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Introduction

After much discussion by various groups in the College community, a proposal (1)* was submitted to the Board of Trustees in June, 1974, to reorganize the instructional services at SBCC on an experimental basis. The general form, intent, and direction of the proposal, were approved, and the staff was directed to present elements for implementation as they developed. The plan, which had previously been reviewed by the Representative Council and accepted in its general form, intent, and direction, provided for the creation of three Teacher/Coordinator positions to provide certain instructional support services. It also provided for autonomy for certain defined departments (roughly corresponding to cost centers) to plan and administer their programs. These departments could combine in any way they wished to form clusters, and each department would be entitled to an administrative stipend.

The plan was refined and further developed, and job descriptions were written. In October, 1974, the plan (2) for implementation was presented to the Board of Trustees as an information item. The plan included three basic elements:

"a. A functional approach to instructional support and to the description of work assigned to professional personnel.

b. Appointment of three Teacher/Coordinators to assist in performing functions not served or not served adequately in the current organization.

c. A new approach to departmental organization with the following elements:

1) Subject area departments will be identified. The faculty of each subject area will be permitted to join with the faculty of other subject areas as they wish for planning and organizing their instructional programs.

2) Compensation for departmental leadership will be assigned on the equitable basis of $140 per F.T.E. faculty plus $20 per teacher.

3) Compensation for departmental leadership may be used in any of the following ways:
   -- to provide hourly release time.
   -- to provide a stipend.
   -- to be distributed among department faculty.
   -- to provide for student worker assistance."

This plan, with some further refinement, was presented in final form (3) to the Board on November 14, 1974. It was approved for a two-year experimental period to begin with the Spring semester, 1975. As part of the experiment, the plan was to be evaluated at the end of one year and again after two years. This report covers the first year evaluation of the implementation of that plan.

*Superscript numbers refer to references at the end of the report.
Evaluation Plan

The evaluation has been carried out in substantial accordance with a plan presented to the Representative Council on September 29, 1975. This plan dealt with each of the three elements of the reorganization—development of a functional approach to instructional support and job descriptions, creation of three Teacher/Coordinator positions, and restructuring of departmental organization. Evaluation was to include the following:

1) Republication of the rationale for each element of reorganization to all involved so that the evaluation would be related to the rationale.

2) Involvement of the Superintendent/President, Administrative Dean - Instruction, other administrators, Representative Council, Curriculum Committee, Professional Standards and Leave Committee, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, Improvement of Instruction Committee, Facilities Committee, department and cluster chairpersons and coordinators, and the three Teacher/Coordinators.

3) Evaluation of comparative costs associated with the reorganization vis-a-vis the previous structure.

Questionnaire - It was originally proposed that the Assistant to the Superintendent/President develop questionnaires to be sent to administrators and to department and cluster chairpersons and that the Representative Council send its own questionnaire to faculty members. Instead, a single questionnaire was developed by the Assistant to the Superintendent/President. This instrument provided for identification of respondents as department chairpersons, administrators, faculty, counselors, librarians, or members of the above committees. It was used for all constituencies.

The instrument was distributed to the Superintendent/President, the Administrative Dean - Instruction, the Representative Council, and the Teacher/Coordinators for comment and suggestion. After a few revisions requested by members of the Representative Council, it was distributed to all contract instructors, counselors, librarians, and administrators (except those in Continuing Education). Results of the responses are summarized below.

Teacher/Coordinators - Each Teacher/Coordinator was asked to summarize his/her activities in terms of the respective job descriptions. The T/C's were asked to describe what work had been done and what they felt was most significant in work to be done. Also, the T/C's were each interviewed to determine their thoughts on what might be done to make these positions more fruitful to the institution.

Administrative Dean - Instruction - The Dean of Instruction was asked to provide his own written evaluation of the experiment.
His comments are included in a separate section, and his responses to the questionnaire are included in the summary.

Comparative Cost - A comparative cost analysis, showing the costs before reorganization and those after reorganization was prepared by the Dean of Instruction and is included in a separate section of this report.

Summary of Questionnaire Results

A total of 175 questionnaires were distributed. The overall response was 80, or 46 percent. The breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. Distributed</th>
<th>No. Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Library)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of the librarians, this does not represent adequate response to have high confidence that the results are representative of the entire campus community, nor of any of the above sub-groups. Even for instructors the response rate should be at least 70 percent. The possible reasons for this poor response are: 1) The instrument itself was somewhat lengthy, 2) It was distributed near the end of the semester, and 3) Many persons may feel unaffected by the structure, and therefore not strongly motivated to respond.

In anticipation that response might be inadequate, two questions were included so that the representativeness of the sample might be evaluated with respect to academic field of interest and length of time affiliated with SBCC. In terms of the number of semesters in contract status with SBCC, the respondents break down as follows, compared with the total campus community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of semesters in contract status (incl. Fall, 1975)</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>All Campus*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 10.29 \]

The hypothesis that the distribution of respondents is representative in terms of time on campus is rejected at the 5 percent level.

*The discrepancy between the total of 170 here and the number of questionnaires sent out (175) is due to the fact that no list was maintained of who received questionnaires. A later attempt to construct such a list after the fact resulted in only 170 names.
There is an under-response from those who have been at SBCC less than three semesters (and who, therefore, had no experience with the previous organization except perhaps as hourly instructors), and an over-response from those who have been here 6 to 10 semesters.

Of the academic areas listed on the questionnaire, the pattern of responses was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Area</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>No. Questionnaires Distributed</th>
<th>Response by Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Educ.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Occ.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Educ.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc/Tech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \begin{cases} 16.21 & \text{All areas} \\ 9.19 & \text{Instructors only} \end{cases} \]

*The 125% response rate here is evidently due to a keypunch error on one questionnaire.

This respondent distribution is judged to be representative with respect to academic area at the 5 percent level. Likewise, if only instructors are considered, the distribution is deemed to be representative at the 5 percent level. Although the overall sample is thus statistically representative, it can be seen from the percent response column that there is a relative under-representation of Health Occupations and Physical Education and a relative over-representation of the Natural Science, Social Science, Voc/Tech, Administration, and Other groups.

Among the respondents were**:

- 24 department or cluster chairpersons
- 28 former division chairpersons
- 26 members of the Curriculum Committee
- 7 members of Professional Standards and Leave Committee
- 7 members of Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee
- 10 members of Improvement of Instruction Committee
- 9 members of Facilities Committee
- 4 members of RARB

**Except for division chairpersons, these are people who served in these capacities in Spring, 1975 or Fall, 1975.
The remainder of the questionnaire was structured so as first to elicit opinion regarding the underlying rationale for the reorganization. Next was a section which dealt with the roles and duties of the three T/C's. In this section the duty statements were paraphrased, and respondents were asked to indicate by Y (Yes), N (No), or D (Don't Know) whether they felt that each particular function or duty was:

a) Important  
b) Adequately done before  
c) Improved now  
d) Worse now  
e) Better handled some other way

A substantial number of respondents failed to respond fully to these questions, either by not responding at all or by checking off only one of the above responses as a "best choice." Evidently the question was presented in a confusing manner or it was felt that it would be too time-consuming to respond. The result is that the responses to the question regarding T/C functions are too sporadic to be reliable.

The next section of the questionnaire dealt with the departmental restructuring. Questions were included at the end to identify department and cluster chairpersons, former division chairpersons, and members of selected committees. Finally, three open-ended questions provided an opportunity for respondents to elaborate on their answers to earlier questions.

Seven out of eight respondents felt that they were reasonably familiar with rationale for the reorganization. The table below summarizes respondents' attitudes about the rationale. It would appear that there is substantial agreement with the rationale that was the basis for the reorganizational experiment.

ATTITUDES ABOUT RATIONALE
FOR REORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Don't</th>
<th>Don't</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Do you feel that there is a need to define and clarify the instructional support functions that are needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do you feel that there is a need to assign responsibility for support functions and to provide for accountability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-5-
c. Do you feel that there were support functions that were being inadequately carried out under the prior organizational structure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Definitely No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


d. Do you feel that new legislative, fiscal, and instructional trends warrant coordination at the college-wide level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Definitely No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Definitely No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard for the need to centralize instructional support functions that were assigned to the T/C's, the pattern of opinion was as follows:

In general, is there a need to centralize the coordination of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general, is there a need to centralize</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know or No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Curriculum development and long-range planning</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b. Professional development and evaluation, in-service training, and inter-departmental articulation | 39  | 30 | 11                      |

| c. Planning, budgeting, and analysis of instructional resources | 66  | 7  | 7                       |

TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general, is there a need to centralize</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know or No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the apparent overwhelming opinion is that centralization of these functions is needed, although opinion is much more divided with respect to articulation and professional development, than it is with respect to the other areas.

All respondents were asked if they had had direct or indirect experience or contact with T/C's acting in their role as T/C's. Instructors were further asked if the T/C position had made an improvement in their teaching environment.
Have you had direct or indirect experience with the T/C for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N. A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Educational Planning and Curriculum</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Articulation and In-service Training</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional Resources</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has the existence of this position made an improvement in your teaching environment (instructors only)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N. A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Educational Planning and Curriculum</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Articulation and In-service Training</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional Resources</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While most respondents have had contact with the T/C’s, the instructors for the most part do not feel that the positions have had much effect in improving their teaching environment.

The reaction to restructuring by departments instead of divisions, the clustering of departments, and the provision for department administrative stipends is summarized in the following table. In a few areas the scale of opinion was tipped very decisively. It is felt strongly that the organization should be broken down by academic disciplines and almost as strongly that departments should be relatively autonomous. While respondents were almost equally divided on the creative possibilities offered by periodic re-clustering, it was felt by almost 3-to-1 that re-clustering would create too much confusion but by almost as great a margin that it would serve a useful purpose.

Nearly two out of three who expressed a clear opinion said that they would not want to be a division chairman under the prior plan, while nearly three-fourths said that they would be willing to serve as department or cluster chairperson under the present structure.

There was fairly good consensus that the stipend formulas are fair and equitable, but the weight of opinion seems slightly in favor of a formula which would provide more money overall for this purpose (see comparative cost analysis below).

Finally, in general, most people seemed to feel that the 12-division structure was serving the College well, but they were almost equally divided on their preference between the 12-division and the present department structure, with a very slight leaning toward the department structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion and N A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. Subdivision into 12 divisions was serving the College well | 12   | 19    | 20    | 13        | 9                 | 6                  |
b. Under the 12-division arrangement, I would not want to be a Division Chairman | 14   | 21    | 12    | 14        | 5                 | 14                 |
c. Instructional organization should be subdivided by academic disciplines | 21   | 32    | 13    | 4         | 1                 | 9                  |
d. Departments should be free to operate more or less independently | 20   | 28    | 10    | 10        | 5                 | 7                  |
e. Formation of clusters of departments, serves no useful purpose | 7    | 15    | 15    | 26        | 11                | 6                  |
f. Re-clustering every 2 years or so offers creative possibilities | 6    | 18    | 15    | 15        | 13                | 13                 |
g. Re-clustering every 2 years or so creates too much confusion | 14   | 24    | 14    | 12        | 2                 | 14                 |
h. Formulas for stipends are equitable and fair | 7    | 30    | 12    | 8         | 6                 | 17                 |
i. Formula for stipends does not provide sufficient money for responsibility | 8    | 12    | 15    | 18        | 10                | 17                 |
j. I would be willing, under present arrangement, to serve as department or cluster chairperson | 11   | 28    | 13    | 7         | 7                 | 14                 |
k. Prefer 12-division to present department/cluster arrangement | 12   | 12    | 17    | 14        | 11                | 14                 |
Responses of several subgroups of respondents were also considered for certain questions. The group of respondents who had been in contract status more than 10 semesters expressed a very slightly stronger feeling of need for centralization of instructional support than did all respondents. They were also slightly less satisfied with the 12-division arrangement and about as equally divided on their preference for 12 divisions versus the departmental structure tending slightly to prefer the 12 divisions. This group had a somewhat lesser aversion to serving as a division chairman under the prior plan, but was significantly more willing to serve in the role of department or cluster chairperson. Of the 21 persons who expressed an aversion to serving as a division chairperson, only 7 also expressed an unwillingness to serve as a department or cluster chairperson under the present plan. Of 14 who were not opposed to being division heads, all expressed a willingness to chair a department or cluster. The subgroup is about the same as all respondents with respect to their strong preference for structuring according to academic discipline and departmental autonomy.

Administrators who responded were virtually unanimous in their expression of the need to centralize the coordination of instructional support. There was only one dissenting response in the area of curriculum. Two of the five administrators felt that the 12-division structure was not serving the College well while the remainder expressed either mixed feelings or no opinion. One administrator prefers the present arrangement, one prefers the 12 divisions and the rest expressed no opinion.

Of the 31 persons who felt that the 12-division plan was serving the College well, 21 said they preferred the 12 divisions to the departmental plan, and three said they did not. The rest were mixed or had no opinion. Of the 22 who said the 12-division plan was not serving the College well, 18 preferred the department plan and the rest had mixed or no opinion.

There were 41 persons who had served as division, department, or cluster chairpersons. Of these 41 percent felt the 12-division arrangement was serving the College well and 29 percent did not. The remainder had mostly mixed feelings. However, 29 percent said they preferred 12 divisions to the present plan and 36 percent did not.

Twenty-eight of these chairpersons had at some time served as division head, and 24 now (or in Spring, 1975) served as department or cluster chairpersons. The ex-division heads felt by a 2-to-1 margin that the 12-division arrangement was serving the College well, but were split about equally on their preference between the old and new plans. The current department/cluster heads leaned slightly toward the present structure.

Of the prior division heads, 9 said they did not want to be division heads while 10 indicated a willingness to be. However, 18 said they would be willing to be department or cluster chairpersons under the new structure, and only two were not willing. The current department/cluster heads indicated equal willingness to serve under the present plan.

Present department/cluster chairpersons felt (by about 2-to-1) that the stipend formula was equitable and fair, but felt (by about 3-to-1) that it did not provide enough money to cover the responsibility involved.
At the end of the questionnaire there were three "open-ended" questions to permit persons to elaborate on their feelings. The comments in response to these items are summarized at the end of this report.

Teacher/Coordinators

The following described briefly some of the principal activities of each T/C and the work that had not yet been started as of about the end of September, 1975.

Curriculum – In this area the five-year academic plan was up-dated and presented to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor's Office. The T/C worked on new curriculum in the following areas: 1) Courses offered at the jail, 2) A bi-lingual, bi-cultural Teacher Aide degree program, 3) A Geo-Science Technician program, 4) Courses related to Physical Therapy, 5) A degree program in Communications, and 6) A possible Psychiatric Technician program.

A recommendation was submitted to the Curriculum Committee for a procedure to evaluate new curricula for funding. After adoption this procedure was followed with each request for a new course or program, and the results were used to prioritize requests.

An in-service workshop was conducted to develop criteria for evaluation of existing curricula and ideas were presented to the Curriculum Committee.

The T/C chaired the Curriculum Committee and talked with several persons about the possibility of developing interdisciplinary courses.

Major work to be done includes the development of criteria for evaluation of existing curricula, development of interdisciplinary courses, and development of institutes and mini-colleges.

Professional Development – Evaluation policy and procedure were evaluated, and a system for scheduling faculty evaluations was developed. Departments were assisted in working out intra-departmental evaluation procedures. Evaluation policy was distributed to several individuals and published in the Faculty Manual, and an Evaluation Manual was published.

In-service activities were planned and carried out at the beginning of the Fall semester. A special component of this was an orientation for new faculty. Many materials on in-service training have been obtained and distributed to departments as well as notices of workshops and other in-service opportunities.

An analysis of faculty participation on committees was conducted, and another analysis was conducted to learn how faculty members progress across the salary schedule. A form was developed for verifying units used in salary class transfer.
The 1975-76 Faculty Manual was revised, updated, and published, and put on mag card storage for easier typing in the future. A Business Services Manual was compiled for the use of department chairpersons and cluster coordinators.

Work in process includes an assessment of the evaluation process and revision of procedures and policies on evaluation, further in-service training programs, preparation of a comprehensive staff development program, including incentives.

Instructional Resources - A data base was established to permit analysis of departmental cost center expenditures. The T/C was involved in planning of facility modifications, including Library remodelling, Physical Science building addition, Audio-Visual projection booth for PS-101, and chaired the Accreditation Committee on Physical Plant and Equipment.

Assistance was provided in rationally prioritizing new certified personnel requirements and new and replacement capital outlay. A study was also made of facility utilization and space allocation.

The position was created too late in the 1974-75 year to be of much influence in the budget process, but in the future this will be a major activity. Continuing data gathering will be a necessity. A great deal needs to be done in relating departmental goals and objectives to resource needs.

Improving Effectiveness of T/C's - The Teacher/Coordinators are of the uniform opinion that the work to be done warrants a more than half-time assignment. While there is general agreement that direct contact with the classroom environment is essential, the consensus seems to be that no more than one class should be taught. It is possible that this feeling would change after some of the groundwork has been done, but while these functions are in the process of being established, it is felt that a one-half time assignment does not permit sufficient time for research and planning.

Also, there is a feeling of a lack of support in terms of personnel for telephone answering, appointments, correspondence, and filing.

There is insufficient "teamwork" among the T/C's partly because there is no apparent concerted effort to promote it and partly because there is insufficient time to meet and develop common goals and purposes. This situation could be helped by having T/C's share a common office area.

The Statistical Clerk in the Instruction Office is not available for research support enough of the time, requiring much of the "leg work" to be done by the T/C's.
Finally, the T/C's lack the leverage, or authority, to effectively carry out many functions that lie within their areas of responsibility.

Administrative Dean - Instruction

Comments were received from the Dean of Instruction and these comments are summarized here.

"Am positive toward the reorganization, although . . . there is more 'ground to plow' as to T/C responsibilities.

"Favor the T/C approach as contrasted to an administrative assistant. There is merit in the part-time teaching responsibility in to 'keep in touch' with the classroom environment.

"Consideration might be given, particularly in the case of the T/C, Instructional Resources, for additional released time . . . tasks are considerable. Much remains to be done.

"I see the possibility of combining the responsibilities of the T/C, Articulation and In-service Training, with . . . the T/C, Curriculum, possibly with 3/5 released time.

"With the exception of the T/C, In-service, (most) T/C-faculty contacts (are) with Department Chairpersons and certain Academic Senate Committee members.

"I am convinced that for the first time in the tenure of my position we are . . . addressing ourselves to functions . . . that are essential to the instructional program . . . of this college. The T/C concept must be supported and expanded!

"(Regarding) Departmental/Cluster organization--more time is needed . . .

a) A follow-up to the 'Needs Assessment for Department Chairpersons' . . . needs to be finalized and evaluated.

b) The . . . performance of the Department Chairpersons . . . needs evaluation.

c) I think we have too many departments. . . . would hope we could look forward to an amalgamation (more clustering) of the various departments. Administratively, the number of departments is somewhat unwieldy. Also, we have had no 'creative type' clustering to date. . . . there is a need to break down traditional departmental barriers and open up the communication lines. Clustering would also enhance interdisciplinary approaches . . ."
**Comparative Cost Analysis**

The comparison of costs between the old and new organizational plans takes into account bonuses or cash stipends and released time for administrative activities, and teacher-coordinator stipends. Under the prior plan divisional leadership costs broke down as follows*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Cash Bonus</th>
<th>Released Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Tech</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Counselor</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$5,300 11/5 (= 2.2 FTE)

The equivalent dollar cost of released time is calculated at the hourly replacement rate of $7,000 per year. Thus, $7,000 x 2.2 = $15,400, for released time.

| Total Bonuses          | $5,300     |
| Total Released Time    | 15,400     |
| Total Cost of Divisional Structure | $20,700 |

Under the current organizational structure, division chairman bonuses and released time have been replaced by department stipends of $140 per FTE plus $20 per individual instructor. The total of such stipends budgeted for 1976-77 is $26,165*. In addition, each T/C receives a $1,400 per year stipend and 50 percent released time.

| Total Department Stipends | $26,165 |
| Total T/C Stipends (3 @ 1400) | 4,200 |
| Total Released Time (7000 x 1.5) | 10,500 |
|                           | $40,865  |

**Comments on Questionnaires**

Many respondents accepted the invitation to add comments at the end of the questionnaire. While such comments are probably unreliable in forming a conclusion about overall campus-wide opinion, they do have value in assessing the qualitative aspects of pro and con opinion. They are included here.

*This list does not include $500 each for Head Librarian, Athletic Director, and Director of ADN program, nor 1/2 released time for ADN Director. These items are carried over unchanged into the present structure.
with minor editing to remove the identities of individuals or to remove irrelevant or redundant material.

If you answered, "Better handled another way" to any items under 6., 9., or 12., your thoughts on alternatives would be appreciated.

---More emphasis should be placed on innovative teaching techniques and materials. There should be a college-wide "information/materials faire" where publishers are invited to attend and display materials.

---(Research and data gathering related to curriculum) was supposed to be done by Assistant to President. (Development of instructional goals and five-year academic plan) should be done solely by the department. (Development of interdisciplinary courses and programs, and special projects) should come from a committee of instructors.

---Leave (selection of evaluation committees) to departments. Professionals train themselves. Orientation can be done by departments, as in the past. In-service time is better spent in teaching. Professionals keep up in their fields independently of pseudo-administrative help.

---Departments will get advice (on budget control) from Dean when it is needed.

---(Plans for new instructional facilities or modification of existing facilities) is the function of the department working with the classified facilities planning office.

---In-service training should be within department.

---a. More emphasis - enforcement - of having Department Chairpersons fulfill complete responsibilities.

b. Attach form - job description of instructors to contracts so that each instructor will be reminded of their (sic) responsibilities. These forms should be reviewed by each Department Chairperson since some departments may have included special requirements in the hiring and selection process.

Same recommendation for Chairpersons.

---Form six small (membership of eight) committees and allocate important functions to them. Members of committees are elected from a pool of instructors, one person from each department, by vote of instructors in the pool.

---In-service days should either be compulsory for all or dropped. If compulsory, attendance should be checked and enforced.

---Evaluation of teachers should be changed—simplified and more directly related to administrative responsibility of our Deans and Chairpersons.

---Too many assistants to assistants creates more red tape. Perhaps, it might help to have two or three Deans of Instruction.
--I think all of the T/C's could be combined into a single administrative assistant to the Dean of Instruction.

--Many of the tasks described are, in fact, merely clerical and do not require the direct attention of an administrator. In fact, they have been, and continue to be, performed by the clerical staff.

The 3 or 5-year budget or department goals projection I have written have never yet been used as a factor in budget requests. If they are not to be used, don't bother to do it.

--Use experts available on temporary basis either on staff or in community.

--Certificated Evaluation: Get a system which will eliminate most of the sheer paper work (90% of which is unnecessary) and devise some means of taking the manipulation of the final results out of the hands of the person being evaluated. Under the present system, any instructor can adjust the final results any direction they want to, if they had the inclination to do so.

--6a. Departments can research these themselves adequately.

6b. Depending on Curriculum Committee provides no checks and balances. They often have "tunnel vision" or refuse to look at financial obligations. Too much horse-trading possible. I hate to mention it, but some sort of responsible community advisory board may be needed.

10c. Evaluation should be simplified, rendering coordination unnecessary.

--Decentralized handling through department or divisional authority.

--Give responsibility and more time to Chairperson of Department. Need less administration-coordination and more action by Chairperson. A good Chairperson can save time, money and get better results financially and educationally than going through so many people, committees, forms, and "red tape." The newest way--give each department X dollars and let them run their own show--save money and get better results.

--Retain T/C's but put decision making in the hands of a faculty group such as division chairmen. T/C's could be invaluable as resource people.

--(7., 10., 13) The cluster chairpersons in conjunction with the Dean of Instruction staff (such as the coordinators). Get input to the coordinators. Let the cluster chairpersons follow through working directly with faculty in their cluster.

If you answered "Yes" to 6b., 9b., or 12b., can you describe how the T/C position affected your teaching position?

--It has increased the paper work enormously--useless Evaluation Manual read by no one . . . T/C has overstepped authority in some cases (e.g., attempt to make publication an evaluation criterion).

--T/C very cooperative in assisting department in goals, growth. New building problems--100% cooperation.
--a. Teacher/Coordinator, Articulation and In-Service
   1. Provided effective means of improving techniques of instructor evaluation
   2. Developed the first in-service education programs for entire staff
   3. Provided meaningful orientation to campus for new staff

b. Teacher/Coordinator, Educational Planning and Curriculum
   1. Provided reasonable and practical method for development of departmental goals and objectives
   2. Provided rational basis for evaluation of new course proposals

c. Teacher/Coordinator, Instructional Resources
   1. Provided assistance in budgetary development
   2. Assisted in structuring and simplifying requests for new teachers
   3. Developed system for allocation of replacement equipment funds and new equipment monies

--6. Helped some with goals and objectives

--Paper flow heavier--some of which was unnecessary.

--It actually depressed my environment.

--8b. In-service, though not perfect, has been more helpful this year than previously. Also, have been better informed about conferences that helped me because T/C has mentioned them to me.

12b. Information, retrieval of data buried somewhere in the College when this data was needed for sound committee decisions. No one available previously to do this.

--6b. Ease preparation of Department Goals and Objectives. More classroom time.

12b. Clarify and ease budget preparation and equipment procurements.

--6b. Gave me an overall view in a highly systematic way of where we were going and what policy we were working under.

   I was confused about the evaluation procedures which seemed simple and easy to conduct prior to this year.

9b. Most of my contact for instructional resources was with our Cluster Chairperson and that was most satisfactory. I had no need for and no help from the coordinator.

--This is a difficult question to give a specific answer to, but this last Fall semester as opposed to all other 13 I've spent here, got off to a very smooth, positive start. Buildings were ready on time, faculty morale and spirit of cooperation was high, few if any snafu's.

--The evaluation procedure has been clarified (despite numerous complaints to the contrary). The alternatives are clearer. The evaluation T/C has been extremely accessible and helpful. In-service training has also been a positive, reinforcing and informative experience. New courses have been added in our department with the help of the Curriculum T/C. Planning T/C has been invaluable in representing department and guiding us through maze of budgetary considerations in negotiations of additional funds.
--The process of instructor evaluation was much clearer. The preparation of the budget was made easier.

--I feel there are now 3 definite people that are available to handle the 3 different problem areas; whereas, before I felt there was no one to approach who had time.

--Helped provide necessary teaching lab equipment.

--Helped me with evaluation of my teaching and influence. Was not helpful in evaluating and creating criteria for choosing new positions to be funded.

--Met with T/C, Planning/Budget to go over budget requests. It was helpful.

--It provided the physical means for teaching.

--You should have another question: same as No. 19, except replace "Yes" by "No." The T/C, Articulation/In-Service Training has negatively affected my teaching environment. He has made evaluation more cumbersome, wasted time and money on a useless Evaluation Manual, deluged us with reading material of dubious professional value and has overstepped his authority by evaluating evaluation and by suggesting that publication, addresses to professional groups (giving a research paper), etc., should be evaluation criteria.

Please add any other comments you care to regarding the effectiveness of the experimental reorganization of instruction at SBCC.

--I have not been involved with reorganization or departmental leadership. I cannot add much to your survey.

--1. Remuneration for Department Chairmen was essential.
2. T/C's have had minimal effect on college operation.

--The biggest problem of the faculty is still that they lack effective leadership. This was true under the old scheme, and it is more true now. With effective faculty leadership many of the problems this scheme is designed to solve would simply disappear; without it, they will never be solved.

--Thank God for the reorganization. It has been much better.
1. Dave Williams has been helpful, considerate, understanding, and very hard-working.
2. Manuel Rivera has flooded our mailboxes with information. He has attended many meetings, has sincerely tried; but I personally feel the position is not needed. The man is outstanding.
3. Betty Dean - Same as Manuel. Outstanding person. Sincerely does her job, but the job is not needed.
We need strong chairpersons and strong administrators—no in-between persons. Too much red tape. Too many committees. Administrators, Deans, Assistant Deans, T/C's, Chairpersons—what next? Assistant T/C's, Assistant Chairpersons, etc.? Is there no end? Let the Chairpersons do their jobs.

--The concept seemed reasonable, but there are two different things working. T/C and departments are not necessarily one and the same idea. T/C's could be very useful to divisional structure. The result of so many departments, I believe, is that the faculty has become mute and impotent. I do not feel a part of the school and feel frustrated about effecting any change.

--a. Reorganization has increased responsiveness—sensitivity—of administration to needs of individuals within a subject area.
b. Reorganization has increased effectiveness of the operation of subject areas.
c. Reorganization has lessened conflicts/competition between subject areas and has increased cooperation between subject areas.
d. Reorganization has provided first approach to planned development of the entire community.

--Evaluation becomes a burden and also too time-consuming. Coordinators only increase work to be done. We need people to assist with work rather than merely advise. Student evaluations are of value only to the individual teacher and not as an instrument to be used in the required evaluation procedure. The questionnaire is very confusing.

--Need administrative coordinators who do tasks rather than only coordinate. Much of the work accomplished as I see it was administrative duty and was not of assisting or help to teachers.

--I think it has served no positive purpose. Money could be used for instructional support of greater relevance. I think it has decentralized rather than centralized the whole operation of the College.

--I haven't really noticed much difference. A few things have improved, but I don't think a significant number have nor do I feel certain that they are attributable to the reorganization. No really startling changes or cause-effect relationships have been demonstrated. On the opposite side, we have even a more unwieldy, top-heavy organization which I always consider a detriment.

--The cluster format is O.K. I see the cluster leader as the focal point of our activities, requests. He is more easily accessible, is usually in our general field and has the "feel" for our needs and purposes (and their importance to us).

With more secretarial help for a cluster leader, and added financial support, I believe you would have more people willing to take over the responsibilities of a cluster leader.
The coordinators don't seem to me to have had that much of an impact on the end product of good teaching, nor on the organization as a whole. They certainly can be useful in helping the Dean's office accomplish its tasks and liaison with cluster chairpersons, but I doubt the latter has taken place too effectively.

--From my limited view of all its working parts, I'd say that it's a good plan. I'm for giving administrative duties to administrators and letting them do them.

--The reorganization has streamlined many procedures--also clarified responsibilities.

--I feel the reorganization has been most effective.

1. There are now specific individuals to help with specific needs.

2. Departments are more responsible for themselves and their future. (Before, the Division Chairman was an unnecessary middleman.)

There are certainly rough places to be smoothed--but, in general, the reorganization has worked well.

--The departmental setup is an excellent idea and gives each department autonomy and a "closeness" in working together to accomplish departmental goals. I am very excited about continuing under the present reorganization.

The former divisional organization had a foul smell about it, especially when one considers that it enabled certain small departments to huddle together to form a bulbous festering sore.

--I am for breaking up the rigid divisional structure with competitive divisional chairpersons blocking change!!

--Cancel T/C for Articulation/In-Service Training. Cancel T/C for Curriculum. Appoint someone (full-time) with primary responsibility in planning and budget analysis--but who can help out in the office areas as time permits.

--It's probably premature to judge the effectiveness of this reorganization, although some of the streamlining will probably require our close scrutiny--especially Dave Williams' work. However, a major step backwards has been the avalanche of paper work. Can't there be a better way? Never have I spent so much time filling out forms.

--It is the best we have had because of its flexibility.

--Departmental reorganization seems O. K. I would prefer that the T/C's be eliminated and an Assistant Dean of Instruction be hired. At least eliminate the T/C's of Articulation and Curriculum.

--1. Before too many more "games," wouldn't it be a good idea to survey other colleges to find out what has worked and what hasn't worked for them. Learning often is easier on an observational level than on a trial-error basis.
2. If reorganization is to occur, should it be done piecemeal or should all functions of the instructional components be studied? (i.e. Dean, Assistant Deans, Department Heads, clusters, coordinators)

--I believe the experimental reorganization has worked much better than I anticipated even though I always approved of the concept. It is my opinion that the 3 T/C jobs are much more than half-time, and I believe that all 3 people have worked very conscientiously to make the jobs effective. I foresee even further expansion of the positions as the people become more comfortable in them and as the faculty learn their usefulness.

--I feel that I have a closer relationship with the T/C's and am able to communicate more effectively with them. They have made many changes for the better, and their actions have been more expeditious.

--Too soon to tell, but the administrative aspect is top heavy. We are doing too much administrative work as it is. The College is TOP HEAVY with administrators and their support personnel. The T/C's exemplify, so far, Parkinson's Law: work expands to fill the available time/void. They make more work for teachers to justify their new existence instead of relieving the teachers of administrative burden.

--Since the structure of the English Department was not affected, most of these questions do not apply to us directly. I leave it to others to argue the merits of the reorganization as it affects other clusters. It is perfectly obvious that we have needed additional administrative services for a long time--and the T/C's are providing some of those. The stipend for this department is inadequate for reasons I would be delighted to spell out.

--I see that it has had very little effect one way or the other.

--I am waiting and watching!

--More released time for Department Chairpersons! Under this system, they are the persons who are accountable.

--For the most part the Teacher/Coordinators have created more work for the instructors, rather than helped ease their work load. The method of asking teachers for more and more time to fill out forms to evaluate performance cuts down on the time spent on developing good teaching at this school. We seem to be marching backwards.

--I am of the opinion that one full-time Assistant Dean of Instruction could do the job of the 3 T/C's with better results.

--This is a double-edged situation. When we had Mr. Huglin in charge directly, without coordinators, I felt I knew whom to consult on matters of instruction. Now we have coordinators in several areas, but I find no great desire to consult with them on individual matters, formerly handled by Mr. Huglin. Perhaps the contact with the Administration is better, more direct with the Coordinators on hand, but I felt more comfortable dealing directly with the persons in the Administration
designated to handle such matters as come up. Doubtless, the Coordinators take a great load off the Administration's duties; yet somehow the Coordinators (all good people) don't really mean the same to me. I see these 3 people very seldom. They don't really help me improve my performance. Perhaps I should seek them out more on nettlesome matters.

--It seems to be a good plan for greater efficiency, and I would like to know more about it.

--I give up on your "evaluation." My position is diametrically opposed to the department concept. When we had divisions, we had some opportunity for cooperation and compromise. I think we should have combined several divisions, rather than gone the departmental route, and cooperated more.

Now there is no cooperation. It is each department out for itself. An example is the government proposal, which we cost-share. This is not "cheap money"—it is the most expensive money there is, for the Board of Trustees takes money from all departments—stripping them to nothing—and gives it to one department. The whole school suffers while one department gains.

We need a critical review of courses which have proliferated far beyond the realistic position of a junior college. We need a critical review of the books of the Library, which have expanded to match the unrealistic position of the courses.

--Different but not better—more centralization and administrative paper-shuffling cancel any gains in efficiency or responsiveness that supposedly accompany the reorganization. I see no tangible improvement.

--The only valuable T/C is the position for Instructional Resources, and it is too soon for me to be sure of that. Organization by department seems to be the most reasonable way to proceed. This is not a good questionnaire in terms of clarity.

--The reorganization has brought about a mountain of new forms and "paper work." Although the T/C's mean well and are, generally, helpful; they have made the instructors suffer a new burden of paper work which is generated by their offices. This generation of a paper avalanche is the result of their zealous desire to quantify every aspect of their responsibilities. Their conscientious desire to better serve the Dean of Instruction is admirable, but in their duties they have overlooked the chief objective of most faculty members who supported the T/C concept—that concept was to reduce the amount of paper work not to increase it. What has developed is a classic case of empire building by the T/C's. This empire building while not premeditated, will inevitably lead to full-time administrative appointments with the usual secretarial support and other perquisites.

I believe the entire T/C system should be dropped and replaced by one Assistant Dean of Instruction in order to save the teachers' time and paper work and to save the District from future expense. This action would enable the SBCC District to have some belt tightening in the administrative sector which has become bloated in recent years.
Line organization much preferred. Our present system is one of minimal strength for the faculty because of breakdown into inconsequential units. Why do administrators fear strong divisions?

New system gives teachers a chance to improve their lot in that T/C's are more interested in teacher problems than were (are) the administrators under the old system who were most interested in administrative problems.

I am for personal and departmental autonomy, with reduced administrative superstructure. Given a dollar figure, a course title, and free rein, I can do better than with any kind of "help." I strongly suspect that all this leads to is more long and confusing questionnaires like this one, and that all this wasted motion is siphoning off time, effort, and money that could be better spent on teaching.

Time to experiment more or go to the former way, modified for those divisions who couldn't get along.
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