSTITUTION.**

The literature of higher education does not greatly aid the community college administrator engaged in planning and development; the decisions called for in traditional college and university planning are different from those faced by community college planners. In the absence of appropriate help in the literature, community college planning has tended to be stereotyped, with presidents and governing boards often willing to consider alternatives to the proven model—the medium sized, suburban campus, built on a large acreage. Planners do not prepare adequately for the decisions they should make and are poorly informed of the options open to them in each decision area.\(^2\)

Knoell and McIntyre also observe the community colleges have changed so much in the past few years it is necessary for planners to consider new options and new alternatives and not be led by traditional colleges and

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 129.

programs. They underscore a most salient point as they recognize that plans must be adapted to the now declining enrollment, to the dwindling financial resources for higher education facilities and programs, to changes in student preferences and attitudes, changes in social needs, to trends in student financial need, and to problems involved when students who are minors are enrolled away from districts of their parents residents. ¹

The spectacular growth in the community colleges in recent years has been a deterrent to planning in that oft times student needs, characteristics, life styles and interests were ignored in an effort to meet the crush of new students that were arriving on the scene. ²

Knoell and McIntyre have developed six themes they feel have relevance for a planning group in that they indicate an approach that can be useful for all kinds and levels of community college planning and development. They are:

1. The basic nature of community college planning for the next several decades should switch from the facilities emphasis of the 60's to an emphasis on increasing access.

2. The notion of a comprehensive community college should be modified and give way to that of a comprehensive community college education.

3. Education should be for multiple, adult roles.

¹Ibid. ²Ibid., p. xii.
4. Comprehensive community college education requires more time, more options, and more outcomes.

5. Access must be made easy.

6. To be effective, community college planning must be comprehensive, academic, fiscal, and physical planning must be conducted together, and federal, state, and local-institutional planning must be integrated appropriately.¹

Although planning is given a significant position in the writings of management and educational leaders, it appears that Knoell and McIntyre are the first who have written specifically in any great length of planning for the community and the community college. The literature does not describe who the planner is, but it can be assumed that the responsible educational planner in the Iowa community colleges must be the chief administrative officer. The tasks and responsibilities of this educational planner are many and in the case of the community college president, even though he must have substantial feedback and input, he must, as with all the other roles, assume the primary leadership responsibility. The specific role of the president-planner has been described by Koontz when he says:

> A president needs time to reflect, to think, to plan. Particularly in the time of such rapid change as now envelops us all, the present and future status of any college must be seen in the broad context of all higher education. The chief executive must take time to read about major issues and shape

¹Ibid., pp. xiii-xvi.
up the framework of his mind. Some men seem moved by every new wind and whim. Others seem unmoved by anything of recent date... No college president can afford to be unmindful of current transit thinking and expression and where his own institution fits in at all, but he should not drink down all he hears without some thought as to the applicability of these ideas to his situation. This requires time, but the alternative is decline or death.

Indeed, the task of the educational planner is not a simple one, and it is the belief of this writer that a responsible educational planner in any situation faces a moral imperative:

He must have the courage to allow for marked increases in unit costs when he computes the financial price of reaching bold future targets for educational expansion, especially when these are coupled with a policy for improving quality. To assume that costs per student will be held at a standstill by far-reaching economy producing innovations still to be introduced is to indulge in fantasy. Such fantasy can produce a further decline in quality; it can dangerously mislead higher authorities and the general public, and be followed by disenchantment and cynicism.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, recognizing the planning dilemma, devoted a program segment of the 1974 convention to the subject of Planning Problems of a Small Community College. At this


2Coombs, op. cit., p. 51.
forum, seven interdependent levels of decision making, each requiring long range planning for any degree of effectiveness, were identified. They could serve as a planning model for most community colleges. They were:

- **a. Philosophy:** The educational needs of society
- **b. Objectives:** The role of the particular institution
- **c. Programs:** Instructional and research programs, and service activities
- **d. Organization:** Administrative, academic, and service functions, positions and their relationships
- **e. Staffing:** Numbers, kinds, and qualifications of people
- **f. Facilities:** Numbers, kinds, and location of facilities, and
- **g. Financing:** Determination of the operating and capital funds required and plans for attainment.¹

Joseph P. Cosand has long been recognized as a giant in the field of community college administration. His lengthy and broad experience qualifies him to speak with a high degree of reliability. He places, in summary, a good portion of the literature written about community college planning and more specifically the role of the president in the planning scheme:

Community college leaders cannot bask in the glory of greatly increased enrollment for the past twenty-five years. Our job now is to plan intelligently and cooperatively in order to achieve our goal which is the stated philosophy and objectives of our numerous and potentially great institutions. There is an urgency. If we do not act aggressively, this planning will be done for us by those who have their own beliefs and biases which may differ markedly from the comprehensiveness which we have advocated among ourselves for many years. Who is to plan for and decide the future of our hundreds of institutions which are the hope of millions of our adults and youth? As we enter a new era of employment, cultural, and social needs, it is our responsibility to see that the planners and the decision-makers do understand the role we play, and do realize that we intend to be a forceful part of the totality of post secondary education.¹

QUESTION XI. PLEASE DISCUSS INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, HOW THEY WERE DEVELOPED, HOW THEY WERE UPDATED, HOW THEY ARE USED, THEIR AVAILABILITY TO STAFF AND THEIR ACTUAL INFLUENCE ON THE OPERATION OF THE INSTITUTION.

It is recognized that the approval of institutional policies is a responsibility of the total board. It is also recognized that clarity and validity of these policies greatly influence the effectiveness of the president. It is for this reason that the president must be concerned about institutional policies and their relevance toward the official operation of the institution.

Official policies are many times viewed as something that is passed by the board and administered by someone else. As it is the president's duty to act as the executive

officer of the board, he must become involved in policy and procedure development. In order to insure that the institution is free to fulfill its mission, board members need to form a concept of what learning means in terms of their policies because, without doubt, they will be called upon by numerous groups for interpretation or justification of the policy.

Richardson, et al., speaks to the importance of carefully developed and well written policies when they say:

The existence of written policies and procedures governing board action and relationships among internal constituencies and with the board is extremely vital. Properly utilized, the development and periodic revision of such policies can be made a major source of inservice education for the board.1

It is the president, then, as the executive officer of the board, that must be responsible for the development and periodic revision of said policies. The president must not only be responsible for the development and revision of policies, but:

It is the president who will do much to interpret board policies to the public, the students, and the faculty. It is the president who must assume leadership for the development of means and programs for the execution of the board's policies. In a sense, the president becomes a symbol of the community college board and its powers.2

---

1 Richardson et al., op. cit., p. 49.

2 Monroe, op. cit., p. 309.
QUESTION XII. DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AT YOUR INSTITUTION.

As a result of the popularity, the burgeoning enrollments, the local and state support during the past ten years, community colleges have been less aggressive for outside sources of funding than any other segment of higher education. However, the situation has now changed and the community colleges find themselves facing the same problems of state control, rapid acceleration of costs and general fiscal insolvency that are facing other institutions of higher education.

It is as a result of this competition for outside funding sources, and because the community college movement has been recognized by the federal government that many community colleges are employing a staff member who operates throughout institutions under many titles, but might be called the director of resource development.

The presidents of the community colleges, in assuming the role as not only the educational leader but as the fiscal director as well, are responding to the pressures for competition for available funds and are establishing offices to tap specific heretofore untapped sources. The target areas for these new monies for community colleges are primarily (1) federal funds, (2) foundations, and (3) private and alumni giving.

Marie Martin of the U.S. Office of Education, in
speaking of federal support to the junior and community colleges, stated:

Because growth has been so rapid and absorbing, junior community colleges, along with other segments of higher education, have turned to the federal government for assistance. The federal government has heard the pleas for aid, and has responded with laws, financial assistance, and advice.¹

Sharing in support of the junior community college movement was Elliot Richardson, then secretary of the office of Health, Education and Welfare, in his address to the American Association of Junior Colleges in March, 1971, when he said:

It is abundantly clear that your institutions is where the action is in higher education. You represent the major institutional innovation in higher education since World War II. . . . You have been the principle responsibility for delivering on our social commitment to provide meaningful higher education opportunities to all who seek them.²

In spite of the apparent support for the community college segment of higher education at the federal level, the two year colleges do not fare well in the competition for funds, particularly those that are not exclusively reserved for the community colleges.


The Carnegie Commission report recognized the need for financial support for the community colleges when they stated:

The need for broader financial support for community colleges is critical. They are faced with reductions in federal appropriations, financial stringency in many of the states, and an increasing reluctance of voters to approve increased property taxes for the support of community colleges. Furthermore, the development of the community colleges has lagged in low income states and some of the states with sparse populations. It has also lagged where there has been inadequate provision or no provision for state financial support of community colleges.¹

The prominence of this presidential role is aptly described by Rauh in this manner:

If there is a single characteristic common to all institutions of higher education—large or small, public or private—it is the never ending struggle to develop financial resources equal to the demands of the program. It is a struggle which preempts much of the time and energies of the president and his staff, and of the board, as the president shares with it his frustrations. I know of no one who thinks that the magnitude of the problem will diminish with time. Further, the problem has no general solution.²

QUESTION XIII. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN THE SELECTION OF TOTAL STAFF.

Throughout the interview, the college presidents emphasized the importance of recruiting of good staff members that


were compatible with the institution, its goals, and its objectives. Community colleges were faced with recruiting their initial staff during the height of the teacher shortage. This, coupled with the fact that they were a new institution, made recruiting anything but routine. Administrators often recruited teachers from high school, and this, of course, affected the kind of teaching force at these colleges. As the institution aged, and the organization stabilized, there was a more clear picture of the exact kind of people the community college wanted. The criteria became more clearcut. However, since the institutions are now undergoing change and revision, the criteria for choosing staff might not be so clearcut. Regardless of the situation, it could well be that teacher selection is most critical to the success of the institution. The exact role of the individual president varies from institution to institution, but the responsibility still remains in that chair.

Thornton explicitly states:

One of the most important tasks of administration is the careful selection of teachers. In the final analysis, the classroom teacher is the embodiment of effective college curriculum. He is the most important employee of the college. The administrator who fails to choose a good instructor, fails.¹

Speaking to the total responsibility of the administrator in the employment of effective staff, Brawer proposes:

¹Thornton, op. cit., p. 122.
The administrator in charge of hiring other administrative personnel should himself know people and understand the various roles and functions intrinsic to the education profession. He must be able to hire, for example, deans of instruction who will in turn provide leadership in a manner consistent with the institutional goals. In cases where administrators and faculty are employed through vast bureaucratic systems, the opportunity to exercise option may be tenuous. It is important, however, that good people be selected to man our educational organizations and that the highest officials in the junior college have opportunities to act in employment situations.

Assistance for administrators who have the responsibility for selecting a faculty for a community college was given in the form of a panel during the American Association of Community and Junior College meeting at which time the panel identified five factors that should be considered when selecting a faculty for a community college:

**Factor One.** Competency as a generalist. The faculty member should possess competency as a generalist in his discipline. His teaching required him to go no further than the second year of any undergraduate program. Frequently the highly skilled specialist has forgotten the basic assumptions of the discipline which frequently are questioned by the beginning student at the freshman level.

**Factor Two.** Competency in a second discipline. The faculty member, in addition to being a generalist in his discipline should show evidence of competency in a second discipline. This flexibility is required for survival as a faculty member in today's fluid market as well as providing flexibility for scheduling.

---

1Brawer, op. cit., p. 68.
Factor Three. Experience in fields other than teaching. The typical community college student tends to be extremely pragmatic in his reaction to instruction. He respects success in the real world rather than success in graduate school. In occupational programs, of course, the faculty member must have experience in that particular occupational area.

Factor Four. Adaptability to environment. The faculty member who takes a position at the community college will find himself in an environment other than the university prototype. Both the instructor and the spouse must be willing to adapt to the environment.

Factor Five. Negative experience. It is generally not practical to hire a staff member who has had long high school or university experience. The secondary approach, and conversely not the university approach, translates readily to the philosophy of instruction needed at the community college.¹

QUESTION XIV. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN THE EVALUATION, PLACEMENT, PROMOTION, AND DISMISSAL OF STAFF.

Literature relating to this question could be found on each of the topics. However, literature specific to the president's role in each of the criteria was not found in a search by the writer. The president's role in each of these processes would be described by the organizational structure and would illustrate such a variety that it is this writer's opinion that authors do not choose to speak this specifically.

On the heels of the concern for institutional

accountability and in the midst of the popularity of management by objectives program, literature did reveal a great deal of interest in the evaluation process, not speaking specifically to the role of the president. Evaluation, as it was discussed by the presidents interviewed in the study, closely parallels the concepts of evaluation as described by various authors.

Cohen and associates discuss in great detail practices of faculty evaluation, discussing evaluation forms that can be used and teacher evaluation on the basis of ratings by their supervisors and colleagues, evaluation by students, and, of course, self evaluation. He points out advantages and pitfalls of each form of procedure and postulates that student gain might quite possibly be the ultimate criterion for evaluation.¹

The trustees have formed an Association of Community College Trustees and have planned and conducted their own meetings through this organization. In association with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and statewide association, the group collectively has begun to study issues that are critical to the community college endeavor. Accountability, thereby involving evaluation, particularly in the areas of instruction and development, was

one of the initial subjects for review, hence resulting in
the development of a paper speaking to this specific subject.

Evaluation plays a most important part in professional development, first as a tool to determine
growth needs for each professional, and second to
determine the effectiveness of the professional development program undertaken.

The key to successful staff evaluation seems to relate to the underlying reasons why individual colleges establish evaluation. If established for punitive purposes, evaluation is something to be afraid of and to be avoided at all costs. If viewed as an assistance or developmental program, evaluation can be used to set new needs for professional development. In general, there tends to be four broad types of weaknesses or needs for development, recognizing the many variations within each type:

1. The need for increased knowledge within the individual's special field.

2. The need for increased ability to perform the specific duties of the position, whether teacher, counselor or administrator

3. The need for broadened overall knowledge and understanding of related fields or practices.

4. The need for desirable personal characteristics and attitudes.

Through good evaluation procedures, plans for professional development should evolve.

Evaluation of the individual development project, when completed, should refer back to the original needs and objectives. Some questions to be asked might include:

How well have the project objectives been met?
Does the project meet the needs it was intended to meet?
How is the program perceived by peers and administrators?
Can others benefit from the experience?
What is required for widespread dissemination of information or implementation of the results?
Has a final report been filed on the project?

The answers to these questions will allow for sharing of rewarding experiences as well as poor experiences.¹

It is from participatory experiences such as these that general models might be established that would provide some degree of uniformity in the process but also allow the uniqueness of each institution and administrator to manifest itself.

QUESTION XV. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN MAINTAINING CONTACT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION AND THE IOWA COUNCIL OF AREA SCHOOL BOARDS.

The role of these two organizations was discussed earlier in this chapter and by virtue of being specific to the State of Iowa, no literature could be found other than models from other states that were not germane to the State of Iowa. This question would provide an interesting area to pursue in years to come as centralization at the state level occurs.

Gleazer states that community colleges will not be left alone. As the budgets increase, this expanded figure will attract more than local concern. As enrollments and

costs go up, the search funds increasingly leads to the state level and the state wants to know what it is getting for its money. He further states that the legislature has little desire to deal with community colleges, a point that could be questioned by some of the presidents in the State of Iowa, but he continues to qualify by saying that the legislature will look to a state agency as its point of contact. This, in essence, has been done in the State of Iowa with the Department of Public Instruction acting in this role. He then poses what might be the most crucial issue as he recognizes:

The quality of that agency will be of critical importance in maintaining a constructive tension between local and state forces. State-level leadership is required which has high respect for the capacity of the local institution to identify and respond to community needs, a leadership which exercises its authority more through persuasion than through regulation and seeks a full discussion and involvement by those who are affected by policy determinations. ¹

QUESTION XVI. DISCUSS YOUR CONTACT WITH STUDENTS, FORMALLY AND INFORMALLY, HOW STUDENTS ARE USED IN CAMPUS GOVERNMENTS AND DECISION MAKING, THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT IN YOUR INSTITUTION, STUDENT ACTIVITIES AND STUDENT RECRUITMENT.

Although some literature is found that speaks directly to the role of the president as it relates to the students of the institution, most of the literature deals with the role

of the student on the college campus and the part they should play outside the regular class activities in government decision making and critical input roles.

This literature is helpful as from its review the president can make an analysis of his own institutional climate and determine how the institution may better involve students in keeping with the needs of the total institution. The fact that the overt student demonstrations of the sixties have by and large been discontinued, and student activism is not as prominent on most college campuses, should not dim the impact that the student should play in helping determine some educational experiences on the campus. Alvin Toffler states, "The student-consumer is forced to fight to make the education industry responsive to his demand for diversity."¹

Some administrators might feel that Toffler has overstated the situation, but in any case the fact remains that students, as the product of the institution, can provide input that will be valuable in the accomplishment of many of the educational objectives. It is recognized that, for administrators to include students to assist in making competent decisions that will lead to actions is not a particularly easy task. Bolman illustrates the difficulty of such

a task when he reports:

One gifted administrator, in working on the curriculum and other aspects of a brand new college, used students from other institutions to help him... only to have his thinking classed as antediluvian by those students. But I do see that a greater knowledge of and preparation for working with the students must be a part of creative administration today. At all levels of education, the generation gap must be closed.¹

The Iowa community college presidents expressed concern that apathy and conformity has impregnated the attitude of the community college student, but recognizes that the community college student is a different type student by the fact that many of them commute and hold part or full time jobs. However, this situation should not indicate to the administrator that he can abdicate his responsibility of attempting to involve students in whatever manner that might be most effective and useful.

Thornton supports this feeling as he states:

Some officer of administration must bear the primary responsibility for helping to organize the student government and for advising the student officers in carrying on their responsibilities and associated functions.²

Supporting the fact that presidents must determine precise operations of their institution according to the internal and external factors, Simonsen offers this

¹Bolman, op. cit., p. 181.
²Thornton, op. cit., p. 125.
I feel that the specific relationship of a president with his students should depend a great deal upon the factors such as size of the school, size of the staff and student personnel services, and the personalities involved. Not the least of these is the personality of the president himself. I don't think anyone can say, "this is the way it ought to be." What will work for one president will not necessarily work for another.¹

The community college student is not a typical student. The administrator must learn that the community college student possesses many unique qualities with more heterogeneity being found among the community college student populous than any other college student group.

Moore indicates that the profile of the community college student is atypical of students in higher education as a whole and the administrator must be aware of these characteristics. He defines these characteristics, which delineate his varient student population as the apathetic and complacent, the rebellious, the idealistic, and the confused. Moore indicates that students expect the community college administrator to be cool under fire and be able to give and take in formal and informal rap sessions. They expect him to have a personal stand, have the integrity and

the guts to proclaim it. He further recognizes that the positions and decisions of a good administrator do not necessarily correspond to his personal persuasion and that students will not always agree with him, but in the end they will respect him if he maintains his position with integrity.  

---

1 Moore, op. cit., p. 10.
Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

It was the express purpose of this study to accomplish something that to the knowledge of this writer has not been heretofore accomplished, that is, to provide information about the role of the president in the Iowa Area Community Colleges. It is most essential that as the area community colleges of the state are called upon to provide a myriad of post high school training programs and courses, the chief administrator has some conceptualization of the role that is demanded in this position. This chapter will describe the method used by the investigator to elicit the information necessary to initially recognize the roles of the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges.

SOURCES OF DATA

All of the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges, with the exception of the writer of this study, were to be used as the principle resources. Their responses to interviews, questionnaires, and requests for other data would be used as the base information for making the initial role determination. Cogent literature to the specific role functions used in this study was sought and obtained from a wide variety of sources including the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges, the Association for
Community College Trustees, the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, and the libraries of various colleges and universities throughout the midwest.

THE STUDY

Sixteen role categories were identified by the investigator as a president of a community college as areas that, for the most part, when placed together, would comprise the majority of the functions that make up the job of the college president. These roles were taken from an initial list of some forty types of categories, with the final list coming from literature from the above described sources, from conversations with incumbents in the presidential offices, and from the writer's observation of presidential roles based on thirteen years experience in the junior and community college field.

A determination at this point in time was made to identify specific roles and not involve characteristics or qualities of good managers such as leadership and decision-making, and to entwine these characteristics into the study as they appeared relative to the specific role categories.

PROCEDURE

Upon the completion of the identification of the sixteen role categories, the fourteen Iowa community college presidents that were to be used as principles in the study,
were contacted as a group at a monthly meeting of Iowa Area School Presidents. This meeting was held April 5, 1974, and at this time an overview of the study was presented to the presidents, their cooperation solicited, and obtained.

The presidential responses to the sixteen role categories were verbal responses and were obtained through telephone, electronically recorded interviews. It was felt by the writer that the personal candor and comments expressed by the presidents were more desirable than a structured, inflexible form that would not allow a new dimension heretofore unanticipated to become a part of the study. The presidents were advised of the interview procedure, that the conversation would be taped, and that the responses, when used in the report, are presented anonymously.

To make more effective use of the interview time, and to allow the presidents an opportunity to review the role categories prior to the interview, an interview form was developed outlining the specific role categories and sent to the presidents in advance of the interview.

Simultaneous to the process of working with the fourteen Iowa area community college presidents, two community college presidents from Illinois and two from Missouri were contacted and asked to participate in the study in the same manner as would the Iowa community college presidents with their role being that of providing interview experience for the investigator prior to the interviews taken from the
sources to be used as a base for the study. In essence the community college presidents from the two outlying states were to be used as field testors. These presidents were selected because of their availability and willingness to participate in the study, with the taped personal interview with the two presidents from Missouri occurring during the North Central Association annual meeting in Chicago, March 25 and 26, 1974. One Illinois president was personally interviewed in his office on the return trip from Chicago, with the other Illinois president being interviewed by telephone, as would be the Iowa presidents.

The participants in the study were each contacted by telephone to establish a time and date schedule for the actual interview as well as to answer questions that might have arisen after the receipt of the interview form. The first interview took place April 18, 1974, and the fourteenth interview was completed on May 6, 1974. The interviews ranged in length from thirty-five minutes to sixty-eight minutes, with the original tape being held in existence until the completion of this report. Then came the long and arduous task of making written transcript of the interviews, this transcript resulting in over 350 pages of edited interview.
OTHER STUDY DATA

Using the same activity categories, the same sequence as followed in the interview, the questionnaire was prepared and sent to each of the Iowa community college presidents with the presidents being asked to respond to each of the role categories on the basis of annual percentage of time spent in each of the sixteen roles, and a percentage of annual times they perceived should be spent in each of the sixteen roles. This form can be found in the appendix of this report. All of the presidents responded promptly and the information obtained from this segment of the study is included in this study.

During an interview with one of the out-of-state presidents, it was suggested that the study might be enhanced with the addition of another survey instrument, that being a form that would permit one to sixteen ranking for each of the categories on the basis of importance of the role as perceived by the presidents. A copy of this form can be found in the appendix. This form was given to the Iowa college presidents at a monthly meeting held June 7, 1974. The completed form was promptly returned and the results are found in this study.
PREPARATION OF THE PROJECT REPORT

The results of the "is" and "ought" questionnaire, as well as the ranking questionnaire, were hand tabulated, the results of which are found in Chapter 4. The results of the interviews from which the base of this study is formed, was handled question by question through exhaustive editing with portions of the interviews inserted in the body of Chapter 4 that were determined germane to the study. Tables, or descriptive diagrams, were interspersed through the report rather than totally in the appendix. They are placed in this manner in an effort to make them as convenient to the point of reference as possible. All locations of tables and descriptive diagrams are found in the index.
Chapter 4

THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT

AN ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data presented in this chapter provides some insight into the community college president's personal views of his role and responsibilities as they relate to the institution.

As each college district is unique in many respects, so are there areas of similarity. Both of these situations are manifested by the presidents as they discuss their role as the chief administrator, and their perceptions and practices in carrying out this role.

Specific data included are: results of interviews with Iowa community college presidents, the percentage of time spent in each of the sixteen roles used in this study, the percentage of time needed to be spent in each of these categories, a ranking in order of importance of the sixteen categories, and educational and personal characteristics of the person who occupies this chair.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT--

BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

In the early planning stages of this study, the decision was made to include in the actual body of this study the data and responses from the fourteen community college
presidents that are the chief administrators in all of the community college districts in the state with the exception of the one administered by the writer of this study. Two out-of-state presidents from Illinois and Missouri each, were surveyed in the same manner as the presidents from Iowa, however, the out-of-state presidents interviews and their responses were used as validating materials only and were very helpful in giving the writer experience in interviewing and collecting information needed for this study.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE PRESIDENTS

Total Number of Months in Present Position

Data collected in this segment of the study show that the community college presidents in the Iowa area schools had occupied that position from eight to ninety-six months. The specific number of months were: 8, 10, 30, 32, 36, 41, 48, 72, 84, 92, 93, and three for 96 months. These figures show that the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges have occupied their positions for an average of 60 months.

Previous Position

A study by Raymond E. Schultz indicates that a shift has occurred in the source of community college presidents. In this study there was no attempt to determine whether or not this same shift was indicated in the presidencies within the State of Iowa, however, in the recollection of the
men who formerly occupied these positions within the state, one could certainly assume that more of the presidential incumbents have had previous experience in an institution of higher education than was evidenced in the past. Schultz's study indicates that a lesser percentage of community college presidents came directly from elementary or secondary positions in 1967 than was the case in the period from 1952 to 1962 and, as earlier stated, one could assume this was the case in Iowa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Position Held (^1)</th>
<th>Percent by Period of Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by Type of Institution</td>
<td>1952-1962 ((N = 265))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public:</td>
<td>26.0 (N = 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private:</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary or Secondary</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>All Institutions:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Past previous positions of the Iowa area school presidents are:

**Public Schools**

a. Superintendent of Schools 3
b. Director of Personnel 1

---

Two Year Community Colleges, Vocational-Technical Institutes

a. President or Administrative Head 2
b. Dean of Instruction 2
c. Director of Arts and Science 1
d. Director, Vocational-Technical Education 1
e. Administrative Assistant 1
f. Business Manager 1

Four Year College or University

a. Dean 1
b. Research Assistant and Instructor 1

Academic Preparation of the Presidents

Highest degree earned. The respondents indicated that four held Master of Arts degrees, one the Educational Specialist degree, four the Doctor of Philosophy degree, and five, Doctor of Education degree.

Academic Institutions from Whence the Degrees were Obtained

a. Colorado State University 1
b. Duke University 1
c. George Peabody University 1
d. Iowa State University 2
e. Northeast Missouri State University 1
f. Purdue University 1
g. State University of Iowa 2
h. University of California, Los Angeles 1
i. University of Kansas 1
j. University of Northern Colorado 1
k. University of Northern Iowa 1
l. University of South Dakota 1

Areas of educational concentration. All the presidents but one included in this study indicated that the major area of study in their graduate program was educational administration. One president indicated a specialized area of vocational education administration. The one
president that indicated an area other than education declared his graduate major to be mathematics.

**Undergraduate major.** The responses indicated that the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges were quite diverse in their interests at the undergraduate level. The undergraduate majors as reported were:

a. Business administration  
b. Business education  
c. Economics  
d. Engineering  
e. General science (2)  
f. Industrial education  
g. Mathematics  
h. Music  
i. Political science  
j. Social science (3)  
k. Speech

**Major areas of the Masters Degree.** By the time that the incumbent president had completed the first graduate degree, the desire to enter an administrative field had begun to manifest itself as twelve of the respondents obtained masters degrees in administration, one in guidance, and one in mathematics. In an attempt to get a clearer picture of the academic background of the area college chief administrators, the participants in this study were asked to report the total number of graduate hours in educational administration. The range was from six hours to one hundred semester hours, with the average number of semester hours in educational administration being 45.64.
Experience of the Area College President

Number of years experience at the elementary-secondary level as a teacher. The range in the responses to this question was from one year experience to sixteen years experience indicating that the community college presidents made their decision to enter administration fairly early in their educational career. The mean years of classroom experience was 6.64.

Number of years experience at the elementary-secondary level as an administrator. The responses in this case indicated a wider range than in the former, with the range being zero to thirty-five years. Two of the respondents indicated that they had had no previous experience as an elementary-secondary level administrator. Mean years of experience in this case was 10.6 years.

Number of years in higher education as an instructor. The range in this category was zero to five years with nine respondents indicating no years experience as an instructor in higher education with the mean number of years being .94. A year in this case is referred to as an academic year, or nine months.

Number of years employment in higher education as an administrator. The range in this category was six to thirteen years experience. Two presidents indicated six years experience, three indicated seven years experience. Seven
indicated eight years experience, two indicated thirteen years experience, with the mean years experience being 8.25.

There was no attempt to correlate these averages with national averages, but were included in the study to better form a profile of the persons that occupy the chair of the president of the Iowa area community colleges.

THE INTERVIEWS

The findings as a result of the interviews with the fourteen incumbent presidents of the Iowa area community colleges as they spoke to the sixteen role categories, are as follows:

QUESTION I. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE AS PRESIDENT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO YOUR BOARD OF TRUSTEES

It was generally felt by the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges that the president is the executive officer to the board of trustees and that he is responsible for the total operation of the institution. This position is supported by the Iowa Code that states in part, under Section 5.3 (280A) when it describes the duties of the community college president:

The superintendent (president) . . . shall be the chief administrative officer of the area community college operated under the jurisdiction of a merged area board, and he shall be the executive officer of that board. The superintendent shall be the responsible for the operation of the area community college with respect to its educational program.
its faculty and student personnel programs, and the use of its facilities.¹

Although the general feeling of the responsibility of the president to the board of trustees was in the main very similar to and coincided with the Iowa Code, the presidents expressed their role in board relationships in numerous and interesting ways.

I am not a dominant factor in governance or molding the board, but I do consider myself an educational leader for the board. I like to be a democratic leader and I work for 100% agreement with my board.

From that low profile, lesser degree of control position, another statement was:

I am the primary agent of the board as far as operation of the college is concerned. Ideally I would spend at least a significant portion of my time dealing with the board activities, educating the board, informing the board, reviewing board policies, evaluating them, (meaning the policies) and this sort of thing.

A slightly more oligarchic position was expressed by a president who shared:

I am the executive officer of the board, I prepare all agendas and all information for them. Anything I want them informed on, I will send it to them in writing. Very seldom am I in contact with the board members or the board president unless it is a case of getting something signed or to discuss some particular issue. I would imagine that doesn't come up over once every three months. It is my feeling that you are the executive officer,

¹Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Area Schools Division, Selected School Laws and Standards, Specific School Laws Relating to Area Schools (Revised, Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1972), p. 13.
and you are in the position to make the decisions. That is definitely the case here. I make 99% of the decisions.

A more unique feeling of the board-president relationship was expressed by a president when he stated, "I consider myself the board in that I am an extension of the board, and the board and I better stand together or else we won't stand at all."

All of the presidents interviewed felt that they were comfortable in their working relationship with the board. All of them thought that there was a good positive relationship between the president and the board. However, three or four were a little more positive about the president-board relationship in stating that a very fine working relationship was shared by both the board and the president. It was obvious in the conversations with the presidents that there was complete agreement that within each institution a structure of administration and a structure of governance should be in evidence. Writers in the field of higher education have long noted what they termed, "a dual procedure for making decisions," i.e., a structure for administration and a structure for governance.

Communication

To the man, each of the community college presidents expressed concern about his effectiveness in communicating with the board. Various thoughts were expressed and methods
attempted. One of the most common was a weekly bulletin to
the board advising them of the weekly happenings. In most
cases the organ was referred to as an "Update." Seven of the
fourteen Iowa presidents interviewed indicated that a board
Update bulletin was sent to the board members weekly. One
president, in reviewing the contents of his weekly report
to the board, described what he referred to as, "my best
mechanism for keeping the board informed." This plan, in
essence, listed the ten major institutional priorities, or
institutional objectives. The most recent objective identi-
Fied occupies the tenth spot, and through the developmental
stage, this objective moves its way to the number one posi-
tion. The president feels this is an excellent way to keep
the board informed of the institutional objectives as well
as appraising them of the progress that is being made toward
the completion of these goals and objectives.

Six of the fourteen presidents interviewed stated
emphatically that they feel that keeping the board fully
informed is one of their primary functions, but in keeping
the board informed properly, another problem becomes inher-
ent, that being the problem of the board members taking the
time to read the literature that is prepared and sent to
them by the president.

One president who said he "floods" the board with
material indicates that board apathy is one of his major
concerns.
It is logical that direct communication between the president of the board and the president of the institution would come with much greater frequency than would communication with other board members. As this segment of communications was discussed, three presidents indicated they communicated with their board president rarely, two weekly, four twice weekly, and five often. When queried as to the meaning of often, description was given as daily and oftentimes several times per day. One community college president indicated that the board of trustees president many times initiated communications and was a frequent visitor to the school. This president indicated he was happy with the situation and felt that the better informed the president, hence the board, was, the less misinformed they would be. However, the president did acknowledge that there was a feeling in the community and among staff members that, "the board president might be running the school."

Board Structure

Nine presidents indicated that their board operated as a committee of the whole and if there was need for special committee attention, an ad hoc committee would be appointed by the president of the board and immediately disbanded after the task was fulfilled. Of this group, one indicated that many ad hoc committees were formed throughout the school year and one indicated that ad hoc committees
were rarely formed throughout the year. One school indicated that an ad hoc committee was never used in their board structure and if there were special considerations that needed to be taken before board action, the college president would review the condition, make formal submittal to the board as a whole, and the board as a whole would respond. Five presidents indicated that they had a standing committee structure within their board framework, and in all instances the presidents indicated that they were quite happy with the structure. The standing committees that were appointed by the various board presidents were committees for bills and statements, faculty and staff welfare, buildings and grounds, legislative action, educational concerns, long-range planning, buildings and sites, budget and finance, and personnel. Statements made by the presidents that would describe the feeling for each of the types of board structures are:

I have worked with both types of board arrangements but in the past several years I have worked with what I call a committee of the whole. It has been my experience that when you have board committees there is a great possibility of building animosity between board members.

We do not use subcommittees of the board. It is in the philosophy of the board that the board should act as a board as a whole.

We prefer having the committees being informed of action which the board should take approximately one month in advance, so we have complete and detailed committee meetings. Our committee meetings get fairly lengthy and we usually start the committee meetings an hour before the board meeting,
but our board meetings do not last more than an hour. Our committee reports are given one month and board action is taken the next month. The need for a long board meeting is diminished because the committee has made a recommendation based on exhaustive research. I want the board per se on top of the material, not digging into every little item--because they hired an administrator to do that.

Our board seems to prefer a committee structure, and I, as a president, definitely do. If a board member can stand up in lieu of the president and make a recommendation, the recommendation is usually accepted without much problem.

One president indicated that he felt that it was much easier to "get things done" as he had a tendency to use the board committees to achieve the goals, purposes and objectives of the institution. This president also felt that he had a deeply involved and a deeply concerned board as a result.

Primary Concerns

One would have to conclude, as a result of the interviews with the college presidents concerning their role and its relationship with the board of directors, that there was not any single issue that was a cause of great concern to the presidents. Some of the objective comments concerning a board-president relationship centered around such items as:

1. The board needs to be able to delineate between governance and administration.

2. There is a need to acquaint board members with their responsibility in becoming a board member as well as a
desire of each board member to practice ethical boardmanship. This comment was made specifically with regard to the line of communications that must be followed up and down the organizational chart, and that an individual board member, in making comments concerning school matters, should not be identified as speaking for the total board.

3. There is a constant concern about communications with board members so that the board would be aware of situations within the community college district.

It was also apparent that each president was appreciative of his board of trustees' willingness to invest in him the executive authority as outlined by the law and also as necessary to operate the college in an independent, effective, and efficient fashion.

QUESTION II. WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE BUDGETING PROCESS OF YOUR INSTITUTION?

As one reviews the general fund expenditures of the Iowa area schools for fiscal year 1973 and notes that the total general fund expenditures for that fiscal year totals $45,090,174, or an increase of $4,415,650 from the previous year, it is apparent that some person or group of persons in the area schools must occupy a position of au courant.1

1Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Area Schools Division, "Annual Report, Iowa Area Schools--Fiscal Year 1973," (Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1974), p. 6.
Section 5.3(1) 280A, in defining the legal obligation of the area school president, states:

The superintendent (president) shall be responsible for the operation of the area community college with respect to its educational program, its faculty and student personnel programs, and the use of its facilities. He shall delegate to the directors all the necessary administrative and supervisory responsibilities to insure efficient operation of the institution.

This identifies rather clearly that the president has plenary responsibility in the area of fiscal accountability. In the same section of the code, item 3, under the duties of the business manager, it states:

The business manager shall perform the functions of the financial accounting, record keeping, and reporting, and he shall implement decisions of the administration relative to budgeting.

The interviews with the area school presidents indicated that each of the area schools had a person in their administrative structure who was directly responsible for the preparation and administration of the budget. The various levels and the degree of input expressed by the president in the budget making process was quite different, however.

All of the area school presidents expressed real concern at the lack of money that was available for educational

---

1Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Selected School Laws and Standards, p. 7.

2Ibid., p. 13.
programs in the area schools, and a large percentage of them stated that inadequate financing would be one of the top two major concerns when reviewing the entire Iowa area school picture.

In the review of the prime role of the chief administrator in the budget making process, the role of decision maker would be paramount. Herbert Simon, many years ago, in speaking on decision making, indicated that, "Men approach most decisions with the goal of satisfizing rather than optimizing."

Simon's observation of a decision maker could not ring more true in the case of the area school administrator and his role in the budget making process. When asked this question, some of the responses were:

I feel very strongly about this role. I feel that the chief administrator must keep his finger on the pulse of the purse. If he doesn't, he is not in charge and is not giving educational leadership. However, I believe in much involvement, beginning with the classroom teacher up through department chairmen, supervisors, directors, and in the end, the business manager. I rely very heavily on the input from these people. ¹

Another president shared this feeling:

My role in the budgeting process of my institution would have to be considered very very strong, very involved. As a matter of fact, I consider that one of my most important roles within the

operation of the institution. I am actually the quarterback of the budgeting process. I work very closely with my business manager, but I consider him my agent in this process and I pretty much give directions and pretty much generate the assumptions. My business manager works up time tables, details, etc., but I make all approvals and am involved in the projections of revenue and that sort of thing.

Another president lent his perceptions in yet another way as he described the process of working with staff in determining a budget that would fit within available income, and then proceeded to state:

In the future, I hope to base our financial needs on an educational program specifically based upon a competency based and life-long learning prospect. In other words, I hope that tomorrow's budgets will be prepared and worked from the bottom up, not from the top down. Most of us today work on our financial matters as, this is how much money we have, and how are we going to squeeze it into all of these little cubicles? In the future we are going to have to raise such questions as, what are our specific needs, our educational needs, what is it going to cost per student, what are our priorities? We are going to have to go to the general public, the legislature, etc., to get additional monies in order to do these things if we believe in them.

All of the presidents but two indicated a very high degree of personal involvement in budget making. Moreover, they, as well as the two presidents who are not as highly involved in budget preparation, indicated a high degree of staff input into the total budget making process. Again, all of the presidents recognized the constraints encircling the area schools and recognize that their position many times must be that of the final decision maker. One president lightly identified his final role in the budget making
process as the "budget butcher."

In all instances where the income does not match the expenditure expectations, the president, with the aid of the business manager and affected staff, establish priorities for expenditures and these priorities are taken back to staff before final budget determination is made.

In an illustration of the "top to bottom" process of budget building in the Iowa area schools, all presidents were emphatic in the need to determine income before expenditure items are even approached. It was felt that only by accurately predicting income could valid priorities be given to expenditures. This again indicates the top to bottom planning for budgets that occurs when inadequate financing is felt by the chief administrator.

As one administrator stated, "I feel as though we are being called upon to do more and more with less and less."

Lay Committees

To date, none of the area school boards or presidents have involved lay study committees in budget preparation and determinations. However, two of the area school presidents recognized this as a possibility. In any case, the interest and participation by the citizenry will be on the increase year by year. Harold Spears speaks to this when he says:

As costs have gone up, so has direct public participation in school operation. The citizen's
ever increasing school tax bill has been his license to participate openly and forcibly in public school affairs, to advocate this and that and to oppose that and this.¹

That the presidents realize the critical need for extremely sound and prudent budget preparation and management is obvious. Even though the degree and level of involvement of the president varies greatly, there can be no doubt that all of the presidents occupy the position of final authority in the preparation of the budget, in the recommendation of the budget to the board, and of budget management as the budget becomes operative.

QUESTION III. WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN STAFF SALARY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS?

Even though the presidents included in the survey spoke specifically to the role that they now occupy in staff salary discussions, it was obvious throughout the interviews that the presidents felt that their role would be changing greatly as a result of the public employee negotiations bill that was at that time either in the legislature in the form of an introduced bill, was being debated by the House, or had been passed and was awaiting the Governor's signature to become law. This bill was referred to as Senate File 531

and was an act relating to public employee relations.

In reporting the role of the presidents of the area community colleges, the writer will report the reactions to the questions as originally stated and also the presidents' observations as to their role in the future now that Senate File 531 is a reality.

As one might anticipate, the roles of the presidents throughout the state varied considerably with relation to their degree of involvement in staff salary discussions throughout the year. It is somewhat significant that the presidents did not at any time express concern that the staff was demanding and receiving an unfair amount of money appropriated for staff salaries. To the contrary, they expressed concern that the very limited budget would not allow either the administration to recommend or the board to approve the allocation of monies for staff salaries that were felt adequate.

It is difficult to generalize concerning the president's role as there were literally as many different types of roles in response to the query as there were interviewees. Therefore, in order to give an accurate description of the roles as perceived by the presidents and to illustrate the real importance of the style of the individual in fulfilling this role, annotations from most of the respondents will be presented.
Involvement

Each of the presidents interviewed is deeply cognizant of the fact that salaries and fringe benefits occupy anywhere from 68 percent to 80 percent of the total institutional budget. Therefore, the determination of salaries is the first priority before establishing the final budget for presentation to the state and to the taxpayers of the district. The individual responses and comments concerning this question is in no way in order of the numbers of the school districts or in the order the interviews were conducted, so only the respondent himself might identify his response in the reading of this material.

"Coordinator and resource person" was a description two presidents gave of their role in staff salary discussion, decisions or recommendations. In both cases the faculty has a staff salary and welfare committee. The faculty committee, after reviewing the budget with the aid of budget figures presented by the president's office, makes a recommendation to a board committee. The board committee, in essence, has followed the same procedure as the faculty committee in that they collected budget materials from the president and/or the business manager's office. Both groups, then make recommendations to the total board. Then, as one president described his role, at this point, "the two groups and I then negotiate. I try to find some little ground which both groups can agree on."
Two presidents acknowledged that they, "played too heavy a role." In one instance the president and the business manager conducted numerous negotiation sessions with the salary welfare committee of teachers as well as the entire group of teachers. This president has the responsibility for describing in detail the budget and the amount of money available for consideration of staff salary increases. This president did not feel that his direct role in negotiating with teachers created problems with staff or administration and he definitely felt that the staff viewed him as a representative of the board.

The other president that indicated he was highly involved in the process had a somewhat different procedure in that the staff salary welfare committee, after considerable work and input on fiscal matters from the business manager, then brought the recommendation to the president. At this point the president approves or disapproves and the faculty committee then makes a decision whether they send it on to the board without sanction of the president, but to date this has not been done. The faculty committee then goes back to work and resumes the process of bringing their proposal to the president for final approval. When questioned as to the board's role in making the final decision, the president indicated that the board would only make a decision based on his recommendation. "In the end, I make the final recommendation to the board."
One president, in describing his more participatory role, indicated that he first makes an analysis of the budget with input from staff and administrators. He then makes the decision as to how the money will be distributed among certified, non-certified and administrative staff. He also makes recommendations at this point as to the method of distribution, i.e., an across the board grant, a percentage amount, etc. The president and the salary committee then meet and confer and reach an agreement with the president holding the final decision making position. The president then goes to the board with the joint recommendation. The faculty or committee of the faculty never meet with the board. This president indicates that he finds this method to be most effective and saves a great deal of time. He also acknowledges, "This method will come to a screeching halt with the passage of Senate File 531. I won't be at the bargaining table or even be involved."

To a slightly less degree of involvement, one president responded to the question by stating:

I am involved more than I want to be. The board wants me to take more responsibility than I should. If I wanted to, I could call all of the shots concerning salaries as far as the board is concerned. The board relies on me for all the answers and this is a difficult position for the president as I have a feeling it strains relations with staff since negotiations are always an adversarial type situation.

A somewhat unique situation was described by the president who had at one time occupied the position of
administrative assistant. In that situation, the administrative assistant was responsible for being the administrative liaison between faculty and staff in salary negotiations. When this individual was appointed president of the institution, this portion of his previous role was attached to his presidential job description through mutual request from staff and board. This president acknowledges that as a result of his previous role, he continues to carry a much higher profile in staff salary negotiations than he desires.

I used to do it all. As a matter of fact, I did all of the staff salary negotiations up until this year. With Senate File 531 becoming a reality I realized that this could no longer be my role. Now, in an attempt to prepare staff, second and third level administrators, and board with the condition that will be existing within a very few short years, I have had one of my second level administrators occupy the leadership role in staff salary negotiations with me making the final recommendation to the board.

Throughout the conversations with the presidents concerning their role and staff salary negotiations, there was constant reference to being in the middle, and even some recognition that the passage of the collective bargaining bill (Senate File 531) might more clearly define the position of administration, making for a less role-personality conflict situation. The dilemma felt at this point in time by the chief administrator in salary staff negotiations, is a perfect example of what Jacob W. Getzels described in his model for the analysis of a social system. Getzels describes role conflict in his model of the social system as
contradictory expectations held by members of the same group for someone in the role of power, authority and responsibility. ¹

Four of the presidents described their role as being very similar in that they themselves did not become directly involved with staff, but rather only as the central office is called upon to provide information that would be beneficial in determining amounts of money that might be reasonable to expect for staff salary increases. In two cases the business manager was the person who was identified by the central office to meet directly with the staff committee and supply them with information that they requested. The administrative assistant was identified in the other two instances. In no case was the central office representative in a position to make recommendations or to give opinions as to the direction the staff committee should take in preparing their salary requests for board action.

The remainder of the presidents maintained a very low profile during the staff salary procedure. It was apparent that this group was attempting to place the board in the position of being responsible for making the final decision on staff salaries and also to place the staff in the position

of being accountable and responsible for the requests made to the board of trustees relative to staff salaries. As earlier indicated, with the professional negotiations bill being so prominent in everyone's thinking at the time of the interview, the presidents were very helpful in indicating their feeling as to how their role would change July 1, 1975, the effective date for Senate File 531.

It is appropriate to indicate that collective bargaining is probably not as good nor as bad as it is pictured by its protagonists or detractors. It is not and cannot be a panacea to solve all faculty problems. In addition, it is an event that should not necessarily be feared by board members and administrators. It is the law; it will be a reality in many institutions of higher education, and should be faced in a light which will allow the procedure to function in a manner which will best serve the student and the institutional public.

While discussing collective bargaining during the interview, the presidents were unanimous in their opinion that the governing board should establish a negotiations leader in the form of a person other than the president. It was felt by all that it would be impossible for the educational leader and manager to sit across the table in an adversarial position and still hope to maintain any type of educational dynamics and leadership within the institution.
There were varied opinions as to which staff member might be the bargaining representative of the board. In most instances it was felt that a non-instructional administrator such as the business manager, would quite possibly be the logical person to serve as the chief negotiator for the board of trustees. The presidents also expressed the feeling that negotiations with staff should be viewed as a task of the board, not of the administration, so that the purpose of the educational process within the institution will not be impeded.

The title of Director of Employee Relations was mentioned frequently and even though this title was unheard of in most educational organizations a few years ago, it is now appearing with some frequency in college organizational charts. In searching literature for a more precise definition of the areas of responsibility of this newly formed position, it was found that the four broad areas of responsibility of the Director of Employee Relations can be classified as, (a) preparing to negotiate, (b) being management's chief spokesman at the table, (c) administering the negotiated contract, and (d) directing the total management-employee relations program.¹

When the writer asked the presidents specifically what they anticipated their role to be in the negotiations process, again there was unanimity in the response that they, along with the president of the board of trustees, would act as strategists for the entire session and would serve as active members of the backup team. The backup team in this case was described as the group doing the planning for the process and defining parameters within which the director of employee relations, or a like person, could operate.

One can conclude from the responses to this question that the role played by the president in years past will be altered greatly in future years. All of the presidents agree that Senate File 531 has already changed their role in the salary determination process. The general feeling of this group is that the president will be a resource person to both groups but primarily responsible to the board for the administration of the policy decisions made concerning salary and fringe benefits.

QUESTION IV. WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE INTRA-INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM OF YOUR COLLEGE?

It is quite possible that the efficiency and effectiveness of the total organization might depend a great deal on the effectiveness and efficiency of the communications system within the organization.

The presidents spoke to both the formal and informal
types of communication within their systems. The formal
communication system is largely determined by the organiza-
tional pattern or the formal organizational chart of the
college. The informal communications system, many times,
is one of indeterminable nature, origin and effectiveness.

There was specific concern about the informal pat-
tern of communication and concern was voiced frequently about
not having a model to expedite two-way communication.

The most common methods of intra-institutional com-
munications were faculty meetings, student meetings, presi-
dents meetings with mid-level administrators, and, in turn,
mid-level administrators meeting with staff members, articles
in student newspapers, and periodic bulletins released from
the office of the chief executive.

Of major concern for most presidents was the appar-
ent breakdown in downward communications at some level below
the president's office. Several of the presidents expressed
the feeling that if they wanted to insure communications
from the chief administrator's office, the communication was
sent from their office directly to the party desired to re-
ceive the communication.

All the presidents, with the exception of one, felt
that they were doing a reasonably good job in attempting to
provide communications to the entire staff.

There were several unique types of communications that
appeared to be working rather effectively. One president
issues a daily bulletin at 3:00 P.M. containing all activities for the following day. This president felt this was the single most successful communication in which he was currently involved or that had been attempted in the past. Staff members as well as students looked forward to the three o'clock bulletin that could be found in strategic areas in the student center or on bulletin boards.

Another unique approach, but again one that is apparently rather effective was a dinner meeting of the entire faculty twice yearly. At this occasion the president, in essence, speaks to the entire staff on the state of the institution.

A college council approach is being used by one president. This council is an eighteen-member group made up of six administrators, six teachers, and six students. An agenda for the college council meeting is sent out a week in advance of the meeting. Any of the groups represented on the college council are encouraged to send specific concerns or questions through their representatives to the council as a whole in regular meetings. It was felt that this system encourages participation and minimizes a condition whereby particular interest groups feel that they are not represented. An interesting point concerning this arrangement is that any decision that can be made by administration will be made on the spot. If it is the type of problem that requires
board action, a time schedule for presentation to the board for action will be given to the group.

A president of a multi-campus institution indicated a real problem in communicating with equal effectiveness to two or more campuses. In situations such as this, the president maintains a regular communication flow through the dean, or the chief campus administrator. In this instance, the president meets with the dean weekly to discuss the type of information that should be disseminated back to each campus. This institution also publishes what is referred to as a house organ, containing news sections from each of the divisions, i.e., arts and science, vocational-technical, student personnel, adult and continuing and non-certified staff.

One president expressed the feeling that upward communication could be improved by "being out on the campus more." His feeling was that if the chief administrator was visible and if staff had the opportunity to communicate informally, the upward communication would be more effective and more valid.

Two superintendents indicated that they almost never met with the entire staff of the institution, quite possibly once every two or three years. However, they did use small groups and sub-administrators to provide communication to the entire staff. One president stated, "My communication system is probably weak. I rarely communicate with staff on a formal basis, and just use the bulletin form of communications.
for special occasions."

The presidents each expressed a concern with the total communications program and recognized the need for continued scrutiny and the development of superior methods of intra-institutional communications resulting with communication occurring in all directions.

QUESTION V. WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE INSTITUTIONAL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM?

"A distinguishing characteristic of the community college is its intimate relationship with the community it serves."¹

The president of the community college must have more than a casual speaking relationship with the community that the college serves. He must be well acquainted and almost as essential as the administrator knowing the community, is the community knowing the administrator and the institution. The chief administrator must be constantly concerned with the impact of his institution on the people whom the institution serves. This impact can be translated as image and will, no doubt, make a difference whether the institution is tolerated or strongly supported, or whether it is merely adequate, or it maintains a high degree of excellence.

The context within which a college is viewed by its

constituency has the likelihood of becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy. If the community has an unfavorable impression of the institution, the idea cannot help but affect the faculty and their sense of self-worth and attitude toward responsibility. Students, too, are affected by the community and its attitudes, particularly as the college embarks upon a new program.

The chief administrator must recognize the need for educating the community before moving in the new direction. An institution will not become more than its constituency will accept and support, and it is the responsibility of the president to lead the institution in a manner that is understood and supported by the community it serves.

There are many types of influential groups within a college district and with whom the college must work. There are various political, civic, ethnic, social and educational groups and all with different degrees of influence and impact.

Community college presidents must comprehend the nature and behavioral patterns of these groups and organizations within a community if the college is to be an integral part of it.¹

Further support for the necessity of a successful chief administrator to recognize the relationships within a

¹Ibid., p. 38.
community is expressed in this statement:

The director of a community school must recognize there exists within the community a dichotomous relationship between what people express in terms of democratic beliefs and what really does exist. In our society we believe that schools are free from outside pressures, but in reality they are not. It must be recognized that these outside influences may be of value and service in developing a community school program. In fact, if many of these influential structures do not support the schools and the programs adopted to further an improvement in the social climate of a given community, not much will be accomplished. Knowing that these exist is not enough. The community school director must relate these outside forces to what is happening in the school and develop working relationships between himself and the various sources of influence. These interrelationships are essential to continual growth.¹

To the man, the Iowa community college presidents spoke to the critical nature of the institutional community relations program with awareness and encouraging a high degree of support for involvement by the president. In review of the various programs as identified by the community college presidents, it is evident that the presidents are not only keenly aware of the need for involvement in the institutional-community relations program, but are, in fact, highly involved. It is also evident that the presidents use themselves as relators to the community through various organizations. The membership in organizations is quite high and varied, with the presidents holding memberships in

organizations and agencies such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce, (in which many hold offices), Boy Scouts, the Library Board, Planning and Zoning, Industrial Development, YMCA, Sheltered Workshop, Churches, Masonic organizations, Elks, Country Clubs, and clubs pertaining to areas of special interests. A president described what might be felt by many of the presidents by saying, "I am a joiner, but not much of a participator due to the number of organizations to which I am expected to belong."

Specific Approaches

The most common approach of the presidents to deliver the community college word to the community was that of speaking to various groups and organizations within the district. One president indicated that he had in times past spoken to as many as fourteen groups per week, but that he now averages about three engagements a week. Several presidents indicated that they averaged over one speaking engagement per week, with one expressing the view that, "Speaking engagements can be quite a load, but I cannot think of a more important task."

Presidents who were with the college during its initial foundation stage indicated that the public engagement speaking demands were terrific with ten appearances per week not uncommon. It was also apparent that a president who had just been appointed to the job was also much more active in
speaking throughout the communities than was a person who was an incumbent for some time.

Another president, in speaking of the obligation of the administrator to appear in the community, stated:

I think that when I appear in public, whether or not I am officially representing the school, I am still viewed as the president. I believe our conduct, both formally and informally, is indicative and reflective of the kind of image that people form of us. In other words, if our appearance is sloppy, then they think of the institution as being sloppy. If you are inconsiderate, the institution is viewed as being inconsiderate. You are indeed a man on the spot, and I emphasize this with my staff, and I hope we are very sensitive to this. Our appearances, our attitudes, our manners and our conduct have a lot to do with how people feel about our school.

One president indicated that he was not asked to appear before groups nearly as often as he would have liked, and one president indicated, "I retain a very low profile. Our public relations staff does all of the speaking. They love to speak and they speak for me all the time."

In discussing the demands on the time of an administrator and the requirement of speaking before various groups, one president indicated that they were considering paying college staff to go out into the communities to speak. Another indicated that they split their administrative staff so that they could cover all of the requests and stated, "This is by design, and not accident."

Four institutions indicated that they had organized a formal speakers bureau, including all staff, and another administrator stated, "Public relations, or the process of
informing the public is a continual, ongoing process. It should be so consistent the public never feels that there is a big push on for some specific project."

All of the presidents indicated high use of the various media throughout the district. However, there appeared to be some discontent with the results and the coverage by the media. There was also expressed concern by the presidents of multi-campus institutions that it was difficult to express the total college concept to the campuses that had allegiance to specific programs or to specific communities. In the districts with singular campuses, the primary concern was that of relating the entire district to the total community college program, and tearing down the notion that the community college belonged to one city, that in which the campus was located.

**Public Information Office**

As the community colleges have grown in numbers and in programs, and as specific programs and institutional development have occurred, there has been an evolution of a segment of the institution that assumes the prime responsibility for public information, the Public Information office. As indicated earlier, an institution that fails to project a strong, positive image is quite unlikely to have much success in any developmental activities.

Only within the past few years has the decentralization of the responsibility for public relations material in
the community college occurred. The advantages of a centralized public information office are many with the primary advantage being that of accountability in that the direct responsibility for the program as outlined by the administration of the institution can be traced directly to the office or the individual.

Seven of the area community colleges in Iowa have at least one full-time person whose total responsibility is that of a public information officer, even though the titles vary greatly. Three institutions have a staff member that is assigned half-time duties to this endeavor. In the remaining institutions that have no regular staff assigned to this task, the deans, the directors, and the various departments are responsible for the formal media-type communications that are sent from the institution. In all instances, where a staff member is assigned on a part or full-time basis, this staff member reports directly to the president of the institution. This is not to be interpreted as meaning the president reviews all materials. However, it was evident that the president would review all major pronouncements and articles concerning policy, reports from board meetings, and most announcements concerning administration and governance.

The presidents reporting no formal department in community relations for their institution expressed a feeling of great need and a desire for this type of activity within the organizational framework and indicated the absence of
such a segment of their organization was due largely to financial incapabilities.

None of the presidents interviewed expressed the feeling that they were doing a good job of communicating with the constituency, leading one to believe that this role in the list of presidential roles and responsibilities, would have high priority.

The importance of the need to communicate with the public has been expressed by many of the educational writers of our times, and is succinctly described by one writing thusly:

Public information programs in many colleges have missed the emphasis that their importance would seem to warrant. While it is true that a good program will sell itself, and that nothing can sell a poor program, there are certain time factors involved that are of increasing importance. Many people who help support public institutions never come into contact with them directly, indicating a need for colleges to explain themselves and their services to the general public. In the absence of a carefully planned and methodically sustained program, institutions seem to respond only during intermittent crisis conditions. Unfavorable information in headlines result in a flurry of activities oriented to erasing the impression created (e.g., a tax issue is imminent so the public is flooded with information). ¹

The attitudes of the institution are formed as a part of exposure to the institution over a long period of time and, unquestionably, the best defense against unfortunate publicity

surrounding the institution can be attained by utilizing all media over a longer period of time. The importance of the institutional-community relations program was best described by an Iowa president when he stated, "A viable total program of public information may be the difference between the success and failure, not only of the president, but of the institution."

QUESTION VI. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE IN INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

This question spoke to both long and short-term projects, but primarily to program and curricular development. One has a tendency to assume that the president, or chief administrator, occupies a position of strict management and assumes the role of not being active in specific program and curricular developments. While this assumption may be true in part, the very nature of the community college being a part of a community or group of communities, with the president being the chief liaison man between the communities and the institution, would indicate that he would have some degree of input and provide some mobilizing force to program and curricular development within the institution.

The community college presidents in Iowa, in their responses to this particular quest for information, indicated that the assumption of the president or administrator held by many would not be true. Moore shares this idea when he
The administrator is a key figure in a success or failure of any developmental program. He is the liaison person between the program leader and the board of trustees, the community, the faculty, and others. He presents the budget requests and other proposals to the policy making body. Since every member of the board will not necessarily share his enthusiasm for compensatory education or the salvaging function of the community college, the favorable response of that body to the proposals submitted to it may well depend upon the administrator's support of the program.\textsuperscript{1}

He later states:

His influence can provide for the sustained attempts at success and a developmental effort or guarantee the immediate failure of it.\textsuperscript{2}

To a man, the community college presidents indicated a high degree of interest and concern about the individual programs making up their institution. The concern seemed to run at a higher level when the administrator felt that program review, change, innovation and expansion were not taking place. General comments surrounding this question, in part, were:

The president must be responsible for initiating program ideas if they are not generated through the staff. Many and most fine ideas come up through the staff, and this is ideal, but sometimes the president must "shake the bushes." It is this type of action that falls in our responsibility of educational leadership.

Another president expressing a similar opinion observes:

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 126.  \quad \textsuperscript{2}Ibid.
My role here is more one of motivator and direction setter. I seldom go to somebody and say, start such and such a program, or this and that course. I usually will work through encouraging the people to explore ideas and encouraging them to meet with advisory committees. I have taken a more direct role, however, in some instances, where I did not see action happening with the staff or at the department level.

For the most part, the presidents indicated that when they do have questions concerning various program areas or areas of expansion, they work back through the department head or a mid-level administrator, encouraging that person to provide leadership and technical expertise for the program development. One president stated:

I constantly seek out innovative ideas from faculty, coordinators, chairmen, deans, directors, and any other management types. Often, if I don't see the activity I desire, I push major projects directly from my office. Almost every year there is one major project I have to push to completion. Of course I do this only when there is sound evidence to insure that this project is needed. We do have curriculum committees, but they do not really generate the ideas for curriculum expansion to any great extent.

In the main, most of the program development was the actual responsibility of the coordinator or director working in that area. However, in two instances there was a person assigned as the coordinator of curriculum in the areas of change. One was identified as a student personnel services staff member and the other as a dean of instruction. In both instances a similar procedure was followed in the development of programs, that being the study of the philosophy of the institutions, the objectives of the institutions
and the program, and more importantly, a precise survey of the student needs with regard to the intended program. As soon as the preliminary steps were accomplished, then the actual program development would be placed in the hands of a person in that specific area.

Several of the presidents indicated that they reviewed curricula areas from time to time and if they perceived a weakness in any specific area, they attempted to stimulate action. Some specific responses to the question that would indicate some unique qualities within the area school framework were:

With multi campuses we have to depend on individual directors of specific areas (i.e., arts and science director, director of vocational-technical education, director of adult and continuing education). They, in turn, cooperate with the deans of the respective campuses, explore and recommend programs. I, then, make the final approval before the program request goes before the board for approval.

Another president expressed some degree of frustration with planning in general when he stated:

I expect my planners to do more than day-to-day or month-to-month planning. It is very frustrating for me to be working on next year's programs and I find my planners are working on this year's programs.

Another president stated:

I play a fairly active part in all curricular changes or development. I can take partial credit for all of our curricular changes, but not all of the credit for any of them.

Two presidents indicated that their role remained
substantially as that of an administrator when it was stated:

    My role is push, push, push. Then when the curricular proposal is presented to me, I say, then, here is the money, let's go.

and:

    I do very little other than arrange financial details for new and expanding programs as they are proposed. However, if I see areas of no action, then I really prod.

All of the presidents indicated that their institution had a structure for program development. Some of them were highly complicated, sophisticated structures, others left the program development responsibility with the department head or coordinator, with no particular administrative structure used, but in the end, they were unanimous in their agreement that they assumed two primary roles, that as (1) the stimulator of curricular and program development, and (2) giving final approval or disapproval to a program prior to its presentation to the local board and to the State Department of Public Instruction for approval.

Even though the primary thrust of the question was directed toward new programming, the more odious task of curricular change invariably crept into the discussion with the presidents. With the world facing tremendous change as is called to attention in publications such as Allen Toffler's Future Shock and with the community college being an institution that survives on change and the changing needs of people, it is a concern of the presidents that the developmental
aspects of the community college programs change to meet the needs of today's people tomorrow. Even in a new institution such as the junior college, there is still considerable concern from administrators, primarily presidents, over faculty members who view two or three years of fairly successful program operation as setting a precedent that will not require a program change during their tenure as a staff member. It is a truism that most people will resist change if it appears to be a threat and the areas of change that are not understood often cause fear and resistance. Consequently a most important task of the administrator-innovator must be to gain acceptance of the possibility of change.

The presidents were unanimous in the recognition of primary responsibility being their role in institutional development. However, the degree of direct participation varied greatly from one individual to another.

One would have to conclude that the president's role in curricular and program planning would, for the most part, be that of leading, probing, and stimulating, with the technical development occurring as a result of work done by personnel in a line assignment.
QUESTION VII. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ROLE YOU PLAY IN LEGISLATIVE MATTERS CONCERNING THE AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF THE STATE AND LEGISLATIVE MATTERS THAT SPECIFICALLY AFFECT YOUR INSTITUTION.

The legislative situation, at one time of very little concern to the community junior college, is now occupying a much greater portion of the community college associates' thinking, as well as their time. Roughly 30 percent of the income for the Iowa area community colleges is obtained through allocations approved by the legislature. The community college then, with its tremendous growth in enrollment, finds itself in a position of competing with the other institutions and agencies that must impress upon the legislators the value of their product.

As the problems of the legislature became more complex, it was necessary to either extend the length of sessions or have annual sessions. The Iowa legislature chose the latter. The area community colleges found themselves involved in legislative planning sessions throughout the year and, as with most new institutions, had neither the technical background, tradition, or resources to carry on what most people would identify as a viable legislative action process.

It has become evident that within the past three or four years the state legislature is moving away from placing huge amounts of money in graduate education and research. The universities, faced with the dilemma of fund cutting from both the state and national level, have become more
aggressive in their legislative endeavors. The Iowa State Legislature, also recognizing that Iowa is a state encumbered with many private four-year institutions, has assigned itself the responsibility of supporting these institutions in the form of state scholarship grants. The private four-year schools have a well organized legislative action body.

The area community colleges, in assuming a competitive position to the aforementioned institutions, are seen by some people, as facing an extremely difficult task in maintaining the amount of state support that would be necessary to maintain, develop and expand the programs at the area community college level.

Up to this point legislative strategy and programs have been planned by leadership from the Iowa Community College Presidents Association and the Iowa Council of Area School Board Members. The role of the president in legislation has never been described, and in most cases, has never been discussed. The boards of trustees, in occupying the position of policy-decision maker in matters such as legislative concerns, are the only groups that can legally determine legislative programs for the area schools. However, the input from the presidents has been a major factor in the development of the legislative programs to date.

So, what is the role of the president in this legislative endeavor? Writers of presidential political activity, for the most part, believe that college presidents should
express themselves on sensitive public issues, on issues of conscience, of fundamental moral values, and specifically on issues that influence their role as the educational leader of any institution. Hicks speaks to this when he states:

The college or the university president is a key figure in lobbying. He should develop his own style and stick to it. He should avoid over exposure and it is useful if he can be surrounded by an aura of integrity and sincerity and, in fact, appear a bit larger than life. He should never engage in half-truths or name calling. Legislators would like him to wear a halo. He should try with all his might to do so.¹

If this is the role to be played by the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges, it has not been and will not be identified as such in the near future. Until that point in time, it is essential that the area community college presidents operate informally and in their own style to help achieve a positive legislative result with regard to community college programs. They work pretty much without direction.

However, it appears in an analysis of the responses elicited from the presidents, that there is a balance of intensity of effort placed by area school presidents toward legislative matters, particularly in lobbying or personal contact.

All of the presidents indicated that they did maintain some form of contact with their local legislators. Five of the presidents indicated that they arranged a work session, a dinner, or a formal meeting with the legislative representatives prior to or early to the opening of the session. This was done to express felt needs concerning the area school legislative program and to speak specifically to some of the major areas of concern.

In categorizing the legislative involvement in three categories, low, average, and high, the writer finds the responses from the presidents placed in the individual categories very adequately describe the types of actions that one might find from administrators expressing the varied levels of influence on legislative persons.

Low Influence

Comments in this category were, "I feel very little role. I can call local legislators concerning some issues but I feel I have absolutely no clout out of our area."

Another president indicated:

I have quite limited contact. I work primarily through my board, as I feel the board members represent the taxpayers and the voters. Also, the board members are the decision makers for the area school and I act only as an executive person, so I do feel board members can carry a lot more clout to the legislature than can administrators.

A similar response was made:

I have only made contacts with legislators when asked to by the Executive Secretary of the Iowa Council of Area School Boards.
And another:

I believe that we should work as a team and so therefore usually do not make contacts with legislators unless I am asked explicitly to do so.

**Average Influence**

The president who has been classified as an average participant in legislative matters primarily acts as a result of a request from other committees or groups associated with the community college. A statement that illustrates this position was made by a president as he observed:

I contact legislators occasionally, but rarely if ever go to Des Moines to the legislature. I have another staff member who maintains most of the direct contact. Our board thinks that legislative contact is their responsibility, the faculty thinks it is their responsibility, so quite possibly we have a healthy situation.

Another response was:

We work very hard locally but the board does most of the work. The board makes all of the contacts at the state level.

**High Influence**

Several of the presidents function in keeping with the ideas expressed by Hicks and maintain an active legislative program throughout the session. Responses from presidents in this category were:

I am highly involved in the legislative matter. I make maybe as many as one hundred contacts with legislators throughout the session and make frequent trips to Des Moines. I work very hard on personal meetings with legislators so we can develop a face-to-face relationship. I feel that area
schools do not do enough "off-season" contacts. Legislators, even though they ask for input, seem to resent direct contact on controversial issues during the heat of a legislative session.

Another president expressed concern over the lack of coordinated effort at the area school level when he said:

I maintain a great deal of contact with legislators, however, our contact would have been more effective if we had had a more coordinated effort and could have worked for a mutual cause.

Another president indicated that he did a lot of work locally and was quite active in the Chamber of Commerce legislative committee:

We invite in representatives and senators weekly from our area and receive reports from them on happenings in legislature the past week. We express our interest and our concern over upcoming bills. However, I make very infrequent, if any, trips to Des Moines.

And another president who indicates he maintains high contact with the legislature, states:

I have had 100 percent open and easy contact with the legislative people of my area and I have good rapport with our federal legislators. We also have at least two dinner sessions a year with our congressmen to discuss issues that affect our area schools.

Other Areas of Concern

The majority of the presidents indicated very little contact at the national level other than when requested to do so by the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges, or the Association of Community College Trustees, both Washington D.C. based agencies. However, one president
of an area school in Iowa is quite active in legislation at the national level as he is a member of the legislative committee of the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges. Concern has been expressed on a national level from congressmen and senators that communication from community colleges throughout the United States is so limited that they are not knowledgeable on the real issues that are important to the community colleges.

Another major concern expressed by the presidents and alluded to in some of the earlier statements was what was expressed as, "A lack of unified direction for the area community colleges in the state." It was felt that there was not a clear and concise direction or method of establishing direction for the community colleges in the State of Iowa. Even though the various groups, i.e., faculty, directors, presidents, board members, are fairly well organized, there is no person or office at an executive level that has the responsibility for preparing, submitting, explaining, and legislative handling of issues vital to the community college movement.

It is the general feeling of the presidents that they must be given a more precise definition of this particular role. Until this direction occurs, the presidents will continue to operate as they now are, without coordination and largely as their personality, style, and interests permit.
QUESTION VIII. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INSTITUTION IF YOU WERE THE ORIGINAL PRESIDENT. IF YOU WERE NOT THE ORIGINAL PRESIDENT, YOUR ROLE IN THE REVISIONS AND CHANGES IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE WOULD BE APPRECIATED.

The intent of this question was to determine in some manner the role of the president in determining the administrative structure for his particular college system. There was no attempt to determine the type of structure in each of the systems as this endeavor would justify a study of its own.

The state, when establishing rules and regulations for the area schools and community colleges, defined the administrative structure and identified administrative positions. Even though there were different uses made of these particular positions along the administrative chart, one might assume that there was a great degree of commonality in the administrative structure and organizational chart in the early days of area vocational schools and community colleges.

The specific school laws relating to administrative structure and the community college state:

Administrative Structure "Each merged area board, subject to approval of the State Board of Public Instruction, shall, for each educational institution or branch thereof which it may operate, establish and staff an administrative structure consistent with the educational services offered. Each area community college shall have the following divisions with a director, responsible to the superintendent (president), for each such division: Vocational-Technical Education, Adult or Continuing Education, Education in the Arts and Sciences, Student Personnel Services, and Institutional Services. If additional
attendance centers are operated, a center director shall be appointed for each such center.¹

In attempting to determine the presidents' input and role in determining administrative structure, the writer asked the presidents to classify their role in organizational structure or revision as slight, some change or average modification, and radical. It is interesting to note that of the fourteen area school presidents, seven were the original presidents, being with the college since its foundation, and seven were non-original and in most cases either the second or third person filling that position. Each of the presidents indicated that their basic organizational chart had undergone gradual change, probably better described as transition. This gradual change, it was indicated, was due primarily to personnel changes with roles and assignments being adjusted to meet the strengths of the occupant of the new position.

In discussing the role and responsibility of the president in organizational change, one president indicated:

I am a firm believer in continual change in an organization. As an organization changes, so must its organizational framework, or unthinkable conflict is bound to arise. I feel that the president's role is the implementer in any organizational change. Of course, when an institution is

¹Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Selected School Laws and Standards, op. cit., pp. 13-14.
undergoing change, the staff feels insecure initially, but when they see the changes working and understand the reasons for change, they usually appreciate it.

Another president, when asked about the changes that had occurred in the structure in his institution, stated:

I completely changed the structure when I assumed the president's role, because it was basically the structure that cost the last president his job.

A president who was not the original institutional president, expressed his feeling about the organizational structure as:

The original structure of this institution has experienced considerable change down through the years. Many different organizational structures were tried which followed the general pattern originally recommended by the Department of Public Instruction and seemingly, all of these had one common fault. There was always a conflict between the authority and responsibility of the divisional directors (arts and sciences, career education, and adult education) and the campus directors. Finally in 1972, a new administrative structure was adopted which clearly places the campus directors in a direct line of authority directly under the superintendent.

In all cases the presidents indicated that the administrative model must reflect and accommodate the unique characteristics of the particular institution. A somewhat different reason for change was expressed by one president in a statement:

We started by accepting the basic chart that was set up by the State Department of Public Instruction. We have never fully implemented it because we were not big enough to start with. But we have found over a period of time in working with our consultants at North Central, that it was
not a viable system and that you cannot operate under somebody else's model, so we have changed it a number of times, quite honestly reflecting what North Central said you had to do if you wanted to be accredited.

Multi campus district administrators expressed more concern about an administrative structure they felt would adequately describe the true operation of the organization. The dilemma of the campus operation, and whether it should be operated as a multi campus single institution or the campus operate as a fairly autonomous institution under the central framework, were concerns that were voiced by the presidents of the multi campus institutions.

The recently passed collective bargaining bill, Senate File 531, was mentioned in three of the responses by the presidents as a reason for anticipating a radical structural change within the next year. It appears that the organizational structure in most of the institutions have described the three recognized dimensions of organizational structure and have been viewed as simultaneously being the authority structure, the communication structure, and the role structure. However, it appears that the community college district in future years may be confronted with several structural charts that identify each of the three dimensions so that all who work within the institution will understand the hierarchy in each of the dimensions. Victor Thompson describes the hierarchy as a system of roles as:
The roles of subordination and superordination---arranged in a chain so that role one is subordinate to role two; two is superordinate to one but subordinate to three; and so forth until a role is reached that is subordinate to no other role (but perhaps to a group of people, such as a board of directors or an electorate).

As indicated earlier, the presidents were asked to classify their perception of organizational change within their institutions as a result of their influence. Five indicated that the structure had undergone slight change, four indicated average change, and five indicated radical change. It is significant to note that the five indicating slight change, were all original presidents of that institution and five indicating radical change were not the original presidents of the institution. Of course two indicating average change were original presidents and of the two non-original presidents indicating average organizational change, one was relatively new on the job. It appeared that the presidents were quite concerned and aware of the need for constant review of the organizational structure. It was also quite clear that no one structure design would remain constant year after year. There was also no unanimity on the type of design that would be ideal for the area schools. The general feeling of the presidents can best be expressed as:

---

There is no ideal structural design. Appropriate design is contingent upon task, environment, people, and the state of technology. The ideal is adaptability and self modification much more than it is a fixed structure.¹

**QUESTION IX. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE AS IT RELATES TO THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES OF YOUR INSTITUTION.**

It is significant that of the fourteen Iowa community college presidents that participated in this study, eleven indicated that there is a building project currently ongoing in the community college district. From 1966, when very minimal amounts of dollars were invested and floor space allocated to the area schools, an annual report of Iowa area schools for fiscal year 1973 indicated that there is 2,403,608 gross square feet of buildings owned by the area schools with the value of fixed assets reaching $4,873,899 for land and $42,936,365 for buildings. The value of furniture, machinery and equipment inventoried for fiscal year 1973 totalled $19,974,889.²

When one views the total dollar value of the physical facilities of the area community colleges in Iowa, it becomes obvious that the presidents had to be highly involved in the facilities role. Even though a large percentage of the area


²Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Area Schools Division, "Annual Report, Iowa Area Schools," op. cit.
schools are currently involved in a building program, the
presidents indicated that there was no doubt that the general
building patterns of the Iowa area schools would slow con­
siderably.

Each of the respondents indicated that their insti­
tution did have a master plan, but with current enrollment
trends, it was necessary for the master plan to undergo
critical evaluation year by year. One president indicated
that the original master plan for his particular institution
was developed for a total full-time student enrollment of
12,000. He also indicated that the plan is now useless and
a new one must be developed for a substantially smaller en­
rollment.

All of the presidents viewed the master plan responsi­
bility as a part of their role as the president, and all
indicated a great deal of similarity in the approach toward
master planning for the institution. Basically this plan is:

1. Development of educational specifications by an
administrative team consisting of staff, administrators and
board members, and an educational planning firm.

2. The educational specifications are translated
into building need specifications.

3. Preliminary building plans are drafted and
brought back to the initial committee for review and change.

4. The final planning stage, by a committee, or by a
campus planning firm.
Throughout this whole process the president must play the role as leader and director. The president is also responsible for applying known budget figures to the master plan of the institution, indicating some concert between funding possibilities and the facilities needs.

In the day to day operation of the plant, eleven presidents indicated that their involvement in the total physical plant maintenance was very limited. Three indicated they would classify their involvement as limited but on a regular basis, this meaning that they made periodic inspection tours of the buildings and grounds with the person who was responsible in that area. One president indicated that he was highly involved in the complete physical facilities area of his institution.

All of the presidents indicated that there was a person directly responsible for the facilities of that institution. However, as one might imagine, the assignments differed by institution. Six presidents indicated that their organizational chart indicated a superintendent of buildings and grounds who was responsible directly to the president or his designee. Six institutions indicated that the business manager was directly responsible for the physical facilities of the institution and with this arrangement there was either a superintendent of buildings and grounds or a position sometimes identified as that of head custodian. One president indicated that as a result of their district being
a multi-campus institution, the head custodian was directly responsible to the dean of that particular campus and one president indicated that one of his vice presidents had as a specific duty the responsibility for coordinating all physical facilities programs.

When speaking about the building programs that were ongoing within their institutions, the presidents, with few exceptions, indicated that it was their responsibility to coordinate the work activities of the building project with the architect and the various contractors, reporting regularly to the board. However, in one instance, this being a multi-campus institution, a board committee, along with the dean of that campus who acts as clerk-of-the-works, makes the majority of decisions concerning the building project, i.e., change orders, a change in plans, deletion of items, materials, etc.

Another president, in discussing the building program of his institution, indicated that they were following the master plan to the limit that their budget would permit and are having good results with the PERT system in all of their building programs.

When queried about their input into building supplies and equipment, only one president indicated any participation in the decision-making process. He indicated that only then it would be when a substantially large piece of equipment was being considered. Even though the president would have
final responsibility in his role relation to physical facilities of the institution, apparently the high involvement shown by administrators a few years ago is being delegated to other staff members.

Other than the high involvement in a new building program, the presidents agree that their role in specific building problems is substantially less than the other roles described in this study.

QUESTION X. DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN PLANNING, BOTH LONG RUN AND SHORT RUN, IN THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF YOUR INSTITUTION.

There is almost no component of higher education which does not require some measure of planning. The areas of planning might vary with the individual chief administrator or with the uniqueness of the institution, however, the need is still very critical. It has long been recognized that realistic and accurate planning is the key to institutional success. However, the noise created by today's problem and the elongated list of demands upon the college president's time, forces all but the very organized to neglect this most essential element. It is recognized by most people involved in higher education that the most pervasive need is for more and better planning. President Babbidge of the University of Connecticut states the issue well:

A principle purpose of planning is to insure that an institution retains a degree of control over its own destiny . . . . internally we are in
danger of creeping ad-hocism . . . Externally we are in danger of being forced into a master scheme of some sort.1

The dilemma of adequate long and short range planning and the external and internal forces that affect our planning schedule, became readily apparent in the discussion of long and short range planning with the presidents of the Iowa area colleges. All institutions were originally required by law to have some sort of educational master plan. If these dealt specifically with goals and objectives of the institution, they must be viewed as short range planning. As one president indicated:

Our institution is involved in a five-year plan, but I guess this is really short range, even though we think of five years as being a long time. We are so busy trying to meet the present needs, the long range thinking gets lost in the clutter.

Another president lent his support to the previous statement by saying:

I have been very, very disappointed in the time that I have been able to spend in long range planning.

Other comments such as, "there is not nearly enough time," or, "I have good plans but time seems to get in the way," were quite common throughout the interview.

All of the presidents perceived their role as being

that of the leader and the precipitator of long range planning. However, by their own expression, even though the intent and the pressing concern for planning was present, it would have to be concluded that there are very few viable planning programs in effect in the community college system in the State of Iowa.

It was pleasing to note that there are programs for long and short range planning in various stages of sophistication in some area community colleges. One president states:

I consider my role as a very, very key role and one of great responsibility in planning for the institution, particularly as far as the specific institutional goals are concerned. I keep reminding people that this is what we say we are and what we are shooting for, and how does what you are doing fit into the final goal. I try to motivate each division to set goals and objectives for the division for a year. It therefore becomes possible for each individual to assess their contribution to the achievement of the divisional and institutional goals. We also have an individual goal setting program for each professional staff member of the college whereby this staff member is expected to establish objectives for a given year to try to accomplish. This is the way that person is assessed at the end of the year.

A president who has succeeded in identifying a planning program for his institution has printed and distributed to staff members, board members, and constituency his perspective of the long range plan for his community college district. The plan recognizes that it is not an absolute and is presented in three parts. Part one is a preface for the work that is to be accomplished, part two represents an overview of the national climate in terms of some of the
leading trends in comprehensive community college education, and part three is a plan indicating how all of the people in the district might participate in and become leaders in this specific effort. The basic assumption in this plan is that sometime within the next decade each person shall see their particular role change and that by recognizing this role change, each individual has the opportunity to become a change agent who can then determine the course of each individual's role. He challenges the staff with this basic premise:

A basic premise for all of us is that change is already occurring in education, but that any change must be orderly and therefore, properly come from those of us best prepared to cause such change—not from sources external to the teaching profession.

The Management by Objective approach is the system being developed by the president and staff at another area community college. This president states:

We are going to the management approach and are attempting to systemize it. We are using the system first on budget development with the next step being the development of goals and objectives as they relate to long range planning. Preplanning is the name of our game, and we are insisting that every activity, every function that we serve, is going to be preplanned with as many measurable objectives as we can agree upon and negotiate without dollar amounts assigned. It appears that staff throughout our institution supports this approach and we feel we will be able to decentralize the decision making process by going this route and overcoming the concern that people have about administration and governance being so autocratic and that all decisions are made at the central office or top level.

Total involvement from the faculty, students, various
standing committees, and advisory committees, as well as the board, was an approach that another community college president chose to take. This president asked for and obtained input from faculty, students, administration, and board. From this data he then developed a goal and objectives document for the 1973-74 school year. The document was then taken to the board and discussed in detail. After approval by the board, the goals and objectives document was put into practice and used as a model this school year. The president states:

I have found it to be most successful and I think we have accomplished a great deal more since it has given the faculty, the students, and administration a handle to grab as far as knowing what is happening and what is going on.

This president then gave a midyear report on the progress of the goals and objectives that were agreed upon between all levels of the college, with the progress of the individual goals being shown on a continuum between zero and one hundred. The same process will be repeated at the year end.

This president indicated that he felt that this process would be very instrumental in assisting him and the institution in establishing a long range planning program.

The concern over the absence of a statewide program of planning in higher education manifested itself several times throughout the interviews. The presidents felt as though it were impossible for an individual institution to
determine long range goals if a state wide plan of long range objectives was not evident.

QUESTION XI. PLEASE DISCUSS INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, HOW THEY WERE DEVELOPED, HOW THEY ARE UPDATED, HOW THEY ARE USED, THEIR AVAILABILITY TO STAFF AND THEIR ACTUAL INFLUENCE ON THE OPERATION OF THE INSTITUTION.

The formulation of educational policies by the area school board of directors is not optional as Iowa Code 280A.23 states:

Authority of area directors. The board of directors of each area vocational school or area community college shall: .6 establish policy and make rules not inconsistent with laws and administrative rules, regulations, and policies of the state board, for its own government and that of the administrative, teaching, and other personnel, and the students and the school or college, and aid in the enforcement of such laws, rules, and regulations.¹

It is assumed that as the president is the executive officer of the board of trustees, it would then be his role and responsibility to see that a complete set of board policies is available. He must also assume the responsibility of keeping the policies current and germane by regular and periodic updating.

It was found that one of the area community colleges did not keep and maintain an official board policy handbook. A technical question would arise as to whether or not this

¹Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Area Schools Division, Selected School Laws and Standards, op. cit., p. 6.
institution was in violation of the code as previously specified. The president of the institution indicated that instead of an official board policy handbook, the board used as their operations manual a document called a *Motions History Book*. In this somewhat unique arrangement, every motion made during a regular board meeting was filed under specific headings. This document then, really functions as a guide in terms of a policy approach to the operations of the college. The president indicated that he found this situation evident after he was employed, and stated:

> It has worked reasonably well but it is not good enough. One of my specific goals and objectives in the coming year is the development of an official board policies handbook.

All of the remaining area schools maintained what might be classified as a traditional board policy manual. The board policy manuals of the institutions followed a standard format with all of them being developed between 1966 and 1968. The education department at the University of Iowa provided assistance to the area community colleges and in all cases but two, constructed the initial board policy manual. The board then reviewed the policies as submitted by the university team and made approval or revision.

Eight schools had developed what might be called an operational procedures manual used to supplement and interpret board policy for all staff members.

The remaining five schools interpreted board policy
from the original document, however, they did indicate that an administrative manual for all staff members was available and that document, in turn, assisted staff members in interpreting board policy. In discussing the procedures manual for policy interpretation, a president stated, "How nice it is to have that book to turn to when general policy statements are unclear."

The institutional plans for updating and revising these policies were quite different from one institution to another with four presidents indicating that their institution did not have a specific update plan. The usual pattern was to modify the policy when a situation arose that dictated the need. The president of one of the area schools pretty well expressed the feeling of this group as he stated:

They (board policies) are not in as good a shape as I would like to have them. They are one of those things that doesn't speak loudly at me, consequently I have them on a first list, way on the bottom that as soon as I find time to work on, we will go through the updating process, but they haven't been causing us a great deal of trouble.

The remainder of the presidents indicated that there was an annual or continual updating process ongoing in their institution with the president maintaining the leadership role in the updating of policies, of course, realizing that every policy must be finally adopted by the board. In most instances the president's plan of updating board policies included staff members from all levels in both certified and non-certified categories.
One president submitted his plan for board policy updating that involved two standing committees, each committee being represented by administration, certified and non-certified staff. The first committee made the general review of policies to determine if change was needed. The second committee then took the policies recommended for change by the first committee, made a study of the policy, and then passed the policy on to the president with a recommended change for presentation to the board.

High involvement was expressed by one president in describing their continual update program:

For this purpose a ten member committee that cuts across all areas of the institution is assigned the summer task of complete review of the board policies as well as the employee handbook. The president meets with this committee regularly during the summer months. The policy manual and the employee handbook are updated and they are submitted to the board of trustees at the regular August meeting for review, interpretation, and usually implementation. With this procedure the institution is assured of an updated policy manual at the beginning of each academic year.

Ingenuity was shown by this group as all changes that are recommended to the board are done with red ink so the revision can be immediately identified.

A president who has more recently occupied the president's chair in an Iowa community college, made a slightly different observation of the policy manual for his institution. He recognized that the people who preceded him as presidents of that institution had done a fine job in developing administrative policy. He further stated:
If I have any complaint, it is that the policies copy quite adequately, and maybe too much so, policies that are normally adopted by secondary schools rather than institutions of higher education. As far as development of future policy, my feeling is that I need to update our policies with the primary purpose of developing broad educational policies supplemented by guidelines which could be much more flexible. I would prefer for the board to come up with broad policy and then have some guidelines within which we might work. As an example, rather than define a specific sick leave policy, the board could make a statement, "to the best of our ability we will help people in sickness, personal need, etc." and a more specific guideline could be developed by the administration so that it could also be changed administratively and internally without the necessity of having to take it back to the board.

Another plan that appeared to have a great deal of merit because of its consistency in updating as well as keeping the board aware and informed of institutional policy, was submitted by a president who indicated:

Three or four policies were reviewed at each board meeting with the board having the option of leaving the policies stand as they were originally written and/or revised, or accepting recommendations from the staff and administration for specific policy revisions.

Board policies and the constant update thereof are recognized as a necessity in all area colleges' operations. The role of the president in this endeavor is again one of final responsibility. Even though there are a few active plans for board policy updating, one would, as a result of the interviews, conclude that this task is one that is more easily postponed due to the lack of day-to-day pressures to necessitate accomplishment.
QUESTION XII. DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AT YOUR INSTITUTION.

The primary focus of most two year college offices of development will continue to be the federal government and those state offices which distribute non-mandated funds. These will be the sources of most available funds. Increasingly, however, two year colleges must organize to bring concerted influences to bear in a consistent and continuing pattern on state and federal legislators. In a similar manner, the current haphazard applications submitted by many colleges must be replaced by proposals carefully thought out by the best minds the institution can muster.1

Feelings re-enforcing the statement by Richardson manifested themselves repeatedly in conversation with the presidents when queried about their role in resource development at their particular institution. Nine presidents indicated that they do not have a director of resource development in their institution. Even though the role may vary slightly from one institution to another, the president takes the leadership role in resource development with specific personnel unique to that particular institution holding the primary responsibility for resource procurement. These nine presidents again spoke in support of a position similar to that as expressed by Richardson when they concurred that placing the responsibility for program proposals in the hands of several different people was indeed a haphazard approach and that there was no question that only

1Richardson, Blocker, and Bender, op. cit., p. 144.
minimal results were being obtained. However, seven of the nine indicated that they were favorable toward a person working at least part time in this area if authorization could be gained from the board of directors. The other two indicated that they have done very little and have received minimal federal funds. A president referred to the grantsman as a "federal moocher" and went ahead to state:

I think that this person is just the thing to have, but being an institution of limited size, I just can't see where we can justify bringing someone on staff to set up these type programs. It is impossible for instructional staff and administrative staff to work successfully on these projects as they are completely loaded with their own duties. So many of these federal projects are kind of make-work affairs, they bring in dollars but they also bring in a lot of extraneous activity that is not exactly directed toward the goals of the institution, so we have just been staying away from them.

Three of the nine presidents felt that they would have a position related to resource development in their administrative framework next year and felt that this position would be filled.

Of the five institutions that had a person specifically identified as the resource development person at that institution, four were full time personnel and one was classified as half-time. In all five instances the person occupying the development position not only is responsible for federal resources but for grants, foundations, private gifts, and alumni giving coordination. All of the institutions indicated that the grantsman more than paid his salary with
two indicating highly successful programs. These two institutions have been benefited by 2 million and 2.8 million dollars coming to those colleges within the past three and one-half years from federal sources and as a direct result of effort expended by the resource development office. In the institution that had obtained 2.8 million dollars, the president expressed a very high degree of role involvement with the resource development office. This president spends at least one hour per day with the director of the program in discussion of projects and their various stages of development.

Foundations

Eight of the respondents indicated that a college foundation had been formed in their district and the five that had a staff member as the resource development coordinator was the institutional representative to the foundation. In the other three instances, the president played the primary role in the liaison between the college board and the foundation board. The foundations were formed primarily to accept gifts to the benefit of the college, to operate dormitories to the benefit of the college, or to manage farming operations outside of the legal framework of the college, but again to acquire money for purposes used to benefit the college.


Other Sources

None of the presidents indicated that private gifts and alumni support occupied a large area of responsibility in their outside sources fund quest. It was recognized that the open door community college does have strong appeal for many private citizens and it is a certainty that if the college can project its influence into the minds of these people, this segment will eventually become an important source of income. Although many two year college students retain a strong sense of identity with the institution, there has been very little done in the Iowa community college system toward developing a strong alumni association. This source, also, most assuredly would be an area for development in the future.

The presidents of the area community colleges are responding to increasing financial pressures by seeking additional sources of funds to support all educational programs. The recognition of the importance of success in this endeavor has resulted in the president assuming a high leadership and planning role in resource development in his college district.

QUESTION XIII. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN THE SELECTION OF TOTAL STAFF.

The role of the community college president in Iowa community colleges as he becomes involved in the selection
of total staff, in some manner no doubt illustrates the sophistication, or at least a change in attitude, in the hiring practices of the chief administrator. The recruitment and selection of faculty members is no doubt the most important single factor in the success of any system of higher education. It was apparent that the presidents recognize the importance of a staff selection procedure that garnered results. However, in most instances, the presidents viewed their primary role as that of making the final recommendation to the board for contracting.

Of the fourteen presidents interviewed, four could be identified as having high involvement in staff selection, three identified as having average involvement in staff selection, and seven identified as having low involvement in staff selection. While discussing the selection of staff with a president that was classified as maintaining a high role involvement, the president made this statement:

I play a big part in the selection of staff. All the advertising for staff comes out under my name. The applications or correspondence with perspective staff members come directly to me. I arrange the personal interviews and spend a great deal of time reviewing the qualifications of the various applicants. I do the initial screening with the top candidates being carefully scrutinized by the directors and the department chairmen. Interviewing is done by the director of the division, by the curriculum coordinator, and by myself, so I guess I would have to say that I played the part of the lead person in the employment of staff. I like to play this part, because the selection of good staff members is the key to a good institution.
Another president indicated that he, in essence, was the personnel director. All applications are received by the president and after review, the applications in which there is still an interest are sent to department chairmen or directors for review. The president also indicates that they attempt to do an exceptionally good job of checking references and screening before the person is invited in for an interview. The director, department chairman and some faculty as well as the president are involved in the interview with the primary concern being the question of, "will he fit into our group, and is he compatible with our institution?" This president reserves the final right to select a staff member. However, he indicated that he would in no way select a staff member that was not completely acceptable to the total group involved in the interviewing process.

Another president indicates that he has high involvement in the selection process, however, he does not interview instructors at the outset. This is done at the director level with the top candidates being brought before the president for an interview. This president does indicate, however, that he would take the leadership in interviewing and selecting persons for special programs and of course counselors and anybody at the administrative level.

The presidents who were assessed at an average level of participation in the staff selection process were those that occasionally would be involved in interviewing
prospective staff members. Each of these presidents also had another staff member, either in the form of a personnel director or a director of that specific division that had the primary responsibility for interviewing and screening. However, in all cases the applicants are brought to the president for the purpose of becoming acquainted and giving the president an opportunity to ask specific questions of the applicant.

The remainder of the presidents who indicated a low role involvement in the selection of staff followed essentially the same pattern. As one president indicated:

I have less and less role to play in the selection of staff. The directors or other administrators do all of the screening and interviewing. They recommend to me and of course I take the recommendation to the board. In most instances, however, I may never see the candidate. I put absolute trust and responsibility on those people who are doing the selection.

In the institutions that have a multi-campus operation, the presidents have a very limited role in staff selection in that the deans or the campus directors play the most active role.

There was illustrated a minimal use of committees for staff selection process, and in only one instance, even though others indicated the committee process was used, was the screening committee procedure spoken to in any great detail. In this particular instance, a personnel director is responsible for all staff selection below his administrative
level. They use a standing committee explicitly for screening applicants.

The committee screens down to two or three and then participates actively in the interviewing. The committee maintains the prerogative of calling in a resource person in the particular academic area of the person being interviewed, if they so desire. The president states, "In most cases I never see the finalists. If the committee and the personnel man concur, then I will make a recommendation to the board."

A somewhat unique selection process occurs in one area community college in that the person directly above the vacancy in the administrative chart is responsible for the hiring process. As an example, the president would hire his assistants or the deans if they were at the next administrative level below. The deans, then, would hire department chairmen and department chairmen would have responsibility for selection of staff in their area. The president was queried as to whether or not this appeared to be a satisfactory procedure with the response being, "I am completely satisfied with the process."

In all cases the presidents are involved in staff selection at the administrative level. Three of the presidents also indicated that in some unique situations they might become more highly involved than the regular procedure would call for, that being in areas that had been trouble areas, some coaching positions, positions that would
necessitate a high profile, high visibility in the community, and public information personnel as well as office staff in the central office. In no cases were support staff and service personnel employment viewed as the role of the president of the institution.

The majority of the college presidents agree that although the selection of staff is a most important job, the role of the president should not be that of the personnel officer. There is general agreement that the selection of staff will continue to play a lesser part in the total role-responsibility of the community college president.

QUESTION XIV. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN THE EVALUATION OF STAFF, PLACEMENT OF STAFF, PROMOTION OF STAFF, AND DISMISSAL OF STAFF.

This question was asked with the notion that the presidents in the Iowa community colleges, in maintaining their role as educational leader, must be highly concerned and highly involved in the process of evaluation, placement, promotion and dismissal of staff, if not highly involved directly in direct role.

Evaluation

This study disclosed that each of the area school systems in Iowa were involved in a minimum of one formal program of evaluation of staff. Staff in this instance is referred to as certified staff, even though there were some
indications that non-certified staff evaluation programs were in evidence.

Several of the area schools had more than one formalized program with the evaluation not only being made at the most common level, that of superordinate evaluation of subordinate, but vertical evaluation, horizontal evaluation by peers, upward evaluation involving student evaluation of instructors and instructor evaluation of superordinate. In a description of the evaluation system and the role played by the president of each of these institutions, it was indicated that there was a great deal of similarity in the concept and in the procedure in which the evaluation was conducted.

The typical evaluation process is one of a superordinate-subordinate evaluative relationship in which the president of the institution makes a formal evaluation of the next level or two levels of administration directly below him, i.e., deans, directors, department chairmen. The director or department chairmen are then responsible for evaluating the instructors within their specific departments. After the formal evaluation, the typical procedure is to share the evaluation with the person that is being evaluated, discuss the results of the evaluation, and then make it a part of the instructor's personnel file.

There are some variations in this procedure as illustrated by one president as he stated:
We try to evaluate on the basis of goal setting and then goal evaluating for the people who report directly to me. At the staff level we use representative staff committees to establish goals, objectives and guidelines. Each committee, then, sets goals and objectives for the group and the degree to which these goals and objectives are met as an individual are judged by a peer. This peer evaluation is then viewed by the person being evaluated and then made a part of the personnel record.

Another president who prefers the goal establishment method indicated that he evaluated all administrative level people but that it is a loose, one on one situation. He then stated, "I would prefer to outline expectations a year in advance and then determine whether or not they have been met."

A president, in discussing faculty input in the evaluation process, indicated that in this particular institution, faculty, through the use of a faculty committee, developed an evaluative instrument and submitted it to the general faculty for their acceptance. The instrument was accepted and the president felt that the involvement of faculty in the development of the instrument as well as the procedure, had a very positive effect on faculty and allowed them to discuss accountability without becoming defensive.

Another president who views his role in evaluation as "the implementer" indicated that the board does have a policy on evaluation for the system and it follows the typical procedure by being handled by the immediate superiors. He also indicated that they have a very successful student
evaluation of teachers as well as peer evaluation. He states:

We have vertical, above, below, and sideways, (evaluation) and it appears to be working. Most any evaluation system will work if you make it a consistent thing and if staff knows that they will be going through the process periodically.

One president indicated that he had been working for some time on an upward evaluation translated as a staff evaluation of all persons occupying those levels above them. The staff evaluations of the department chairmen, deans, and directors, will go directly to the president. Staff evaluation of the president of the institution will go to the president of the board of trustees. This was the first year that this procedure was attempted so the president was unable to supply an opinion as to the success or the validity of the evaluation.

It was interesting to note that only three of the presidents of the area schools indicated that there was any formal process of board evaluation of the president. Only one president indicated he was not satisfied with the evaluation procedure in his particular institution. He commented:

The whole evaluation process will be changing drastically with the enactment of Senate File 531. There is a question as to what type evaluative procedure will be recognized so this past year we have actually just drifted away from the evaluation process that we had used in the past. It has become a very informal affair.
The role of the president in evaluation as well as the process that is being followed in most area community colleges was best described by the president who succinctly stated:

The president is responsible for the direction of the total evaluation process of all staff members. However, he is directly responsible for the actual evaluation of only those administrative staff members who answer directly to him.

Placement

Placement, or the movement of staff members within a total staff, occupied a very slight role as far as the presidents were concerned. It was general consensus that placement could come from a recommendation at any level, and if the placement did not actually involve what would be classified as a distinct promotion, the movement of the person from one assignment to another would be a very simple process and in many cases there would be no presidential involvement other than fielding the recommendation, and presenting it to the board of trustees for final approval.

Promotion of Staff

In speaking to promotion of staff members, it appeared that the presidents are more highly involved than in the horizontal placement of staff. In most of the community college systems, a promotion from the instructional level would usually mean the occupying of a position on the departmental chairmanship level or even quite possibly a level
of management on a higher step. It was the concensus of the
presidents that in these cases the recommendation for promo-
tion would be made to them and after investigation of the
materials substantiating the promotion recommendation, they
would either concur or veto. Only one institution indicated
a definite procedure for making promotional opportunities
available, that is, other than as a result of recommendation
from a superior. This president indicated that:

In the event of any vacancy within staff posi-
tions, the vacancy is listed in memo form and
distributed to all departments within the system,
thereby allowing any staff member who might view the
vacant position as a promotion and who felt that he
might qualify for the position, could submit an ap-
plication and be considered for the vacancy. In
all cases, the existing staff member would be given
an interview by the director or the vice president
in charge of personnel.

Dismissal

Dismissal of staff proved to be an area of great con-
cern to the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges.
The presidents were unanimous in viewing their primary role
in the dismissal process as that of being responsible for
due process as outlined by the Iowa Code and assuring that
the recommendations made for dismissal of staff are valid
and documented. The presidents indicated that dismissal was
a very distasteful task and that many times they felt that
they were the man in the middle. One president, in
describing his role in the dismissal process, said:
Our first attempt is to counsel people out rather than dismissing them. By counseling out, I mean we spend a great deal of time in discussing their situation with the institution and pointing out the facts and pledging to the staff member our assistance in the procurement of another position. This has worked 95 percent of the time.

Another president, in discussing the dismissal process, gave a specific example of the role that the president must play in substantiating all of the facts in the dismissal process. This president states:

Of course I must look very carefully at the department or division chairman's reasons for wanting to dismiss the person and I have refused on a couple of occasions. In one instance they wanted to discharge a man when the evaluation just three months old indicated that this man was performing above average. After a fairly thorough investigation of the situation, I found that it was definitely a case of prejudice with pressure being put on the department chairman from some of the other faculty members. The outcome of this situation was that I finally had to replace the department chairman.

The presidents were unanimous in their feeling that dismissal should be avoided at all costs and that the emphasis should be placed in an attempt to assist the person throughout the school year rather than collect data that would substantiate his dismissal.

There was also a great concern among the presidents about the impact Senate File 531 would have on the retention and the dismissal of staff members at any level and whether or not dismissal would become more complicated and difficult than it now is.
In summary, the presidents perceive their role in the evaluation process, including placement, promotion and dismissal, as the leader and the responsible party for closing the gap between the ubiquitous, informal practice that exists in most systems of higher education. They realize that many present evaluation practices are invalid and the criteria on which the evaluation is based is nebulous. It appears also, in conversations with the presidents that the emphasis for future evaluation will be concentrated in the area of instructional effectiveness as compared to the past concentration of instructor effectiveness.

QUESTION XV. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN MAINTAINING CONTACT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION AND THE IOWA COUNCIL OF AREA SCHOOL BOARDS.

Department of Public Instruction

The responsibilities with which the area schools have been charged, that of meeting educational and service objectives, for the most part, fall within the normal purview of the State Board of Public Instruction and its Department of Public Instruction. Within the total Department of Public Instruction framework there is a division called the Area Schools Branch that is responsible for the state level administration of the programs making up the state area schools and community colleges network. It is then apparent that close and direct contact with the individual area colleges and the Department of Public Instruction must take
It was the purpose of this question to determine the intensity of the role of the president of the community college and his direct contact with the Department of Public Instruction.

It was interesting to note that only three presidents indicated that they were involved to any great extent in direct contact with the Department of Public Instruction. One of the presidents, when asked his opinion of the role identified by this question, stated:

It is my opinion that this is one of the most important functions the president performs and a good bit of effort is exerted to maintain a proper relationship with the Department of Public Instruction. Frequent visits are made by the president or delegated representatives to the Department of Public Instruction in an effort to gain their support for the functions that are being conducted at the institution or are being proposed for future developments.

Another president indicated that:

I am in contact quite often with the Department of Public Instruction. Many times it is by phone but I do make frequent visits to their offices in Des Moines. I handle a large percentage of the contact of our institution to the Department of Public Instruction.

The remainder of the presidents indicated that they do have contact with the Department of Public Instruction on specific issues by phone with the general concurrence that this contact might be one time per week, but that they, the presidents, depended on other administrative personnel with specific program assignments to maintain contact with the
Department of Public Instruction and its various divisions specific to the project.

Five of the presidents indicated that all communications concerning programs, new, existing, modification or phasing out of programs, go through the president's office, but the major responsibility of dealing with specific programs was handled by individual departments.

The location of the area colleges might, to some degree, indicate the frequency of contact and the method of contact with the Department of Public Instruction in that all of the presidents who were some distance from Des Moines indicated that their contact was infrequent and that almost all of their contact with the Department of Public Instruction was made by phone. There is a monthly meeting, however, of the presidents of the community colleges of the state at which time the Department of Public Instruction is represented. This one monthly contact was mentioned by four presidents as being the primary personal contact with the Department of Public Instruction. One president spoke directly to this when he said:

I am sure my direct contact with the Department would be much more frequent if the distance between our college and Des Moines was not so great. The distance almost necessitates any contact with the Department as being done by phone.

In summary, the presidents do not assign a great deal of time to the role of being in contact with the State Department of Public Instruction. However, they do occupy
the position in all instances as being the final decision
maker when related to policy, programs, and financial
matters.

Iowa Council of Area School Boards

The Iowa Council of Area School Boards is an organiza-
tion designed to give total area school representation and
provide coordination of efforts beneficial to the area com-
munity college plan. Each of the area community colleges
are members of this organization and are represented by a
voting delegate selected from each of the local boards.

The Iowa Council of Area School Boards is a formally
organized group with an elected president and a paid execu-
tive secretary-treasurer and office staff. The Iowa Council
of Area School Boards meets monthly to discuss business and
coordinate activities of the Iowa area community colleges.
The presidents, as they discussed their role with the Iowa
Council of Area School Boards, indicated that their role was
that of an observer and a resource person at the monthly
meetings of the Iowa Council of Area School Boards and at
the local level were responsible for distributing minutes
and other information obtained from the executive secretary's
office to the local school board members.

Each of the presidents interviewed indicated that they
were regular attenders at the monthly meeting of the Iowa
Council of Area School Boards and even though their
relationship with the group was an informal one, they felt that they filled a very important role in the association with the area school board members and felt that being able to become aware of the concerns, problems and business of the Iowa Council of Area School Boards was quite helpful in making decisions relative to their own institutions. The feeling was expressed by one president that a formal organization combining area school presidents and representative board members might be a more viable and influential organization.

In summary, one would have to conclude that the role of the president and the Iowa Council of Area School Boards is one very similar to the role they maintain with their local board, that of being an executive officer and expected to carry out functions as designated by the formal group.

QUESTION XVI. DISCUSS YOUR CONTACT WITH STUDENTS, FORMALLY AND INFORMALLY, AND HOW STUDENTS ARE USED IN CAMPUS GOVERNMENTS AND DECISION MAKING, THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT IN YOUR INSTITUTION, AND STUDENT ACTIVITIES AND RECRUITMENT.

This question was not designed to discuss the role of the student on the community college campus but to discuss specifically with the presidents of the community colleges in Iowa, their perception of their role in their formal and informal involvement with the students. As one might imagine, there was unanimous support for a high degree of student involvement in all levels of college activity.
Also, as one might imagine, the time demands facing the chief administrator of any institution does not permit the formal and informal contact with students that was viewed as highly desirable by each of the presidents.

Student Involvement

When asked of his role in relation to the students of his particular college, one president responded:

I think I play a key role in setting up the basic mechanisms to get two-way student communication and student involvement. We have two key councils at our college dealing with formulating policies. They are academic affairs and student affairs. Students serve on both of these councils and the students that are serving on these councils are appointed or elected by the student senate. We have a student activities budget committee which is dominated by students even though there is faculty on the committee. All of the standing committees in the college framework have students as members. This has seemed to be a real help in making it possible for students to understand some of the real problems of a community college operation.

All of the presidents indicated that they had formal student organizations that were classified as student senates or student councils and that not only was this type organization desirable but it was highly recommended by North Central accrediting association.

There was concern expressed by several presidents that despite repeated attempts to involve students in a recommending capacity, the student activity was much less than desirable. One president opined:

It is my belief that the community college student is here such a short time and that the programs
are so concentrated he or she really never gets the opportunity to become highly involved in activities other than direct class assignments or club work specifically related to that class. I would have to categorize the general situation as one of apathy as far as the student is concerned.

Another president indicated much the same feeling and stated:

About the only organization in which our students seem to get highly involved and interested in is our student government. I believe this is because they can provide services to their constituency and work primarily in a social sense of setting up programs, picnics, dances and this type of thing. This is really their main function and they seem to enjoy this much, much more than being involved in total college problems.

Another president, in analyzing student involvement at his institution observed that over one-third of the student population was married and about the same percentage was working full time while attending college. These statistics, when added to the number of students that commute from home to college and return each day, illustrate the reasons for the apparent lack of interest in college activities by the students. The fact is, they just don't have the time to become involved in social type activities.

President's Role and Contact with Students

To the man, the presidents indicated that their time spent with students was much less than was desirable. Five presidents indicated they had specific programs to assure that there would be at least limited direct contact between
the president and students throughout the year.

A plan devised by a president that seemed to be rather effective was one involving four open meetings a year for the purpose of students appearing in a group and posing questions or concerns to which the president might respond. This same president also scheduled four meetings per year with the student senate at which time the student senate can express their concerns or the concerns of their constituency.

Another president indicates that he is highly involved on both a formal and informal basis. A plan this president devised to maintain contact with students is a publicized open lunch session where students are invited to attend and chat informally with the president. This president's observation was that it was working well and that the students seemed to appreciate the opportunity to associate with the president.

A president from one of the smaller institutions has very high social and informal involvement with the students. There are several all-school picnics at which the president is always in attendance. The president attends every home athletic contest. He participates in intermural type activities such as volleyball, ping-pong, or any activity in which faculty could participate, and by virtue of the location of the student center, this president chooses to take his coffee or coke breaks in this vicinity, thereby giving
him an opportunity to rap with the students.

In summary, it appears that the presidents are spending much less time in contact with the students than desired, particularly on an informal basis. It also appears that all of the institutions, at the behest of the president, are making every attempt to involve students in capacities of input and decision making whereby their talents might be utilized, but that there is some degree of apathy toward these activities. The question might be asked, are we planning for the students, or planning with the students? It is also apparent that the presidents are good attenders at student activities, athletic events, and try to take every opportunity, outside the school working day, to come in contact with the students.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study were as follows:

1. Turnover in the presidential positions of the Iowa area community colleges is relatively low. The area community colleges have been in existence for only eight years with the incumbents of the presidential position occupying the present chair for an average of sixty months. Only four of the fourteen presidents have been in the present position less than thirty-six months, with five indicating that they had been in the position for more than ninety months. Six of the fourteen presidents were the original
college presidents and in no case has an area school district had more than three presidents, including the current chief administrator.

2. The past previous positions of the Iowa community college presidents were largely in the community college field, with eight of the fourteen respondents indicating this type of experience. Four respondents indicated they had held previous positions in the public schools with three of the four indicating the past previous position being that of superintendent of schools. These three respondents were all original presidents. This indicates that during the initial stage of community college development in Iowa, most of the community college administrators came directly from the public school ranks while administrators that arrived on the scene after the formation of the community college district tended to come from within the community college ranks.

3. Educational attainment of most Iowa area community college presidents was the doctor's degree, with nine of the fourteen respondents possessing the doctorate. One president is currently a candidate for the doctor's degree.

4. Academic institutions granting the highest degrees earned by these individuals were varied, with twelve different institutions being identified as granting the highest degree.

5. Educational administration was the major area of concentration for a large majority of the community college presidents in their graduate studies.
6. The undergraduate preparation of the presidents is quite diverse, with eleven undergraduate majors reported.

7. The presidents made a decision early to enter administration as the first graduate degree of twelve of the respondents was in administration.

8. The college presidents had a propensity toward administration early in their educational career with the average time spent in education prior to administrative experience being less than seven years.

9. Most of the community college presidents gained their initial administrative experience as an elementary-secondary administrator in the public schools. A mean of 10.6 years of such experience was reported.

10. The chief administrator in the Iowa area community colleges has very little experience as an instructor in higher education.

11. The experience of the community college presidents (as administrators) in higher education is less than experience from the same group as administrators in elementary-secondary schools.

12. The presidents of the area community colleges feel that not only the development of a good working relationship with the board of trustees is a most important task but it also occupies a considerable portion of time and should occupy a greater portion of time if the time were available.
13. Effective communication is the single most important factor in developing good board of trustees-administrator relationships.

14. The responsibility for the budgeting process of the institution is the plenary responsibility of the president, even though a high degree of input is obtained from staff members at all levels. An administrative staff member, usually the business manager, has the responsibility for the actual budget preparation. Presidents would like to spend less time in this role, but due to fiscal situations, will not discharge the responsibility.

15. There is a great deal of concern among the presidents about a top-to-bottom budgeting procedure in which expenditure assignments must be made on the basis of anticipated income rather than on the basis of established educational priority.

16. Community college presidents are less involved in salary discussions, decisions, and recommendations than they were as administrators a decade ago, with the board of trustees and faculty committees now being the principals in staff-salary negotiations.

17. An overwhelming majority of the presidents see their role in staff-salary discussions, decisions and recommendations as being even less direct as a result of the newly passed collective bargaining bill, Iowa Senate File 531. A similar majority sees the role of the president
in a formal collective bargaining setting as being that of a strategist, and a member of the backup planning team, but never as an across-the-table bargainer.

18. The presidents indicate that they are spending very nearly the amount of time in intra-institutional communications as should be spent. Although each of the presidents acknowledged that communications within the institution is a most vital concern, the role was ranked as of only average importance. This might indicate that the presidents feel that the burden of responsibility for the communications network of the institution must be shared and distributed throughout the staff.

19. The time spent by the president in the institutional-community relations program is basically the same as the amount of time reported spent in the intra-institutional relations and communications program. The two roles are also ranked side by side in order of importance. However, the presidents indicate that more time should be spent in helping the community become aware and understand the total function of the college.

20. The presidents of the Iowa area schools are highly involved in community affairs and participate and belong to many and diverse groups.

21. The presidents, in recognizing the need for a viable institutional-community relations program are assigning the responsibility to persons in most cases known
as the public information officer. The majority of the presidents have made such an assignment, albeit in some cases, a part time assignment. In all cases, this person reports directly to the president, giving support to the importance of this function as it is perceived by the presidents.

22. The presidents spend more time in institutional development than they feel they should. The presidents view their role in institutional development as the stimulator and as the provider of means for new program development. In all instances the president assigns lower level instructional administrators to this specific task.

23. The presidents of the Iowa area community colleges indicate a wide variety of participation in legislative matters. Although not a great deal of time is spent in legislative matters, this function is viewed as being an important role in the eyes of the administrator. There is indication that the administrator would prefer to become more involved in this specific role.

24. Although the basic organizational structure of the area community college was initially described by official guidelines, the organizational structures of the colleges have undergone constant revision with the amount of change being described as from slight to radical, and that even though there are similarities in the positions identified in the organizational structure, the structures
had evolved in keeping with the perceptions of the president(s) and with the unique characteristics of the community college district itself.

25. Greatest involvement with physical facilities occurs during campus development with specific regard to new building programs. From the development of a basic master plan to the completion of various building projects, the presidents were quite highly involved. With regard to maintenance and operation of the physical plant, the presidents are involved in a very slight manner. This function is viewed by the presidents as one that should be and is in most cases, assigned to a specialist in this area.

26. The presidents recognize the extreme importance of institutional planning and the leadership role that the president must occupy in this effort. Although a sizable amount of time is spent in performing this function, the chief administrators feel that quite likely a greater percent of their time should be spent in the performance of this role.

27. The absence of a state-wide program of planning for higher education that is constantly updated as a result of trends in higher education, economic growth and population changes, makes it extremely difficult for individuals to plan for an institution in a manner that will allow it to keep in step with the total state needs.

28. The large majority of institutions operate
within a framework defined by an institutional policy book. It is the role of the college president to provide leadership in the development of such a policy book and for the constant updating of this document. The presidents perceive this role as an important one. They also indicate that they are spending very nearly as much time on this function as it deserves.

29. The presidents view resource development primarily coming from sources other than taxes, tuition, and state aid. Federal aid is the resource that was most commonly mentioned in the discussion of this question. The majority of the institutions do not have a staff member that is specifically identified as an administrator of resource development resulting in very minimal results in most institutions. As a result of the lack of a person identified for this specific function, and with the presidents not assigning time to the performance of this role, college foundations, college development corporations, alumni, and other sources of income are not being utilized with a great degree of success.

30. The chief administrator does not take nearly as active a role in the selection of staff as once was the case. Although the selection of staff is a most critical element in any institution, it is felt by the presidents that this job can best be performed by administrators in the respective areas. The primary role of the president in this function
is that of giving final approval to recommendations made by lower level administrators and presenting the recommendations to the board of trustees for final approval.

31. Each of the presidents indicated that his school system was involved in at least one formal staff evaluation program. Evaluations are typically superordinate evaluations of subordinates but there are scattered instances of multi-directional evaluations.

32. The presidents indicate by rank that evaluation of staff is of least importance with regard to their specific role. However, in a study of the responses to queries about this role, one must conclude that the presidents spoke specifically to their involvement and expect other staff members to be directly responsible for the evaluation process.

33. Dismissal of staff is an area of great concern to the presidents of the Iowa community colleges as it is their ultimate responsibility to carry a dismissal recommendation to the board with documentation as to the reason for the dismissal request. This segment of this particular role was identified by the presidents as being the most distasteful of all of the presidential roles.

34. Contact with the Department of Public Instruction occupies an amount of time in the presidents' schedule consistent with the amount of time described by the presidents as necessary to perform the function. It is the primary
responsibility of lower level administrators to maintain contact with the Department of Public Instruction relative to their particular areas.

35. Proximity is a determining factor in the frequency of contacts with the state Department of Public Instruction. The nearer the college to the Department offices the greater the number of contacts.

36. The presidents of the Iowa area community colleges do not spend a great deal of time in formal or informal contact with the students of their institutions. Although the presidents expressed the desirability of more direct student contact, the realism of the office dictated that the relationship, regardless of how enjoyable it might be, was the primary responsibility of other segments of administration.

In the process of conducting the study, it was apparent that the time being spent in the performance of the various role functions was not the same as the amount of time considered desirable for each. There was also disparity in time desirable and importance of various role functions as judged by these community college presidents.

It seemed reasonable, therefore, to determine to what extent the time spent in performing these functions related to the time desired for their performance. At the same time, it was deemed important to look at the relationship between perceived importance of the functions and time desired for
their performance.

The mean time spent in each function as reported by the presidents is presented in Table 2 with their corresponding ranks. Also found in Table 2 are the mean times considered desirable for performance of these functions and their respective ranks.

Table 3 shows the same ranks with the differences in ranks and the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation coefficient. There is a moderate positive relationship between time spent and time desirable ($\rho = .67$) indicating that there is a tendency to spend more time on those functions where more time is desirable for their performance. However, the relationship is far from perfect and could indicate a need for the presidents to review the times spent on various functions in order to most effectively meet their obligations.

Table 4 presents the ranks of importance which were determined from the mean ranking of importance specified by the community college presidents.

Table 5 shows the rank by perceived importance of the various roles, the ranks based on time desirable for their performance, the differences in their respective ranks, and the corresponding Spearman Rank-Order Correlation coefficient.

There is a moderate positive relationship between the perceived importance of the various roles and the time desired for their performance. Thus, those functions that are
TABLE 2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the president in</th>
<th>Average Mean &quot;is&quot;</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Average Mean &quot;Ought&quot;</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Board relationship</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Budgeting process</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salary determination process</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intra-institutional communications</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional-community relations</td>
<td>7.57%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institutional development</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legislative matters</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Institutional organization</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Physical facilities</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Policy development</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Resource development</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff selection</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Evaluation, promotion, dismissal of staff</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Liaison with DPI &amp; Iowa Council of Area School Boards</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Student relations</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the president in</th>
<th>Rank &quot;is&quot;</th>
<th>Rank &quot;ought&quot;</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>d²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Board relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Budgeting process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salary determination process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intra-institutional communications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional-community relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institutional development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legislative matters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Institutional organization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Physical facilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Policy development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Resource development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff selection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Evaluation, promotion, dismissal, of staff</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Liaison with DPI &amp; Iowa Council of Area School Boards</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Student relations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2-1)} = .67 \quad \text{RHO} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the president in</th>
<th>Importance Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Board relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Budgeting process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salary determination process</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intra-institutional communications</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional-community relations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institutional development</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legislative matters</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Institutional organization</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Physical facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Policy development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Resource development</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff selection</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Evaluation, promotion, dismissal of staff</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Liaison with DPI &amp; Iowa Council of Area School Boards</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Student relations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5

ROLES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS, THEIR RANKS BY IMPORTANCE AND BY TIME DESIRABLE FOR THEIR PERFORMANCE, AND THE CORRESPONDING RANK-ORDER CORRELATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the president in</th>
<th>Role Importance Rank</th>
<th>Time Desirable Rank</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>d²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Board relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Budgeting process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salary determination process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intra-institutional communications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional-community relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institutional development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legislative matters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Institutional organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Physical facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Policy development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Resource development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff selection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Evaluation, promotion, dismissal of staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Liaison with DPI &amp; Iowa Council of Area School Boards</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Student relations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)} = .74 \quad \text{RHO} \]
considered more important are seen to require somewhat more time. Since the relationship is not perfect however, there are some functions of lesser importance which are viewed as requiring more time than certain other functions of greater importance.

As the study developed, it was important to look at the nature of responsibilities of the president. These responsibilities tended to be of two types: (1) primary responsibilities of the individual, and (2) responsibilities that are shared or delegated. Seven of these responsibilities were identified as primarily individual and nine as shared and/or delegated.

Table 6 presents this information with the functions listed in order of ranked importance and the desirable percents of time needed for their adequate performance. Of particular note here is the relationship between the importance rankings and the nature of responsibility. Those activities that are considered essentially individual responsibilities are all ranked as more important than those activities that are primarily shared or delegated.
TABLE 6

ACTIVITIES OF THE IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS RANKED BY IMPORTANCE, NATURE OF RESPONSIBILITY, AND PERCENT OF TIME INDICATED AS NECESSARY FOR ADEQUATE PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Rank</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Nature of Responsibility</th>
<th>Desirable Percent of Time Indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Board Relations</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Budget Control</td>
<td>Individual - Shared</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Individual - Shared</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Policy Development</td>
<td>Individual - Shared</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Legislative Involvement</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>Individual - Shared</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Institutional Communications</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Resource Development</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Institutional Development</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Staff Selection</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>State Agency Liaison</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Student Contact</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation</td>
<td>Shared - Delegated</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the research findings, conclusions and some possible implications for future study.

SUMMARY

The problems with which this study dealt were:

1. To determine the actual and desired percentage of times spent in the sixteen identified role categories,
2. To ascertain agreement between these two percentages,
3. To identify the academic and professional backgrounds of the incumbents, and
4. To utilize this and other data toward the identification of the roles and functions of the chief administrator in the area community colleges of the State of Iowa.

In considering the problem, the following purposes were chosen.

1. To describe the perception of the presidential role as each of the roles are currently being performed by percentage of time spent annually in each category.
2. To identify by percentage how the presidents would allot their time in each of the categories if such schedule control was possible.
3. To determine to what extent there is agreement or disagreement between the "is" and "ought" of each function.

4. To determine the importance of each of the sixteen role categories as perceived by each of the presidents of the area community colleges, this degree of importance to be determined by a ranking of each of the role categories.

5. To determine if there is a correlation between the roles that are ranked high in importance and roles that occupy larger percentages of the presidents' time, both real and perceived.

6. To identify the academic and professional backgrounds of the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges.

Data utilized in fulfilling this problem was collected by electronically recorded interview with each of the fourteen community college presidents in area school districts other than the district represented by the writer of this report. The interview was prefaced by a discussion of the questionnaire with the respondents as well as the questionnaire being sent to the respondents for viewing prior to the interview.

Questionnaires eliciting specific information about the percentage of time actually spent in each of the role categories, the amount of time desired by the respondents to spend in each of the categories if the choice were theirs, an order of importance ranking form containing the sixteen role categories, and a form reporting various academic and
professional experience was used. The study was limited to the fourteen area community college presidents in Iowa with two such presidents from Missouri and two from Illinois being surveyed initially to provide experience to the investigator in interviewing and data collection as well as field testing the data instruments. The assumptions of the study are that the sixteen categories used in the study adequately cover the role of the community college presidents and that the responses are unbiased and as accurate as possible to obtain in this type of study.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Although there are many similarities in the actual and the perceived role of the presidents of the Iowa area community colleges, there are also significant differences. The similarities can be viewed as the result of the initial state structure and the differences can be viewed as a result of individual differences in the persons and the settings.

2. The roles as determined by the presidents as being more important are not necessarily the roles that occupy the larger amounts of the presidents' time.

3. The most important presidential role, as perceived by the president, is the development and maintenance of a good president-board relationship.
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Several of the individual roles included in this study encompass areas of such breadth that an investigation of a singular role would be quite significant.

2. If a more broad role-function research would be desired, an approach similar to the delphi technique would appear to be desirable.

3. The personal and professional characteristics of the occupants of the presidential chair in given areas or of the total United States would provide useful and important data.

4. A study using roles similar to those used in this investigation, but encompassing a larger geographic area, would be quite useful in determining to what extent the individual and the setting contribute to the overall presidential role function.

5. A study encompassing the managerial skills, with explicit attention to leadership and decision-making, to the knowledge of the investigator, has never been dealt with in a study specifically speaking to the community college administrator. Within such a topic area would lie innumerable opportunities for research involving these managerial skills in a broad sense, or segments of these characteristics with very specific application.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

GENERAL INFORMATION - IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL INSTITUTE SUPERINTENDENT/PRESIDENTS

(1) Name ________________________________

(2) Institution ________________________________

(3) Location of Institution ________________________________

(4) Location of other campuses ________________________________

(5) Size of Institution ________________________________
   (a) Full-time day enrollment _____
   (b) Arts and Science _____
   (c) Vocational-Technical _____
   (d) Adult Education _____
   (e) Head count for past year _____

(6) How many months have you been employed in your present position? ________________________________

(7) What was your immediate prior position, institution or company location, and length of employment in that position? ________________________________

(8) What is the highest education degree you have obtained? ________________________________
   (a) From what institution? ________________________________
   (b) Major area of concentration? ________________________________

(9) What was your undergraduate major? ________________________________

(10) What was the major area of your Masters Degree? _______
(11) Total number of graduate hours in higher education?

(12) Number of graduate hours in educational administration?

(13) Number of years experience at elementary-secondary level as a teacher?

(14) Number of years experience at elementary-secondary level as an administrator?

(15) Number of years employment in higher education as instructor?

(16) Number of years employment in higher education as administrator?
APPENDIX B

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTION I.

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE AS SUPERINTENDENT/PRESIDENT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO YOUR BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? %

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? %

QUESTION II.

WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE BUDGETING PROCESS OF YOUR INSTITUTION?

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? %

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? %

QUESTION III.

WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN STAFF SALARY DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS, OR RECOMMENDATIONS?

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? %

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? %

QUESTION IV.

WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE INTRA-INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM OF YOUR COLLEGE?

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? %
b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? %

QUESTION V.

WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE INSTITUTIONAL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM?

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? %
b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? %

QUESTION VI.

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE IN INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? %
b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? %

QUESTION VII.

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ROLE YOU PLAY IN LEGISLATIVE MATTERS CONCERNING (1) THE AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF THE STATE, AND (2) LEGISLATIVE MATTERS THAT SPECIFICALLY AFFECT YOUR INSTITUTION.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? %
b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? %

QUESTION VIII.

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ROLE IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INSTITUTION IF YOU WERE THE ORIGINAL PRESIDENT. IF YOU ARE NOT THE ORIGINAL PRESIDENT, YOUR ROLE IN REVISIONS AND CHANGES IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
WOULD BE APPRECIATED.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? __________%

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? __________%

QUESTION IX.

PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE AS IT RELATES TO THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES OF YOUR INSTITUTION.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? __________%

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? __________%

QUESTION X.

DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN PLANNING, BOTH LONG-RUN AND SHORT-RUN, AND GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF YOUR INSTITUTION.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? __________%

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? __________%

QUESTION XI.

PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? __________%

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? __________%

QUESTION XII.

DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AT YOUR INSTITUTION.
QUESTION XIII.

PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN THE SELECTION OF TOTAL STAFF.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? ________%

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? ________%

QUESTION XIV.

DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN THE FOLLOWING: A. EVALUATION OF STAFF, B. PLACEMENT OF STAFF, C. PROMOTION OF STAFF, AND D. DISMISSAL OF STAFF.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? ________%

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? ________%

QUESTION XV.

PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR ROLE IN MAINTAINING CONTACT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION AND THE IOWA COUNCIL OF AREA SCHOOL BOARDS.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? ________%

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role? ________%
QUESTION XVI.

DISCUSS YOUR CONTACT WITH STUDENTS, FORMALLY AND INFORMALLY, HOW STUDENTS ARE USED IN CAMPUS GOVERNMENTS AND DECISION MAKING, THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT IN YOUR INSTITUTION, STUDENT ACTIVITIES AND STUDENT RECRUITMENT.

a. What percent of your time is spent in performing the role? 

b. What percent of your time should be spent in performing the role?
APPENDIX C

PLEASE RANK IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE AS YOU PERCEIVE YOUR ROLE TO BE IN THE OPERATION OF YOUR COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE ROLE</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. President - Board Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff Salaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intra-Institutional Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. College - Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum &amp; Program Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legislative Matters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organizational Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Physical Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Institutional Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Resource Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff Selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Staff Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. D.P.I., I.C.A.S.B. Liaison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Contact with Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

RANKING OF THE SIXTEEN ROLE CATEGORIES

The sixteen role categories used in the study were listed and the presidents were asked to rank each of the functions according to their perception of the importance of the role with respect to the total presidential function. The instrument used for ranking showing the position of the question ranked on an average basis is shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Average/Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>