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(ABSTRACT)

Three-fourths of educational change in recent years has been mandated by external groups such as legislative bodies, executive agencies, and accrediting organizations. Much of this mandated change affected the academic realm of the colleges and universities. Newcombe and Conrad's development of their 1981 mandated academic change (MAC) model, which identified four stages of progression of implementation and four variable categories that affected this implementation, was the only research which addressed this important topic. More research was needed to add to the knowledge base regarding mandated academic change as a strand of planned organizational change.

The purpose of this study was to examine the applicability of Newcombe and Conrad's theory of mandated academic change to two-year public institutions in Virginia in the context of the state mandate for all public colleges to adopt student outcome assessment plans. This research
employed the qualitative case study method at two community colleges in Virginia which provided real-life examples of the extent of the MAC model's applicability to the implementation of student outcome assessment plans. One-on-one interviews with the college personnel most closely associated with the implementation were utilized.

The principal finding was that the stage theory of the MAC model was unstantiated. It was also determined that the four variable categories described by the authors were appropriate in a community college setting, but further refinement of these categories using Creamer and Creamer Probabilty of Adoption of Change model of planned change might be helpful. It was also found that communication and vision, particularly determining the lines of authority, dissemination of information, and the early involvement of those affected by the change, should be given consideration as separate variables in studying mandated academic change.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Hall and Loucks (1977) and Sarason (1971) wrote that change should be envisioned as a process, while Hanson (1985) concluded that change is a process that alters behaviors, procedures, or purposes of an organization. Various conceptual frameworks have been presented in the literature to define this process as it operates in different political, economic, social, and educational settings. Researchers' explanations of the process of change have provided extensive information using corporations, colleges, the armed forces, and other such entities as subjects for the studies. The resultant data have identified a plethora of variables that affect the change process, as well as providing definitions of different types of change.

One such framework of change which has drawn a considerable amount of attention is planned organizational change. Studies of planned organizational change began in the 1940's with attempts to understand the technical processes of innovations. Parker (1980) wrote that the early literature on planned organizational change placed heavy
emphasis on overcoming resistance to change through the use of outside consultants or change agents, thereby leading to the adoption of the change. The implication drawn from these early studies was that adoption meant that the change would be implemented by the institutions and further that the change would be institutionalized within the organization. Institutionalization is the inclusion of the change into the programs, policies, and procedures of the organization. The critics of this implication pointed out that adoption does not necessarily lead to implementation or institutionalization, and that it is not individuals, but organizations that adopt changes in complex organizations such as colleges and universities (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975). Colleges and universities have been accused of having no commitment to change (Hefferlin, 1969), being designed to obstruct change (Gardner, 1969), and producing only unrealistic symbolic changes with short-term strategies (Deal, 1984). Parker (1980) maintained that educational institutions have adopted these stances due to the conservative nature of campus constituencies, particularly administrators and faculty.

Giaquinta (1973) stated that the early research on planned organizational change was only atheoretical efforts to make change instead of testing the theories of change, and that more research was needed to explain why educational institutions vary in their degree of acceptance of
change. Clark (1983) differentiated between academic institutions and other systems in regard to planned organizational change. He noted that as academic systems grow, budgets and personnel become fixed and more complex. The structures and regulations of the college evolve to protect the interests of the constituencies at the institution. The difficulties in effecting change at these institutions are exacerbated when proposed alterations from the understructure of the college consisting of faculty and administration, and those from the superstructure or external groups, have cross purposes. As the superstructures become larger, many of the external trends are translated into mandates from the external groups to the college. The vehicle for change then becomes political or bureaucratic rather than the professional vehicle of change from the faculty and administration at the lower level.

Cameron (1981) also discussed the complex position of colleges and universities in his work on organizational effectiveness. He presented four approaches to institutional effectiveness, none of which were appropriate in all instances of change, or with all types of institutions. The author noted that educational institutions are characterized by loosely organized units and ill defined goals which increase the complexity of such institutions. In turn, institutions are affected by external changes which lead them to adopt changes proposed by
the mandate. Cameron (1981) called this the strategic constituencies approach which defined organizational effectiveness in terms of how much the organization meets the needs and expectations of external constituencies. The later literature regarding planned organizational change gave consideration to the various factors affecting the ability of the complex organization to effect change given the political, economic, and organizational realities and constraints. More emphasis was given to such factors as influences external to the organization, compatibility of individuals involved with the change, communication of the need for the change, and clear definitions of the goals of the change.

STRANDS OF PLANNED ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

There are two major strands which have emerged in the development of planned organizational change theory. The Creamers' Probability of Adoption of Change (PAC) Model and the Mandated Academic Change (MAC) Model of Newcombe and Conrad represent examples of these two strands. Newcombe and Conrad state that the MAC theory has common elements with the complex organization, planned change, and political frameworks. They refer to these frameworks later as models. This study will use the terms model and theory as synonyms since this research will describe the phenomena rather than explore the theory. The PAC model deals primarily with internal processes of the institution and
concentrates on the influences of specific variables in effecting planned organizational change. Creamer and Creamer presently have not included discussion of the role of either external groups or of the role of stages of change in the process. The MAC model does stress specific stages in the change process and includes the world beyond the organization, but does not delineate in specific terms the organizational variables affecting change as does the PAC model.

Bennis (1966) developed the idea that planned organizational change was a process which involved collaboration with the use of a behavioral scientist acting as an outside change agent. He admitted that the terminology used to describe the process was imprecise and ambiguous, but Bennis did provide the reader some guidance toward understanding the terminology. For example, he described valid knowledge as using a behavioral scientist to identify variables that could be identified empirically to explain the behavior of persons and groups operating within the context of social settings of the institutions. The collaborative relationship was described as the ability of the change agent and the internal constituencies to set mutual goals, share data, and to interact with, and to influence each other.

The recent research of Creamer and Creamer has attempted to answer the criticisms of Giaquinta and others
by developing their PAC model of planned organizational change. Creamer and Creamer (1988) defined planned change as the intentional modification of goals, structures, and the culture of a college or university including the values and attitudes of employees. The authors have identified key variables affecting the acceptance of change in colleges and universities. Planned organizational change assumes that organizations will work through their own change processes in collaboration with a change agent who provides the necessary skills to assist the organization with the process but does not consider any of the external forces which may affect change projects.

These external forces such as legislatures, accrediting agencies, and executive agencies alluded to in the works of Clark and Cameron remain a facet of change which has not been fully explored in the change literature. Legislative bodies have in recent years become increasingly active in mandating changes to colleges and universities. Keller (1986) found that three-fourths of all changes in colleges and universities were initiated by external groups. Newcombe and Conrad (1981) described mandated change as any alteration to the environment of educational institutions which emanates from agencies outside of the institution. The authors, in developing their MAC model, have added to this scarce literature by attempting to isolate key variables that influence the ability of a
college or university to adopt successful long-term programs, policies, and practices. They defined these long-term changes as personnel and budget alterations, policy revisions, new role definitions, and new responsibilities and expectations among the key participants involved in the implementation of the change.

Newcombe and Conrad identified four stages of implementation of mandated academic change and four categories of variables affecting each of those levels. The four stages of implementation identified by the authors were infusion, preparation and policy formation, trial and transition, and policy execution. They further stated that the conclusion of each stage can be identified by certain activities having occurred. Progression from each of these stages to the next is dependent upon the interaction between four categories of variables identified by the authors. The first category, administrative leadership, requires a commitment to change and a decision that the change is needed. Administrative leadership consists of key individuals in the top level administration who facilitate communication and control over the change process with the president of the college initially assuming this role. The second category, facilitative substructures, perform various support services for implementing the changes. They provide channels of support for communicating, gathering, and assembling the required reports. The third cate-
gory of institutional subsystems includes all offices, departments, and groups that comprise the organization. The institutional subsystems, which includes the faculty, are critical elements in gathering support for, or reducing resistance to, the proposed mandates. The final category of variables is government intervention which is used when the process of change stalls internally.

Newcombe and Conrad determined that the relationship between the administrative leadership and the faculty was the key determinant of effecting long term mandated change. The administrators must make an early decision to implement the mandate by providing the necessary monetary and human resources necessary for effective implementation. The faculty too must be committed to the proposed change, but first must clearly perceive what their role will be in the process. The roles of administrators and faculty must be clearly delineated with each group understanding how the mandate will affect their individual responsibilities as well as the institution as a whole. Unless the administrative leadership of the institution interprets the mandate with the vision of the institutional mission, and communicates this vision to the faculty, long term change will not occur.

Both the administrative leadership and the faculty have vested interest in change. Administrators frequently interpret organizational goals and values in terms of
institution-wide concerns, while the faculty historically have been protective of changes that affect their classroom environment. Sieber (1972) described three basic images of faculty. The image of the rational adopter distinguished the faculty as having clear objectives and being receptive to precise information regarding the proposed change. Within this image, faculty will accept change if it has a clear purpose and if the alteration is sufficiently communicated to them by the administration. A second image of the faculty is that of resisting any change that alters traditional practices and disturbs the status quo. This group of faculty often adapts to change rather than adopting change. They will not endorse the goals, use the specified techniques to effect change, nor commit to the philosophy of the change. Deal (1984) called this a "ceremony of change, a dance of legitimacy, not a strategy of change" (p. 128). The final image of the faculty is the pragmatic skeptic who place heavy emphasis on protecting classroom autonomy. Faculty are protective of their classroom environment and tend to be suspicious of change proposals which are theory based with little evidence advanced to demonstrate how to employ them in the classroom (Doyle & Ponder, 1977; Fletcher, 1986; Fullan, 1982; Hanson, 1985; Lippett, Langseth, & Mossop, 1985). The mandating of change by external groups to educational institutions often forces administrators into a mid-level position between the
mandating agency and the faculty, thereby interfering with the proper relationship between the faculty and administration (Cohen & Brawer, 1982; Seidman, 1985). External agencies often do not have the expertise to properly understand the exact mission of the educational institution which causes a communications gap to affect the implementation of the mandate.

Newcombe and Conrad stressed the importance of administrative leadership in the MAC model. McCabe (1984) wrote that leaders must be visionaries who maintain a focus on institutional goals and values, while McGregor (1960) cited the need for an open communications system as a necessary trait for leadership. Both the PAC and MAC models, as strands of planned organizational change, include the variables of leadership, communication, and vision as being important elements of effecting successful change.

LEADERSHIP

Maccoby (1979) stated that competing interests within the institution and the nature of those being led were primary differences in the educational environment as contrasted with the business and governmental environment. These differences create a desire for swift decisions on one hand, and also the desire for an open, candid involvement by both faculty and administrators in the decision-making process. Leaders need to recognize this paradox and
understand that the interaction of administrators and faculty is a necessity (Abrell, 1979; Gardner, 1987; McGregor, 1960; Vaughan, 1986). Burns (1979) described this type of leader as a transforming leader or one who relies on the involvement of their followers. Tichy and Alrich (1984) wrote that transforming leaders require vision and an ability to motivate others to support the vision and seek long-term change which requires a system of open communications.

Bennis (1976) wrote that when leadership is at a low point, there is a need for those who can lead, since leaders are endangered by the demands of external mandates, and also by the diversity of the demands of internal constituencies. The problem of leadership today is how to set goals that will be acceptable to these constituencies. Bennis and Nanus (1985), Burns (1978), Creamer and Creamer (1986), McCabe (1984), McTavish (1984), O'Banion and Roueche (1988), and Roe and Baker (1989) described leaders as having the ability to communicate this vision to those affected by it, thus creating an environment on campus which is conducive to change. Unless the leaders can interpret the mandated change with the vision of the institutional mission and communicate this to the faculty, the change will not be effected.
COMMUNICATION

Lippett, Langseth, and Mossop (1985) cited the need for an open system of communications for information sharing in order for change to be effected. Communication occurs at the individual level, so it is imperative that administrators and faculty work in an open environment which allows for a free exchange of ideas. This communications process requires an attempt to gain a complete and accurate understanding of the need for the change and a delineation of the practical effects resulting from the change. Faculty may not understand the change proposal and therefore fear the consequences resulting from the change. This lack of understanding often leads faculty to comply with the letter of the mandate without actually changing any practice which might result in long term changes. Without proper communication between faculty and administrators this suspicion of hidden agendas can be expected. Unless the mandate is clearly communicated to the faculty in a fashion which promotes the interests of the institution without sacrificing the welfare of the individual, without compromising institutional integrity, and without aborting the college mission, faculty will be skeptical of the proposal (Vaughan, 1986).

VISION

Bennis and Nanus (1985) wrote extensively of visionary leaders as necessary components of any change process.
They defined vision as "an act of persuasion of creating an enthusiasm and dedicated commitment to change" (p. 107), and concluded that the vision may be as vague as a dream or as precise as a goal. Vaughan (1986) described vision as using the mission and goals statement of the institution to strive for the highest ideals. Visionary leaders communicate in order to develop shared meanings which creates an atmosphere of openness and collaboration that will "encourage individual motivation, development, and fulfillment" (French & Bell, 1984, p. 18).

Parnell (1986) distinguished between leaders with vision and those without. Leaders with vision consider all alternatives and change in order to solve problems. Those without vision allow the problem to take care of itself, or else they will impose an ad hoc solution until a more suitable one arises. Visionary leaders adhere to their goals and inspire others through positive action. Vision also entails the ability to empower others since the leader cannot be expected to carry out all aspects of the change process alone (Creamer & Creamer, 1986).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Effecting mandated change entails a lengthy process involving a number of stages each of which is dependent upon the preceding one. An assessment of the change process must be constantly reevaluated with external agencies understanding that meaningful change results from a
consensus building process by those whose work patterns will be altered by the mandates (Bryant, 1988; Feldman, 1988). External agencies must confront the fact that when implementation of mandates depends on changing behaviors of those affected by the change, failure can be anticipated (Schroeder & Jackson, 1988; Timar & Kirp, 1987). Mandated change can be difficult to achieve if proper leadership involving visionary planning and the communication of these plans is not present. Since the goals of these external agencies and of the internals, faculty and administration, are often contradictory, uncoordinated, or at least misunderstood, the process of change takes on a new perspective.

The recently mandated student outcomes assessment programs in Virginia's community colleges provide an excellent opportunity to increase the knowledge base on mandated change by using this mandated change research of Newcombe and Conrad as a test of the planned change model in a community college setting. The rise in the number of mandates from external agencies has increased the emphasis on accountability originating from pressures to spend tax money more effectively and has brought with it more centralized regulation (Boyer, Ewell, Finney, & Mingle, 1987). Peter Ewell (1987), a nationally known expert on assessment, stated in a presentation before the Virginia Community Colleges' Association Convention that "assessment goes to the heart of the institutions and questions whether
faculty are doing what they ought to be doing." The new emphasis on student outcomes assessment changes the focus of past reviews of institutional quality. Prior emphasis was on the means employed to provide quality education, while assessment shifted the emphasis to the ends or what the student actually learns. Effectiveness rather than efficiency became the criterion by which community colleges are judged. Mandated change emphasizing the accountability motive must be examined in terms of whether the change is compatible with institutional goals. Such a significant change in educational practices can be expected to create skepticism and resistance among administrators and faculty. This skepticism and resistance might be expected to increase because outcomes assessment was mandated by an external agency.

Mandated change such as student outcomes assessment demands that faculty and administrators respond to change proposals that may not be clearly understood by either group. This research will assist in furthering this understanding by examining changes in community colleges incurred as a result of this legislative mandate. The examining of Newcombe and Conrad's theory will add to substantive theory which derives from practice and is therefore suitable for use in practical situations. Conrad (1978) stated that there have been few ventures to study those internal variables most crucial in the change process
in educational institutions. Creamer and Creamer have developed these internal variables in their PAC model of planned organizational change, but the effects of an external mandate on these variables have not been considered. Newcombe and Conrad found that specific stages and specific variables interacting at each of these stages affected the successful implementation of long-term change. This study will add to the research of planned organizational change by further refining those categories of variables identified by Newcombe and Conrad, and by determining if the stage aspect of the MAC model does occur. More specificity can be given to the broad relationship between the administrative leadership and the faculty which was described as a key element in affecting long-term academic change by Newcombe and Conrad.

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE

O'Banion and Roueche (1988) wrote that external mandates provide less chance for the institutions to grow and effect long-term change. Change will be even more difficult to achieve since many external agencies have no educational orientation or fail to understand institutional mission and goals in terms of effectiveness, usually resulting in ad hoc measures that only address immediate problems (Martorana & Kuhns, 1975; Fantini, 1981). Newcombe and Conrad's study represented the only research specifically dedicated to the largely unexplored topic of
mandated academic change. Their study dealt with the implementation of Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 in thirteen four-year public institutions in Virginia. Even though the final sample included only four of the institutions, the authors concluded that four categories of variables and four stages of implementation influenced institutional ability to adopt programs and policies mandated by external agencies.

The purpose of this study is to examine the applicability of Newcombe and Conrad's theory of mandated academic change to two-year public institutions in Virginia in the context of a state mandate for all public colleges to adopt student outcome assessment programs. This study examines the role of administrative leadership, institutional subsystems, facilitative substructures, and government intervention in effecting long-term change caused by mandates from an external agency. It attempts to explain specific relationships among these categories of variables and how they accelerate or impede long term change. Refinement of these categories of variables are contrasted with those found by the Creamer and Creamer's PAC model with the intent of adding specificity to the categories identified in the MAC model. Newcombe and Conrad also found that mandated change is characterized by specific stages of progression marked by specific activities being completed which signifies the end of one stage
and the beginning of another. This research explains the importance of these stages in the present study. These purposes are accomplished by answering the following research question:

1. To what extent is Newcombe and Conrad's theory of mandated academic change adequate to explain the implementation of student outcomes assessment plans in Virginia's community colleges?

DEFINITIONS

1. Administrative leadership- key individuals in the top level administration who facilitate communication and control of the change process (Newcombe & Conrad, 1981).

2. Category- a basic theoretical concept, or conceptual element of a theory, that allows the researcher to explain and predict behavior (Darkenwald, 1980).

3. Category saturation- when no new idea is found to develop additional hypotheses (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

4. Clustering- grouping together of things that appear similar (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

5. Criterion-based sampling- requires that researcher establish standards necessary for the units to be included in the investigation, then find a sample that matches these criteria.

6. Facilitative substructures- perform mechanistic support services, such as providing reliable and efficient networks for communication of information, and task related functions, such as compiling and reporting data and assisting with budgetary requests (Newcombe & Conrad, 1981).

7. Factoring- hypothesizing that certain disparate words have commonalities (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

9. Institutionalization—changes which have become a part of the programs, policies, and procedures of an educational institution.

10. Institutional subsystems—wide range of departments and divisions comprised of individuals, including faculty, most likely to experience the impact of change (Newcombe & Conrad, 1981).

11. Long-term change—changes in personnel and budget, policy, role definitions, and responsibilities and experiences among participants involved in the implementation of change (Newcombe & Conrad, 1981).

12. Mandated change—any alteration to the environment of an educational institution which emanates from an agency outside of the institution (Newcombe & Conrad, 1981).

13. Model—small representation of planned or existing object; style or design. Used as synonym for theory in this study.

14. Theory—formulation of underlying principles of certain observed phenomenon which has been verified to some degree. Used as synonym for model in this study.

15. Vision—act of persuasion of creating and enthusiasm and dedicated commitment to change (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

DELIMITATIONS
1. This study is delimited to colleges within the VCCS.

LIMITATIONS
1. The case study method may present threats to generalizability.

2. The validity and quality of the data depends upon the trust relationship between the researcher and informant.

3. This study is limited by the ability of the informants to communicate their ideas and express them clearly to the researcher.

4. This study is limited by the expertise of the researcher in perceiving what was intended by the response.

5. The researcher must remain open to emerging concepts in the data without employing preconceived interpretations or notions in the analyses of the data.
6. Answers to the questions are affected by the level of awareness of the informant.

7. Responses of the informant are affected by the use of a tape recorder by the researcher.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

This study is comprised of six chapters, references, and various appendices. Chapter One presents an overview of the study including an introduction, the significance of the study, the purpose statement and research question, definitions, limitations and delimitations. Chapter Two represents a complete review of the extant literature regarding planned organizational change, concentrating primarily on the MAC model of Newcombe and Conrad and the PAC model of Creamer and Creamer. The chapter also includes brief reviews of the literature covering leadership, communication, and vision which are three important facets of planned organizational change. Chapter Three is the description of the methods employed by the researcher to conduct the case studies followed by Chapters Four and Five which respectively present the findings and the applicability of the findings to the case studies. Chapter Six describes the conclusions and recommendations from the study. The appendices include relevant supporting data which substantiate both the method used and the findings of the study. A complete reference list cites all of the sources used in this research.
Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

INTRODUCTION

Much has been written about change, but little has emerged concerning the complex topic of mandated academic change. However, many of the same situational and organizational factors relevant to other change are applicable to mandated change. The task of reviewing the voluminous material regarding change at first seems implausible, but it is necessary to gain an insight into the variables which are active in the change process. The process of mandated change is interactive, requiring an understanding of various factors and how they relate to each other at various levels of implementation.

This study proposes to examine the appropriateness of the theory of mandated academic change as it applies to community colleges in Virginia by using mandated student outcome assessment as the example of change. Since the literature regarding mandated change was sparse, this chapter will present a synthesis of the general change literature in order to provide an appropriate knowledge base for the study. This review will be followed by a brief description of leadership, communication, and vision: three variables identified in the literature which affect the progression of change. This synthesis concludes with a
presentation of Newcombe and Conrad's theory of mandated academic change (MAC) contrasted with Creamer and Creamer's Probability of Adoption of Change (PAC) Model of planned change. The discussion of these two distinct perceptions of planned institutional change will provide the reader with perspectives from two theories in differing stages of development.

PLANNED ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

The process of change involves a myriad of stages with specific variables affecting progression through these stages (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Fullan, 1982; Gaynor, 1977; Hall & Loucks, 1982). Berman and McLaughlin (1975), Chin (1967), Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1984), Dunn and Swierczek (1977), and Orlosky and Smith (1972) offered the view that the change process includes four possible levels of adoption. These authors have given different names to each of these levels, but basically they can be synthesized into four levels: first, the change may be adopted without an alteration of authority or responsibility; a second level of implementation involves certain modifications in authority or responsibility; the next level is institutionalization in which a real change in practice occurs at the institution; the final level may be total rejection of the change proposal.
Each of these levels of the adoption of the change is dependent upon the frame of reference in which the organizations perceive and define them. The degree to which change is effected depends on many variables including the clarity and complexity of goals, the need for the change, and the quality of the change (Fullan, 1982). Fantini (1981) concluded that the extent to which the change is effected depends upon the perceptions of all parties involved in the change, the authority of the proposers of the change, and the interpersonal skills of those in authority. Therefore any proposers of change must employ strategies to make the process a coherent procedure for effecting meaningful change. Change rearranges roles and relationships continuously (Deal, 1984). New variables affecting the change may appear causing modifications in the change process due to the interaction of these variables. Haworth (1979) and Parker (1980) warned that even though change is inevitable, it takes time. This is especially true in regard to educational institutions due to the conservative nature of the constituencies of colleges and universities (Hartle, 1987). Hefferlin (1969) wrote that some things become sacred in educational institutions as a result of institutionalism and ritualism caused by this conservatism. Change often requires risk-taking behavior which is essential in the change process.
but not present at most educational institutions. Administrators must recognize the needs of individuals within the organization and also must possess the necessary skills to gain a commitment from the faculty for support of the change proposal. Although change can be effected without support from the lower levels of the organization, ignoring them in the process can affect the stability and permanence of the change (Schroeder & Jackson, 1988).

Berman (1981) wrote that educational change is an implementation-dominant process. He distinguished between implementation and institutionalization. Implementation is a process whereby the system attempts a change in the organization, while institutionalization can be thought of as long term change, or a real change in practice (Fullan, 1982). Effecting long-term change created by external mandates often requires educational institutions to accommodate these mandates without fully considering the impact of the alteration on all groups within the organization. The issue for colleges then becomes the management of change. Nadler (1981) noted that three steps are necessary to effectively manage change. Diagnosing the present state, designing the future state, and implementation represent the three steps. Fantini (1981) wrote that unless those in authority take into consideration the feelings of co-workers, an adversarial
climate will exist that will hinder the implementation phase where resistance to change is most prevalent.

Keller (1986) described four groups that are usually active in any resistance to effecting change. The first group, defenders, tends to resist change and is protective of the status quo. Faculty resistance to change is attributed to both organizational and psychological factors. Organizational factors include tradition, maintaining the status quo, fear of a new procedure, non-participatory process, and competition for resources (Creamer & Creamer, 1988; Hanson, 1985; Nadler, 1981). Psychological factors that inhibit change are fear of the unknown, threats to classroom autonomy, and threats to personal security (Creamer & Creamer, 1988; Hanson, 1985; Nadler, 1981). These factors create an adversarial climate at the college that divides the constituencies into competing groups, thus lessening the possibility of effecting long term change.

A second active resistance group identified by Keller is the analyzers. These individuals do not attempt innovations but will follow if the change proposals appear to be successful. For instance, proposals which do not address such issues as a reward system for faculty for their participation will be opposed (House, 1974; Lortie, 1975). Fullan (1982) wrote that the exclusion of such
items as a rewards system in the change proposal often causes faculty to change in an ad hoc fashion without a commitment to or an understanding of the rationale behind the proposal. The third group according to Keller is the prospectors who seek to adapt the changes to their own situation and change in a way which will make the college more diverse. The studies of faculty characteristics and their commitment to change have produced the consistent finding that faculty believe that they have an impact on student learning (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984). Fullan (1982) wrote that educational change which affects student learning is shaped by the conditions within the socio-political system. Chin (1967) and Fullan (1982) concluded that change affecting student learning will usually be slower than the faculty member's sense of need to alter the status quo and the supply of new technologies, materials, and teaching approaches. Keller identified reactors as the final group. They respond to external pressures, but lack direction or are inconsistent in their own environment. These individuals need specific direction to fully understand the goals and purposes of the proposed change.

The importance given by Keller to the role of individuals in effecting change brings to light the question of whether individual change precedes organizational change. Argysis and Schon (1974), Gibb
(1972), and Lippett, Langseth, and Mossop (1985) wrote that change can be effected only if it occurs through the efforts of all individuals in the organization. Beer and Walton (1987) and Katz and Kahn (1966) stressed the importance of change occurring at both the individual and organizational level in order for it to be long-term change. Wilson and Corbett (1983) wrote that in order to completely recognize the full effects of change a distinction between the quality and quantity of the implementation of the alteration was needed. Quality refers to the degree of difference in content, behavior, and structure after the change while quantity includes persuasiveness, or the proportion of persons at the institution making the change. Fullan (1982) wrote that effective implementation is a process of clarification in which individuals exchange their views with each other. He concluded that conflict is inherent in this clarification and is necessary to allow faculty and administration to react to each other. In order to set the stage for such a relationship to exist, a proper climate for change must be established on campus.

Walker (1981) wrote that the climate at a college is a critical factor in its capacity for productive change which develops as a result of the management styles of the administrative leadership (Gellerman, 1959). Forehand and
Gilmer (1964) defined climate as "set of characteristics that describe an organization, that distinguish an organization, are relatively enduring over time, and influence the behavior of individuals in the organization" (p. 362). Roueche and Baker (1987) identified leadership, communication, motivation, rewards, and decision making as five climate variables which affect the administrators' management styles. Leaders must determine how to provide strong leadership without alienating people by carefully delegating authority and motivating by example (McCabe, 1984; Vaughan, 1988).

Giving a sense of ownership to persons affected by the change can create an environment that will often cause individuals to go beyond their usual commitment to effect change (McCoy & Allred, 1985). Those responsible for effecting changes at educational institutions must develop appropriate strategies in order to convey the purposes and goals of the proposed alterations to the various constituencies affected by the change. Vaughan (1986) commented that some community college leaders have eroded their leadership by spreading their decision making authority too thin by assigning it to the lowest possible levels and expecting results to occur. On the other hand, Abrell (1979) wrote that the leaders of institutions must understand that the sharing of power is not a weakness but
rather a sign of courage. Belasco and Alluto (1972) noted that the lack of participation in the decision making process represents one of the greatest dissatisfactions among faculty. If the area to be changed affects the faculty, they expect to be involved in the decision making process. Thus the strategies employed in the change process are of paramount importance in effecting the change. Chin and Benne (1969) and Sieber (1972) described three strategies of change which include the locus of control, channel of influence, and the type of change agent involved. The rational man or empirical-rational strategy assumes that individuals will act rationally if the change is reasonable or justified. Information dissemination is imperative as a central component in this strategy because the only barrier to the acceptance of change is the lack of knowledge about the proposed change. These authors thought it unlikely that this strategy will be effective in educational institutions due to the channel of influence being only one way communication from the administration to the faculty.

A second strategy, the normative re-educative or cooperator, is closely related to the first in that the rationality of those affected by the change is recognized, but the assumption is made that actions are not based on rationality alone. The task of the change agent is to
motivate people to cooperate requiring two-way communication and mutual understanding among all involved with the change. Trust is a key element in this strategy because individuals and groups who do not trust each other will have difficulty understanding the motives of others. The third strategy of change is the coercive or powerless functionary in which political and economic means are employed to effect change. Under this strategy, schools are bureaucratic institutions with the faculty being powerless to alter situations. Changes usually come about in these bureaucracies because administrators possess the power and have the ability to deal with the problem at hand. The locus of change is usually external or structural. This strategy does not seek to alter attitudes or increase knowledge, but mandates sanctions to induce change. Externally prescribed mandates often create suspicion at the college due to lack of understanding of the intent behind the mandate. The channels of influence are the bureaucratic or legal mandates with communication being the prescription for action and evidence of compliance.

Mandated change adds another level in the process of change. The place of the external agency in the total process of change must be considered as a part of the interaction needed to effect change. Martorana and Kuhns
(1975) suggested that three separate, identifiable, and, to some extent, predictable interactive forces exists in order to classify change in higher education. These forces interact to reinforce or cancel their effect on change. The first of these forces is personal which the authors divide into decision makers, implementors, and consumers. Decision makers are the influential people at the college and its surrounding environment. Implementors are responsible for carrying out the decision rather than making the decision. The consumers include legislators and other external groups. The second force according to Martorana and Kuhns (1975) is extra-personal, including tangibles and intangibles. Tangibles include faculty, land, and equity while intangibles are the policies and trends that affect the college. The third force is goal hiatus which represents the discrepancy between aspiration to a goal and the actual achievement of that goal.

Aspiring to a goal involves having a vision of where the institution wants to be, whereas goal achievement represents the current status of the institution. Wise (1977) stated that the creation of goals in the absence of theory is a useless process. Setting goals which alter existing practices in higher education requires understanding a number of factors. Martorana and Kuhns (1975) wrote that academic change includes a cycle of
exploration, formulation, trial, refinement, and institutionalization. Leaders must understand that their solutions to problems may not always be right, but must be viewed in relation to competing values (Fullan, 1982). Important factors to consider are the potency (Hanson, 1985) and the complexity (Fullan, 1982) of the change. Potency is the degree to which changes depart from the current state and draws out how much time, resources, energy, and teamwork will be required to effect the change. Complexity refers to the extent and the difficulty of the alteration for the individuals responsible for the implementation. The complexity of the proposal requires that it be clarified by various diagnostic methods to develop strategies and explain the philosophy of the change (Fullan, 1982). Gaynor (1977) pointed out that the number of levels at the college, together with the sub-divisions of those levels will determine the complexity of the change. The change literature emphasizes that the leader's ability to create an environment on campus which is supportive of change is a key component in successful change projects. Within this leadership ability, the communication of the goals and purposes of the change must be clear, concise, and understandable to all of the college constituencies. Clear communication involves long range
planning and a vision on the part of everyone at the educational institution in order to effect change.

LEADERSHIP

Bennis (1976) wrote that after fifty years of research there are no generalizations about leadership. Vaughan (1986) wrote that defining leadership is "like trying to lasso an eel, once you feel you have it in tow, it slips away" (p. 179). Even though as these writers agree that definitions of leadership are elusive and often complex, numerous traits have been cited as essential for the effective leader. The research listed such traits as possessing vision (Bennis, 1976; Creamer & Creamer, 1988; Gardner, 1987; McTavish, 1984; O'Banion & Roeuche, 1988; Roe & Baker, 1989; Vaughan, 1986; Watkins, 1986); conflict resolution skills (Mintzberg, 1980); and communication skills (Creamer & Creamer, 1988; McTavish, 1984; Mintzberg, 1980; O'Banion & Roueche, 1988; Roe & Baker, 1989; Vaughan, 1986; Watkins, 1986). Most of these authorities on leadership recognize that the interaction between leaders and followers is a two way process allowing for a climate on campus of mutual understanding between faculty and administration (Abrell, 1979; Gardner, 1987; McGregor, 1960; Vaughan, 1986).

Leadership in academic affairs differs from leadership in business and government in two ways: first, the nature
of those being led, primarily the faculty, and second, differences in the academic world itself (Maccoby, 1979). Faculty must understand that administrators cannot provide leadership without faculty support (Vaughan, 1986). Vaughan further contended that faculty should encourage administrators to make decisions without confrontation in those areas which do not directly affect the teaching-learning process or the well being of the faculty. Leaders must in turn recognize the needs and wants of the faculty and change the environment in which both leaders and followers operate. There appears to be a paradox in the academic world involving the desire for quick decisions on one hand, and the desire to be open and candid and to provide involvement in decision making on the other.

The problem faced by leaders in higher education is how to set goals that will be acceptable to all constituencies. Keller (1986) stated that these goals cannot be determined until the institution has a clear understanding of its current condition. This leader-follower relationship involves an interaction of individuals with common purpose, but working with differing degrees of motivation and power (Roe & Baker, 1989). This type of leadership which relies on the involvement of followers has been called transforming leadership (Burns, 1978). Even though Burns was writing about political
leadership, the application of the term is most appropriate to educational leadership. Vaughan (1986) wrote that transforming leadership establishes a relationship of mutual elevation that converts followers into leaders and that possibly converts leaders into moral agents.

Bass (1985), Terrey (1989), and Tichy and Alrich (1984) wrote that transforming leadership requires vision and the capacity to influence and organize meaning for followers to seek long term change. These authors cited the leaders' need for realism in setting the vision in revealing the possible outcomes of their supportive efforts. Burns (1978) wrote that the final test of practical leadership was the effecting of real change that meets the needs of people affected by the change. Vaughan (1986) in supporting this pragmatic view of leadership suggested that omitting pragmatism, prudence, and a willingness to compromise will make leadership impossible.

Persuasion and empowerment are important terms associated with transforming leadership. Neustadt (1980) defined leadership as the power of persuasion. Beer and Walton (1987) and Creamer and Creamer (1986) wrote that leaders must empower others. The transforming leader must have the ability to clearly communicate and define the mission of the institution, and persuade others to develop a belief that the proposed change will be consistent with
this mission (Heffelrin, 1969). The leader will then encourage followers to promote this change. Nural-Momen (1985) stated that a leadership style which combines authority with participatory decision-making is likely to create an environment producing the highest accomplishments. This style increases the followers' desire to assume responsibility since the leadership has shown confidence by empowering them with important roles to effect change.

Leaders in colleges and universities tend to be identified by their peers as ones who share and articulate their values. Hollander (1987) wrote that the view has emerged that followership is vital to leadership and involves a recognition and acceptance of mutually exchangeable roles. Vaughan (1986) concluded that leaders need to recognize that things will not always go as they planned. This view of leadership seems to define leadership as an art rather than a science. Fisher (1984) proposed that leadership is an art in that an effective leader must possess self esteem, ignore petty criticisms, and fully understand the total organization including the structure as well as the people within the organization. Bennis (1976) defined leadership as the capacity to diffuse new perspectives into an organization. He concluded that
at a time when leadership is at its lowest point, organizations need people who can lead.

Leadership involves the ability to diagnose the environmental demands of the institution and to either change styles to fit these demands or develop means to change certain variables affecting the environment (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Morris (1985) contended that leadership means preparation of the institution for unanticipated changes. While it is impossible to allow for all contingencies, leadership that supports the change process increases satisfaction and will possibly bring a sense of stability equated with the permanency of change (Morris, 1985; Paul, 1982). The leader must understand individual resistance to change, establish principles that build trust and explain the importance of the change to the individuals. This trust building process involves openness, honesty, and candor from the leadership and followership (Kegan & Rubenstein, 1973; McCabe, 1984; Ouchi, 1981).

Leaders who face a changing environment must know how to manage change. Even though leadership, not management, is the force for change (Smith, 1984), management is one of the functions of community college presidents (Vaughan, 1986). Corson (1975) and Rogers (1985) wrote that for higher education to be more effective, the administrative
leadership, together with the assistance of the faculty, must develop a process for managing change which includes defining the institutional mission, setting objectives, and allocating resources to meet these objectives. The differentiation between leadership and management is often not clearly explained in the literature. Keyser (1985) provided some clarification to the question of leadership versus management. Keyser wrote that leadership is an extension of sound management. He described the relationship between these two concepts in terms of the left brain-right brain concept. Management is seen as the left brain science which defines order out of ambiguity, while leadership is the right brain science which creates and anticipates new directions while influencing others to accept these new directions.

COMMUNICATION

Pyles (1984) defined communication as the achievement of a complete and accurate understanding as possible between two people. Glaser, Abelson, and Garrison (1983) concluded that clearly communicating the goals of a change project is likely to improve its chance of adoption. Alderfer (1977) wrote that organizations can be viewed as open systems of groups bound together by common goals and hierarchy of authority. The author stated that the quality of exchange of information is a necessary component to the
organization. Alderfer defined this quality of information exchange as mutuality. Alderfer, Kaplan, and Smith (1974) wrote that the level of mutuality is decided by the willingness of all groups in the organization to express ideas and to accept ideas of others. This requires that statements, either written or verbal, will be reliable (Rotter, 1967). The development of a trust relationship is necessary in order for communications to be believed and accepted by others (Giffin, 1967). A past history of reliable communication can lead to positive beliefs in the present change project. Golembiewski and McConkie (1975) and Kegan and Rubenstein (1973) found that the level of trust increases as communication increases.

Waugh and Punch (1987) observed that many fears and anxieties of those affected by the change may be alleviated by clear communication. Kouzes (1985) stated that the leadership must communicate their vision in a way which encourages followership. The communication of the change should make clear the need for the change, delineate the role of the faculty in terms of the amount of time and energy required by them, and explain clearly how the status quo will be affected. Creamer and Creamer (1988) found that there were often too many complex goal statements filled with jargon and vague strategies.
The communication of knowledge about the change project should be accomplished through an efficient network intended to increase faculty awareness of the advantages of the proposed alteration (Punch & McAtee, 1979). Kozma (1979) cited four sets of factors which might influence the dissemination of information even though the communications network may vary at different institutions. The first factor is an informal network involving social interaction among members of a system. This informal network is as simple as faculty discussing a change in the snack bar. Second, a formal network exists which includes the resources and personnel to support the change. Early involvement of the faculty in the change project will assist in creating an environment which is conducive for change. The faculty and administrators can then work together in an environment which allows each side to better understand the needs and wants of the other (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Corbett, Firestone, & Rossman, 1987; Richardson, 1988). Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1984), Crofton (1981), Fullan (1982), and Richardson (1988) suggested that early involvement of the faculty is necessary to clearly communicate goals, reveal strategies for implementation, and create a sense of ownership. Creamer and Creamer defined ownership as the need to
involve individuals who have the skills, drive, and understanding needed to carry out the change effort.

Martorana and Kuhns (1975) cautioned leaders of organizations to communicate any unfavorable aspects as well as the merits of the change; otherwise, faculty perception of the change project might be distorted. Fullan (1982) referred to this distortion as false clarity or making a complex change appear too simple. A planning document is a necessary component to communicate both the negative and positive aspects of the alteration. Creamer and Creamer (1988) found that the more successful change projects reflected the concerns of both faculty and administration in this document. It seems then that administrators need to translate the potential modifications from abstract principles into understandable practices which faculty can initiate (Fullan, 1982). For instance, change proposals often do not consider classroom contingencies until later in the process. Translating broad principles and outcome statements into specific classroom strategies becomes a demanding task for faculty. By clarifying these items for faculty, administrators can help alleviate fears of hidden agendas, provide information about the practicality of the change, and enhance faculty awareness of the advantages of the change (Bennis, Schon,

The final two factors cited by Kozma which might influence dissemination of information are the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. An intrinsic reward is administrative encouragement, while extrinsic rewards are primarily personal satisfactions by the individual (Bess, 1977; McKeachie, 1978). McTavish (1984) discussed rewards while alluding to what she called the contribution theory. Open communication is a requisite trait for this theory. The basic tenet of the contribution theory is that faculty have a desire to make strong contributions to the institution and wish to have this recognized by their peers and superiors. One way to enhance the contribution theory is to make rewards available to faculty and other constituencies contingent upon the achievement of specific goals (Nadler, 1981). These rewards may be simple recognition of the achievement or more substantial rewards such as promotion, bonuses, or raises. Stephens (1974) found that even skeptical faculty accept change if contingencies for rewards are included in the proposal.

Havelock (1971) emphasized that good communication connects the users of information with those who produced it. The author found that faculty involvement with formal institutional support agencies increased the likelihood of
adoption of the change since the agencies increased the faculty member's awareness of the change, thus reducing the perceived risk of the modification. Faculty resistance is often more intense due to a lack of understanding of how the proposed alteration will modify the present state of the faculty (Drucker, 1974; Nadler, 1981; Nisbet & Collins, 1978). Beckhard and Harris (1977), March and Simon (1958), and Nadler (1981) stressed that faculty who see no practical benefits in moving from the status quo will resist change. McCoy and Allred (1985) recommended that this situation may be eased by clarifying what change is desired, why it is desired, and who determined that the change was needed. This belief supports evidence which suggests that only after translating the theory behind the change proposal into concrete procedures, do the faculty fully understand the proposal (Doyle & Ponder, 1977; Gross, Giaquinta, & Bernstein, 1971; Smith & Keith, 1971). A dilemma often exists, however, for administrators in setting and clarifying goals. The problem becomes how specific should the administrator be in setting goals while attempting to reach consensus among all groups. Harris (1987) wrote that the more specific the goals, the better the clarity and more acceptable the change; however, the greater the specificity, the more difficult it is to reach a consensus.
Ewell and Boyer (1988) found that the role of communication is a primary factor in mandated change. They determined that the best communications process is a mixture of formal and informal networking with a clear document trail which provides opportunities for clearing up misunderstandings. The authors emphasized that in mandated change any communication between the external agencies mandating the change and the educational institution becomes political. This politicalization often causes academics to search for hidden agendas and therefore misinterpret the true meaning of the mandate. On the other hand, the external agencies may not completely comprehend the academic environment which leads to misinterpretations of the mission of higher education.

Gwinn (1981) suggested that institutions should go through a self analysis when change proposals are introduced. The institution should determine what the change is, what it will be, and what it should be. Nadler (1981) contended that a need exists to identify dissatisfaction with the current state and build a participatory climate. This will improve the flow of communications as to what the change will be and the reasons for the change. McCabe (1984) and Ouchi (1981) wrote that the essential ingredient needed to build a climate in which persons go beyond their usual commitment

VISION

Bennis and Nanus (1985) defined vision as a target that beckons. This vision may be a dream or a precisely stated goal. McCabe (1984) viewed vision as setting goals for the future. Vaughan (1986) wrote that vision was using the institutional mission and goals statement to guide the college toward a higher purpose. Parnell (1986) added that leaders without vision will eventually be replaced. He differentiated between leaders with vision and those without vision. In Parnell's estimation, leaders with vision change in order to solve problems after considering all choices, while those without vision allow problems to resolve themselves or implement an ad hoc solution until a permanent solution arises.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Keller (1986) wrote that vision does not necessarily originate with the administrative leadership, but may come from faculty, the literature, or any other internal or external source. Terrey (1989) stated that at the center of any vision is
learning, teaching, instruction, curriculum, and an intangible called connectors. Connectors belong to the faculty who must assume responsibility in order for the vision to be institutionalized. The faculty must have a clear image of the change project in order for them to connect all of the pieces in ways that will effect modifications in existing practices. For this connection process to be a reality, leaders must treat their co-workers in an ethical manner and share sufficient information with them.

Bennis (1976) and Lippett, Langseth, and Mossop (1985) recognized that change involves confrontation. Confrontation implies reacting to issues that divide individuals. Without proper vision and the communicating of that vision, confrontation may become an irreconcilable block on the way to change. Confrontation may occur in four areas. There may be confrontation in knowledge which includes a conceptualization of understanding the changes in behaviors which increase performance. Skill is a second possible area of confrontation. Skill relates to an increase in the new ways of accomplishing tasks by changing behaviors. Attitudinal change is a third area of confrontation in which new feelings occur as a result of some successes resulting from changes being effected. The final area of confrontation is the adopting or rearranging
of one's values (Bennis, 1976; Lippett, Langseth, & Mossop, 1985).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) cited six different dimensions of vision. Foresight determines how the vision fits the environment of the institution. Hindsight attempts to maintain the tradition and culture of the organization while effecting necessary changes. The world view dimension interprets the effect of the visionary plan on the widest possible milieu. Depth perception and peripheral vision enable the leadership to see the total picture and as a result prepare themselves for all possible responses. The final dimension of climate revision allows for constant alterations to the visionary plans.

The Chronicle of Higher Education (1986) reported that the most effective college presidents identified as visionaries were strong risk takers with a dream. Risk taking requires a strong trusting relationship between the constituent group and the leadership (Giffin, 1967; Lillibrige & Lundstedt, 1967; Swinth, 1967). Watkins (1986) wrote that risk takers are not afraid of failure and impart this fact to others. Etzioni (1961) noted that this fear of failure is often the reason higher education lacks visionaries. He wrote that reputation is the prime indicator of success in higher education. Since innovative ideas tend to be risky in the educational community,
Etzioni reasoned that innovations are rarely the basis of solid reputation.

Vision requires that leaders in higher education analyze and interpret an ever changing data base and interact with constituencies both pragmatically and philosophically. This allows the leader to maintain a faculty perception of confidence in the situation, and, at the same time act as a catalyst for change (Smith, 1984). Gardner (1987) wrote that leaders must understand the concerns and expectations of their co-workers. Hoy and Hupersmith (1984) called this leader authenticity or a constant behavior in which the subordinates' perception of the leaders is one of taking personal responsibility for the actions, outcomes, and mistakes of the organization. These leaders personalize their vision and display a caring attitude for all constituencies at the college and promote this vision through a system of shared governance with the president being the final arbiter (Lippett, Langseth, & Mossop. 1985).

CONTRASTING MODELS OF CHANGE: MAC AND PAC

BACKGROUND

The literature is scarce regarding mandated academic change. The reasons for this lack of research are unclear unless it can be assumed that the topic was simply ignored because of the nature of the term mandate. Researchers may
feel that a mandate carries with it the obligation to change, and therefore, the process was just one of implementing the order. Another possibility for the sparse literature on mandated academic change may be that mandated change is seen as the same as planned organizational change. In order to gain some perspective on the literature in this area, Newcombe and Conrad's (1981) model of mandated academic change (MAC) is reviewed. This theory is in the earliest stages of development. The Probability of Adoption of Change (PAC) model of planned change of Creamer and Creamer (1986) is presented as a contrasting model. The PAC model was chosen as the contrasting model because of several factors. First, the two models provided the researcher with several important contrasting features. This section concludes with a thorough discussion of these features but a general listing is provided at this point to provide a perspective on these contrasting features. The presence of the stage theory of the MAC model provided the first contrast. The terms planned and mandated offered the second contrast. Third, the PAC model used student development programs as the basis for the research whereas the MAC model used academic change. Fourth, the MAC model defined what was meant by successful change whereas the PAC model did not. Fifth, the PAC model assumed a rational change process emanating from the top down while the MAC
model spoke of change being effected by the relationships established among four variable categories.

The researcher's familiarity with the PAC also led to the decision to chose the model as a contrasting one. It is noted that certain similarities do exist in the MAC and PAC frameworks. Studies on both frameworks lack a single unifying theory. A second similarity is that certain methodological flaws exist in the research from both frameworks. The two models have given very little emphasis to empirical studies. Efforts have generally been single case studies or comparative studies with small samples. This commitment to case studies as the method of analysis created some problems with the generalizability of the findings and a lack of methodological controls. Though there were many contrasting features of the two models, the variables defined by Creamer and Creamer and those described by Newcombe and Conrad had similarities. The categories of variables developed by Newcombe and Conrad lacked the clarity of those established in the PAC model due to the extensive development of these variables by the Creamers. This review serves to provide a perspective on specific frameworks and their development, together with a chance to contrast the two models in the final section of this chapter.
MANDATED ACADEMIC CHANGE

Newcombe and Conrad's 1981 work on mandated academic change represented the only study of this topic. Newcombe and Conrad defined mandated change as any alteration to the environment of educational institutions which emanates from agencies outside the college. The role of the external agency must be considered together with the internal variables that have been identified in the literature on planned organizational change as having an impact on successful change. Mandated change often causes resistance because educational institutions oppose attempts by external groups to impose change without first asking the colleges for their input. The goals of external agencies who mandate an academic change often differ from those of internal constituencies of administration and faculty. Externals may assert that their action is the result of public interest, while internals question the externals' ability to understand the mission and goals of colleges and universities. The collaboration and cooperation of both internal and external forces is necessary if long term change is to become a reality (Lippett, Langseth, & Mossop, 1985).

In order for educational institutions to change, leaders need to assess the nature of resistance to the alteration (Henegar & Taylor, 1988). Without proper
communication between externals and internals, and between the faculty and administration, academics tend to suspect that hidden agendas exist in change proposals. Kerr (1984) maintained that external mandates create less chance for the institutions to grow and effect long term change. Lane (1987) and Cross (1984) agreed that externally mandated change will receive negative responses from educators if the change affects the quality of education. Mandated change emphasizing the accountability motive must be examined in terms of whether the change is compatible with institutional goals. Gleazer (1985) feared that the accountability movement would subject community colleges to increased bureaucracy and provide less flexibility in bargaining to meet community needs. Measuring effectiveness entails resolving the extent to which institutional purposes or ends are accomplished. However, consideration must also be directed to the question of efficiency or the ability to accomplish these ends with available resources (Boyer, Ewell, Finney, & Mingle, 1987). The reaction to such mandated changes by maturing institutions like community colleges is to return to those concepts and principles that have been effective (McCabe, 1984).
THE MAC MODEL

Newcombe and Conrad (1981) presented a theory of mandated academic change (MAC) to explain effective implementation of mandates by four-year colleges and universities. The authors identified four stages of implementation of mandated academic change and four categories of variables that affect those stages of implementation. Newcombe and Conrad identified the four stages of implementation as infusion, preparation and policy formation, trial and transition, and policy execution. They identified the four categories of variables as administrative leadership, facilitative substructures, institutional subsystems, and government intervention. The institution's progression toward implementing the mandates depends on the interaction of one or more of the several relationships among the variable categories operating at each stage of implementation. They further contended that the end of each level of implementation can be shown by certain activities having been accomplished.

STAGES OF THE MAC MODEL

The four stages of implementation identified by Newcombe and Conrad are dependent upon the interaction of the four categories of variables. The first stage of implementation, the infusion stage, involves the
introduction of the mandate which college leaders interpret and examine for fit within the institution. Various groups within the college participate in formal and informal discussions which provide feedback or reactions to the mandated change. At this stage individual attitudes and opinions are clarified and articulated. The mandate is introduced either formally or informally for discussion among personnel. Administrative leadership is very important at this level with the college president usually assuming responsibility for the articulation, interpretation, and clarification of the mandate. The president, or another leader, must show a commitment to the change by allocating proper resources, both human and financial; otherwise, direct control over the change process may not be possible. Once the process of clarification and initial interpretation is completed, the infusion level ends and the preparation and policy formation stage begins.

The preparation and policy formation stage initiates the institutional planning phase. Administrative leadership is important at this level also due to the attention directed to the formulation and planning of the change. An institutional self-study is appropriate at this stage. The results of the self-study are interpreted and a decision on how to utilize the results is made. A
declaration of intent to comply with the mandates is usually filed at this point. The internal and external receptivity to change and the potential conflicts, risks, and options are evaluated. A decision is made on the selection of the college substructure to be used to facilitate the change process. If a substructure is not in place at the college, one must be established to provide this needed support for the project. The reaction and responses of the college constituencies mark the end of the preparation and policy formation stage.

The third stage, trial and transition, begins with the onset of observable changes which include the cycles of decision making, conflict, action, reaction, and adjustment. Leaders respond to reactions from college constituencies at this stage. Personnel changes, budgetary changes, policy revisions, and redefinitions of roles and responsibilities all may transpire. The facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems are of primary importance at this stage. Often change agents other than the institutional leader emerge. The activity-conflict-response patterns are accelerated at this level since the impact of the change will be felt more by certain constituencies. Stage three ends when formal institutional policy in implementing the mandate is concluded.
As the trial and transition stage proceeds, the institutions move toward the final level of implementation, policy execution, as the policy gradually gains acceptance. The policy execution stage will be determined by the extent to which the new practices are accepted by all constituents. Colleges may fail to reach this stage for various reasons. The administrative leadership may resist the mandates. The leaders may also fail to use the substructures and subsystems effectively, thereby increasing opposition. Another hazard that may impede progress toward the final level is the failure of the government mandating agency to intervene in the change process, or the possibility that they may re-interpret existing regulations. If the college gets to the final stage, the subsequent changes are likely to be better planned and more systematic. The action-conflict cycle is less pronounced. In some cases the change cycle may regress due to personnel changes among the key leadership, or due to the re-interpretation of policy. The variables of facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems are important at this level of implementation.

CATEGORIES OF VARIABLES OF THE MAC MODEL

The variable category, administrative leadership, requires that the top level administration determine that a change is necessary and that they will commit the fiscal
and human resources to effect the proposed change. Administrative leadership must demonstrate the ability in the early stages of the change project to act in an effective manner that promotes progress and acceptance of change within the college. The president of the college usually assumes this role as communicator and controller of the change process.

Facilitative substructures are the second category of variables. This category includes the substructures which perform various support services for implementing the changes. They provide channels of support for communicating, gathering, and assembling the various reports, and attempting to increase support for the proposed modification. These groups also assist with budgetary and personnel matters. This category includes various committees, faculty senates, institutional research, budget office, and others. These substructures must be in place, or at least the ability to put them in operation, in order for effective implementation to occur.

The third variable category, institutional subsystems, includes all of the departments, offices, and groups that comprise the organization. The individuals within the subsystem, including the faculty and administrators, are the ones most likely to experience the impact of the change. The subsystems become crucial elements in
garnering support for, or reducing resistance to, the suggested alteration. As the conflict potential increases, the role of the institutional subsystems intensifies. Effective communication may lower this intensity by maintaining a two-way relationship with the administrative leadership. The political climate which surfaced during the first two stages may influence the perceptions and the decisions of the leadership and thus their relationship with the subsystem. The subsystems must be committed to change, capable of administering the change and given the authority and resources to carry out the change. The extent to which all of the subsystems adopt the change becomes an important consideration. Government intervention is the fourth variable. This variable is used if the change process stalls internally. In the event the process does stall, adequate oversight from the mandating agency is necessary to assist in effecting the change. Newcombe and Conrad noted that even when minimal government intervention occurs, the colleges do react to the intervention in a manner which will add impetus to the implementation of the mandate.

PLANNED ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

The earlier studies of planned organizational change placed a good deal of emphasis on the intervention of outside change agents. This literature was often referred
to as OD or organizational development which assumed that organizations would work through their own change processes with outside consultants providing them with the necessary skills to complete the task. Giaquinta (1973) criticized this early literature because he characterized the studies as atheoretical efforts to make changes, not efforts to test theories of change. He suggested that more research was needed to explain why organizations like educational institutions vary in their degree of acceptance of change. Dunn and Swierczek (1977) provided more focus for planned change research in their meta-analysis of several studies of planned change. They attempted to determine if the various hypothesis derived from the earlier studies were valid. The authors found change efforts which featured collaboration were more successful than those which did not employ collaborative strategies. A collaborative strategy includes mutual goal setting with equal opportunities for all constituencies to change these goals. Second, planned change efforts having a positive orientation are related to successful change. This orientation is one in which the change agent seeks full involvement of all groups in order to gain the greatest amount of input in order to effect change. Dunn and Swierczek's final characteristic of successful change, closely related to the second, was that
the strategies with high participation levels are more successful than those with lower levels.

Creamer and Creamer's efforts to further refine the variables continue until the present. Creamer and Creamer (1988) found that opposition to change proposals was caused by competition for resources or by objections to the process used to effect the change proposal. The authors verified the findings of Dunn and Swierczek that any change proposal which did not include a participatory process would likely result in failure to achieve stated goals. This opposition was found to be primarily passive and was demonstrated by a lack of participation and apathy. For instance change strategies which involve the faculty must give them a sense of ownership of the plan which may be provided in a clear, concise planning document. Change may be effected without the support of those at the lower levels of the institution, but ignoring them in the process may adversely affect the implementation of any resultant change.

In January of 1988, Creamer and Creamer reported that the research still had not developed the theoretical framework for predicting successful change efforts. The authors stated that even though the efforts to accomplish this framework had increased, the application of the research was still applied significantly more to
organizations other than institutions of higher education. Current models of planned organizational change failed to define specific situations unique to colleges and universities. Factors which affect outcomes of planned organizational change had grown but still exhibited weaknesses in the lack of identification of variables affecting successful change efforts, the lack of a theoretical base, and the lack of evidence of reliability of the studies.

THE PAC MODEL

Creamer and Creamer have continued to attempt to bring clarity to those variables which affect the successful outcomes of planned organizational change. Creamer and Creamer (1986) wrote that the applications of OD research to colleges and universities were increasing. The authors stated that this research was primarily devoted to the research and reporting of practioners unsupported by theories of organizational change. Such a theoretical basis was necessary because, without such a basis, findings cannot be generalized across multiple settings and problems. Creamer and Creamer's research was designed to increase the understanding of planned organizational change in student development programs in colleges and universities. They used the AVICTORY model of Davis and Salasin in their initial 1986 study and found that this
model placed too much emphasis on the variable of resistance and not enough on the leadership and advocacy for the change. In analyzing their findings, Creamer and Creamer discovered that student affairs officers in colleges and universities created the impetus for change both as leaders of and advocates for the change projects. This finding contradicted the earlier OD literature which emphasized the role of outside change agents in effecting successful change projects (Creamer & Creamer, 1986).

The literature on planned change is extensive with Creamer and Creamer (1986) defining planned change as "an intentional effort to modify organizational goals, authority structures, program activities, and the normative cultures of a college or university, including values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of employees" (p. 431). Creamer and Creamer during the past four years have developed the Probability of Adoption of Change (PAC) model in an attempt to develop a unified theory of planned change. The process is still in its initial stages, even though their work has added considerable clarification to the variables that impact on successful planned change efforts. The research on the PAC model suggested that resistance was overemphasized while the role of leadership was not given enough emphasis. In the years following their initial research, Creamer and Creamer have tested and
refined the PAC model on different occasions. The most recent version of the PAC model identified nine key variables within an organization that influence the outcomes of planned change efforts (Creamer & Creamer, 1989). This study was conducted by using nine cases of curricular reform as compared to reforms in student affairs used in their previous research. Creamer, Creamer, and Ford (1990) followed this study with a statistical examination of the reliability of the PAC model constructs to determine what variables contribute to each of the constructs.

The following variables, presented in condensed form, were identified by the authors as contributing to outcomes of planned change projects in organizations:

1. Circumstances- a feeling of the need for change shared by many.

2. Value Compatibility- project goals are consistent with the prevailing values and priorities.

3. Idea Comprehensibility- frequent communication about project goals, benefits, and plans for how implementation will be accomplished.

4. Practicality- adequate resources (monetary, physical, human) earmarked for the project.

5. Superintendency- directives and endorsements from top-level leaders about the project.

6. Championship- official empowerment of an individual with responsibility to implement the project.

7. Advantage Probability- perceived benefit(s) of the project.
8. Strategies- groups and activities established with responsibility to plan the project.


These variables in the PAC model represent two major refinements in Creamer and Creamer's model. First, the variables of top level support and leadership were merged into one variable called superintendency. This variable together with championship is consistent with the earlier studies of the authors that two rather than three levels of leadership are influential in planned change projects. The second refinement was the addition of opposition as a separate construct. Opposition was clearer in curricular reform than in student affairs reform. The researchers recognized that opposition was important in their earlier studies, but they included it under other variables rather than including it as a separate construct.

In addition to the two levels of leadership variables identified by Creamer and Creamer, the remaining constructs of the PAC model appear to be dependent on leadership. Circumstances, idea comprehensibility, advantage probability, practicality, and strategies all are dependent upon the ability of the leaders to show certain traits to accelerate the change process. This leads to the conclusion that planned change since it is dependent upon
leadership can be compared with mandated change in this respect.

THE MAC MODEL CONTRASTED WITH THE PAC MODEL

Contrasting the two models must be organized in a way which emphasizes the main features of both models. It was determined by the researcher that organizing the discussion around the stages identified in the MAC model would be the best approach. This discussion will be followed by brief discussions of other contrasting features of the two models. The MAC model does define four categories of variables that affect the implementation of mandates at each of the stages. However these variables lack the clarity of the nine variables identified in the PAC model. The contrasting of the PAC variables with the categories of variables within the stages in the MAC model may provide more insight into the total process of change.

CONTRASTS IN STAGES

A key distinctive contrast between the MAC and PAC models was the stage theory of Newcombe and Conrad. These authors concluded that mandated academic change passed through four distinctive stages of implementation. These stages of infusion, preparation and policy formulation, trial and transition, and policy execution were not a part of the PAC model. The emphasis placed on the stages of implementation by Newcombe and Conrad was probably due
to the implication that mandated change dictated implementation. The degree of implementation, however, depended upon the four categories of variables and the establishment of several relationships at the four stages of implementation. Newcombe and Conrad wrote that each of the categories of variables were more important at one distinctive stage. For instance administrative leadership was most dominant at the first two stages of infusion and preparation and policy formulation. Facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems were most prominent at the trial and transition stage with government intervention being important at any stage depending upon the institutional progress toward reaching the goals of the mandate.

The MAC model cited infusion as the first stage of the implementation of change. The requirement is introduced, interpreted, and examined for fit within the institution. The mandate is articulated to the various constituencies within the institution and their feedback is received. The MAC model suggests that the variable of administrative leadership is of most importance at this stage. The commitment of the president of the institution is viewed as a critical element of the administrative leadership. Change will not be effected unless the president is convinced that the requirements of the mandate correspond
to the mission of the college. The president must be convinced that the commitment of both human and fiscal resources will benefit the college. This first stage is critical since the administrative leadership must set the proper tone for the institutional response to the mandate.

Several items not fully pursued by the MAC model affect this stage. In order for the leadership to set the proper tone and receive valuable feedback from the institutional constituencies, the administrative leadership must know if there is a widely felt need for the change and if the campus environment is supportive of the proposed changes. The leadership must understand the values, beliefs, and attitudes of the faculty. If the proposed change is inconsistent with the institutional culture, the implementation of the mandate will be hindered. Further, the leadership must be able to clearly articulate the benefits of the mandated change. They must gain support by communicating clearly to all constituencies in the academic as well as the student services division the intent of the mandate. The president can set the proper tone only if he/she possesses the necessary insights into the factors, and then are willing to commit resources, provide support and oversight, and then make a determination about the assignment of qualified personnel to make the project a top institutional priority. The variables of circumstances,
value compatibility, advantage probability, strategies, and superintendency identified in the PAC model of Creamer and Creamer address these factors more completely than does the MAC model of Newcombe and Conrad.

The second stage of the MAC model is preparation and policy formation. Administrative leadership is identified again as the most important variable at this stage. Ideally a self study is conducted at this stage and the findings are used to determine the internal and external receptivity to change. An examination is made of conflicts, risks, and options apparent at the college. The policies needed for implementation are adopted. Many of the factors which affect the implementation of the mandate evident in the first stage are also present at this the second stage. The president's commitment, definite strategies, and the clear articulation of the benefits of the change are necessary at the preparation and policy formation stage. These components correspond to Creamer and Creamer's superintendency, strategies, and advantage probability variables. Two additional factors are important at this stage of the MAC model. The mandate must be clear enough to allow understanding by the college constituencies and sufficient human and fiscal resources must exist to support the initiative, together with the consideration of the timing of the issue and the
availability of enough talent among the faculty and staff to implement the plan. Creamer and Creamer's variables of idea comprehensibility and practicality appear to address these factors.

The third stage of trial and transition is the stage at which decisions regarding resources, personnel, roles, responsibilities and expectation, and policies are made. Newcombe and Conrad considered these as long term changes. Leaders respond to reactions from constituents at this stage. Resistance is likely to appear at this level. The use of facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems play a more dominant role. Consideration must be given to whether or not proper substructures are in place and whether they will be effective in facilitating implementation of the mandate. It is also critical to determine the extent to which all subsystems have adopted the change. The PAC variables of advantage probability, superintendency, strategies, and opposition variables appear to provide greater insight at this stage. The MAC model also suggests that a leader must emerge from the faculty subsystem during the trial and transition stage to assist the leadership in selling the idea to the college. This emergence of a faculty leader seem to correspond to the championship variable identified in the PAC model. This champion should possess the skills necessary to
diffuse opposition to the project. The individual must assume responsibility for the execution of the project and be committed to the plan in order to serve as a strong advocate for the mandate.

The final stage of policy execution involves determining the extent that the new practices have been accepted by college constituents. It appears that all of the variables of administrative leadership, facilitative substructure, institutional subsystems, and government intervention are important at this level. Whether or not long term change has been effected will be determined by the interaction of all of these variables at the previous stages of the MAC model. In contrast, the variables from the PAC model which impact at this level appear to be opposition, championship, and superintendency. The role of the other PAC variables at this level may be present but not to the extent of those listed.

PLANNED VS. UNPLANNED CONTRAST

Another contrasting feature of the two models was the obvious planned versus mandated change definition. Mandated change implied compliance with an external directive while planned change was viewed as being intentional alterations with the change emanating from the top down. Schroeder and Jackson (1988) questioned whether the collective behavior of colleges and universities was
rational enough to plan change from the top down. Creamer and Creamer (1988) stated that the PAC model was most applicable to conditions influencing outcomes of projects by leaders within the institution. The authors' earlier research found that the institutional leadership in student affairs played a primary role in the eventual outcomes of planned organizational change efforts. Newcombe and Conrad found that the role of the mandating agency may be a major determinant in effecting change. These authors found that even the slightest intervention by the external agency affected the institutional progress toward change.

CONTRASTING LEADERSHIP ROLES

The role of administrative leadership was also given a dominant role in the MAC model. The MAC model of Newcombe and Conrad stated that successful mandated academic change projects were determined by the development of several relationships among the four variable categories which would be present during the four stages of implementation. The MAC model emphasized that even though administrative leadership was a key determinant in effecting successful change projects, the roles of the other variable categories must not be overlooked. Creamer and Creamer concluded that their future research would include a further clarification of the leadership roles defined by the PAC model. Their most recent study found that two levels of leadership were
important contributors to the outcomes of planned change projects. They merged the variables of top-level support and leadership into one variable called superintendency or "directives and endorsements from top level leaders about the project" (Creamer, Creamer, & Ford, 1990, p. 22). The other leadership variable was called championship which was the "official empowerment of an individual with responsibility to implement the project" (Creamer, Creamer, & Ford, 1990, p. 22).

CONTRASTING DEFINITIONS OF SUCCESSFUL CHANGE

Dungy (1988) and Rickard (1988) questioned Creamer and Creamer's research for not defining what constituted successful change projects. Dungy continued by stating that attention needed to be given to the institutional record on change projects. She suggested that a past record of trust and cooperation of constituencies at colleges and universities may affect the success of these projects. The MAC model defined successful outcomes of mandated academic change in terms of long-term change. Long term academic change was defined as changes in budget, personnel, policy, expectations, and roles and responsibilities.

CONTRASTING PROGRAMS FOR THE STUDIES

The MAC model dealt with mandated academic change as opposed to the majority of the PAC model's studies being
based on research of student development programs. Creamer and Creamer recently increased their research into studies of curricular reforms and found that the variables previously emphasized were evident in curricular programs as well, even though, opposition was found to be a key variable in the curricular studies. The previous research of these authors found that resistance was not a key variable in determining successful outcomes of planned change projects in student development areas. The MAC model does not consider a separate opposition or resistance variable in their study of the implementation of Title IX athletic programs for women which they call academic change.

SUMMARY

Creamer and Creamer have developed the PAC model to a higher degree than the MAC model of Newcombe and Conrad. The authors have determined key variables important in measuring successful outcomes in student development programs of planned change. They have tested these variables for reliability using curricular reform projects and have modified the variables accordingly. Their research has led Creamer and Creamer toward the development of a theoretical base for planned organizational change. The MAC model in contrast remained in the earliest stages of development. The same types of studies are needed for
the MAC model to develop more fully the four categories of variables, and equally important, to determine if the stages of implementation will stand the test of research.

The heuristic nature of the PAC model made it useful to consider changes which were mandated and often unplanned. Creamer and Creamer (1988) reported that college administrators faced many issues which may affect the implementation of successful change projects. One of the issues cited was compliance with regulatory change or mandated change. Educational institutions in recent years have faced an increasing number of mandates from external agencies such as legislative bodies and accrediting agencies. Therefore it may be that change in colleges and universities is often unplanned and irrational rather than planned and rational (Rickard, 1988). Dungy responded to Creamer and Creamer's research by thanking them for attempting to add clarity to this very difficult topic. She questioned the authors concerning the impression she drew that some college administrators believed that they could operate in the same manner as heads of the corporate structure when change was mandated. The corporate structure according to Dungy was better equipped to reorganize in a brief period of time in order to facilitated change.
Dungy suggested that the cultures of corporate management and those of colleges and universities presented a major distinction. She suggested that mandated change caused passive resistance among the faculty when an all-out effort was necessary to effect successful change. A special consideration for those responsible for implementing the mandates was that many of these mandates affect the faculty. The faculty represented a unique group at the institution because they were not subordinates or followers necessarily because of the nature of their job. This unique characteristic of the faculty had always made it difficult to use organizational and management principles in which those in charge can order and demand compliance. Dungy suggested that it would be most helpful to learn how this passive resistance may be overcome.

The role of leadership is stressed in both the MAC and PAC models. The leadership variables in the PAC model have been refined. The variables of top level support and leadership have been combined into superintendency (Creamer, Creamer, & Ford, 1990). This revised category is consistent with the earlier studies of Creamer and Creamer that two rather than three levels of leadership are influential in planned change projects. The remaining constructs of the PAC model appear to be dependent upon leadership. Circumstances, value compatibility, advantage
probability, practicality, opposition, and strategies all depend on the ability of the leadership to demonstrate certain traits that will accelerate or impede the change process.

The role of administrative leadership in the MAC model was also stressed by Newcombe and Conrad. The authors drew two implications from their study of mandated academic change. They stressed the importance of administrative leadership. The priorities of the institutional leadership do affect their willingness to make difficult decisions. Also, their leadership styles influence the development and use of the substructures and subsystems necessary to effect change. Since mandated change implies implementation, the second implication was that the degree of implementation at the faculty level occurs only when individuals within the subsystems are committed to the change and capable of administering the change. The ability of the leadership to communicate and provide a clear vision will affect the faculty's willingness to comply with the requirements of the mandate.
Chapter 3

Method

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this study was to examine the applicability of Newcombe and Conrad's theory of mandated academic change to two-year public institutions in Virginia in the context of required institutional change to adopt student outcomes assessment programs. The review of the extant literature revealed quantitative and qualitative works describing various facets of change. These studies dealt with both the stages of change and the various characteristics that affect the success of change. Many of the existing theories and models for change were developed for non-educational settings but could very easily be adapted to the educational milieu. The two areas this literature review found to be the least represented were mandated academic change and the community colleges.

The work of Newcombe and Conrad in 1981 in attempting to develop a theory of mandated academic change was the only research on mandated change. Since educational institutions are often under the control of external groups such as accrediting agencies, governing boards, and legislatures, the area of mandated change appears to be a viable topic for research. Newcombe and Conrad's work was
conducted among four-year colleges and universities in Virginia. It thus seemed appropriate that a similar study be conducted of mandated academic change in Virginia's community colleges.

A fact which emerged from the literature review was the complexity of the change literature. Change was found to be multi-dimensional and related to numerous individual and situational variables. The fact that most of the literature on change concerned four conceptual frameworks—planned change, complex organizations, diffusion of innovations, and the political—also lends credence to the idea that there exists no clear empirically based understanding of mandated academic change in community colleges. Given the multiplicity of variables that might be proposed to contribute to the process of mandated academic change in community colleges, a research strategy that began with a tentative analytical framework and used a process based on a qualitative analyses of data was judged appropriate for this study.

The theory of mandated academic change as described by Newcombe and Conrad proposed that four variables interact at four successive stages enabling long term change to be effected. The variables of administrative leadership, facilitative substructures, institutional subsystems, and government intervention are present in each of the four
stages and will interact with each other to gradually move from one stage to the other. Their theory stated that the stages of infusion, policy preparation and formation, trial and transition, and policy execution can be viewed as successive stages. Certain characteristics marked the end of each stage which must be completed before moving on to the next stage. This theory was in its earliest level of development, and therefore, the variables were explained in the broadest context. In an attempt to bring further clarity to mandated change, the contrasting Probability of Adoption of Change (PAC) model of planned change was reviewed together with the literature of change in general. This review of literature revealed several characteristics, which most agreed, impacted upon the change process. The most significant were leadership, communication, and vision.

The recently mandated student outcomes assessment in the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) provided an opportunity to research Newcombe and Conrad's theory in a community college setting. The implementation of student outcomes assessment plans in the VCCS was in the early stages of an on-going process. Most of the colleges have implemented at least a portion of their plan. The plans offered a diverse array of techniques to access student outcomes. A review of the process used to effect the
change may be expected to produce results just as diverse as the plans themselves. Determining the reasons for the changes presented a multiplicity of problems. Recognizing what changes have occurred required keen observation, but delineating why the changes ensued can become laborious and can present difficulties. The answers to questions which seek to elicit how or why certain change was effected were often difficult to discern. Planning the method to address these questions was equally difficult. A choice must be made between quantitative and qualitative methods. The literature revealed strong arguments for both techniques. However, searching for answers to the how and why questions seemed, on balance, to be best suited to a qualitative approach using case studies.

Erickson (1986) and Merriam (1988) appraised the case study as being a good model for educational research. Qualitative research attempts to relate how all of the parts or variables of an event or process work together to form an entity. This type of research which focuses on discovery, insight, and understanding from the view of those being studied presents the primary hope of contributing significantly to the knowledge base and practice of education (Merriam, 1988).
PREPARATION OF THE RESEARCHER

The researcher reviewed the works of Glaser and Strauss (1967), Yin (1984), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Merriam (1988) in order to gain familiarity with the case study literature. The researcher had some knowledge of this method through his master's work and also as a result of teaching in the field of political science and dealing with case studies. A portion of the researcher's coursework was the Anthropology and Education class which added to his knowledge. To further develop interview skills and note-taking techniques for use in the research, the researcher sat in on classes in interviewing skills and talked at length with the instructor who assisted in refining these interviewing and note-taking techniques. The researcher also participated in a Police Review Board in which twenty-eight candidates for promotion were interviewed. This exercise allowed the researcher to refine his own interviewing and observing skills as well as observing four other more experienced interviewers. A pilot study was conducted at one Virginia community college consisting of four days of interviews with the faculty members and four administrators. These interviews provided practice in the interview method of data gathering and helped to develop initial impressions of typical areas of concern as related to the theory of mandated change. The
researcher also used the interviewing process to revise the protocol to elicit more detailed responses from informants. A follow-up critique of the interviewing session was completed with several of the participants in the pilot study.

CHOICE OF THE SAMPLE

Two community colleges were chosen for the study. Pseudonyms are used to identify these colleges in order to maintain confidentiality. These colleges, McClure Community College (MCC) and Rush Community College (RCC) were chosen after consultation with individuals at the Virginia Community College Systems Office. Each of these colleges had different levels of success in complying with the student outcomes assessment mandate. MCC responded quickly to the mandate, while RCC's response was much more cautious. Their plans were accepted, but at different points in the approval process. These institutions were also chosen for their similar size, their willingness to participate in the study, and their accessibility all of which made it possible to utilize a diverse number of informants in program and discipline areas. MCC and RCC are similar in size with a full-time equivalent student enrollment of approximately 1,500 students. Both institutions had an experienced faculty because of very little turnover. Each college had experienced recent
periods of growth which had allowed them to offer a
diversity of course offerings and degree programs in the
college transfer, allied health and vocational areas. In
addition to these similarities the colleges' service areas
included a rural population interspersed with more
urbanized cities and towns.

The presidents of each college granted permission for
the study and assigned their respective administrative
assistants to aid the researcher. A list of faculty and
administrators who had worked at the colleges for at least
five years was obtained. The five year cutoff was chosen
primarily at the discretion of the researcher. He wished
to ensure that each informant was employed by the college
at the time of the mandate in order that they would have
sufficient knowledge of the implementation process.
Institutions were informed of the assessment mandate in
1986, so the researcher determined that five years of
employment was at least a minimum figure. In reality, most
of the informants had worked at the colleges many more than
five years.

The most appropriate sampling strategy for case study
research was called non-probabilistic. The most common
form of this type of sample was called purposive (Chein,
1981) or purposeful (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). This type of
sample was based on the assumption that the researcher
needed to select a sample from which he/she could learn the most. Patton (1980) labeled this type of sampling as maximum variation sampling, the purpose of which was to include as much information as possible about all of the various ramifications and constructs. This required the researcher to establish the standards necessary for the units to be included in the investigation, then find a sample that matched these criteria. This differed slightly from the theoretical sampling of Glaser and Strauss (1967) in that purposeful sampling occurred before data collection, while theoretical sampling was done in conjunction with data collection. The technique chosen for this study was purposeful sampling with a variation that included additions to the sample as data collection progressed.

THE INTERVIEW

The researcher was concerned with the process used at MCC and RCC as they devised their assessment plans. In addition to the faculty lists, the researcher also used the initial assessment plan to identify the committee that was used to facilitate the development of their plans. The composition of the Assessment Committees was checked to ensure that those on the committee had at least five years experience at their respective institutions. Arrangements were then made to interview these committee members
individually. It was decided that the interviewing process would begin at MCC. Initially, interviews were scheduled for a one-hour block of time. At the end of each interview, the informant was asked to identify others who might be helpful to the researcher. As more informants were identified, interviews were arranged with them. The process was also used at RCC.

This process resulted in twenty-nine interviews being conducted at MCC and seventeen informants being interviewed at RCC. The twenty-nine informants at MCC consisted of twenty full-time faculty members and nine administrators including the president and the dean of instruction. MCC was slightly further along in their process with more individuals involved. RCC had not had much involvement by the faculty so they had fewer informants. As individuals were identified at RCC, it became apparent that the seventeen informants represented those who have knowledge of the process used to design the student outcomes assessment plans. These seventeen informants were six full-time faculty and eleven administrators including the president and the deans of instruction and student services. All informants at RCC who were identified were contacted. Since the interviews at RCC took place after the end of spring semester, two of the informants identified were out of the state and another one refused to
be interviewed. With these exceptions all those named as possible informants were questioned.

The informants were given a brief explanation of the nature of the research without revealing any pertinent information that might prejudice their responses. An interview guide with typical questions used in interviews is provided in Appendix A. Questions generally followed the format, with sequence and time spent on each question area determined by responses of individual informants and researcher's need to explore emerging categories and themes. The researcher asked permission from the informants to tape record their session; informants were assured that their responses would been kept in the strictest confidence. None of the informants objected to the taping of the interview. Each interview was transcribed in its entirety as expediently as possible. After the transcribing of the interviews was completed, the researcher reviewed and analyzed the transcripts, attempting to identify emerging themes and categories. This was accomplished by using a systematic procedure of open coding which initially coded different incidents or items of discussion in the interview transcripts into as many categories as possible. During the interview, the researcher wrote notes regarding follow-up questions but
made no attempt to keep a complete account of the proceedings during the interview.

The interviews were one-on-one interviews with each session scheduled in one hour blocks of time. A quiet room was scheduled for the interviewer in order to provide a proper setting for the interview. When possible a fifteen to twenty minute break between interviews was arranged in order to provide time for the interviewer to write a short memo describing the major points of the previous interview. These summary memos were used to allow the researcher to immediately depict what had transpired. If time did not permit, the summaries were written at the end of each day. These summations were very short in nature, usually no more than a paragraph, and served only to offer some perspective on the major categories and topics. A sample memo is provided in Appendix E.

The researcher attempted to schedule no more than four interviews per day with one day between interviews. This was not always possible due to the schedules of both the researcher and the informants. For the most part the number of interviews averaged four per day with only one day consisting of more than the desired number. The interviews were conducted during April and May of 1990. The administrative assistants to the president of each institution scheduled each interview from a list of names
beginning with the Assessment Committees. MCC was selected as the first site for conducting the field research. The interviews were scheduled on Tuesdays and Thursdays beginning at 12:30 pm to 5:30 pm. As these informants named other individuals who might assist the researcher, it became impossible to schedule interviews on these days or at the noted times. Alternate days and times were selected to accommodate both the researcher and the informants. The scheduling at MCC was never a problem and no major deviations from the researcher's agenda were needed. The interviewing process was completed at MCC in approximately four weeks.

The month long interviewing process at RCC presented some minor inconveniences due the interviews beginning near the end of the spring semester. The composition of the Assessment Committee at RCC was primarily administrative. This was a positive factor for the researcher in that the majority of the informants were readily available to assist in the study. Minor problems were encountered with the scheduling of the faculty members on the committee. The short distance which separated RCC and the researcher allowed a good deal of flexibility in scheduling the faculty interviews. It was possible for the researcher to schedule interviews between the end of the spring semester and the beginning of the summer session for the faculty
members on the Assessment Committee and those faculty members subsequently identified during the interview process as individuals who might aid the researcher. These interviews were conducted at the researcher's office at his college, at RCC, and at the private homes of these individuals.

During the interview, several informants offered to provide the researcher with specific documents which could be of assistance. Such items as minutes of sub-committees and committee meetings, correspondence from administrators to faculty and vice versa, and guidelines used to develop specific areas of the plan were provided. These documents were reviewed for the purpose of clarification and to gain a better insight into the process used at the colleges to develop the plan. All these documents assisted the researcher in the development of the protocol and in gaining a better insight into the total process.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Coding

The goal of data analysis was to draw conclusions from collected data, synthesize the data, and make some sense out of the data accumulated (Merriam, 1988; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). Merriam further concluded that data analysis was a complex process involving the researchers' initiative and sensitivity as they attempt to describe and
interpret the data. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described qualitative data analysis as inductive rather than deductive which requires the researcher to interpret the data from specific categories of information in order to follow up on local hypotheses or questions. Data analysis was accomplished by employing a systematic procedure of open coding which initially involved the coding of different incidents or items of discussion in the interview transcripts into as many categories as possible. This coding also aided the researcher in determining when to stop collecting data. Case study data collection was different from quanitative data collection in that the researcher often had difficulty determining when to stop gathering data. Two guidelines were used to determine that the data collection phase of the study had ended. The first was the exhaustion of sources. The informants identified others who could assist and and then these sources were completely exhausted. The second guideline was category saturation, or the producing of very little new evidence with much effort, and with the continued emergence of regularities in their responses which was determined through the use of the coding process.

Merriam (1988) referred to this coding process as unitizing. Unitizing consists of separating units bearing information that will facilitate the definition of
categories which will assist the interpretation of the data (Krippendorf, 1980; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988). These units should be heuristic or relevant to the study and must be the smallest bit of data about the circumstance that can stand by itself. The first coding was structured around the variables and stages in Newcombe and Conrad's theory but was not limited to this. The coding of the transcripts for the variables identified by the MAC model began with the researcher coding the smallest bit of evidence of these variables. Attention was also directed toward the information gathered in the literature review. Certain traits of leadership such as communication and vision were recognized as important characteristics of a successful leader. Also both leadership and communication were cited by Newcombe and Conrad as essential in effecting long term change. The researcher used a systematic coding process which remained consistent throughout the analysis of the data to identify important units. Appendix B provides the reader with a completed sample transcript which is fully coded. The explanation of the coding process was further complicated by the fact that the MAC model contended that four categories of variables interact with other at four specific stages of implementation. Therefore the difficulty of explaining the researcher's steps in the coding process was one of organization of the
information detailing the procedure followed. The decision was made by the researcher that the best way to organize such a description was around the stages of implementation and the variables which were important at that specific stage.

Coding The Infusion Stage

The infusion stage introduced the mandate by involving different groups at the institution in formal and informal discussions. These discussions provided the institutional leadership with input which allowed them to interpret the mandate to see if it matched the college mission. At the infusion stage attention was given to individual attitudes and opinions. Administrative leadership was identified as the most important variable at this stage with the college president assuming responsibility for articulating, interpreting, and clarifying the mandate. A commitment of both human and fiscal resources must be evident at this stage in order to successfully implement the mandate. The infusion stage ends with the initial clarification and interpretation of the mandate.

Informants were asked to describe the process used at their institution to develop a student outcomes assessment plan. They were often not able to recall the entire process due the time lapse since its beginning. In cases where this occurred, the researcher was able to refresh
their memory by using the colleges' plan of action. The informants were also asked to define their level of understanding of the purposes of the mandate. It was readily apparent from the responses that the informants were not really sure about the institutional plan or the reasons there was even a plan. The researcher attempted to identify both the stages and the variables and systematically coded the transcript in a manner which indicated the existence of divergent and convergent data.

As the transcripts of the interviews were coded, the researcher was aware of certain variables that might be present. The researcher did not consciously code items according to any preconceived notion. The following explanation may give the reader such an impression. For instance, the use of the code "champion" was later used to determine the importance of the leadership variable. "Dissemination of information" was used to facilitate the importance of the communication variable, and "vision" was determined to be related to both leadership and communication.

The pilot study together with valuable assistance from the researcher's committee produced a very good protocol. This process and the willingness of the informants to respond in an open and candid fashion proved beneficial to the researcher. The researcher used such codes as "lack of
clarity", "lack of focus," "lack of understanding", "confusion", "lack of goals", and "lack of information" in coding the responses to these questions. At this point, the researcher made no attempt to determine the effects of administrative leadership on the infusion stage, or even whether infusion had in fact occurred. It should also be stated that the same was true for the initial coding at the other three stages also. The identification of specific stages determined by the ending points was difficult due to inconclusive evidence that such stages existed. When it was possible to note the beginning or ending of stages it was coded simply by the stages' name using a red marker. Of course as the researcher moved to the next step of analysis, or categorizing, specific characteristics of the stages were evaluated.

**Coding The Preparation And Policy Formation Stage**

The preparation and policy formation stage begins the institutional planning phase. The administrative leadership represented an important variable at this stage also due to the attention given planning and policy formation. Newcombe and Conrad suggested that an institutional self study was appropriate at this stage followed by a declaration of intent to comply with the mandate. Decisions were made on which college substructure will be utilized to facilitate implementation of the
mandate. The reaction and responses of the various college constituencies marked the end of the second stage. In the present study, the constituency at the colleges most affected by the assessment mandate was the faculty since they were being held accountable for student outcomes. The researcher followed the systematic coding procedure in an attempt to identify information that would either substantiate or not substantiate the theory of Newcombe and Conrad. Codes such as "facilitative substructure", "self study", and "declaration of intent" were used to identify these specifics. Any indication of the involvement of constituencies were noted as "ad hoc committees", "permanent committees", "awareness", "involvement", and "planning". The codes described in the infusion stage were also considered since administrative leadership was also an important variable at this stage.

**Coding The Trial And Transition Stage**

The third stage, trial and transition, began with the onset of observable changes and included the cycles of decision making, action-reaction, and adjustments. Personnel and budgetary changes, policy revisions, and redefinition of roles and responsibilities all may transpire. Facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems were the primary variables at this stage. Often a change agent other than administrative leaders emerged at
this stage since the impact of the mandate will be felt more by certain constituencies. Stage three ended when formal institutional policy in implementing the mandate was concluded. The unitizing of this stage created few problems. The researcher was able to use codes such as "resistance", "new expectation", "change in classroom", "change in personnel", "policy change", and "procedural change". The researcher was also concerned with the interaction of the variables of facilitative substructures and institutional subsystem of faculty. The researcher used codes such as "ad hoc committee", "permanent committee", "faculty involvement", "faculty participation", "fears and anxieties", and "status quo" in order to discern the importance of these variables.

**Coding The Policy Execution Stage**

The final stage of policy execution was determined by the extent to which the changes incurred as a result of the mandate are accepted by the college constituencies. Facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems were also the most important variables at this stage of implementation. Colleges often do not reach this stage for various reasons including lack of administrative support, changes in personnel, failure to properly use the college substructure and subsystems, and lack of government intervention. The same procedures were used to code the
important variables of facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems, but at this stage government intervention was also an essential variable. Since the State Council of Higher Education (SCHEV) and the VCCS were the interveners, instances of action on the part of both groups were noted simple as "SCHEV intervention" or "VCCS intervention". The researcher noted additionally whether the intervention was helpful or of little or no assistance. This stage represented both the simplest and hardest to code. It was very simple to code the interventions. However, it was very difficult to ascertain whether or not the college actual entered the fourth stage of policy execution.

This difficulty was due to the uncertainty of the informants about the status of the mandate. Informants often responded affirmatively to questions regarding changes in procedures such as entry and exit testing, but were unsure of the status of this procedure as permanent policy. This caused a little trouble in analyzing the data and will be discussed in Chapter Four.

MEMCING AND CATEGORIZING

Goetz and LeCompte (1984) described categorizing as an intuitive but also systematic process. Developing categories involves looking for recurring regularities in the data. Categorizing was a way to organize so the
researcher could describe and draw inferences from the data. Miles and Huberman (1984) referred to the building of categories as clustering and factoring. Clustering was the grouping together of things that appear similar, while factoring was the hypothesizing that certain disparate words have commonalities called factors. Basically categorizing involved comparing, contrasting, and classifying.

As core variables and dimensions began to emerge, the focus shifted to a more selective coding which attempted to identify conditions and consequences related to the core categories. Following the coding process, the researcher used the technique of memoing to raise the data description to a higher level. Glaser (1978) wrote that "memos are the theorizing write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding in order to theoretically develop ideas, with complete freedom into a memo fund that is highly sortible" (p. 83). These memos focused the researcher's thinking on the theoretical relevance of data and its relationship to the process of mandated change. These memos served to focus the thinking and the analysis of the categories of variables that emerged from this process of coding and memoing.

Writing a memo after coding each interview enabled the researcher to focus in on the major categories emerging. A
representative memo is provided in Appendix C. The structure of the interview questions also enabled the researcher to focus specifically on those variables and stages identified in the theory of mandated academic change. It remained to develop the data into a more workable pattern to assist in applying the theory to the community college setting. After writing the memo, key categories and phrases were highlighted to ensure that no information would be overlooked as the researcher continued to analyze the data.

Before writing the memos, the researcher carefully examined each transcript to determine the many pieces of information on which to begin to develop the categories. Each code was written on a sheet of paper according to the researcher's discretion in as much as possible under yet unnamed categories. A representative sample is found in Appendix D. For instance codes such as "confusion", "lack of understanding", and "lack of clarity", "lack of direction", "lack of early faculty involvement", and "lack of focus" were placed in the same column. These codes were not all inclusive but a representative sample of the codes utilized. The researcher followed this same procedure with each transcript before writing the memos. This process enabled the researcher to refresh his memory about each
interview and also to begin to think more analytically about what the emerging categories might be.

The writing of the memos was begun after reviewing each of the list of codes on the notebook paper. The researcher refined the list stated above into "confusion", "lack of understanding", and "lack of clarity" into the emerging category of communication. "Lack of direction", "lack of focus", and "lack of early faculty involvement" were placed in similar fashion under an emerging category of vision. This procedure was employed by the researcher on each transcript. The procedure was tedious and time consuming, but it enabled the researcher to fully develop each category. When all of the memos were completed the same basic procedure was used to identify the emerging categories. The memos were marked with a highlighter to identify major themes and categories which emerged. The highlighted text was written down on notebook paper to further identify the major themes and categories.

EMERGENCE OF DOMINANT CATEGORIES

Communication and vision were two emerging categories that was also related to the role of leadership. The literature revealed that the leaders should have vision and clearly communicate the intent of the mandate to those affected. Leadership then emerged as another category. The next conclusion reached by the researcher was that
communication was a major factor in determining effective leadership which Newcombe and Conrad described as a key factor in effecting long term change at educational institutions faced with mandates from outside agencies.

The memos further increased the researcher's awareness of the dominant categories that were emerging. It was determined from the memos that the lack of communication was a contributing factor which lead to difficulties at each institution. The communication gap was apparent from the beginning. The difficulty began with the early information flow from SCHEV to the institution. It continued between the administration and faculty as the infusion stage began at the institution. The gap has continued on to the processing of information from one sub-committee to the other sub-committee and to the total faculty. The impact of communication on the process of effecting long term change was identified as a primary category. The themes of leadership, communication, and vision are all interrelated in determining the applicability of this theory of mandated academic change to two-year public institutions. The relationships of these themes to each other are developed further in Chapter Four and Chapter Five.
LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH METHOD

This research relied on the interview method for collection of data. There were methodological limitations frequently associated with this type of research. The validity or truthfulness and the richness and quality of data were dependent on the trust level established between the researcher and the informants. It was often difficult for a deep trust level to be established within the time frame set aside for the interview. The use of a tape recorder might be expected to cause the informant to be cautious and guarded in his/her responses. Most of the informants seemed open and willing to share experiences and opinions during the course of the interview. The informants did vary in their ability to articulate their ideas and experiences in a clear manner. This was caused by differences in their level of awareness and involvement in the process at their institution.

There may have been a tendency for some informants to respond in a manner which would ensure that their institution or the informant received favorable reviews. Some were reluctant to admit to problems that caused their lack of awareness or involvement. This limitation could have been due to the presence of the tape recorder during the interview. None of the informants objected to the recorder, but there may have been an understandable
reluctance on the part of some informants to commit themselves on tape to statements that would appear to be negative. While this limitation must be considered in this type of research, the flexibility of the researcher to direct the focus of the interview and pursue the concepts that emerged outweighs the limitation.

Another limitation had to do with the researcher, the level of expertise and sensitivity brought to the interview process, and the ability to perceive what was meant by the informant's responses. Twenty-eight years of teaching experience with eighteen of those in the Virginia Community College System, as well as the preparation of the researcher prior to beginning the study, should minimize the effects of this limitation. The researcher was concerned that familiarity with many of the informants and knowledge of the literature might cause a problem. There was fear that the researcher would form pre-conceived ideas that would hamper his objectivity. This did not appear to occur. Awareness of the need to remain open to emerging concepts from the data should have minimized this effect on the analysis of the data.

This chapter has described the method of data collection and analysis, how it was applied to this study and the specific steps in the process of conducting the research. The following chapters will present the results
of this analysis and how the findings relate to the theory of mandated academic change in Virginia's community colleges.
Chapter Four

Findings

BACKGROUND

Since the late 1960's, there had been much discussion over the quality and public accountability of institutions of higher education. The focus of this accountability movement in the 1970's was on the efforts to quantify the input and general output of higher education using measures such as faculty workload, fiscal data, and economic efficiency indicators. These efforts continued into the 1980's, but in the 1980's there had been more widespread attention directed toward obtaining evidence of the effectiveness of colleges and universities in educating students. The move toward assessment of higher education outcomes rose due to growing budgetary demands creating an environment in which a sense of need for evidence of both budgetary efficiency and educational effectiveness had become compelling to officials in many states.

Measuring student achievement became an important facet of the teaching-learning process in higher education. Faculty evaluated their students through various means to determine a student's grade. Recently, however, doubts had been expressed about the value of traditional evaluation procedures and new means had been proposed to determine how
well college students are learning. The student outcomes assessment movement required institutions to answer fundamental questions about who they were and what they were doing. Assessment emphasized a commitment to obtain information that would assist the college toward change by looking not only at what students should learn, but also at how they know the students have gained the knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, and behaviors appropriate to their course of study.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ASSESSMENT IN VIRGINIA

In the early 1980's the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV) attempted to translate the traditional ideas of quality, assessibility, and accountability into specific action to affect institutional policy. SCHEV's emphasis on institutional quality was also reflected in its mandate to identify and eliminate unproductive academic programs. A 1984 conference on undergraduate curricula in Arts and Sciences was another SCHEV activity designed to stimulate institutional thinking about an agenda to ensure quality in higher education.

Interest within the General Assembly in Virginia began to grow in the 1980's. Key legislators directed SCHEV officials to respond to the 1984 National Institute of Education study which called on faculty and academic deans to design assessment programs which measured student
knowledge, capacities, and skills. Some legislators indicated an interest in linking assessment of student learning to institutional funding based upon the Tennessee model. This initial discussion led to Senate Joint Resolution 125 in 1985 directing SCHEV to conduct a study of approaches to measure student learning. The resulting report, Senate Document 14, was accepted in 1986. SCHEV reiterated its long-held contention that a standard statewide test was not a viable option for Virginia. Instead, SCHEV suggested that institutions of higher education be allowed to develop their own means of assessing student achievement. The legislature accepted this report, and in Senate Joint Resolution 83 in 1986 requested that all public institutions of higher education in Virginia establish programs to measure student achievement. It further resolved that the State Council cooperate with the state supported colleges and universities in establishing guidelines for designing good assessment programs. In November of 1986 a meeting of representatives from Virginia's state supported colleges and universities and representatives from SCHEV met to establish guidelines, in accord with Senate Document 14, that respected both the complexity of the issue and the need to encourage statewide compliance with the mandate.
The Virginia Community College System (VCCS) moved fairly quickly in responding to the assessment mandate. SCHEV set a June 1987 deadline for submission of institutional assessment plans. However, in a March 26, 1987 memo from Dr. Marshall Smith, then VCCS Vice-Chancellor for Student and Academic Affairs, to VCCS presidents, Dr. Smith stated that "even though the SCHEV guidelines are still in draft form and have not been approved by the State Council itself, we felt you must have this information to begin your work" (p. 1). Due to the lack of completed SCHEV guidelines, many institutions moved slowly in responding to this charge. The VCCS called for the twenty-three community colleges to submit their plan to the VCCS office by June 17, 1987 to allow the VCCS staff to review the plans and submit them to SCHEV by June 30.

Several documents to assist the colleges with drawing up their plans were included with Dr. Smith's memo. Included were the draft of the SCHEV Guidelines for Student Assessment, VCCS Guidelines for Student Assessment Plans, Outline of College Self-Study and Assessment Elements, and a College Assessment Planning Matrix. The final two items were supposed to be valuable to the colleges in drawing up their assessment plans. References were cited from SCHEV Guidelines, Senate Document 14, and SACs Criteria for accreditation. The colleges were warned that adherence to
these guidelines would not necessarily guarantee SACS accreditation. However, this guide could be used to assist colleges in preparing to satisfy both SCHEV and SACS requirements. The planning document created a checklist to assist the community colleges in deciding which pieces of information they might use in their respective college plans.

Individual community college response to Dr. Smith's memo was varied. Some reacted quickly, and others moved slowly. Some hired outside consultants, while others attempted to complete the task using existing personnel at the college. Many colleges expressed concern about what exactly was required from them. Suspicion of SCHEV by community college personnel added to the confusion. Uncertainty about aspects of the mandate caused many colleges to approach compliance with much reluctance and skepticism. The 1987 VCCS Guidelines for Student Assessment Plans stated that assessment plans should demonstrate "the educational soundness of its curricular design, the quality of its instruction, and the achievement of its students both during and after college" (p. 1). The emphasis was on improvement of instruction, which affected the way faculty taught. Either the lack of clarity of the mandate or the lack of interest on the part of the faculty and administrators caused a failure on their part to
understand this emphasis. The fact was that many faculty in the VCCS still failed to recognize that student outcomes assessment was connected to the improvement of instruction.

This mandate by the General Assembly was typical of the many attempts by legislatures, accrediting agencies, and other external groups to effect change in colleges and universities across the United States. Many contended that these mandates were necessary due to the unwillingness of educational institutions to change long standing practices, while educators countered that the mandates were unnecessary intrusions into the academic realm under the guise of fiscal accountability. For whatever reason the mandate was issued, not much research had been done to determine how institutions might respond. Newcombe and Conrad's 1981 study attempted to determine what variables affected the process of mandated academic change. The current study attempted to determine if their theory of mandated academic change (MAC) was adequate to examine the implementation of student outcomes assessment plans in Virginia's community colleges.

The twenty-three community colleges in Virginia experienced varying degrees of success as they progressed through the process of implementing the mandate established by Senate Document 14. Two colleges were chosen for intensive case studies. The colleges were chosen because
each had a different level of success in implementing this mandate and because they were similar in size and service region. The findings of this research are presented in the following case studies.

Case Study One
Rush Community College

INTRODUCTION

Rush Community College (RCC) is a comprehensive community college in Virginia with an enrollment of more than 2,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students. The college had experienced significant periods of growth during recent years. Seventy-five percent of RCC students were enrolled in vocational/technical oriented programs including business, technologies, health care, and public service. The college had a reputation of an innovative institution with no hesitance to change. This reputation must be considered in view of what kind of change was being suggested by the assessment mandate. Informants reported that RCC was willing to change if a need for the change could be proven or if it benefitted the teaching-learning process. The college was skeptical of change mandated from external agencies. RCC was particularly skeptical of mandates which might pass away with no positive results being shown. This was the position that many at RCC assumed toward the assessment mandate. The response to the
assessment mandate at RCC was one of caution. To gain insight into how the college responded to the directive from the General Assembly, the case study is presented using the theory of Newcombe and Conrad as a guide.

STAGES IN THE MAC MODEL

Discussion of the Stages

Newcombe and Conrad (1981) cited four successive stages of implementation of the MAC model. Each of these stages was marked by specific marker events which began the stage and ended the stage. The infusion stage began with the introduction of the mandate at the institution and ended with a clear interpretation and articulation of the mandate by the administrative leadership with the college president assuming the role of controller of the process. The second stage, preparation and policy formation, began with the administrative leadership initiating plans to formulate policy to implement the directive. This stage usually included a self-study at the beginning. This second stage ended with institutional constituencies reacting and responding to the administrative interpretations, policies, and procedures. The middle-level administrative leadership also assumed a leading role at this second stage with the president assuming a lesser role in the process by appointing another person or group to promote the change. The third stage, trial and
transition, began with the onset of observable changes in budget, personnel, policy, role definition, and expectations and responsibilities. This stage ended with formal institutional policies being defined. The final stage, policy execution, had the least defined beginning and ending markers. This stage constituted the gradual acceptance of institutional policy by the college constituencies. Change at this stage was likely to be more systematic and better planned.

STAGE ONE - INFUSION

Discussion of Stage One

The infusion stage of implementation began with the introduction of the mandate at the college. A number of simultaneous activities were completed at this stage according to Newcombe and Conrad. The mandate was introduced to the appropriate personnel either by formal or informal methods. The introduction ordinarily caused reactions from the college about the possible affects of the mandate at the college. The mandate was interpreted by the administrative leadership and this interpretation was then communicated and articulated to the various college constituencies affected by the requirements of the mandate, which resulted in feedback from these constituencies. This stage ended with a clear interpretation and articulation of the mandate by the college President to the entire college.
Discussion of Stage One at RCC

The student outcomes assessment mandate was introduced at RCC by a memo from Dr. Marshall Smith of the VCCS to college presidents in March of 1987 which set forth the guidelines to be used in developing local college plans. The response to the mandate at RCC was one of cautious optimism. Slow might be a better description than cautious. In fact, RCC did not take any major steps toward implementing the directive for almost one year. RCC's response of cautious optimism involved the creation of an ad hoc Assessment Committee and sending representatives to conferences and workshops to learn about the requirements of the mandate. The ad hoc Assessment Committee consisted of twelve members including one faculty member from each of the four academic divisions, administrators, and a representative from the Learning Resources Division. The charge to the committee was to study, to make recommendations, and to help develop and implement the student assessment plan. The committee worked under the supervision of the Dean of Instruction and the Dean of Student Services. As a part of the continuing learning process to gain a better understanding of the requirements of the mandate, some Assessment Committee members, and the Dean of Instruction attended a workshop on assessment conducted by Peter Ewell, an assessment expert, at the
Virginia Community Colleges Association Convention in October of 1987. The two Deans attended the Virginia Student Assessment Conference hosted by SCHEV in December of 1987.

Newcombe and Conrad suggested that during the infusion stage several activities occurred simultaneously. The evidence indicated that RCC conducted many of the activities alluded to by Newcombe and Conrad. The college introduced the mandate at the college with the college administration deciding that the formation of the ad hoc Assessment Committee was the best course of action, along with sending representatives to workshops to gain clearer understanding of the mandate. These activities indicated that RCC was responding but moving in a cautious manner. There was compliance on paper but, according to informants, the early plan was a trial balloon. The President said that he was not sold on the idea, and indeed, felt and wished that it would go away. Others at RCC gave a different explanation for the slow response. They maintained that the college wanted to be sure that they understood the mandate, and then they could proceed in the proper fashion. This latter view contradicted both the President and Dean of Instruction at RCC who stated "you know RCC never does anything until we are forced to" (Interviews, May 15, 1990). This appeared to contradict
RCC's image of being change oriented, but it did not. The administrative leadership simply felt that change should be internally driven due to the college's familiarity with the demographics and the needs of its service region.

The college was testing SCHEV and the VCCS to determine how little they could submit and still comply with the SCHEV guidelines. RCC began to move at a quickened pace in the fall of 1988 after one year of cautious reaction to the assessment mandate. The Assessment Committee recommended that a workshop on assessment be conducted during the faculty workdays in January, 1989. The decision was made that the Academic Dean would conduct a one-day workshop on the general education requirements of the mandate, and another one-day workshop on the program assessment component of the mandate. These two workshops provided a springboard for a flurry of activity at RCC. The format of the workshops was group interaction. The members of the Assessment Committee were asked to be group leaders with the faculty being randomly assigned to each of the small groups. A written guide was provided for each leader with suggested questions provided each group leader. All groups reported results of their group discussion to the Assessment Committee for their consideration for further review and discussion.
Summary

These activities represented a conscious effort on the part of the administrative leadership at RCC to effectively interpret and articulate the intent of the assessment mandate. The workshops were conducted to elicit responses from the faculty who were going to be most affected by the student outcomes assessment plan. The problem with the workshop was that the results from each small group were shared only with the Assessment Committee. The entire faculty never received the topics discussed or any of the information from the Committee so that all might have known what the other groups accomplished. This could have resulted in increasing the understanding of both the faculty and administration. On the positive side, as a result of these workshops, other ad hoc committees were formed to study and develop the areas of general education, program development, and developmental studies including the placement of students in remedial math and English.

Newcombe and Conrad maintained that the infusion stage ended with a clear articulation and understanding of the mandate to the college by the administrative leadership. There was doubt from the evidence from informants that this clarity of understanding was ever reached. However the formation of the ad hoc committees to begin discussion of policy marked the beginning of the second stage of
preparation and policy formation. The marker point
suggested by the authors lacked the clarity of definition
that was proposed by the MAC model.

STAGE TWO—PREPARATION AND POLICY FORMATION

Discussion of Stage Two

The second stage began with the administrative
leadership initiating plans to formulate policy and
procedures to implement the mandate. According to Newcombe
and Conrad, several activities took place at this stage.
The process generally began with an institutional self
study. This stage of implementation involved an evaluation
of internal and external receptivity to change, and the
identification of potential conflicts, risks, and options.
The selection of a proper substructure to facilitate the
implementation must be considered at this stage also. The
reactions and responses from the faculty and administration
to the interpretations and proposed policies and procedures
ended the second stage.

Discussion of Stage Two at RCC

The leadership at RCC determined that no self-study
was needed. The college had recently conducted an
institutional self-study for SACS accreditation and felt
that sufficient data was available without going through
the process again. The formation of the ad hoc committees
resulting from the two workshops was the beginning of RCC's
efforts to formulate policy and procedures. RCC defined three goals which were important in the development of their assessment plan: 1) designing a systematic approach to assessment; 2) improving the quality of outcomes for students; and 3) achieving the standard of institutional effectiveness established by SACS. The college assessment plan mentioned that a sound process was used in the development of their assessment plan. They determined that the proper substructures would be the ad hoc Assessment Committee, a Developmental Studies Committee, and an Administrative Oversight Committee composed of key administrators who received the drafts of proposals and made suggested changes. The ad hoc Assessment Committee under the direction of the Dean of Instruction was given primary responsibility for the implementation of the mandate. The text of the college plan continued by stating that the college planned to allow the committees to continue their work in the future.

There was no identifiable overt opposition to the state mandate or to the plan developed by RCC. There were, however, certain fears, anxieties, and skepticisms regarding what changes might be effected as a result of student outcomes assessment. Several informants expressed concerns over the unknown effect on the student. The President and other administrators were concerned about the
effect of entry tests on the ability of the college to maintain a true open door policy. The concern was that some students would be turned away without being given a fair chance to succeed. This fear was related to the possibility that the college might lose FTE's, the basis of funding for community colleges. These expectations were fueled by a resentment of the role of SCHEV in the establishment of the mandate. Informants stated that the State Council had never understood the mission of the community colleges and feared that this was another attempt to undermine these two-year institutions. Informants felt this was another fad devised by SCHEV to increase the paperwork of the college and, therefore, would pass with no really beneficial changes taking place. This view was very evident at RCC since most faculty were long term and had seen the equally publicized behavioral objectives and management by objectives movements pass without many positive results. There were a number of complaints regarding the amount of time and energy required to complete the task of assessment. The process was envisioned as one which would take valuable time away from the classroom. The already tight budget might also be depleted even further by using funds to provide for implementation of the mandate. This caused many faculty to wonder if monies would be taken from instructional budgets
to complete the task. The faculty generally thought that the change from their traditional activities was unnecessary since they were doing a good job of providing quality instruction already.

A final concern expressed by informants was how the data gathered would be used. A small number feared that SCHEV was attempting to impose a standardized test for use in all colleges. This was a fear even though SCHEV made it clear in Senate Document 14 that locally developed tests were preferred over standardized instruments. The past history of SCHEV's activities and the perceived threats of their attempts to undermine the community colleges' mission could possibly account for this fear. An extension of this threat was the idea that individual colleges would be compared with each other on student outcomes in program areas. Assurances were given that such comparisons would never occur. Informants questioned how the date was to be used if not for these purposes. An overriding factor to be considered at RCC was how to ease these fears. The slow response to the mandate and the accompanying lack of total early faculty involvement did not assist RCC in this task.

**Summary**

The development of stage two at RCC was very unclear. The decision not to conduct a self-study was understandable since the SACS visit was conducted in recent years. The
college received responses from the faculty in regard to certain items as indicated in the foregoing discussion. These responses marked the end of stage two at RCC. The difficulty was that there were never many concrete proposals to which the faculty could react. Regardless of this fact the college began to experience change at the institution which marked the beginning of the third stage of implementation proposed by Newcombe and Conrad.

STAGE THREE- TRIAL AND TRANSITION

Discussion of Stage Three

Newcombe and Conrad concluded that the trial and transition stage began with the occurrence of observable changes at the institution. Formal policy was articulated, clarified, and implemented at the college. Specific long term change in budget, personnel, role definition, policy, and new responsibilities and expectations were supposed to begin at the trial and transition stage. The ending marker of this stage occurred when the college settled into recognizable courses of action.

Discussion of Stage Three at RCC

Change had occurred at RCC. No significant changes in classroom instruction had happened at the college. However several changes were noted which may eventually impact instruction in a direct fashion. There had been a change in the awareness of faculty regarding outcomes of student
learning. The faculty knew that specific knowledge and skills would be measured, and furthermore, it was they who must determine how to measure these items. The hiring of a part-time Assessment Coordinator in 1989 was one change in personnel at RCC. The Coordinator was a faculty member who formerly dealt primarily with off-campus classes. Informants agreed that he had brought some coordination to the process. He had attempted to deal with the faculty on a one-to-one basis and described his role as one which would give faculty ownership to the plan, as well as establish the permanency of the Assessment Committee.

RCC developed an instrument to measure general education outcomes for transfer students. It was administered for the first time in the spring of 1990. This instrument was developed basically through one-on-one communication between the Assessment Coordinator and the faculty teaching English, history, psychology, and the like. Faculty in these courses were asked to submit specific questions to be included in a test bank. Questions were selected from the test bank by the Assessment Coordinator for inclusion in the General Education Questionnaire which was distributed to transfer students. While the Coordinator said that he was unsure how the resulting data would be used, it appeared that the
data will be used to refine the goals and objectives in each discipline.

The test was just recently administered so no data had been analyzed. Some faculty members questioned the validity of the instrument. There was a lack of time for instructors to prepare their questions. The questions were to be knowledge questions, but it was unclear exactly what was expected. Uncertainty also existed as to how the questions for the exit test were chosen. Faculty resented the use of multiple choice questions on the test. One informant said "I do not use them to assess my students in class, so why should they be included on an exit test" (Interview with RCC faculty member, May 31, 1990). The other issue of concern regarding the test was the validation of the instrument. The Assessment Coordinator admitted that validation would be a long process, but that the administration of the test represented the first step. It appeared that more interaction among the faculty preceeded by larger meetings of the faculty would have led the college to consider many of these issues before its administration.

The administration of this test also caused the full-time English faculty to attempt to increase the coordination of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty. Many off-campus classes were taught by adjuncts who were
not closely supervised. There was a perception by some that many students were not receiving good quality instruction from some of the adjuncts. The English faculty had proposed a summer workshop between the English adjuncts and full-time faculty to discuss the assessment question in order to ensure that RCC students received the same quality of instruction regardless of whether they were taught by full-time or adjunct faculty. The college was also cognizant of the fact that the Assessment Coordinator's position will be a permanent full-time funded position this fall. The full funding of this position demonstrated a commitment of the legislature to assessment activities. The thought of assessment being a fad was eliminated in the minds of both faculty and administration.

Changes were also occurring as a result of the Developmental Studies Task Force. This group suggested a change in the placement process of students into developmental English. All entering students were required to pass a placement test or else take a developmental English course. The English faculty had sought this change in placement for a number of years, but it was rejected for fear the practice would have an adverse effect on student enrollment. The mandate represented an opportunity for the English faculty to implement their suggestion. They also
saw it as a chance to improve the quality of instruction at RCC.

Many expectations for change existed at RCC as a result of the assessment mandate. The expectations for more work for faculty in devising and updating student questionnaires, increased student advisement, and an increase in the college-wide data gathering and processing were all present among informants. As the effort to identify and further refine the general education component continued, there was an expectation of more interdisciplinary activity among faculty. There was also the expectation that the hiring of a Director of Institutional Research, which may or may not have been the result of assessment activities, would expand the college involvement in data gathering and analysis.

Summary

The foregoing discussion indicated that RCC was into the trial and transition stage. While many of the changes could not be defined as the long-term change cited by Newcombe and Conrad, they did represent change. There were no identifiable policy changes. The college had changed some procedures but had not yet instituted them as policy. The cited evidence which suggested that the college had reached the trial and transition stage was clearer than at any of the other stages. The college was gradually
adjusting to the new procedures and continuing to work out the details of general education and the other aspects of the assessment mandate. RCC settled into a recognizable course of action. This according to Newcombe and Conrad was the marker which ended the trial and transition stage.

STAGE FOUR- POLICY EXECUTION

Discussion

The fourth stage of implementation, policy execution, involved the gradual acceptance of institutional programs by the college. Change at this stage was described by Newcombe and Conrad as being more planned and systematic. The researcher identified no evidence of RCC having reached this stage. Newcombe and Conrad suggested that it was not uncommon for an institution to fail to achieve the policy execution stage. They suggested several reasons for this fact. First, the administrative leadership of the college may be opposed to the mandate. Second, the administrative leadership may not use the facilitative substructure in a proper manner. Finally, the lack of effective intervention may delay the progression of this final stage.

Discussion of Stage Four at RCC

The above cited reasons for failing to progress to the policy execution stage were all evident at RCC. The President and the Dean of Instruction were both opposed to the mandate. They delayed beginning work on the
implementation of the mandate for one full year. Both the President and the Dean delayed action on the mandate. The President hoped that the fad would pass. The Dean never considered this as his area of responsibility. Newcombe and Conrad stated that the political climate established early by the administrative leadership would affect the latter stages of implementation. It appeared that this fact was true at RCC. The administrative leadership failed to make proper use of the substructures at the college. The ad hoc Assessment Committee did a credible job, but the small number of faculty on the committee was a negative. In fact the lack of early faculty involvement in the early planning stages was a hindrance at RCC. Finally, the lack of overall knowledge of SCHEV interventions proved to be a problem. It appeared that the college was satisfied overall with the interventions of both SCHEC and the VCCS. However very few people were aware that either group intervened. This perhaps was not a problem with the intervention, but a problem with the dissemination of the feedback information.

VARIABLE CATEGORIES IN THE MAC MODEL

Newcombe and Conrad presented four categories of variables that affected the four stages of implementation discussed in the previous section. The institutional progression toward implementing the mandate depended upon
the interaction of one or more of the several relationships established in the variable categories. The four variable categories were administrative leadership, facilitative substructures, institutional subsystems, and government intervention.

Variables Described

The first category of variables, administrative leadership, required a commitment to change and a decision by the leadership that a change was needed. This variable category was most crucial in the early stages of implementation according to Newcombe and Conrad. The administrative leadership needed to demonstrate the ability to act in a manner which promoted progress. The president of the college usually assumed the role of communicator and controller of the change process at these early stages.

Facilitative substructures were the second variable category. This category provided channels of support for communicating, gathering, and assembling the various reports, and attempting to increase support for the proposed modifications. This substructure included the various college committees, faculty senate, advisory committees, and other such groups.

Institutional subsystems represented the third variable category. This category consisted of all of the departments, divisions, and the personnel and students in
those departments and divisions. The individuals within the divisions, including the faculty and administrators, were the ones most likely to experience the affects of the change. As the conflict potential increased, the role of the institutional subsystems intensified. Effective communication might have lowered this intensity by maintaining a two-way relationship with the administrative leadership. The political climate which surfaced during the early stages of implementation influenced the perceptions and decisions of the leadership, thus affecting their relationship with the subsystems.

Government intervention was the fourth variable category. This category was used if the change process stalled internally. Newcombe and Conrad noted that even when minimal government intervention occurred, the colleges reacted to the intervention.

VARIABLE CATEGORY ONE-ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

Discussion of Variable Category One

Newcombe and Conrad stated that administrative leadership was most crucial during the early stages of implementation. The administrative leadership facilitated communication and control of the change process at the institution. The leaders had to make a commitment to change and had to act in a fashion which promoted institutional acceptance of the change. The authors noted
that the political climate established during the first two stages of implementation would affect the relationships at the final two stages. The president of the college usually assumed the lead during the infusion stage, with the president assigning the lead role to someone else during the next stage.

**Influence of Administrative Leadership at RCC**

The leadership of the President of RCC was very much in evidence during the infusion stage. One factor cited by Newcombe and Conrad which affected the President's willingness to implement the mandate was his own personal values. The President saw his role in the process as one of setting the tone, laying out the agenda, and providing resources to sell the idea to the faculty. Admittedly during the first year, his negativism toward the mandate inspired others not to aggressively pursue accomplishment of anything but compliance on paper. He maintained the belief that the emphasis on student outcomes was a fad and hoped that RCC would continue to proceed with caution, and not react too quickly just to satisfy number generation. The President opposed change unless it worked to benefit the college. The President was open, candid, and got directly involved with the issues. He displayed a participatory management style, letting those directly
involved with the topic resolve the problem, while still overseeing the entire process.

The President was held in high regard at RCC. His long tenure there enabled him to accomplish a great deal for the institution. The college had grown and developed the image of a change oriented institution. He was a recognized leader which may have hindered the establishment of clear lines of authority during the implementation process. Regardless of whom he assigned the responsibility for carrying forth the project, the perception was that the President was still in total charge of the final product. This may not be a situation common to RCC since the VCCS presidents often impose their will without the involvement of other individuals at the college.

Informants described the President in almost the same manner as he described himself. He was characterized as loyal, supportive, well-informed, a risk taker, and a visionary. A good environment for change was present with encouragement to innovate given by the President. Not all informants viewed the President as a participatory leader. A few felt that he had too much control over the final decision. One informant described the President's style as "selective authoritarianism" in that he knew what he wanted and was sensitive to others, but was not democratic (Interview with RCC administrator, May 14, 1990). The
informant's perception was that the President was not sold on the mandate and was not going to take action until he was forced to do so. This characterization seemed to have a certain amount of credence to it. The President remarked that he did not like some of the ideas presented to him regarding the mandate but that he was attempting to remain flexible and do what was best for RCC.

After a cautious first year, the President was partially convinced by his administrative staff that student outcomes assessment was not a fad. He referred to RCC's efforts since this realization as serious and professional. He has been supportive of the college efforts even though there were no extra resources to commit, so initially individuals were given extra duties and responsibilities until a part-time Assessment Coordinator was hired to pull everything together. Some funds were also allocated to bring in consultants for faculty in-service. The President's stated intent was to gain more information in order to respond to the mandate in a manner that would be advantageous to the college. As the President displayed an increased commitment to the mandate, the college's progression from infusion to the preparation and policy formation stage increased.
Summary

The President admitted that he did not pursue implementation of the mandate at first. He was convinced that it was a fad which would pass away. After one year he was convinced that the fad was not going to pass. He displayed a commitment to the project and the college had made much progress toward its implementation.

VARIABLE CATEGORY TWO—FACILITATIVE SUBSTRUCTURES

Discussion of Variable Category Two

Facilitative substructures provided communication networks and a means of providing support for the implementation of the mandate. They also assisted with the compiling and reporting of data. Newcombe and Conrad felt that this category of variables was most important during the later stages of implementation. Evidence at RCC was that the choosing of these substructures was most crucial at stage two of implementation. Newcombe and Conrad suggested that this was also true.

Influence of Facilitative Substructures at RCC

Initially, the President delegated responsibility for formulating the plan to the Dean of Instruction and the Dean of Student Services. The Dean of Student Services actually drew up the first response since he had some previous experience in working with assessment. The plan was basically rejected as being unrealistic. At this
point, the Assessment Committee was formed, and the Dean of Instruction was given primary responsibility even though the other Dean was on the committee. Prior to this, the Grants Coordinator was approached by the President asking her to assume responsibility. She objected to the assignment due to her already heavy workload. She also stated that her perception of the mandate was that it was more of an academic matter and should be assigned to the Dean of Instruction.

The Dean of Instruction did not view assessment as his area of responsibility. He reported difficulty with explaining the mandate in front of the entire faculty and felt that clearer lines of authority needed to be established. The Dean indicated, as did other informants, that he had no background in statistical research, and this hindered him in his reporting to SCHEV. The hiring of a part-time Assessment Coordinator in 1989 helped somewhat with this problem even though the lines of authority still lack clarity.

The Assessment Coordinator stated that the Academic Dean still had the primary responsibility for the mandate, but the Assessment Coordinator had been delegated the responsibility of selling the idea to the faculty. This position may become a full-time one in August, 1990. The
present part-time Coordinator would be an applicant for this full-time position.

RCC had also hired a full-time Director of Institutional Research for the first time. The Dean of Instruction felt that this would ease some of the authority question. Apparently, the Dean of Instruction felt he was given the responsibility but did not want it, while the Dean of Student Services wanted more responsibility, but felt that he had not been given it. The Academic Dean perceived that the Director of Institutional Research would be given assessment responsibilities with the Assessment Coordinator placed under the direction of the Institutional Research Office. The President did not support the Dean's contention that this organizational change would take place.

The identification of who was in charge of the assessment mandate at RCC needed clarification. The role of the President in this clarification process was important. The perception of the President's role by informants was very much congruent with the President's own perception of his role. The President was cautious in his response to the mandate. He was protective of student and institutional interests. He viewed the mandate as a threat to open door admissions and thus a threat to college funding from the state. In his view, the mandate from the
state was nothing new. He felt the faculty were doing most of the things required by outcomes assessment anyway, even though it did force the faculty to face specific issues. He felt that RCC was more focused now in its efforts for improvement of classroom instruction, though he was not sure that improvement in this area had occurred, or would occur. This lack of clarity in determining which substructure was in charge hindered the lack of progression from one stage to the next.

Summary

Some problems existed with the formation of the proper substructures to facilitate the implementation of the college assessment plan. Presently the college appeared to be headed in the right direction. While confusion still existed about some of the ramifications of the mandate, the Assessment Committee was made a permanent part of the college standing committees. The Dean of Instruction was still not sold on the idea that assessment was his major area of responsibility, but things were progressing well at RCC. The position of Assessment Coordinator was scheduled to be filled in August, but budgetary constraints may have delayed this. However, the Director of Institutional Research may assume some of the assessment functions.
VARIABLE CATEGORY THREE-INSTITUTIONAL SUBSYSTEMS

Discussion of Variable Category Three

The third category of institutional subsystems was the one most likely to experience the impact of the change. At RCC the faculty represented the subsystem most likely to feel the greatest impact of the assessment mandate. Newcombe and Conrad suggested that two conditions would affect the relationship of this variable. First, a change agent or potential change agent should exist within the subsystem. Second, the involvement of the subsystem was perceived to be important by the administrative leadership. The authors stated that this variable was most important during the later stages of implementation. The evidence at RCC suggested that this variable was of great importance at each stage of implementation.

Influence of Institutional Subsystems at RCC

The President stated that compliance with the mandate could have been accomplished in a very simple fashion. A few key administrators might have written the plan with very little faculty input. The President felt, however, that the "process was as important as the product" (Interview, May 15, 1990). It was surprising, in view of this statement, that more faculty were not involved earlier in the planning stages of the process. One factor which may explain this lack of heavy faculty involvement may be
that the President really thought the fad would pass quickly. Second, it was conceivable that having four faculty representing the four divisions was thought to be sufficient faculty involvement. The Academic Dean stated that these faculty knew that their obligation was to report back to their respective division faculty, keep them fully aware of the proceedings and bring their input back to the Assessment committee. A third possibility may be that the decision of when, how, and to what extent to involve more faculty was a problem fraught with many difficulties and cannot be answered except in hindsight.

One administrator noted that faculty involvement was a given, particularly in situations such as student outcomes, because of the relationship to classroom instruction. He saw a reverse side to faculty involvement. If too many faculty were involved, not much would be accomplished. He felt that too much discussion tended to produce very little results. Many faculty will use the opportunity to discuss their philosophical beliefs, and other faculty will tune the discussion out. Other informants stated that the more ideas received, the better the overall product. This administrator felt that the best scenario was a proper mix, and he perceived that RCC had that good mix. Informants at RCC felt that the lack of faculty involvement in the early stages was not intentional, but simply a lack of
realization of the faculty's role in the process. They reported that faculty desired to be involved, but it was always difficult to know at what point the faculty would feel overburdened and resent the extra responsibilities.

Involvement of the faculty in the early planning may have been accomplished in another fashion. Informants mentioned that the college standing committees and the Faculty Senate played a limited role and were not directly involved in the process. The President said that he could think of no specific reason for the use of the ad hoc committees. He felt that the establishment of the Assessment Committee may have emphasized the importance of the issue and served as a catalyst for the development of individuals to assume a leadership role. In fact, certain persons emerged as leaders of the subsequent committees to develop general education and developmental studies goals and objectives. The positive side of using the standing committee structure of the college was to involve more faculty in the discussion of the issues. This involvement might have created more faculty ownership in the plan. One faculty informant mentioned that he still did not understand the requirements of the mandate until his recent involvement with the Assessment Coordinator. His fear was that student outcomes will "happen" to the faculty (Interview, May 31, 1990). His perception was that most
faculty had not bought into the plan due to this lack of understanding caused by non-involvement.

The faculty had recently been more involved and the expectation was that this would increase the possibility that the faculty would assume at least partial ownership of the plan. The decision to increase faculty activity resulted from the realization of the ad hoc Assessment Committee that their role in the process was changing. Their early role of decision making was evolving into more of an advisory role. As the college developed the sub-committees to deal with general education, developmental studies, program evaluation, and the development of instruments to measure student outcomes, the need for more faculty input was evident. It was apparent that more broad based faculty expertise was needed particularly in the development of general education goals and objectives, and also, in the development of instruments to measure these goals and objectives. Faculty appeared to be buying into the plan. However, their late involvement in the early planning of the documents that "happened" to them may have affected their willingness to change.

Summary

The role of the faculty at RCC has increased significantly in the past year with regard to the assessment process. The faculty were involved in many
activities that related to assessment. Their largest function presently was to complete general education goals and devise an instrument that could be validated to effectively measure student outcomes. The failure of the administrative leadership to involve more faculty earlier in the process caused a delay in the faculty acceptance of ownership in the plan. Whether the involvement with general education would increase the level of faculty ownership was still uncertain.

**VARIABLE CATEGORY FOUR—GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION**

**Discussion of Variable Category Four**

Newcombe and Conrad emphasized that government intervention was important at all levels of implementation. They cited three implications about government intervention. The first implication was that even minimum intervention by the mandating agency influenced the institution toward compliance. Second, government intervention was necessary when the external agency and the college could not agree on the mandate. The final implication was that government intervention was needed when the external agency reinterpreted the intentions of the mandate.
Influence of Government Intervention at the Infusion Stage at RCC

Government intervention was required at RCC during the infusion stage. The college invited a SCHEV representative to visit the college to meet with faculty and staff to discuss the directive from SCHEV. Informants agreed that even though this visit was beneficial, many problems still existed at RCC after the visit. The review of the plans and the ensuing feedback to the institutions by SCHEV was a necessary component of the process. If improvements were to be made in the quality of instruction, a clearer understanding of what exactly was required had to be gained. Much of the trouble may have been the result of the General Assembly and SCHEV reacting to a perceived crisis without proper intensive planning. The state needed to clarify its position. This did not mean that more mandates were needed. A statement to the colleges with specific recommendations about the direction SCHEV thought the colleges ought to pursue was needed.

Influence of Government Intervention at Other Stages at RCC

The role of SCHEV in this process was also fraught with concerns over communication, understanding, and direction. The communication between SCHEV and RCC was described as a "sparring match". There was a "feeling out" and a "give and take" period which was SCHEV's way of
allowing the college the flexibility promised them. RCC's description of state feedback was "supportive, helpful, constructive, and beneficial" but "uncertain, confusing, and lacking direction" (Collective interviews at RCC, May 14-15, 1990). In responding to the plan, SCHEV was really in a difficult position of trying to give direction while not appearing to interfere. This may have accounted for the uncertain or vague feedback perceived by RCC. Some contended that SCHEV's comments were general because they did not understand the community college mission. This had historically been a perception of many in the community college regarding any action by the State Council. Whether or not the perception was true, it served a negative purpose for SCHEV. Oversight by SCHEV had improved and RCC seemed pleased with the improvements. They were specifically satisfied that a personal representative from SCHEV had been assigned to the colleges. This should assist all parties in a better understanding of each other's mission.

INTERACTIONS
COMMUNICATION AND VISION

Two important variables continued to appear as the researcher analyzed the data. These two variables were not emphasized in the MAC model, but do appear to have an affect on the relationship of the categories of variables
as well as the progression through the stages of implementation. These two variables were communication and the lack of vision on the part of the administrative leadership at RCC. Communication and vision were not significantly more evident at one stage than another. They appeared to be important at each stage.

The difficulties at RCC in alleviating the oft mention concerns of the RCC faculty were often hindered by the lack of communication and lack of vision resulting in misunderstandings about the mandate. The sources of these deficiencies were not easy to trace. It might well be that the defects in the process at the college were caused by the dominant problem of communication. The lack of understanding and lack of vision could be attributed to this communications defect. Communications were described as vague, uncertain, and informal. Informants reported that communications had improved recently, but the damage done early in the process may continue to hamper the implementation of the assessment mandate at RCC. The communications appeared to have broken down or had not been adequate to allow SCHEV to properly explain to RCC exactly what was expected from them in their response to the requirements of the mandate. RCC, due to this communications gap, had been unable to transmit clear directions to the college constituencies, including the
faculty. It was important, in order to fully understand the situation at RCC, to examine the informants' perceptions regarding communication at the college.

One factor hindering the communication of information was the possibility that SCHEV did not fully comprehend all aspects of student outcomes. SCHEV was attempting to avoid being specific in its requirements to the college for implementation of the assessment plans. The Virginia Plan adopted by the legislature at the request of SCHEV was to allow the colleges flexibility in drawing up their plans. This lack of specificity often frustrated faculty and administration at RCC. The individual who had the most personal contact with SCHEV during the process was the Dean of Instruction. He reported that he was hampered early in his communications with SCHEV by a lack of articulation between the two. He said that he "was never able to explain to SCHEV what was being done" (Interview, May 15, 1990). The Dean still perceived a communications gap because he was uncertain about what type of information to report and in what manner to report it.

The failure to involve faculty earlier resulted from a lack of realization about the role of faculty in the mandate. This was hard to understand since improvement of instruction was noted as a purpose in most communications to the local colleges by both SCHEV and the VCCS. The Dean
of Instruction felt that there was no lack of communication at RCC. He perceived that some just did not want to listen. Informants reported that since they were not involved, they did not perceive that they had a role. As involvement had increased, communication had improved.

There were other problems early at RCC. The slow response caused many not to take the mandate seriously. The information being disseminated was not perceived to be important since this fad, too, would pass. Semester conversion had just resulted in many changes at RCC. Faculty and administrators were tired and really were not prepared to face up to the changes that resulted from student assessment. The massive information flow resulting from semester conversion coupled with new information regarding assessment was too much for many individuals to absorb. A faculty informant stated that excessive memos caused him to overlook important issues. The Dean's statement that maybe some were not listening can also be expanded to some not reading.

There were other factors early at RCC that may have affected the communications. A lack of clearly defined authority was evident and, to some extent, still existed at RCC. The President felt that involvement of those affected by the issues was important. Faculty involvement in the assessment process had increased with the hiring of a part-
time Coordinator to continue to refine the plan. This, however, had not solved the problem of communication. There was still no widespread dissemination of information to the total faculty. The issues surrounding the mandate had never been discussed in a meeting with the entire faculty. It was true that large meetings often result in a struggle between problem solvers and problem identifiers. One administrator noted that large meetings tended to identify problems, while smaller meetings solved the problems. RCC was in the process of developing instruments to measure general education outcomes. Problems needed to be identified before developing those instruments.

One other factor affecting the communications process and establishing clearer lines of authority was the lack of participation of the college standing committees and the Faculty Senate. These groups possessed no real power, but they had advisory responsibilities. They served as important vehicles for dissemination of information and for raising questions about the various issues such as lines of authority.

DISCUSSION

Newcombe and Conrad drew two implications from their study of mandated academic change. First, they stressed the importance of administrative leadership. The authors wrote that the priorities of the leadership affected their
willingness to make difficult decisions. Their leadership styles influenced the development and use of the substructures and subsystems necessary to effect change. Since mandated change implied implementation, the second implication was that the degree of implementation at the faculty level occurred only when individuals within the subsystems were committed to the change and capable of administering the change.

The use of the general education exit test provided a good example of the difficulties of providing specific examples of evidence of stage progression in the MAC model. This general education test was developed after the infusion stage and a determination that a portion of RCC's assessment policy would be measurement of general education outcomes. The development of the instrument to measure these outcomes did not appear to have passed through these same stages. The faculty was unclear about the types of questions to be asked, how the data would be used, and more importantly, whether the instrument was valid. No clear indication was found that this part of the mandate followed a patterned stage progression. Newcombe and Conrad left open the possibility that reversion to earlier stages may occur due to reinterpretation of the mandate or the policy established. This possibility may have explained what happened in the development of the general education
instrument, but the lack of definitive data makes this conclusion unsubstantiated. It was more likely that the college was able to establish certain policies which reached the trial and transition stage without fully understanding the mandate. This same possibility caused RCC to effect certain long term changes described by Newcombe and Conrad without necessarily progressing through specific stages.

The atmosphere at RCC was one of awareness and a desire to do what was necessary to benefit the student and the college. It was still a cautious approach, but a flurry of activities was beginning at the college. Formalizing what is and was being done was the phrase that was heard at the college. Formalizing the process had many implications. Hopefully, the college did not mean producing more numbers in order to look good to external reviewers of the plan. The perception was that formalizing indicated an intent on the part of RCC to consider student outcomes assessment as a permanent on-going process that improved the quality of educational programs to the citizens of their service region.
McClure Community College (MCC) is a medium sized community college with under 2,000 FTE students. MCC had conducted a limited type of student outcomes assessment prior to the adoption of the mandated SCHEV approved plan. Professional licensure exams for allied health graduates and student and employer surveys provided valuable information for program faculty and administrators. The purpose of these surveys of transfer institutions, employers of graduates, graduates, and of non-graduating students was to see how the perceptions of outsiders and the facts about former students' achievement at the college matched those of the faculty and administration. The mandate allowed MCC to focus more on program goals and objectives, and also allowed for a better system of measuring student accomplishment. The data gathered was supposed to be available for teaching faculty to use to redirect or redesign instructional efforts to improve student learning. The statement regarding the efforts to improve student learning was taken from the assessment plan presented to SCHEV by MCC on July 15, 1989. The plan also stated that the college was proud of the involvement of all of the college community in the development of the plan.
This study will present the findings at MCC regarding the application of Newcombe and Conrad's theory of mandated academic change. Specific attention will be given to the progression through successive stages of the process and the variable categories emerging from this progression.

STAGES IN THE MAC MODEL

Description of the Stages

Infusion

Newcombe and Conrad (1981) cited four successive stages of implementation in the MAC model. Each stage was characterized by a specific marker event occurring at the beginning and end of each stage. The infusion stage began with the introduction of the mandate at the institution and ended with a clear interpretation and articulation of the mandate to the college by the administrative leadership. The president of the college usually assumed the lead role of communicator and controller of the process at this stage.

Preparation and Policy Formation

The second stage, preparation and policy formation, began with the administrative leadership initiating plans to form policy. This stage usually began with a self-study of the institution. This stage ended with the institutional reaction and response to the administrative interpretation of proposed policies and procedures. The
administrative leadership once again assumed a leading role at this stage, but the president played a less important role. The president usually appointed either another individual or group to promote the change.

**Trial and Transition**

Trial and transition began with the onset of observable change at the institution. This stage included decision-making, conflict, and action-reaction by the college. Changes in personnel, budget, policy, role definition, and expectations and responsibilities all may transpire at this stage. The conflict-response cycle may be accelerated at this stage since the impact of the change will be felt more by certain constituencies. Stage three ended when formal institutional policy was promulgated implementing the mandate.

**Policy Execution**

As the trial and transition stage concluded, the college moved toward the final stage of implementation, policy execution. The end of this stage was marked by the gradual acceptance and implementation of the promulgated policy. If the college reached the final stage, the subsequent changes were likely to be better planned and more systematic with a reduction of the action-conflict cycle. In some cases the college may regress to a previous
stage due to changes in administrative personnel, budgetary restraints, or reinterpretation of the mandate.

STAGE ONE-INFUSION

Discussion of Stage One

The infusion stage began with the introduction of the mandate at the college. A number of simultaneous activities were completed at this stage according to Newcombe and Conrad. The mandate was introduced to the appropriate personnel either by formal or informal methods. This introduction caused reactions about the possible effects of the mandate on the institution. The administrative leadership will use these reactions to interpret the mandate and articulate and communicate to the constituencies at the college a clear statement of the intent of the mandate. This marker event ended the first stage.

Infusion at MCC

The administration at MCC appeared to be aware that the mandate was forthcoming. They recognized that SACS had instituted an Institutional Effectiveness Standard in their evaluation process. Even though MCC did not have to respond to this standard in their last self-study, it was evident that such data was a requirement that the college must face in the future. The topic of student outcomes assessment was also discussed at various meetings attended
by MCC administrators and faculty at both the state and national levels. MCC was not prepared, however, for the short response time given them by SCHEV to comply with the mandate. The administrators understood that in order to comply with the time restraints, the involvement of all constituencies, particularly the faculty, would be difficult. Many activities were going on simultaneously at MCC. The VCCS was converting to the semester system. The college had just finished a ten-year SACS self-study, and some of the allied health programs were undergoing review by national accrediting agencies. These factors, together with the regular duties of faculty and staff, made this an extremely active time at MCC.

The March 26, 1987 memo from the VCCS to college presidents calling for the development and submission of their assessment plan by June 17, 1987 created problems in determining a proper process to use in developing this plan. The President assigned the Dean of Instruction the responsibility for the development of the plan. The Dean chose to use the administrative staff at MCC as the primary vehicle for the initial response to the mandate. He determined that the administrative staff with input from the Improvement of Instruction Committee, a standing faculty committee at the college, would draw up the first response to satisfy the tight June deadline. There was no
evidence that the Improvement of Instruction Committee actually played a major role in the process. The President also formed an ad hoc Assessment Committee comprised largely of faculty to assist the Dean with the development of the plan. This committee also appeared to have played a minor role at this stage. The Assessment Committee reviewed the plan but its members were generally unaware of either the intent of the plan or any of the feedback from SCHEV or the VCCS.

The first response by MCC was intended to be a general statement with no specific details included. The Academic Dean carried the major burden of the actual day-to-day operations for designing and executing the plan mostly with assistance from his staff. Informants tended to identify the Dean as the leader who had been delegated the responsibility by the President for implementation of the mandate. There seemed to be a feeling that the President was still the person who was working behind the scenes in a less visible role, with the Dean the visible leader. The MAC theory contended that the administrative leadership interpreted the mandate at this stage with formal or informal discussions providing feedback or reaction to the directive. Input from sources other than the administrators appeared minimal at MCC at this stage. The involvement of the faculty was minimal, but perhaps the
fact that MCC intended this to be a general statement rather than a specific statement of plans negated much faculty input at this stage.

There was widespread feeling among informants that there was no specific intent to withhold anything from the faculty. The faculty at MCC were long-term faculty with many of them being employed at the college since its inception. The college did not have the reputation of being a change oriented institution even though a willingness to change was evident. Since the faculty were long-term, they had seen many mandates come and go in very quick succession. They viewed assessment as a fad and felt that once again the legislature and SCHEV were attempting to take away from valuable instructional time, to bore faculty with more paper work, and to increase the faculty workload through number crunching.

The general assessment plan was submitted to the VCCS by the June 17 deadline. The response from the VCCS reviewers was not positive. The Dean of Instruction was informed by the VCCS that certain problems existed in the plan, and, in their opinion, SCHEV would reject the plan. The Dean decided to make the suggested changes himself without consulting others at the college. He did this to comply with the deadlines for both The VCCS and SCHEV. The Dean stated that he changed nothing of substance but only
attempted to correct the technical deficiencies cited by the VCCS. In the meantime the college was notified by SCHEV that the plan had been accepted as originally submitted.

Summary

The evidence was inconclusive at MCC that the first stage of infusion actually ended. The administrative leadership never clearly articulated to the college their appraisal of the mandate. The infusion stage appeared to combine with the second stage suggested by Newcombe and Conrad. The entire process used at MCC to gather input from different constituencies never took any form. The informants still expressed confusion over the intentions of the mandate and appeared to be confused by the whole discussion.

STAGE TWO—PREPARATION AND POLICY FORMATION

Discussion of Stage Two

In the preparation and policy formation stage, the college administration gave attention to the development of plans for policy and procedures designed to implement the mandate. Newcombe and Conrad suggested that several activities occurred at this stage. It usually began with a self-study of the institution. MCC had undergone a SACS visitation in 1986, so no self study was required. This stage of implementation involves an evaluation of internal
and external receptivity to change and the identification of potential risks, conflicts, and options. The selection or creation of a proper facilitative substructure to assist the implementation of the mandate had to be considered. The reactions and responses from the faculty and administration to the proposed policies and procedures marked the end of the second stage.

Preparation and Policy Formation at MCC

Another memo was sent to the college presidents by Dr. Smith on July 31, 1987 after a complete review of all twenty-three college assessment plans by SCHEV. The memo cited some general recommendations for the entire system from SCHEV and indicated that more specific recommendations would be sent to each college. As a result of these recommendations, the college determined that three areas needed development at MCC: 1) more emphasis should be placed on the general education component for occupational-technical students; 2) more complete surveys of students should be undertaken; and 3) more detailed plans for describing how to use the results of assessment activities were needed. Specifically SCHEV recommended to MCC that the plans should, at a minimum, have stated who had the responsibility for overseeing the process and how the college expected assessment results to be shared and acted upon by those involved.
When the faculty returned for the 1987 fall semester, they were informed at the opening faculty meeting of the events that had transpired as a result of the feedback to MCC's proposed assessment plan. A part-time Assessment Coordinator was appointed and an ad hoc Assessment Committee, which had already been created, was given the primary responsibility for implementation of the mandate. The Coordinator's position was given to a respected faculty member who received forty percent released time to carry out the assessment duties. The original Coordinator returned full time to the classroom in the fall of 1989 and was replaced by another faculty member with the same forty-percent released time. In addition, the faculty were assigned to one of five sub-committees to respond to the specifics asked for by the State Council. These sub-committees were charged to draw up goals and objectives for developmental studies, general education, occupation—technical programs, and to develop survey instruments for distribution to former students, employers, and present students.

The situation improved somewhat when MCC began to involve more faculty in the committee and sub-committee work. During the 1987-88 academic year, these groups worked on their specific tasks, and there appeared to be an increased awareness of the intent of the mandate. It was
determined during this academic year that since seventy-five percent of all MCC curricular students were enrolled in occupational-technical programs, it was critical to the assessment process to have the outcomes in these programs measured as soon as possible. Two programs were selected for assessment during the 1987-88 academic year. The college administration began to formulate plans for the development of policies or procedures to implement the mandate at MCC. This flurry of activity was replaced by a period of inactivity. The Civil Engineering program and the Nursing program were selected for assessment. The faculty and Division Chairs involved with these two programs experienced an increased awareness of the requirements of the mandate. They sought out information and seemed to understand the direction required of them. After the completion of the assessment activities for these programs, they appeared to have reverted to a state of non-involvement and apathetic attitudes. The perception was that the fad had passed with no specific overall understanding of the intent of SCHEV to improve the quality of instruction.

The responses from the college constituencies to the plan were expressed in terms of anxieties and fears by both faculty and administrators. There was no evidence of widespread covert opposition from the faculty at MCC. They
felt that they were providing quality instruction to their students and viewed this mandate as an intrusion on their already limited time to teach. The general attitude was "if we comply on paper, the fad will pass away" (Interview with MCC faculty member, April 24, 1990). There was widespread agreement among informants that the lack of understanding and the lack of direction hindered the process of effecting change at the college. Informants agreed that the failure to provide this direction was equally shared by both the state and MCC. Even though the college brought in consultants and sent representatives to workshops the feeling did not dissipate. Faculty became convinced that even the experts did not understand the mandate. The result was that until someone provided this direction, the attitude would be one of apathy.

**Summary**

There appeared to be no clear markers at this stage to signal the beginning or end of preparation and policy formation stage. The development of the sub-committees and the choice of two programs for assessment possibly marked the beginning of the stage. However, it appeared that the infusion and preparation and policy formation stages operated together. There was never a clear understanding of the mandate nor were responses from the faculty adequate to improve the progression through the stages of
implementation. The faculty's apathetic attitude did not help this progression. The first two stages at MCC were never clearly defined. Clear communication between the administrative leadership, facilitative substructures, and institutional subsystems, which were needed to facilitate implementation of the plan, never occurred. These variables will be explored later in this section.

STAGE THREE—TRIAL AND TRANSITION

Discussion of Stage Three

The trial and transition stage of implementation began with observable changes occurring. Formal policy was articulated, clarified, and implemented at the institution. Newcombe and Conrad cited specific long-term changes in personnel, budget, policy, role definitions, and expectations and responsibilities as the ones most likely to occur. It seemed that MCC had adopted several changes, some of which may become permanent. MCC had made a positive attempt to design a plan that satisfied the requirements of the mandate. The process was marked with much difficulty, but the effort of MCC was toward compliance in a positive manner. The successful implementation of the mandate carried with it a stated purpose of program improvement and the improvement of instruction. Thus, it may be concluded that recognizable change determined the effectiveness of the process. It
might also be argued that the mandate from the General Assembly implied that change will occur. The only question remaining was how long-term would the change be. Regardless of these views, it appeared that change had occurred at MCC. There had not been a dramatic change in instruction, but it had resulted in noticeable changes in expectations, budget, the assignment of responsibilities, in and procedures at the college.

The General Education Sub-Committee researched options for tests to be used to assess outcomes for transfer students. They recommended the use of a standardized test to accomplish this assessment and then recommended a catalog revision to make students aware of this change. This sub-committee and the Continuing Education Sub-Committee did extensive work on the development of graduate surveys. The math Placement and English Placement Sub-Committees did research which led to the development of new placement procedures for developmental math and English courses.

There were significant changes found in the formalizing of the reporting of data to SCHEV. Formalizing meant to be sure that the data was properly gathered, documented, and reported to SCHEV. There was an increase in the awareness that the data gathered must be measurable. The fact that MCC had a good deal of confidence that the
faculty were providing quality education to their students was evident. There was a sense that they wished to continue, and even improve this quality, even though the informants rarely mentioned improving instruction in order to accomplish this goal. The response usually was that now with the formalized procedures to report, the State Council would recognize the quality of education at MCC. The failure of the informants to mention improvement of instruction may have been based on the confidence in their abilities as teachers. The failure to mention this also may have been that the faculty did not particularly endorse the idea that student improvement in outcomes assessment was related to faculty improving their instruction. Another perception might be that the mandate was actually seeking more formalized reporting methods. The most often cited change at MCC was the informants new awareness of the many facets of assessment. Some indicated that their awareness of accountability, the need for measurable data, and the need to prepare for the next self-study had increased. There was also a change in personnel with the appointment of a part-time Assessment Coordinator, which, in turn, caused some budget adjustments to account for the forty percent released time given to the faculty member who assumed this position. Another change occurred in the attitude of MCC in seeking federal grants. The college
received a substantial Title III grant to study faculty advising. Some informants viewed this change as being directly related to the assessment mandate.

The largest group of changes occurred in the area of expectations. Expectations for more data collection, more accountability, and more work were expressed. Expectations also were evident in the category of instructional improvements. Several informants cited expected changes in curriculum, more emphasis on writing and thinking skills, and changes in the way faculty teach. Only one informant mentioned faculty ownership and considered assessment as part of the faculty routine. MCC had not sold the idea of assessment to the faculty, and it did not appear that the intent of SCHEV to use assessment to improve the quality of instruction had yet been successfully communicated to the faculty.

Summary

It appeared that MCC had reached the trial and transition stage without really passing completely through the first two stages. The college was in the action-reaction cycle even though the reactions were not overt. The third stage was where observable changes took place. Upon further review, however, it could be concluded that MCC had only reached the preparation and policy formation stage. The research of Newcombe and Conrad made it
difficult to identify these stages with any specificity. It may be that the difficulty of identifying specific stages was due to the complexity of the assessment mandate. The source of the Newcombe and Conrad's study was the Title IX provision of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 and the accompanying guidelines and regulations for elimination of sex discrimination in athletics. This mandate was fairly straightforward and specific, whereas, the mandate resulting from Senate Document 14 was less specific. It was clear that SCHEV would have oversight functions in implementing this mandate, but it also gave the VCCS responsibility in the process. It was also apparent that a lack of understanding of student outcomes assessment on the part of the college, VCCS, SCHEV, and the General Assembly hindered the implementation of the mandate.

The observable changes which occurred at MCC, according to Newcombe and Conrad's theory, indicated that MCC had reached the trial and transition stage. Currently the assessment question seemed to be a benign issue at MCC without a clear understanding of the mandate from either the faculty or administration at the college.

STAGE FOUR-POLICY EXECUTION

Discussion of Stage Four

The fourth stage of implementation, policy execution, involved the gradual acceptance of institutional programs
by the college. Change was described by Newcombe and Conrad at this stage as more systematic and better planned. The authors described several reasons why colleges may not reach the fourth stage. Three of the reasons seemed appropriate to explain why MCC had not reached this stage. There was strong evidence that the administrative leadership was not committed to the mandate. This was true despite the fact that the MCC administration did respond in a positive manner. The question was whether this compliance was just on paper or a conscious effort to improve the quality of instruction at MCC. Second, there was ineffective use of the substructures at the college. The lack of early faculty involvement certainly hindered the process. A larger problem in this area was that it was unclear exactly which substructure was in charge. On paper the Improvement of Instruction Committee was given authority, but in reality members of that committee could not recall having any authority at all. The same might be said of the ad hoc Assessment Committee. Finally, the Assessment Coordinators seemed to be unclear about their responsibilities.

Policy Execution at MCC

The administrative leadership at MCC found it difficult to obtain input from the faculty since the administrators were unable to get clear directions from the
State Council or the VCCS, therefore, they found reaching the policy execution stage hard to achieve. The college did make a catalog change relative to the admission of students into developmental math and English courses. Informants were not conclusive in their responses that this was an actual policy change. Most stated that this was just a change in procedure which was easily waived if the student would approach the proper faculty member.

VARIABLES IN THE MAC MODEL

Newcombe and Conrad presented four categories of variables that affected the four levels of implementation discussed in the previous section. The institutional progression toward implementation of a mandate depended upon the interaction of one or more of several relationships established in the variable categories. The four variable categories were administrative leadership, facilitative substructures, institutional subsystems, and government intervention.

Administrative Leadership

The first category of variables, administrative leadership, required a commitment to change and a decision that the change was needed by the administrative leadership. This category was most crucial in the early stages of implementation. The administrative leadership needed to demonstrate the ability to act in a manner which
promoted progress. The president of the college usually assumed the role of communicator and controller of the change process.

Facilitative Substructures

Facilitative substructures provided channels of support for communicating, gathering, and assembling the various reports, and attempting to increase support for the proposed modifications. This substructure included the college standing committees, faculty senates, advisory committees, ad hoc groups, and other such groups. The college president generally designated which of the bodies would be involved in the process.

Institutional Subsystems

The third variable category, institutional subsystems, was comprised of all departments and divisions and the individuals in the departments. The individuals within the subsystems, including faculty and administrators, were the ones most likely to experience the impact of the change. As the conflict potential increased, the role of institutional subsystems intensified. Effective communication lowered this intensity by maintaining a two way relationship with the leadership. The political climate which surfaced during the early stages influenced the perceptions and decisions of the leadership and affected their relationship with the subsystems.
Government Intervention

Government intervention was the fourth variable. This category was used if the process stalled internally. Newcombe and Conrad noted that even when minimal government intervention occurred, the colleges would react to the intervention.

VARIABLE CATEGORY ONE—ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

Discussion of Variable Category One

The administrative leadership facilitated control and communication of the change process at the college. The leaders must make a commitment to change and had to act in a fashion which promoted institutional acceptance of the change. Newcombe and Conrad stated that administrative leadership was most crucial during the first two stages of implementation. The authors noted that the political climate which surfaced during the first two stages would affect the latter stages. The college president usually assumed the lead during the infusion stage, with the president assigning the lead role to someone during the remaining stages.

Influence of Administrative Leadership at MCC

It was readily apparent that this variable category was a key variable at MCC. There was not any evidence to indicate that this category was any more influential at one stage as opposed to another. It was evident that after the
initial introduction of the mandate the President did not assume any active role in the implementation process. This leadership variable with emphasis on the college President appeared to be important, but perhaps more important were the choices made by the President of the substructure to effect the change. The President of MCC did set the tone for implementation of the mandate. He committed resources to the project. Since there were no state funds allocated to implement the mandate, all funds were appropriated from other college budget categories. He was able to provide funds for travel, in-service activities, tests and materials, and released time for the part-time Assessment Coordinator.

The President was described as a delegator who practiced a participatory style. He attempted to lend flexibility to the projects, was open, but was not considered an innovator. The impression left by the informants was that the President adhered strictly to state policy and lacked visibility unless the issue was a top priority for him. It was mentioned that the President often appeared weak and indecisive due to his attempts to be participatory. His role after his initial endorsement of the mandate was to maintain a positive stance and monitor its progress.
Summary

The President did not assume an active role at MCC in the implementation of the assessment mandate. He was a President who followed state policy. The mandate came down from the state and his reaction was to do it as expediently as possible. His style was to delegate the responsibility to someone else. Therefore, he assigned the duties to the Dean of Instruction. Some informants stated that even though the Dean was given these duties, they felt that the President was still the final arbiter of the plan. The lack of a strong statement from the President which set forth the reasons to mean the change was needed was interpreted by the faculty that accomplishment of the task was not a top priority.

VARIABLE CATEGORY TWO-FACILITATIVE SUBSTRUCTURES

Discussion

Facilitative substructures provided the channels of support for communicating, gathering, and assembling the various reports, and attempting to increase support for the proposed modifications. The selection of these substructures was extremely important for the effective implementation of the mandate.

Influence of Facilitative Substructures at MCC

The Dean of Instruction was given the primary responsibility for the implementation of the assessment
mandate. The Improvement of Instruction Committee, a standing college committee, the ad hoc Assessment Committee, and a Part-time Assessment Coordinator were also chosen to play a role in the implementation process. Informants tended to identify the Dean as the leader who had been delegated the responsibility for implementation of the mandate by the President of the College. There seemed to be a feeling on the part of most informants that it was the President, working behind the scenes in a less visible role, who was really in charge.

The role of the facilitative substructure had to be carefully defined if they were to increase support for the mandate. This never occurred at MCC. The greatest difficulty was determining which substructure was in charge. The informants tended to name the Dean with the Assessment Coordinator also mentioned. Many identified their sub-committee chair as the leader, some named the Assessment Committee, while a few stated that it was a cooperative effort. The first Assessment Coordinator remarked that he "never really understood his authority" (Interview, April 26, 1990). Even members of the Assessment Committee were unable to provide documentation that showed any knowledge of their role in the implementation process.
Summary

This category of variables was perhaps the weakest link in the process at MCC. The lack of knowledge possessed by the various members of the substructures was a dominant factor in the benign state of the mandate at MCC. They were not able to garner support for the project because they did not understand the mandate themselves. The lack of clearly defined lines of authority resulted in a complete lack of coordination and interaction among the various constituencies at the college.

VARIABLE CATEGORY THREE—INSTITUTIONAL SUBSYSTEMS

Discussion of Variable Category Three

The third variable category of institutional subsystems were the ones most likely to experience the impact of the change. At MCC the faculty were the subsystem most likely to experience this impact. Newcombe and Conrad suggested that two conditions affected the relationship of this variable category to the implementation of the mandate. First, a change agent existed within the subsystem. Second, the involvement of the subsystem were perceived to be important by the administrative leadership. The authors stated that this category was most important in the later stages of implementation. The evidence at MCC suggested that this
variable category was of extreme importance at each stage of implementation.

Influence of Institutional Subsystems at MCC

The subsystem of faculty was the primary one which needed to be involved in the implementation of the assessment mandate. Faculty involvement in the early planning stages was limited at MCC. There was widespread feeling among informants that there was no specific intent to withhold anything from the faculty. The faculty at MCC were described as long term faculty, the majority having been employed at the college since its beginning. The college did not have the reputation of being a change oriented institution even though a willingness to change was evident. Since the faculty were long term, they had seen many mandates come and go in very quick succession. They viewed assessment as a fad and felt that once again the legislature and SCHEV were attempting to take away from their valuable instruction time.

An important factor which led to this feeling among faculty at MCC was the lack of faculty ownership of the plan. The faculty accepted the mandate, but resented the task. The lack of faculty involvement early in the process contributed to this feeling. The first Assessment Coordinator, a faculty member, mentioned that he felt no ownership of the plan which he was charged to administer.
This lack of early involvement of most faculty led to an overall lack of understanding of the precepts of the mandate. These facts, together with the failure to see a need for the change, led the faculty to the perception that they had no ownership of the plan. The informants stated that they were willing to change if a need for the change existed. Generally the faculty felt that they were already assessing and that this mandate was just another way of increasing their workload. Individually the faculty had not changed any of their teaching techniques because they felt they were doing a good job of providing quality education already.

**Summary**

The President did not make this mandate a priority. The faculty were not aware of when or why their program was to be assessed. The lack of faculty input was evident. The faculty assumed that their input was unimportant and failed to realize that the intent of the SCHEV directive was to improve the quality of instruction at the college.

**VARIABLE CATEGORY FOUR—GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION**

**Discussion of Variable Category Four**

Newcombe and Conrad emphasized that government intervention was important at all stages of implementation. They cited three implications about government intervention. The first implication was that even minimal
intervention by the mandating agency influenced the institution toward compliance. Second, government intervention was necessary when the mandating agency and institution could not agree on the purpose of the mandate. The final implication was that government intervention was necessary when the external agency reinterpreted the intentions of the mandate.

**Influence of Government Intervention at MCC**

This variable was used if the change process stalled internally. Newcombe and Conrad noted that even minimal government intervention occurred, the college reacted to the intervention. SCHEV and the VCCS represented the government interveners. A lack of communication was evident in the dissemination of SCHEV feedback. Only about one-third of the informants had direct knowledge of feedback from SCHEV. Those who responded that they had knowledge of the feedback expressed differing views about the quality of the feedback. About one-half of these informants felt that the feedback was fair and constructive. The others felt that the feedback lacked direction, and some even doubted that SCHEV read the report. The role of the VCCS in the oversight process was also mentioned by some informants. The view of the President characterized the feeling at MCC regarding the VCCS oversight. He stated that the VCCS was more
prescriptive and had more expectations than did SCHEV. He felt that this was true because the VCCS wanted individual colleges to look good to SCHEV in order that the entire system would look good.

The mixed feelings regarding the oversight process together with the widespread lack of knowledge of interventions exacerbated the already deep communication problem at MCC. If real change was to be effected at MCC, the faculty and administrators had to receive adequate information and review from the mandating agency. In turn, the college needed to make every effort to disseminate in an effective manner the proper feedback to all of the constituents. The college was in a stage of trial and error at this point, and those noticeable changes that had occurred need refinement in the hope that the college will be better as a result of the mandate. Unless faculty awareness was increased, long lasting change would not occur.

INTERACTIONS

COMMUNICATION AND VISION

Two important variables continued to appear as the researcher analyzed the data. The problems encountered by MCC might be traced to problems of communications and a lack of vision on the part of the administrative leadership. The problems of communications and vision were
not significantly evident at one stage more than another. There were communication problems at each stage of the process. These two traits were identified by responses from the informants which stated that a "lack of coordination", "lack of direction", "lack of authority", "lack of understanding", and "lack of clear goals" hindered the implementation of the mandate (Collective interviews conducted at MCC, April-May, 1990). A lack of vision by the leadership at MCC caused a failure to recognize the importance of the institutional subsystem of faculty and the need for a proper facilitative substructure early in the process. The researcher felt that this lack of vision on the part of the administrative leadership exacerbated the problem of communication. As Newcombe and Conrad stated, the failure to properly use these groups will hinder implementation at the later stages.

This appeared to result from a communications gap at MCC. Communications at MCC were open but followed a chain of command. Much of the communication was accomplished by memos and division meetings. No one seemed hesitant to bypass the chain of command, but the normal process was to use the established lines of communication. Communication of assessment information encountered several difficulties. Admittedly the Assessment Coordinator never understood his responsibility, and it appeared that communications
suffered from this fact. However, his replacement had not solved the problem at MCC. It was difficult to determine the exact nature of the problem even though it was a serious one. The President stated that "his desire was to maintain high visibility for assessment and to make it a part of the college culture" (Interview, April 27, 1990). He planned to enhance the visibility of the assessment plan through increased faculty involvement and by providing more feedback to faculty and administration. Unless the dissemination of information was more coordinated and the various groups interacted with each other, the vision of the President would never reach fruition.

It should be stated that there was no grand design at MCC to deny anyone information. The problem seemed to be one of determining who needed to know and when they needed to know it. One informant stated that "everyone knows a little, some know a lot" (Interview with MCC administrator, April 27, 1990). The complexity of the issue together with the lack of understanding partially accounted for this situation. More likely, the problem was flaws in the definition of lines of authority. For instance, the Dean of Student Services appeared to have played no role in the process. He was not a member of the Assessment Committee nor was he identified by any of the informants as a possible interview prospect.
There was lack of interaction between the Assessment Committee, the sub-committees, the total faculty, and even the Division Chairs. One Division Chair remarked that he was omitted from the process with the appointment of the Assessment Coordinator. He felt that his input was reduced, not intentionally, but it happened. There was a general lack of knowledge concerning the disposition of the sub-committee recommendations. This was unfortunate since many informants cited the sub-committee discussions and involvement as a positive experience. The sharing of the information with the total faculty possibly increased the awareness of the faculty and established the fact that assessment was not a fad but a catalyst for change at MCC.

A similar problem of dissemination of information existed for the reporting of the data gathered and analyzed as a result of the program assessment at MCC. The sharing of information may have assisted other program heads as they were brought into the assessment process. The changes resulting from the data gathered and analyzed have, for the most part, been shared only with the faculty involved and their Division Chairs. This happened because it was the traditional practice at MCC. Another factor that may have affected this information flow was the replacement of the part-time coordinator. The first Coordinator wanted to devote full time to his teaching, and therefore,
relinquished the job. The new Coordinator’s style was different from his predecessor’s. He felt that one on one communication was the best approach. He did not wish to overburden faculty who were not directly involved with the information. This view hindered the President’s goal of increased visibility as well as increasing the present benign state of assessment involvement.

The communications dilemma in the assessment process at MCC cannot be attributed to one specific factor. The change process had inherent difficulties. Mandated change from external groups with oversight function added another level of communication to the process, and thus another possible level when communication gaps occurred. As one MCC faculty member said, "the college is working at improving communication but due to the listener-sender relationship, the job is most difficult" (Interview with MCC faculty member, May 7, 1990). None of the informants wished to identify the cause of this communications lag, but some perceptions were drawn from the interviews.

It should be noted that the communications gap may be an understanding gap. The initial documents sent to the colleges included a planning document. A matrix and checklist were available to assist each college in developing its planning. The informants, especially those on the administrative staff, were aware of this document.
Other informants did not have knowledge of this document. Some said that they probably saw it but did not remember. The conclusion must be taken as a communications gap which may account for the lack of understanding.

There was also some confusion over the lines of authority as mentioned earlier. The Assessment Committee was no longer in existence. Apparently its role had been assumed by the Improvement of Instruction Committee which was a standing committee. The difficulty with the added responsibility given to the committee was the rotating membership each year. Unless some provision was made for continuity, there was a danger that further fragmentation of dissemination of information will occur. There was a change in the part-time Assessment Coordinator in 1989. Beginning with this academic year each college had been allotted a full-time position for assessment. Perhaps this may assist with the feedback and dissemination of information.

DISCUSSION

It appeared that no clear breakage points among the stages existed at MCC. There was no conclusive evidence to show that the implementation of the mandate flowed in distinct patterns from one stage to the next. The stages of infusion, policy, preparation, trial and transition, and even policy execution appeared to occur simultaneously.
The approval of the assessment document by SCHEV might be viewed by some to end the infusion stage. However this document was so general that no clear understanding existed at the college regarding the intent of the mandate. There was no widespread attempt by the administrative leadership to elicit institution wide input from the subsystems particularly from among the faculty. Newcombe and Conrad stated that the infusion stage ends with the clarification and initial interpretation of the mandate. While the desire to respond positively was evident, the overriding difficulty was how to respond. The attitude at MCC was one of "if we have to do this task, let us do it" (Interview with MCC faculty member, April 26, 1990). The problem was what to do. SCHEV had opted for a locally fashioned plan with much flexibility. In the attempt to allow for flexibility, general guidelines had been established, but specific details were intentionally not included. MCC was aware that the emphasis was on improving quality, but it was not evident that the faculty really felt that the instructional quality was an emphasis.

Presently the mandated change of student outcomes is a benign issue at MCC. Of course, the college was still in the early stages of the process. Only two programs had been assessed, and the major issue of general education in occupational-technical and college transfer programs had
yet to be fully addressed. As the faculty began to tackle the issues of defining and attempting to measure general education, some resistance would be encountered. The attitude of "when it affects me, will determine my involvement", will be a reality (Interview with MCC faculty member, May 1, 1990). All faculty will be affected. Leadership, communication, and vision must be sharpened at MCC if the mandate can be expected to effect meaningful change.
Chapter Five

Case Studies and the MAC Model

Chapter Four described the two case studies. Chapter Five will explain the case studies in relation to the MAC model. This explanation will be supported by a visual representation in the form of tables which include specific descriptions of the activities or traits comprising the stages and variable categories of the MAC model. The two colleges participated in the same or similar activities as described by Newcombe and Conrad. In some instances, the completion of the activity described by the theory was only partially attempted and/or completed. The only difference was in the timing of these activities. RCC delayed taking action on the mandate for almost a full year because of their President's hesitancy to implement the project. MCC decided to comply with the directives from SCHEV and the VCCS without delay.

STAGES IN THE MAC MODEL

Newcombe and Conrad wrote that there were four stages in the implementation of mandated academic change. Specific activities occur at each stage with certain activities marking the beginning and ending of each stage. Table 1 depicts the stages and activities which were supposed to be completed at each stage. The beginning and
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ending markers were noted in the table as (B) and (E). The completion of the activity was described in the first column simply by "c" for completed, "nc" for not completed, or "pc" for partially completed. The last column represented a judgement of the effectiveness of this activity in accelerating the specific stage of implementation by using either "yes" or "no" as the indicator. The observations allowed the researcher to cite examples of the activity or to make comments regarding the completion status at the colleges.
Table 1

Activities Categorized by Stages Within the MAC Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Within Stages</th>
<th>Completion of Activities</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities Within Infusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Mandate (B)</td>
<td>pc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: Introduced at administrative staff meetings; to faculty at pre-school conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal and informal discussions</td>
<td>pc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: Not enough input from faculty and staff; concern was compliance on paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projections of the effects of mandate on the college</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: Most thought it was a fad which would pass quickly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of mandate by key administrators</td>
<td>pc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: Some question whether the task was completed or not. A plan was devised but there never appeared to be clear understanding by this group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation and interpretation of mandate to the college (E)</td>
<td>pc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: The general plan was distributed but no real explanation was given to groups at the college. Lack of understanding of the intent of mandate was evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Within Stages</th>
<th>Completion of Activities</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities Within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study (B)</td>
<td>pc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: Colleges felt no need for this since both recently conducted a SACS Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of internal receptivity to the plan</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: No organized effort to evaluate this. Plan was drawn up and given to faculty. Information dissemination and communication was weak due to lack of understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of alternatives, nc</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risks, and options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: Same as above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of real or implied policy</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: The college chose programs for assessment, revise surveys, and change some procedures but no one appeared to know what to do with the data gathered. No real indication that instruction was improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of substructures or use of existing substructure</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: The academic deans were given responsibility for implementation. Ad hoc assessment committees were established. Later, but not until plan was in operation, a part-time assessment coordinator was hired. No strong lines of authority were established. College standing committees were not included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table continues*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Within Stages</th>
<th>Completion of Activities</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction and responses from college constituencies (E)</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: There was no formal opportunity to respond during this stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Within Trial and Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observable changes (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: This activity was completed earlier in the process. Part-time assessment coordinator, money allocated for travel, changes in procedure, new expectations and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing of alternative courses of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing of alternative courses of action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: This study was completed as this activity was beginning. Surveys were being updated. Work on general education exit tests was being finalized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal institutional policy on implementing the mandate is established, clarified, and articulated (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal institutional policy on implementing the mandate is established, clarified, and articulated (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: There is an assessment plan on paper at the colleges. No evidence was found that the plan was clear to the informants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Within Policy Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gradual acceptance and implementation of the plan (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Colleges were in this process as study was conducted. table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Within Stages</th>
<th>Completion of Activities</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change more planned and systematic</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: No evidence of this, but colleges have not reached this stage

(B) - Beginning marker event  
(E) - Ending marker event  
pc - Partially completed  
nc - Not completed  
c - Completed
Infusion Stage

The infusion stage was marked by the introduction of the mandate at the college. This did occur, but the introduction was primarily confined to informal and formal discussions among a few administrators. The formal vehicle used to introduce the mandate to the entire college was a general faculty meeting at the beginning of the academic year. This presentation consisted of no more than a few words by the president. This study concluded that the infusion stage at both colleges was ineffective. Some of the activities cited by Newcombe and Conrad were completed but the effectiveness of each of the activities was at best questionable. There was no indication that there were any projections of the possible effects of the mandate at either institution. The stated intent of improving the quality of instruction was never emphasized, so the input of the faculty on this academic matter was not received. The leadership at the colleges, and most other groups, felt that the assessment mandate was a fad which would quickly pass. There never appeared to be any attempts to carry on formal discussions or to project the effects of the mandate on the institution. Thus, effective interpretation of the mandate by key administrators only partially occurred and was ineffective. The administrative leadership operated in a vacuum and never was able to articulate a clear
interpretation of how the colleges were to achieve the requirements of the mandate. The greatest difficulty at this stage was in determining the proper manner to proceed. No one at the colleges seemed to have insight into the effects of the mandate, nor did they understand how to acquire this information.

**Preparation and Policy Formation**

The colleges began some of the stage two activities without completing a clear articulation of the mandate to the college constituencies. The preparation and policy formation stage according to the MAC model began with an institutional self-study. Neither institution completed a self-study designed to elicit data regarding the consequences of this mandate. This was perhaps unnecessary since both colleges recently underwent a ten-year SACS evaluation. Conversely, involvement in an institutional self-study relating to this specific mandate might have benefitted the colleges. This self-study could have assisted in defining the receptivity to change and provided a chance to explore the various conflicts, options, and risks brought about by the mandated academic change. The involvement of the entire college in such a project would also have improved the interpretation, articulation, and communication of the intent of the mandate.
The colleges produced an assessment plan, but it was one in which very few people felt any ownership. The evidence suggested that even the members of the ad hoc assessment committees never accepted ownership of the plan. An activity during this second stage was the utilization of the proper substructures to facilitate implementation of the mandate. The ad hoc assessment committees and the deans of instruction were the primary substructures selected to promote implementation. Later in the process, part-time assessment coordinators were given duties in the assessment area. While these actions appeared to be an effective use of college substructures, the reality was that the effort was hampered because no definite lines of authority were established between the substructures nor with the colleges at large. The deans understood that they were assigned by the presidents the overall responsibility for implementing the student outcome assessment plans. The deans, however, did not necessarily understand how to do the job, nor did they necessarily want the responsibility. This caused serious problems with the flow of communications at the institutions. The ad hoc assessment committees, the part-time coordinators, and really the rest of the college were just as confused as the deans. They doubted their authority and no one seemed to know where the information should go or who was responsible for its dissemination in the first
place. This communications problem was evident in the responses from informants regarding who was in charge of the assessment mandate. A small majority of them identified the deans of instruction as the leaders of assessment activities, but many others listed either the presidents, the assessment committees, the part-time coordinators, or even the faculty.

The ending markers at the preparation and policy formation stage were the reactions and responses from the college constituencies. There was never much reaction from the colleges. The faculty considered the mandate another task from SCHEV which had no real meaning. Their reaction was to comply on paper and the fad would go away. The difficulty encountered with this marker was determining if the colleges ever provided a real chance for the constituencies to respond. The entire planning process was completed, the plan developed, and sent to SCHEV for approval. Informants appeared to be unaware of what actually was included in the plan. Those groups involved in the design of the plan knew of the content but many had forgotten its specifics. Communications and dissemination of information once again hampered the effective solicitation of responses from the entire college. The evidence indicated that the lack of total involvement of the faculty and others at the colleges was responsible for the
ineffective data gathering process. The college leadership was unable to identify and articulate the intent of the mandate to the faculty. There was not an attempt to withhold information from the college, but there was a failure to define clearly the areas of responsibility of all persons affected by the mandate. In spite of this, the colleges somehow moved to the third stage of trial and transition.

Trial and Transition

Trial and transition was marked by the beginning of observable changes at the college. Newcombe and Conrad cited changes in budget, personnel, policy, role definition, and responsibilities and expectations as long term change observed at this third stage. The evidence in this study suggested that observable changes in the aforementioned areas began immediately at the college with the infusion stage. Budgets were altered to provide funds for travel, to provide stipends for experts in the field to assist the colleges, and to allow for released time for the part-time assessment coordinators. The hiring of the assessment coordinators was a personnel change which caused other changes in the hiring of adjunct faculty to teach the person's classes. New responsibilities and expectations occurred early at the colleges. Student services were given extra responsibilities in testing and placement. The
faculty had expectations of more paperwork and the feeling that valuable class time would be taken away to complete this task. The expectation that the implementation of the mandate would mean an increased workload for those assigned the task of compiling the reports and distributing the data was almost immediately recognized.

The terms observable change and long term change presented some difficulty in analyzing the progression of implementation through specific stages at the colleges. These seemed to be contradictory terms. Changes which are observed will not necessarily be long term. The key factor was whether or not the change was meaningful in affecting the longevity of the changes in the areas defined by the MAC model. The evidence indicated that meaningful change occurred in the placement of students, in the attention given to the development of survey instruments, and to the assessment of certain programs. To the majority of the faculty, the changes observed were for paper compliance which did not affect their individual classes. The faculty reported an increased awareness of the need to be accountable for student outcomes, but they made no changes in their methods of instruction.

The colleges were in the trial and transition stage at the time this study was conducted. They were testing alternative courses of action even though no clear
articulation of the mandate was evident. The lack of understanding the ways to achieve the requirement of improving the quality of instruction dominated the responses of the informants. The fact that the colleges were attempting this activity of testing alternatives seemed to negate the stage theory of the MAC model once again. The colleges had not satisfied the ending marker of the infusion stage, but were in the trial and transition stage.

Policy Execution

The policy execution stage had not occurred at either college as this study was completed. There were some procedural changes at the colleges, and they could possibly result in policy changes. The ad hoc assessment committee was made a permanent standing committee at one institution. Both colleges changed certain placement procedures for developmental math and English courses. However, there was not enough evidence that the colleges were in the fourth stage of policy execution.

There was no support found for mandated academic change progressing through successive stages. The theory suggested that the completion of an ending marker event meant the successful completion of that stage. Newcombe and Conrad protected themselves by stating that colleges may regress to an earlier stage due to certain factors occurring. This study revealed that rather than regression
to an earlier stage, the marker events ending a stage simply were not effective. The general language used by the authors in identifying the stages made it difficult to determine when stages began and ended. However, the evidence was substantial that the existence of a stage progression did not happen at community colleges in the implementation of student outcome assessment plans.

**VARIABLE CATEGORIES IN THE MAC MODEL**

Newcombe and Conrad identified four categories of variables in the MAC model which interact with each other at the various stages of progression of implementation. The four variable categories of administrative leadership, facilitative substructures, institutional subsystems, and government intervention were important at different stages of implementation. Newcombe and Conrad stated that administrative leadership was most important during the stages of infusion and policy preparation while facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems were most critical at the latter stages of trial and transition and policy preparation. Government intervention was deemed important at each stage if the implementation process slowed down.

Table 2 on the next page illustrates the importance of the variable categories at the four stages of implementation described by the MAC model. The variables are listed with
Table 2

Variable Categories of the MAC Model Defined by Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category &amp; Activity</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Leadership

Use of adminis. subsystem  yes  no  yes  no

Decision and commitment to change  no  no  no  no

Promote acceptance of change  no  no  no  no

Commit resources  yes  yes  yes  no

Facilitative Substructures

Communications network  no  no

Compile and report data  yes  no

Assist with budgetary change  no  no

Assist with personnel change  no  no

Generate support for change  no  no

Institutional Subsystems

Change agent or potential change agent exists  no  no

Table continues
Activities considered important by administration

no    no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category &amp; Activity</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interventions successful

yes  yes  yes  yes

Knowledge of intervention

no    no    no    no

0 - Occurred
E - Effectiveness
specific activities cited by Newcombe and Conrad listed under the variable category. The activities were marked by "yes" if they occurred and by "no" if they did not occur. The effectiveness of these activities were noted by "yes" if they were effective and by "no" if the activity was not effective.

Administrative Leadership at the Infusion Stage

Administrative leadership was recognized as a major variable in the present study. The MAC model stated that the president of the college usually assumed the lead role during the first stage of infusion. The five items cited which indicated the effect of the president on the change process were listed in Table 2. The evidence did not support a finding that the presidents had any desire or commitment to change. The presidents were committed to compliance with the mandate on paper rather than changing anything. The college presidents, however, committed human and fiscal resources to the project. The amount of the resources was somewhat limited since no money earmarked for implementation accompanied this mandate. The presidents provided funds for travel, materials, and for released time for a part-time assessment coordinator. It should be noted at this point that one college reacted quickly to the mandate while the other waited for one year before making any progress toward
compliance. The commitment of resources therefore came at different times, but the college was in the infusion stage in both instances. This did not negate the fact that the decision and commitment to change by the president was recognized by each college. It was just that one of the presidents moved more cautiously than the other. The presidents also used the administrative substructures, not to be confused with the facilitative substructures, during the first stage even though it was an ineffective use. The term administrative substructures seemed to reference discussion among top-level administrators. The deans of instruction were given the responsibility for implementation, but neither dean was clear about how to accomplish the task. The presidents seemed to assume a passive role in this respect. There was no evidence that the presidents considered student outcome assessment a personal priority. Therefore, it was concluded that after the initial announcement of the mandate and the resource commitment by the presidents, the academic deans took charge of the process. Neither president played an active role in controlling the change process or promoting the acceptance of change at the colleges.
Administrative Leadership at Stage Two

The MAC theory described the influence of administrative leadership at the second stage as one in which the president played a less active role. An administrative change agent other than the president usually assumed the active role of promoting change. This role clearly belonged to the deans of instruction. Neither of the deans was very effective during the second stage. They did choose the facilitative substructure to assist with the implementation of the mandate. Ad hoc assessment committees were appointed to carry part of the burden of overseeing the implementation process. In both instances, this committee was hampered by a lack of direction from the dean. The committees consisted of faculty and administrative representatives, but no guidance was given about their responsibility in oversight or reporting back to their peers. The part-time assessment coordinators likewise appeared to be unsure of their role in the process. The administrative leadership at the second stage was uncoordinated and fragmented. Uncertainty as to who was in charge was evident at the colleges. This hampered the dissemination of information and communication at the second stage. The division chairs were often left out of the information loop, while the faculty were not included in the first place. The effectiveness of trying to formulate a
policy was hampered due to the lack of overall coordination of the change process. The evidence indicated that the administration and faculty were waiting for directions from the presidents, but it never came.

This finding gave credence to Newcombe and Conrad's contention that the presidents may be affected by their own values, the political desirability of the change, or whether they perceive the students' best educational interest to be served. This fact does not diminish the finding that the deans of instruction were more critical during the first stage of infusion than were the presidents.

Facilitative Substructures

Facilitative substructures played a lesser role in the process than indicated by the MAC model. The substructures were supposed to provide the communications network for the dissemination of information and the compiling and reporting of data. No evidence was found that there was an effective communications network. As stated earlier the responsibilities of the assessment committees, assessment coordinators, and the role of the existing college structures were never clearly delineated. Data were compiled but the dissemination of this information often was used just within the assessment committees or by the assessment coordinators or deans. Overall understanding of the mandate was hampered by the fact that informants were
not provided access to this information. As the colleges began to write general education goals, develop surveys, and assess programs, the situation improved somewhat. Even then the data was generally shared only within the committees and not with those faculty and administrators who were not on these committees. This study revealed that the choice of the proper substructures was a critical element affecting mandated academic change. The evidence further supported the involvement of the entire college in the choice of substructures as desirable. The implementation processes at the colleges were hampered by the failure to define responsibilities. Perhaps with more involvement in the choice of substructures, this lack of definition might be alleviated.

Institutional Subsystems

The third variable category of institutional subsystems, particularly the faculty, was found to be a crucial variable. The MAC model suggested that the subsystem was more important during the later stages of trial and transition and policy execution. Evidence from this study indicated that involvement in the early stages was more desirable. The faculty never felt ownership of the assessment plan at either college. They were not involved in the planning process with the exception of representatives on the ad hoc assessment committee. The
faculty informants implied and the administrative informants agreed that involvement of the total faculty at an early stage would have assisted implementation.

The academic nature of this mandate made it crucial that faculty be totally involved early. Many faculty felt left out of the process, and, therefore, chose to ignore what was happening at the college. As the institutions moved toward writing general education objectives more faculty were involved and the communications improved. The early involvement of this subsystem may have accelerated the progress of the colleges toward implementation.

The MAC model theorized that a change agent exist within the subsystem. This study revealed that this may be important. The leadership chose a faculty member for the position of faculty coordinator. The leadership's thinking was to get the faculty to develop ownership of the plan. This effort was hampered by the failure to properly define the coordinators's area of responsibility and because the coordinators had to accept responsibility for implementation of a plan over which they had no control.

Government Intervention

Government intervention was the fourth variable category cited by Newcombe and Conrad. The interveners in this study were SCHEV and the VCCS Systems Office, even though SCHEV was the final arbiter. Newcombe and Conrad
contended that government intervention was critical at any stage of implementation. The findings of this study indicate that the only evidence of government intervention was during the first two stages. The intervention of SCHEV assisted the colleges when they were slowed in the process of writing their plans. This substantiated the study of Newcombe and Conrad. Oversight by SCHEV lessened after the initial development of the plans, but later a SCHEV representative was assigned to each institution to aid the college when necessary.

The study revealed that the knowledge of interventions was very limited. In some cases the academic deans or the assessment committees were the only individuals who knew of the results of the intervention. The ad hoc assessment committees appeared to have little knowledge of SCHEV's interventions other than the agency was supposed to review the plan. This pointed again to the problem of communication and information dissemination.

OTHER VARIABLES DEFINED

Communication and Vision

This study revealed other variables which need consideration in determining the success of implementing mandated academic change. Communication was a key variable identified by informants, as was the need for the leadership to provide a vision for the direction the college should
take. Table 3 on the next page cites some of the responses from informants which prompted the researcher to emphasize these two variables.
Table 3

Descriptors Identifying Communication and Vision as Variable Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identifying Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>lack of clarity, dissemination of information, definition of responsibilities, lack of understanding, confusion, lack of information, lack of involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>lack of focus, lack of guidance, lack of direction, lack of clear goals, lack of purpose, lack of planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The infusion stage at both institutions was very disjointed and unorganized. There was a total lack of communication at the college. Even those involved in designing the plan did not understand their task. This communications gap began with SCHEV and filtered down to the internal processes at the institutions. The lack of communication between the administration and faculty was evident, as was the communications gap among other groups. The communications gap was exacerbated by the failure to determine who was in charge of the project, the effects of the mandate, and the dissemination of information.

The MAC model mentioned communication and the need for the leaders to set the tone for the change project. The evidence gathered caused a decision that communication was important enough to become a variable category within itself. The role of the president in setting the agenda requires a great deal of planning and looking to the future in order to effectively communicate, interpret, and articulate this plan to the college at large. The change literature identified the need for visionary leaders. The responses from informants in this study indicated that they too were seeking a vision of what the assessment mandate meant for their college. This warranted a consideration of
vision as a major variable in the process of mandated academic change.
Chapter Six

Conclusions and Recommendations

In recent years colleges and universities have faced the prospect of increased numbers of mandates from external agencies. The increase in these mandates from legislatures, accrediting agencies, and other external groups was partially due to the increased call for accountability of colleges and universities to the taxpayers. The hesitancy on the part of educational institutions to initiate change themselves was also viewed as the reason more mandates were needed. The need to understand how colleges and universities respond to these mandates was important if long term change was to be effected. Newcombe and Conrad's 1981 study represented the only research which specifically addressed this largely unexplored topic of mandated academic change.

The purpose of this study was to examine the applicability of Newcombe and Conrad's theory of mandated academic change to two year public institutions in Virginia in the context of the state mandate for all public colleges to adopt student outcome assessment plans. This study examined the role of the four categories of variables and the four stages of implementation identified by the authors to explain long term academic change. Newcombe and Conrad
also stated that specific stages of implementation were marked by specific activities at the beginning and end of each stage.

The case study method was used. Two colleges were selected for the study; the colleges had experienced differing levels of success with the implementation of the assessment mandate. The colleges supplied the names of those individuals on the assessment committee at each institution. One-on-one interviews were scheduled with these persons and they, in turn, identified others who might assist with the study. Interviews continued at the institutions until all sources were exhausted. The interviews were recorded and transcribed. These transcripts were then coded, analyzed, and the findings reported in Chapters Four and Five.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions regarding the MAC model's stages and variable categories, the identification of other related variables of communication and vision, and the relationship of the variables of the PAC model of planned change to the MAC model are presented in this chapter.

Conclusions Related to the Stages of the MAC Model

This study found that many of the activities in the stages described by Newcombe and Conrad occurred during the change process. The identification of successive stages in
the MAC model was not confirmed in this study. Evidence suggested that the progression through successive stages of implementation was not flexible enough to describe change at the community colleges utilized in this study. The beginning and ending marker events were far too restrictive to allow for the separation of one stage from another one. The terminology used to describe the stages, as well as the variables which affected the stages were also too restrictive. The evidence in this study supported a conclusion that mandated academic change involved activities that occurred in phases rather than in a clear progression from one stage represented by an ending marker to the beginning marker of a next stage.

Conclusions Regarding Administrative Leadership

College presidents were found to be key leaders at community colleges. The colleges used in this research had a history of dealing with many types of changes with both the presidents and the faculties having served their respective colleges for long tenures. Even though both presidents delegated the primary responsibility for implementation to the deans of instruction, they reserved the right to review and revise the final plan. The influence of the presidents was acknowledged regardless of whether they displayed an active or passive role in the change process. It was concluded that an outward negative
response by the president hindered the implementation of the mandate more than a passive positive response aided the implementation. The President of RCC was openly opposed to the mandate, while the President of MCC showed a willingness to implement the mandate without stating an opinion regarding its merit. MCC moved forward with the process with the Academic Dean assuming the major burden of controlling the change procedure. RCC made no progress for one full year due to the President's negative response. It was not until he was convinced that the mandate was not a fad that the President prompted the college to proceed toward implementation.

Conclusions Regarding Facilitative Substructures

The MAC model stated that the substructures were important during the later stages of implementation. Not only was the choice of a proper substructure important, but also the decision on when to utilize it was crucial. If the mandate truly entailed academic change, the leadership must also contemplate the level of involvement of specific groups at the college. Delegating overall responsibility to the academic dean seemed appropriate, but the dean of student services, counselors, faculty, student activities staff, and others needed to be involved. The evidence from this study supported the conclusion that early choice and involvement of substructures was critical in order for all
groups to begin to develop ownership of the proposed plan.

The choice of a proper substructure by the administrative leadership was an important factor in effecting long term change at the community colleges. Decisions had to be made between using an existing college substructure such as a standing committee or faculty senate, or creating an ad hoc substructure to accomplish the assigned task. The choice of using an existing substructure was helpful in that a process was established for the dissemination of information through the formal levels of communication at the college. Conversely, the use of an ad hoc substructure drew attention to the importance of the topic and caused the constituencies to put more emphasis on the matter. The best decision may be to use a combination of the two. It was concluded that the choice of the substructure, while important, was not as crucial as establishing clear lines of communication for the dissemination of information to the individual or group assigned to accelerate implementation of the mandate.

**Conclusions Regarding Institutional Subsystems**

This variable category comprised the personnel most likely to experience the affects of any change. In the present study the group most likely to feel the effects of the mandate was the faculty. The present study indicated that the subsystem of faculty never felt ownership of the
plan, possibly due to the feeling that they were left out of the early planning, and therefore, felt unimportant. There appeared to be no change agent among the faculty who emerged as a significant factor in the process. The part-time assessment coordinators were faculty members, but neither was a force for change.

The MAC model indicated that the subsystems were more critical during the latter stages of implementation. Newcombe and Conrad noted that the political climate established in the early stages of implementation affects the latter stages. This was certainly true at community colleges which increased the need for earlier involvement of the total college. The findings in this study suggested that the involvement of the faculty earlier in the process may be beneficial to effecting long term academic change resulting from external mandates. If this was not done the faculty were asked to accept a very general plan in which they felt no ownership. The reality was that while no overt faculty opposition was evident, the faculty may not accept a plan if they are left out of the early planning process.

The faculty had to understand both the need for the change and the perceived benefits of the mandate. The intent of the student outcome assessment mandate clearly was the improvement of the quality of instruction. How
this would be accomplished, however, was not clear to the faculty. The lack of early involvement of the faculty and the failure of the administration to communicate the needs and benefits of this change exacerbated the problem. The faculty was skeptical of the mandate because of past experiences with mandates from the same external agency. Many faculty felt that outcomes assessment was a fad which intruded on classroom time, caused more paperwork, and was of no use since the faculty were doing a good job of teaching and were already complying with the intent of the mandate. Even though there was no indication that information was withheld intentionally from the faculty, they were still skeptical and no ownership of the plan was established. The evidence from this study indicated that change had occurred at the colleges. It may be concluded that individual faculty had not changed anything substantial in their respective classes, even though there was an increased awareness of student outcomes assessment.

Conclusions Regarding Government Intervention

The variable of government intervention was best described as external intervention at the community college level with student outcomes assessment. SCHEV was the final arbiter, but the VCCS Systems Office also had oversight functions. Interventions can be successful at each stage of implementation but only if both parties
clearly understand the mandate. Personal interventions which provided opportunity to ask questions and react to the answers provided the best opportunity to create a meaningful dialogue between the external agency and the college. Newcombe and Conrad stated that the slightest intervention by the external agency caused the college to respond in a more efficient manner. This did not appear to be true in the present case. If the authors meant compliance on paper, their statement was true, but responding in a way that effected meaningful change was a different matter. The findings of this study led to the conclusion that should the mandating agency not possess the vision of what the results of the mandate will be, the intervention will be unsuccessful.

Conclusions Regarding Other Variables Identified

This research found that vision and communication needed more emphasis than supplied by the MAC model. Vision was conceived as setting clear goals or providing direction and guidance. This vision must be transmitted to all persons at the college, otherwise the establishment of a clear network of communication was impossible. This research revealed that poor communication was the source of many problems encountered in the implementation of mandated academic change. Mandated academic change required that channels of communication be kept open, not only between
the internal and external bodies, but also between the administration and faculty. This research found that a lack of understanding regarding the precepts of the mandate hindered the process defined by the colleges. This lack of understanding was caused by the failure of the colleges to establish clear lines of authority and by the failure to disseminate information to those affected by the mandate. Therefore, it was concluded that communication be included as a major variable in considering mandated academic change which must include a vision of what was expected to result from its implementation.

Conclusions Regarding the PAC Variables

The findings of this study indicated that the process of mandated academic change was consistent with that of the planned change model of Creamer and Creamer. The four variable categories of the MAC model were broad ones which needed refinement. The category of government intervention represented the most clearly defined of the categories. The other three categories, particularly facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems, were difficult to define. It was concluded that the MAC model can rely upon the research of Creamer and Creamer to assist with the refinement of these variable categories.

Creamer and Creamer's PAC model of planned change identified nine variables as contributing to outcomes of
planned change projects in organizations. These nine variables of circumstances, value compatibility, idea comprehensibility, practicality, superintendency, championship, advantage probability, strategies and opposition seemed to fit well within the variable categories of the MAC model. Incorporation of the variables of the PAC model would provide more specificity to the broader categories identified in the former model.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Administrative leadership was a key variable identified in this study. The president of each institution played a key role in setting the tone for the project. The president's active role was diminished after this initial involvement. The assignment of responsibility to the dean of instruction for implementation of the project was the approach used by both presidents. The dean of instruction was identified as the visible leader with the president considered the authority figure in the background. Further research needs to be conducted to determine the various layers of leadership at the community college level. The PAC model of Creamer and Creamer provides some direction to this suggested research.

The use of facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems appears to be a priority for the successful implementation of the MAC model at the community
college level. The importance of leadership from the substructures and subsystems needs more research. The PAC model of planned change research of Creamer and Creamer may aid in this research.

More research is needed to determine when the faculty needs to be involved. Newcombe and Conrad state that the subsystem of faculty is more important at the latter stages of implementation. This research reveals that as faculty become more involved, their awareness of the plan increases. Thus, early faculty involvement may be a necessary component for the effective implementation of mandated academic change. The pay off for a high faculty awareness level may be achievement of stated goals and the possibility of effecting more long term change. General meetings of the faculty are needed to discuss the various options, risks, or alternatives. Early small group discussion may follow the general meetings to make suggestions to the individuals and committees specifically designated responsibility for implementation of the mandate.

The role of communication as a separate variable needs consideration. Mandated academic change of this type requires communication at many levels. There must be clear communication from the external agency to the institutional leadership, from the president to the substructure and to
the faculty, between faculty and division chairs, and from division to division. It may be wiser in the future for external agencies to call together representatives from educational institutions to get their input and discuss the possible risks and alternatives. SCHEV appeared to prolong the process by stating general guidelines and then, allowing each institution to develop local plans. The institutions do not want to be told exactly what is required, but they do need direction toward achievement of the outcomes required by the mandate.

The researcher found no solid evidence that change occurs through successive stages. While some change transpired in what Newcombe and Conrad call long-term areas of personnel, budget, role definition, expectations and responsibilities, and policy, these changes occurred while the college were attempting to gain a clearer understanding of what was expected. Further research is needed to explore the stage progression of the MAC theory. The markers beginning and ending each stage were far too general for researchers to conclude that one stage had ended and another had begun. The evidence indicated that community colleges fluctuate between stages with clarification by the administration needed continuously for the substructure and subsystem.
More research is needed to clarify some of the terms that Newcombe and Conrad employed in their model. The terms long-term change and observable change are not fully explained by the authors. This study reveals changes that fit into the categories of personnel, budget, policy, expectations and responsibilities, and role definitions. These changes, however, may not be properly considered long-term. While these changes are observable, there is no way to determine the longevity of the change; this hampers the researcher in drawing conclusions. The same reasoning applies to the fourth stage of policy execution. Many changes which led to changed procedures were seen in this study. However, the determination of whether this represented policy change is unclear.

The theory of mandated academic change of Newcombe and Conrad had application at the community college level. It served as a useful framework upon which the case study data could be organized. The variable categories of administrative leadership and government intervention were variables recognized at the community college level. The suggestions for future research in the category of administrative leadership can greatly enhance this variable. The categories of facilitative substructures and institutional subsystems will need further research to explain more specifically the roles of the groups and/or
individuals which comprise the category. The research of Creamer and Creamer can assist future researchers in advancing toward more clarity in those categories. Finally, the stage theory advanced by Newcombe and Conrad failed to represent the change observed at least in a mandated academic change of the type used in this study. Future research needs to concentrate on the stage progression and give serious consideration to the marker events that describe the beginning and ending of each of the stages.
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Appendix A
Protocol
Typical Introductory Remarks

The purpose of this research is to help explain the appropriateness of the theory of mandated academic change at community colleges in Virginia. During the interview period, I would like to find out as much as possible about your institutional response to changes at your college caused by the student outcomes assessment mandate. I am looking for data regarding the process of change. The mandated change theory implies that change goes through certain distinct stages. The progression through each of these stages is affected by certain categories of variables that either impede or accelerate the change process. It is this type of data that I wish to collect during our interview.

If you have no objections, I would like to record your interview so that an accurate record of our conversation can be maintained. What we discuss here will be held in the strictest confidence. A code will be assigned to this interview to protect your identity in order that you can be open and honest in your answers. I will also be taking some notes, but will use the tape later to supplement and flesh out my notes in order to maintain accuracy.
Is there anything you would like to ask me before we begin?

Typical Interview Questions

1. From your perspective how has your college responded to the state mandate that all colleges in Virginia must implement a locally fashioned student outcomes assessment plan?
   - Characterize the leadership style of your president.
   - Describe your institution's willingness to change.
   - Describe how your institution committed resources to implement this mandate.
   - Describe the assessment mandate and how it corresponds with the institutional mission.

2. Describe to me the process used to implement your college assessment plan.
   - Was there a planning document?
   - What was the first step? The second, etc.
   - Who offered the leadership at the first stage, the second, etc?
   - What worked best for your college during the process?
   - What did not work well during the process?

3. Was the current governance structure of the college facilitative of this initiative or was it a hindrance?
   - Describe the role of the faculty senate.
   - Describe the role of the college standing committees.
   - Describe the role of ad hoc committees.
   - Describe the communications network used in the process.

4. Was there opposition to this effort?
   - By whom?
   - For what reasons?
   - How was information regarding the mandate disseminated to you?
   - Describe to me your level of understanding of the mandate.
   - How did you articulate your concerns regarding the mandate?
   - To whom did you articulate these concerns?
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5. Describe to me when change began to occur at your college.

6. Describe to me how the college has changed.
   - Budgetary changes
   - Personnel changes
   - Policy changes
   - Role definitions
   - New expectations and/or responsibilities

7. From your perspective, describe to me the oversight process of the mandating agency.
   - Type of interventions
   - Feedback and evaluation

8. I would like to include everyone in this interview process who has knowledge which may enable me to gather the most complete data possible. Please give me the names of individuals that you feel may assist me with this research.

These are only typical questions. The actual interview varied depending upon the level of understanding of the informant and the completeness of their responses to the questions. A sample interview is provided in Appendix B.
Appendix B
Sample Interview Transcript
Interview with RCC Faculty Member

1. From your perspective how has RCC responded to the state mandate that all colleges must implement a locally fashioned student outcomes assessment plan?

Well I think from my viewpoint I would say that we began slowly. It wasn't something we jumped right into. Primarily because there never appeared to be, from my viewpoint at least, a clear idea of where we were going with this thing of assessment. I think a lot of folks had a grip on it, maybe some of us who do assessment in our programs such as the program I work with, we had some idea about what assessment was about in that sense. But where we were going in terms of the college and this state mandated process, I don't think we had a real grip on it. So I think we got off slowly but I think eventually we worked through a lot of the misunderstandings, when I say misunderstandings I mean some of the ideas that people had about assessment, what it really was. That was a hard thing to define, assessment. What were you doing with assessment. I think once we worked through a lot of those things that we've taken a positive approach here again and we really tried to put together a good assessment plan to make sure that we are doing what we should be doing in terms of student outcomes. That they know what they should know, a broad base knowledge. I guess the hardest thing that we had to do, this may be jumping ahead, but one of the hardest things we had to do it was pretty easy to look at assessment in the major, that wasn't too difficult. But the difficult part was assessment in General Education. Because that's even a problem in the literature. When you read it, defining what General Ed is, but I think we have a little bit more difficulty with General Ed than we do with the program majors. We started slowly, but I think here at the end we are coming together real well and the college is trying to do the very best it can to have a good assessment plan.

2. What caused this misunderstanding do you think early in the process?

I think just the idea of folks who had not had any prior experience with someone doing assessment. There was a fear there maybe to some degree. What are we going to do with this assessment, what is the outcome of this assessment, maybe how is it used and what do you do with the data and those kind of things. I think there was a little bit of fear that was not an understanding of what was going to happen. I think in many cases that was something that got us off to a slow start. Because again I think those of us who were working with assessment had an understanding with what you do with this information and that information was useful, that the information can be helpful, not only from the standpoint of
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3. What is your understanding of the mandate and how does it fit with the institutional mission?

Well, my understanding would be that we are to provide data and information that demonstrates that students are receiving the kind of education they are coming here to get. And that we will demonstrate through assessment certain outcomes which students through the process of their education here accomplish certain competencies and certain things that they gain in terms of knowledge here at the college. I think it fits in the mission because our mission is, what it all boils down to is that we are providing an education and various majors and various occupational-technical areas, transfer programs, whatever and I think it fits in our mission in that assessment lets us see are we doing what we (1) think we are doing and (2) should be doing? Are we matching our courses and are the things we are teaching getting students ready for employment if they are in occupational programs? Are the things we are teaching getting students ready for transfer if they are transfer? So I think it fits our mission in that sense. We are to provide the tools and the knowledge that's necessary for a student to succeed either transfer for further education or an occupational-technical program.

4. How would you characterize RCC's willingness to change?

I think RCC is in a position where there are a lot of folks here who want to see change occur. The way I would characterize it is, if I were to say, you could say there is an upper end and a lower end and a middle of the road, I'd say we are just a little bit above the middle of the road. I don't think that everybody is jumping off the wall here to change because I think in general most people aren't. There are very few organizations that I know of that are just continually seeking change. There's always a fear of change. I think we have faculty sometimes that have been around awhile, lots of times there is a reluctance to change. Particularly when they don't always recognize how that change is going to affect them. People here change we know that, but I would say that we are a little bit above middle of the road

I think there are a lot of faculty and various administrators who want to see us move ahead in the right direction.

knowing what kind of job you are doing but also in knowing how to make any corrections that are necessary or how to improve a program or a course or whatever. I think there was a fear there by some people.
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5. Let me ask you one more general question then we will get to the big one on process. Describe to me the leadership style of your president.

Roy that's a tough one. Because [redacted] is a very unique person. I've had experiences to work with different types of administrators both as a practitioner and also as an educator. I think what a leadership style is something between a person who likes to have others participate in management, he seeks that participating style but he also has an element of being a director, a person who takes charge and I would see him as trying to fit his style maybe to the situation to try to be I guess what some people call a situational leader, a situational leadership. He works hard to do what he thinks needs to be done in a particular situation. I think if the situation allows for a lot of participation, I think he would probably invoke that. However if the situation called for a very direct style of leadership where he makes the decision I think he would step in and do that. I guess it would be safe to say he is a situational leader. He tries to do what he sees necessary in each particular situation.

6. What was his role in assessment?

I think in assessment his role as I viewed it was one on the occasions that we chatted, he met with the committee, he gave us just general direction and primarily left it to us. I don't think that there was any push on his part to go in any certain direction that I could see. I think he pretty much left it up to the committee. I never viewed him as being a person who had his thumb on it the whole time. I think he left that to the committee and to the Dean and to the direction. I think about midway, if I remember correctly, he met with us once and encouraged us to, of course this is when we were struggling with some of the things about what assessment was and I guess in some degree in the beginning we were spinning our wheels a little bit. I think I remember a meeting where he encouraged us to really get moving and to make sure we had our focus and to proceed. But that's generally how I would have viewed his part in this role.

7. Were you aware of a resource commitment from the president wasn't?

As a committee member, I guess near the end I became more aware of that, working with the idea and some of the others that I was through the major part of this process. The idea of resources I guess in what I was doing just never came to the surface. We seemed to be doing things that wasn't a factor. Resources, particularly monetary resources, just wasn't something that seemed to be a factor in what I was doing on the committee and the work we were doing. I think the commitment was there as I can see here at the end, at least mostly I think it was. But up to that point I don't think that was an issue, at least with me individually in the
work I was doing on the committee.

8. Hackett up to the process now that you all used. What was the first stage in this process? Just go back to the earliest, when the mandate comes down. Can you describe for me the first stage?

Well, I'll try to do that to the best of my ability. I think when the process started we began by formulating a committee. Well there was discussion about it; I guess in general. The best I remember, some discussion of it in faculty meetings of an idea about what we were going to be doing with assessment, discussion about that. And then the committee of course was formed to deal with assessment and I think we (the committee) sort of took the ball and tried to run with it in a sense and again we struggled some as I indicated to you. Maybe we were pretty far along before we actually began to involve faculty to a great degree. Or at least to the degree that I think most people felt faculty ought to be involved.

9. How far along were you?

It would be hard to say, I think we were pretty far along.

10. Six months, a year?

Yes, I would guess. At least that far along. I know there are different opinions on this here on campus, but I honestly don't think it was an intentional thing either. I think everybody just didn't have direction there in terms of knowing how to do this thing with assessment. I think we were right far along before we ever realized, a lot of folks didn't realize, that hey you need to be involving faculty to some degree.

11. Were there any faculty on this committee that you are talking about?

Well, of course I'm a regular faculty member and let's see, yes there were 4 that I can think of. There may have been more. I'm trying to think right now, but I can't remember exactly. But there were about 4 faculty at least that I remember being on the committee. Of course there was a lot of encouraging along the way that maybe we need to get faculty involved, to get them involved in the process. And I think as I said, eventually we did. I don't think that we used faculty as effectively as we could have, probably because we were so far along and then again I don't think that's anyone's fault. I would never point a finger because I think what we really understood, at least that was my concept of what we were doing with this thing until later. And so I think it probably would have been a lot more smoother process if the faculty had been involved earlier than what they were. Because I know once at the beginning of this academic year, Fall of 1989, we did
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I thought that was really one of the best things that we have done with assessment. And we got, at least with the group I worked with, a lot of good input and they seemed interested, the faculty seemed to be willing to contribute and I just felt good about that. I always thought, looking back, I wish we could have done that in the beginning. I think it would have moved things along a lot more smoothly. We would probably have accomplished a great deal more. I think that faculty involvement earlier would have been a key thing.

12. What was the purpose of this committee that you all had? What were you all supposed to do?

Well, our function I guess in a sense was to be a steering committee and it was to head the assessment process in the right direction and our role was to think to define assessment and to set the major goals that we were to assess there. I think that's where we began. In other words, if you are going to assess, what are the goals of this college and how are we going to define those goals to see if we are doing the job to be assessed and that kind of thing. And I think we spent a lot of time particularly in the beginning doing that and I think our role was primarily in the beginning was to do that. I think we did a lot more than that and that's one of the things that I speak of when I say that faculty involvement earlier might have made things move a little differently but I think we ended up doing a lot of work, the committee ended up doing a lot of work that if we could have had more faculty involvement we might have moved it along quicker. Because we were having to service communicators there, we would talk with faculty and then come back and we'd meet and discuss the processes we were going through and the goals. Just coming up with the goals was a major thing for us. Although they were already there in the catalog in a sense, we wanted to make sure we had a sense of that we were going through this process of assessment that if those needed to be changed or refined or updated and whatever, that we did that, so we spent a lot of time doing that.

13. Who provided leadership?

A Dean and Dean provided. The leadership in the beginning and then I guess they provided. The Dean was what you would call the leader in the group. The was the one who kept us focused and on track and he did that for a long time until of course was employed and then I think that was sort of assumed that role since he's been employed to do assessment. Primarily I guess you could say from the beginning until now, if there is one individual it would be Dean.
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14. O.K. you all do your job, you write your goals and objectives, then what happens?

After we looked at the goals and talked about those, they were then distributed to the faculty, the faculty had time to look at them, make comments, suggestions, whatever. And then once that occurred and we got through that part of the process we began to develop ways to assess those. We talked about how we could. The first thing I remember we discussed was how are we going to do this? How are we going to assess these areas? Even to the very practical points of saying are we going to give tests, are they going to be multiple choice tests, are they going to be questions, how are we going to administer it? We spent a lot of time with that I think. But then eventually what we ended up doing I think through that process was we began to look at the goals and we began to say O.K., how do these match to various General Education courses and that kind of thing. And then we started to developing tests, assessment tools, to determine if we are meeting our objectives and we also spent some time talking about how to assess the majors, how they tie into the general goals and we did that early on.

Sure, major—goals, I think that moved, in my opinion at least, probably quicker than anything. Assessment of the major and how we were doing to tie that to our major goals. I guess because most people who are working with majors, most people, are already doing assessment. So they have the kind of data to say here are the student outcomes, here's what they are doing and here's employer follow-up, here's hard data that we have to say this in what we are doing. With General Ed. that wasn't the case. Of course I don't think many colleges have done very much there. So we spent a lot more time with that.

15. You say we, did this one committee do all these things?

To a great degree. There was again at the beginning of this academic year a lot more involvement of faculty, in particular when we got to the point of developing questions. The faculty had a major role there, when we started about putting an instrument together to assess student outcomes and that kind of thing. When we got to that point, particularly in General Ed. it was the faculty who provided that. Various members of the committee sort of spearheaded certain parts of it, for instance I worked with developing the portion on math and science and others did other parts of the General Ed. outcomes. Then the faculty did most of the work in that area. But a great portion of all this work was done by the committee.

16. You told me some things that worked well for you and some things that didn't work so well, can you think of anything else as you went through the process, other than faculty involvement, that either worked well or didn't work so well for you?
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I can't think of anything. Again, people have different opinions of what happens and we all have our own personal opinions. One thing that I think would have moved our process along more smoothly is what I indicated and that is faculty involvement earlier. Because I think the faculty buy into a lot more readily and probably a lot more interested if brought in earlier. I think how that we have learned this if we were starting again to do this I think a person would benefit in a college environment right on the front end. You know here's the steering committee or whatever you want to call them but we better be, we need to be involving the faculty too much more sooner than maybe we did this trip.

17. How was the communications process throughout this whole thing?

I would say it's been good. Very good. I think it's been good communication probably among the assessment committee and with [Redacted] Communication has been good there. But again, I keep coming back to that point, it sounds like I'm beating a dead dog, I think the communication with faculty earlier on probably wasn't what it should have been. You know people working, the committee was working and I guess being busy it just wasn't enough communication with what was really happening and helping faculty to understand what we were doing. And again part of that's because I think it was a situation where a lot of folks didn't know where we were going with assessment. I derived that too not just from our campus but from discussions, I went to a state assessment meeting, as a matter of fact I made a presentation in the fall of '88 I guess. And my opinion coming away from that was that a lot of folks were going in different directions. Maybe there wasn't a real clear guideline to speak of where we were going as a state system of community colleges.

18. I want to back up to that, I had that written down here. What caused this do you think, this lack of direction?

I don't know. That's real tough for me to answer. I would guess from what I see and what I know about the work that's been done on the state level that all at once assessment became a real key issue. It was important to the public, maybe even politically it was an important thing. We were hearing a lot on the national level a lot of criticisms and we had been hearing a lot about how students were not learning and that kind of thing. I think probably if there is anything that contributed to it it was this thing that hey this is a big issue here all at once and let's get into this and we jumped into it and as so often happens it wasn't good communication anywhere all the way down or at least if communication was occurring somewhere along the way it wasn't being understood to make it all the way down to this point at the faculty level. That's a pretty vague answer, but I think if there is anything that I could say that caused it it was
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19. These committees that were formed, they were ad hoc kinds of committees, temporary committees. Any reason that you didn't use the standing committees, the Faculty Senate, groups like that?

Not to my knowledge, Jim.

20. Do you think it would have helped or hindered the process?

I think it would have helped. Looking back on it, until recently, no one had ever posed that question to me. I'd never thought that much about it. But as we went through it, I sort of drank on you how you could have done this differently by using some of the standing committees. It could have been effective I think. But in the beginning I didn't think of that as a problem or as a situation. But yes, I believe if we had involved some of the standing committees we could have accomplished a great deal more.

21. Was there opposition to this? Or maybe opposition is a strong word.

Opposition in the sense of faculty?

To the mandate yes.

I think so to some degree. I don't think anybody ever came up to me and said I oppose this, but again I think that fear was there among at least some, a few. And maybe the fear was there because again they just didn't understand what was going on and the process. So I think there was opposition in the sense of no one set out to scuttle this. I don't think anybody was trying to scuttle it or anybody was fighting it all the way, but opposition in the sense that you just stay clear of it and then you don't participate, maybe it will go away or whatever.

22. Any other opposition you think from any other groups?

No, I cannot think of anybody who opposed what we were trying to do as a group or whatever.
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23. Have you changed your perception of assessment from the original mandate now that you have been through the process?

I don't think I've changed my perception in terms of the good that comes from assessment. I still see that there is a value in assessing students because I had been participating in that as a program director but I guess when I look at that question in terms of how I view it now from the beginning I'm probably more convinced that real good assessment is not just only necessary but is an asset to the college. I think if you really need good assessment that you are not only doing something that you need to do but it's going to make an asset to you as an institution. It's not going to hurt you. Some of the fear that you hear sometimes out there in the real world in it may hurt us. I don't believe it. I think assessment will help us. I think it shows the character the college has in a sense that hey if there are things we are not doing a good job on we are going to do it better, we are going to face up to it. I think it shows more character. Now that may sound unrealistic, maybe it always doesn't work that way, but I think it's an asset.

24. When did you notice change occurring as a result of the mandate?

I guess somewhere between half the way through, maybe two-thirds of the way through up to this point.

25. What kind of changes have taken place?

Changes in that people began to realize hey this is real, this is here, we've got to be participants and actually more communication occurring. More realization by everybody from administration down to faculty that this is not going away. This is not something that's just another thing that's coming and going but this is here and we're going to have to work with it. I see that attitudinal change. And again a little better communication. I think we are getting our focus to get on the right track. And I think, it's hard to say for every individual faculty member, but I think as a faculty here I think our faculty will support assessment.

26. Have there been any policy changes?

I don't know that we could say there have been any policy changes. There has been a lot of work that I'm sure is going to result in policy changes in that the way we assess students coming into the college here and where we place them in terms of English placement, math placement and that type of thing. I think we've done some real good work there; I really do. Now going back to one of your earlier questions, that's something I forgot about. But I think we've done some real good work in coming up with how students should be placed and what sequence of courses and coming in here reading at certain
Appendix B (Continued)
Interview with RCC Faculty Member

levels or mathematics at certain levels, what courses they
ought to be in and of course we use here on campus for 4 or 5
students the CQT examination. I think that’s going to be a
real good instrument for us. I think that’s come out of this
assessment process. I think we are going to get students into
maybe some better courses or the right courses for them at
that period in their college career. We’re not going to
frustrate them. They may not like, for instance, the idea of
a developmental course, some of them may not, but I think
eventually they are going to be better students and we’re
going to do a better job through that process. I think in
that respect we’ve really come up with some good ideas which I
think eventually will result in some policy changes.

27. Any new responsibilities or expectations on the part of
people other than those you mentioned?

No, I can’t think of anything. I detect in several faculty
members a keen interest or expectations from what is going
to happen with assessment. I think some are very positive
about it.

28. Any budgetary changes?

Not that I’m aware of. Other than I know there’s been, of
course this came from the state I guess, there’s been a
commitment to funding assessment at the campus level. I don’t
know exactly what. I think it’s for one and a half person or
something like that. But other than that I don’t know of any
changes there.

29. One final question I want to ask you and this is about the
oversight process as you all were going through. When you did
your reporting from your original assessment committee, can
you kind of give me some ideas about the oversight process
from the state and SCHEV, what kind of feedback did you get,
evaluations?

I think that’s one of the things that maybe I was alluding to
earlier in that I had the impression on many occasions that
that’s where communication wasn’t real good. As we went
through the process of putting together a plan and coming up
with our ideas, there seemed to be somewhat of a void there.
And when we submitted our first bit of information it didn’t
receive high favorable reviews. I remember that. We were told
to go back and take a hard look at some areas and some things.

30. Who was the review, which one was it?

We sent it to the state. I can’t remember who reviewed it
specifically when it left here. Now we never really had any
problems here in terms of reviewing and oversight of what we
were doing and writing and putting together information. We
could almost always, although it wasn’t always easy, we could
come to a conclusion here, we could get it together and we could write it but again at the beginning it wasn't as satisfactory to folks on the state level as to what we were planning to do. And specifically I think for instance they felt we didn't tie our outcomes real well to our goals and we didn't really have a good system for evaluating or assessing students. And I think initially what we proposed wasn't satisfactory. I think we had to come back and do some work there. I don't know. It may be there is not a perfect way or not a good way, it may be something you have to labor through. But I guess the oversight here was good. I mean I didn't see any problem with the oversight we had here and the direction we had here in our writing and putting together what we were doing with assessment. It seemed to be some kind of little void there on what we did here at the state. You need to do more work but you didn't get any real good clues as to what you needed to do and real good direction as to what changes you need to make or what direction you need to go in. So that was real disappointing to me.

31. Did it change any over the years?

I think it's gotten better, yes. Again, I think there it again goes back to something we said earlier, I think the state or the state level even got into this thing and they weren't sure of the directions they were going in and what needed to be done.

32. Did anybody personally come on campus from these agencies?

Yes. I think is her name. She was here. It seems like there was someone else in the beginning. Ann Marie did a good job. She gave us a lot of help when she was here. She also made herself available for individual faculty members to speak with her and ask questions. I thought that was excellent. And then I think for myself I derived information valuable to me speaking with her, both her presentation to the entire faculty and speaking with her on an individual basis. But other than she and it seems like there was someone else here but I can't really remember, that was the extent of it as far as anyone visiting here and giving us direction.

33. Is there anything else you'd like to say that I haven't asked?

No, I think it's been a process. We worked through it. It's been good and bad but I do think where we are going with it is the right thing.
Appendix C

After the transcription of the interview, the researcher wrote a memo to himself. The memo was a perception of the interview using the codes, together with the initial memo of the researcher, as a guide. These perceptions were recalled and, together with the coded transcription, a memo was written.

The memo was then reviewed and key words or phrases were highlighted with the hope that key categories and/or themes might emerge. These memos were handwritten with a yellow magic marker used to highlight. The research used a black pen to underline these highlighted areas since the copier would not pick up the yellow.

It was also necessary to conceal specific names of the individual and substitute their title instead in order to maintain confidentiality. Abbreviations of the researcher have been changed to identify the specific word where necessary in order to assist future researchers.
Appendix C (Continued)

Memo of Transcript from RCC Faculty Member Interview

Faculty

Slow response due to lack of direction. He had been involved in various committees. Misunderstandings due to lack of perception. Defract to define what current understanding is. Attempting to give a positive outcome.

The view is that the data was to be used due to lack of understanding. Those who had been involved were aware of how the data might be a positive thing. Data was used for improvement in understanding.

The mandate felt the mandate - helps define what is being done, what should be done. See for OT + ET.

Felt that one is committed to change but want to improve direction. Long-term goal with clear vision. Needs to see the vision to change, belief, middle.

Fees in situational leader - demonstrates does what is necessary. The set the tone for mandate and allowed flexibility. He set the tone to be open - the encouraged more action and all to keep up the current sense of ownership commitments and it did not seem to be a factor. To encourage commitment with clear, but it was not something he could cause.

The view is a student or the system over time that will be able to correct early on a balance. Lack of direction could have been allocated to some.

He viewed the student's view of the role of counseling in postgraduate work. He didn't view this as an entitlement more.
Appendix C (Continued)

Memo from Transcript

From the top 1/2 each: I note on the committee and for input was available, more direct involvement would have made the idea better. The fact that you wanted to be involved - (Problem when to involve - if you are overworked over there?)

The committee attempted to set the direction, but it took a lot of work. They were a steering committee.

- Chairman - [Signatures]
- [Signatures]

After the committee set the broad goals, the details came. The creation of a new college had to be made. The question of how to use the money was discussed. The president's views on how to proceed were essential. The college had available programs, but they were not fully utilized. The new college needed a plan, and a plan was made. LADNIT is crucial.

The question is how well you accept the challenge. We discussed many issues, and problems due to involvement in planning process. Involvement created conflict.

Committees have been good, but many have been detrimental at the earlier stages. For some amount of time, the committee was working on an agreement, not helping to resolve issues in the early stages.
Appendix C (Continued)

Memo from Transcript

He feels that lack of clear guidelines from the state contributed to the lack of understanding.

While he suggested that ACT was a quick, the politicians of the situation may have hurt. A few, of course, were faced with continuing jumped on the bandwagon and really did not understand all the implications. The need was there, but how do you accomplish it was more a rehash to a crisis with intense planning.

Headliner one of these caves may have helped (more moments)

file that many didn't get too serious due to hope their it would go away - history of other occurrences.

The desire to being somewhat idealistic in his money and saw it as a way to demonstrate strength required to do production - must be right (accountable)

The presence of a new, rare. They really did not run. Placement procedures - have change and see a change in 50 year cease. Assignments are coming will help rebuild:

Early communication between and grade. There can truly be

feedback and feel suspended. (override has improved due to

better understanding states. The person from states was a real deal and willing to


learn as you go -
Appendix D
Development of Themes and Categories

The researcher carefully reviewed each transcript after it was coded. He wrote down the codes which were used. List 1 represents the codes used on one transcribed interview. List 2 is a further summarization of these codes into more specific categories. List 3 represents a cursory perception of the researcher of the dominant themes and/or categories emerging from this one interview.

This process enabled the researcher to gain valuable insight into the emergence of the categories and themes before beginning an in-depth analysis of the data. While this was a time consuming process, the result was a clearer understanding of the data gathered.
Appendix D
List and Refinement of Codes Used

List 1

quick, get, no, un
not father, try
house, for, star, age
untimely, SNS
Twin, Jack, uncle
cheer, paper
children, sound
company, no, vice, maximum, love
Low, Cure, local, def.
plan, in, produce, for, can, late
Court, fair, in, dimension
Check, clear, directory
church, clarity
Apolly, amount, for
old, chain, command
Saw, reliability, small, advantageous
near, rate, of, good

RCC-LIST 1

man, young, action
improved, clear, come
impossible, of, unable, company
Go, do, so, do
work, for, upon
yes, for, upon
for, doing, in
nation, 1-
Comp., departmentalized
summer, initially
summer

-when does normally come

70

March, document, Inc
O-T, Gen Ed
Appendix D (Continued)
List and Refinement of Codes Used
List 3

- Control - Guard - Guard - Risk
- (Direction - Control - Operation - Analysis)

Knowledge - Info
Involvement - Participation
Clarity - Explanation
Understandable - Vague
Distributed - Dispersed
Authority - Empower

CLARIFICATION - Involvement - Principle
Focus - Empower - Leader
Company - Leadership - Compliance
Dissimination - Common - Knowledge
- Clarity - Common
Appendix E
Initial Memo from Interview with RCC Faculty Member

This memo represents the initial impression of the researcher of the interview. This memo was written either immediately after the interview, if time permitted, or at the end of the day after the interview was completed.

The intent of the memo was to provide the researcher with a general idea of the informant's knowledge of the process used to implement the mandate. In retrospect, these memos provided excellent guidance for the review of the transcripts.
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Initial Memo from Interview with RCC Faculty Member

Memo - Interview 3 - RCC 5/4/98

This informant was very helpful. He was a faculty member who served on the Assessment Committee. His knowledge of the process was remarkable considering the time lapse. Although most of his responses pointed to negative aspects of the process, he was basically supportive of the procedure used.

More emphasis should be placed on early faculty involvement, college standing committees, and development of general education goals only.

Agreed that college should be accountable to President through direct leadership and then to Board of Trustees, providing early leadership. Still felt that understanding of accountability was not sufficient.

Some conflation of stages does exist. He was lacking in knowledge of some instructors. This is important since he was a member of the Assessment Committee. He may have communications flaw in the feedback.

Did indicate some changes occurring, particularly in regulations.
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