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AN ANALYSIS OF MEDIATING FACTORS, PERCEPTIONS, AND PERSONNEL RELATED TO STRATEGIC CHANGE IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE BASED SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

You cannot step twice into the same river. Everything flows and nothing abides; everything gives way and nothing stays fixed. . . . It is in change that things find repose. (Heraclitus, 500 B.C.)

Naisbitt (1982, p. 252) believes that we are living in the "time of the parenthesis," a time of rapid changes between the industrial and information eras. The community college, as an institution that grew in importance because of its ability to adapt to the changing needs of society, is also experiencing a significant transitional period.

Background of Study

In recent years, both academia and the business sector have sought to better understand the dynamic quality of organizational life and the events that trigger major organizational transitions and change. Beer (1980) argued, there is substantial evidence that organizations do not make major changes in a smooth and constant manner, and that this unevenness has
become particularly evident, in recent years, as rapid changes in the external environment have demanded rapid changes within organizations. Management is often unaware of the events, factors, and forces that trigger and direct organizational adaptation and change.

Organizational Change and Adaptation

Kimberly and Quinn (1984) stressed the growing need for all managers to be more skilled in the techniques required to bring about the effective management of organizational transition and programmatic change. A greater sensitivity to and an awareness of the events that trigger organizational change and programmatic adaptation can allow managers to deal with the underlying dynamics that produce such organizational phenomena. Community college administrators are facing an increasingly turbulent and often complex environment. This condition emphasizes the need for them to become more informed and systematic in selecting the means by which they make the strategic changes required for their organization's survival and viability.

In America, the pace, rapidity, and diversity of the events and actions being encountered by the comprehensive community college has caused the scope and nature of its educational programs to reach out into the social structure and fabric of society, to serve groups denied access to higher education in the past as well as to take on new social rules and new educational responsibilities.
Cooperative Partnerships

Through their studies and reports, Beder and Darkenwald (1970), Goldstein (1980), Mahoney (1982), Lynton (1984), and Parnell (1985) have stressed the need for expanded efforts related to cooperative partnerships between community colleges and local business and industry. Myran and Raines (1977) observed that community-based education provides a natural extension of the community college philosophy, particularly as it relates to those values which represent the notion that the community college has a responsibility to function as an integral part of the community. If these responsibilities are to be addressed, then as Bennis and Nanus (1985) observed, the community college must, like most organizations, overcome its "trained incapacity" and adapt to a battery of changing conditions in its environment.

Groff (1983) argued that the ability of the community college to favorably position itself with respect to emerging programmatic opportunities and threats in its external environment is largely dependent upon its ability to collect and analyze a broad range of events and activities in the environment. "The employment of a systematic analysis of the opportunities and threats being faced by the organization besides generating information can be an important factor in: (1) increasing an awareness of the need for change and (2) can generate motivation for change" (Tichy, 1983, p. 154).
Small Business Development Centers: An
Innovative Response to Change by
Community Colleges

The emergence of Small Business Development and Assistance
Centers in a number of American community colleges represents an
innovative response by the community colleges to the changes occurring in
their socioeconomic environments. These centers represent new educational
approaches to the changing needs of the constituencies being serviced by
the community college. They are discrete within institutions yet generally
parallel in program emphasis and history across the institutional system.
As such they provide an excellent research medium to study how strategic
organizational changes have occurred within the institutional settings of
community colleges.

In Oregon, the Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs) have
become recognized as a significant part of the state's comprehensive
economic development scheme. Since its inception in 1983, the Oregon
Small Business Development Center Network (OSBDCN) has promoted
greater collaboration and cooperation between the state's business sector
and the community colleges. The SBDCs have been actively engaged in the
realization of the revitalization of the Oregon economy. However, literature
describing the development and the evolution of this unique partnership is
limited.
Statement of Problem

Comprehensive reviews of the literature on organizational design and adaptation reveal a paucity of longitudinal research on the early development stages of organizations (Miles, 1980; Starbuck, 1976). As a consequence, little is known about the events that trigger changes in the evolution structures processes, patterns of learning and decision making that occur as organizations attempt to move from creation to maturity.

Community College Management: An Outward Focus

Colleges and universities in America are shifting to a style of management driven by the need to accurately and quickly predict and analyze events and activities that present new threats and opportunities for their institution. "The active, entrepreneurial shaping of an organization’s future is rapidly emerging as a large factor in the lives of many academic executives" (Myron, 1983, p. 8). This approach to community college management emphasizes an outward focus: scanning the competition, changing markets, new economic, political, and social influences, the probable directions of new technological discoveries, and the course and intent of academic services and instructional efforts.

Tichy’s (1983) Technical, Political, Cultural model for managing large-scale organizational change, with its organizational development and action research focus, incorporates a theoretical framework that can be used in
helping organizations diagnose the events that can trigger large-scale change at multiple and various levels within it. From the diagnostic data it provides, an informational base can be created that provides the basis for developing organizational and programmatic change strategies.

In the 1990s and beyond, institutions of higher education will almost certainly be required to adopt academic strategies that are capable of addressing frequent adjustments in both external and internal environments. Given the growing number of events that bring about organizational change; institutions of higher education are seeking ways to improve their data collection and diagnostic processes. In doing so, they are shifting towards a style of management which is attuned to addressing those events and activities which trigger strategic organizational changes.

**Scanning for Environmental Threats and Opportunities**

Two tasks are becoming increasingly important in planning the futures of higher education institutions; obtaining a high degree of predictive accuracy in diagnosing the threats and opportunities being created in their environmental landscapes; and generating and providing data that can help key organizational administrators make informed and sensitive responses to emerging organizational and environmental realities. Yet, there is no agreed-upon set of procedures that exist for scanning environmental threats and opportunities. Given that procedures for gathering environmental readings are crude, it is essential to investigate
those theories and/or models that provide a conceptual framework for addressing the events and activities that trigger organizational change processes. Coupled with the aforementioned conditions is the paucity of research regarding the strategic management of change in community colleges.

Research Objectives

1. To investigate the nature and type of events that triggered strategic change(s) in four newly created and innovative community college based Small Business Development Centers in Oregon.

2. To determine if the strategic management changes brought about in the four sites in this study were initiated by a common set of triggering events.

3. To provide community colleges considering new and innovative small business assistance programs with data that will enable them to identify those events that can trigger strategic changes within them, particularly during the early developmental stages of their organizational existence.

4. Investigating and examining the applicability of the TPC model as a conceptual and pragmatic tool for carrying out a diagnosis of those events that can trigger large-scale organizational and programmatic processes within community college based small business assistance programs will represent the major focus of this study.
Definition of Terms

**Cultural Changes** - Those changes in an organization that bring about changes in the attitude, values, and beliefs held by organizational members.

**Cultural Core Systems** - The values, objective beliefs, and interpretations shared by organizational members. It provides the cognitive and affective maps used to understand and influence behavior in the organization.

**Organizational Life Cycle** - The evolution of an organization through distinct stages as it grows and matures. Organizational structure, internal systems, and management issues will generally be distinct and different for each evolutionary stage experienced by the organization.

**Organizational Stress** - When organizational members perceive that an activity and/or event poses a serious risk for both current and new courses of action, and a concern for what the consequences will be for implementing the course of action undertaken.

**Organizational System** - A set of interrelated elements that acquires inputs, transforms them, and discharges outputs to the external environment.

**Organizational Transformation** - The outcome of a situation brought about when an organization has encountered external forces or irresistible internal pressures to such a degree and magnitude that changes in the organization’s goals, structure, and processes are required and brought about.
Organizational Transition - Occurring when core organizational systems (political, technical, cultural) undergo a period of reorientation and adjustment in order to arrive at the desired state of operation and/or output.

Organizational Uncertainty - When organizational members perceive that an activity and/or event has created a degree of variability in the organization's functions which is seen as being intolerable by some portion of the organization.

Political Change - Those activities taken within an organization to acquire, develop, and use power and other resources to obtain a preferred outcome in a situation in which there is uncertainty or dissensus about choices.

Political Core Systems - The organizational structures, rules, and components used to allocate power and to control critical resources within the organization.

Strategic Change - The induction of nonroutine, nonincremental, and discontinuous change to an organization which alters the overall orientation of the organization and/or components of the organization.

Technical Core Systems - The social, financial and technical resources of an organization used to achieve organizational effectiveness and efficiency in the production of its services and/or products.

Technology Changes - Those changes that are brought to make the production process more efficient and/or to produce greater volume.
Changes in technology involve new techniques for making products or services.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Creation of New Organizations:
Choices and Chances

New organizations involve the intermeshing of new roles and structures of relations for its participants. There is a high cost in time and resources if things are not done properly. Schoenherr and Blau (1971), Kimberly and Miles (1980), and Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) all stressed that in the early stages of organizational creation the means and ends of behavior are often not clear, and thus the value system of the organization's structure is non-existent. Stinchcombe (1965) argued that the characteristics and structural forms of an organization that are formed during its creation persist even when the context in which they were created has long since changed.

The choices made at the time of an organization's creation are perhaps the most important ones made during its organizational existence. As such, they warrant careful examination. New organizations, especially those adopting a new form, must overcome many obstacles if they are to survive and carve out a niche for themselves (Aldrich, 1979). Pennings (1980) argued that the creation of a new organization is one of the most salient moments in its existence. From it emerges those events and factors
that mold and constrain the organization's behavior during the subsequent stages of its life.

Assessing Barriers and Opportunities

Failure to recognize, identify, and respond to events and actions that influence the emerging organization's processes and structures can often lead to failure in organizational efforts to initiate and bring about positive changes in its operation. McClenny (1982) argued that the means chosen to bring about organization change and adaptation will largely depend on an accurate assessment of the forces being faced by the organization. Implicit in this approach is the need for management to accurately perceive and identify the barriers and/or problems which could prevent the positive development of the organization.

Keller (1983) noted, perhaps three-fourths of all changes at most institutions of higher education are now triggered by factors outside the institution. Conducting an accurate assessment of internal and external forces is critical for higher education leaders if they are to bring about effective organizational development. Despite the considerable personal and social cost entailed in ill-advised or improperly managed organizational creations, little is known about what kinds of advice or assistance should be offered to potential organization founders (Miles, 1980).

The tasks of sifting, organizing, and detailing the formidable amount of eclectic data required in developing new organizational responses and/or
programs represents a significant barrier (Van Maanen, Dobbs, & Faulkner, 1982). Methods of analyzing such data are not well formulated (Miles, 1980), and in the absence of accepted analytical conventions, the credibility of the data and the means to effectively facilitate their interpretation within a plausible framework make an understanding of the dynamics to be found in newly created organizational efforts difficult to achieve (Weick, 1969).

Organizational Evolution and Development

The research of Chandler (1962), based on an analysis of the historical growth and configuration of 70 large U.S. companies, did much to renew interest in the "life cycles" of organizational development. Chandler was able to identify a characteristic developmental sequence. He was able to identify several characteristic business strategies, each associated with a distinctive organizational structure. Chandler’s work suggested a developmental model or organizational growth based on two areas of managerial choice: strategy and structure. Since Chandler’s research, numerous models have been created to describe how organizations grow in response to their environment and how they follow certain patterns of evolution and development. Among the most prominent and meaningful are the Lippitt-Schmidt Model (1967, 1969), the Scott Model (1973), the Greiner Model (1972), the Galbraith Model (1973), and the Aldrich Model (1979).
The Lippitt-Schmidt Model

The Lippitt-Schmidt Model (1967) represents one of the earliest models of life cycles in private sector organizations. The model suggests that corporations progress through three stages of development: (a) birth--creating an operating system and learning to become viable; (b) youth--developing stability and reputation; and (c) maturity--achieving uniqueness and adaptability along with domain expansion. The model specifies six major management concerns which change as the organization progresses from Stage I to Stage III. At Stage I - Birth, the critical concerns are the creation of the system and achieving a survival threshold. At Stage II - Youth, the principal concerns are stability and earning a reputation. In Stage III - Maturity, achieving uniqueness and responding to diverse societal needs are the major concerns. The organization during each developmental stage must recognize, confront, and cope with a paramount critical concern--or it will suffer crippling, perhaps fatal, damage. This model emphasizes that the managerial capabilities required at various stages in the organization's life cycle vary according to the "critical concerns" encountered and the needs for action that are precipitated (Figure 1).

In developing their model, Lippett and Schmidt drew upon certain personality development theories to examine what happens at various points in an organization's developmental continuum. They make no mention of which personality development theories were used and why they were selected for inclusion. Each of the stages in the model is detailed
### Lippitt & Schmidt: Critical Managerial Concerns (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• One-man rule</td>
<td>• Emphasis on stability and service</td>
<td>• Emphasis on adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Short-range perspective</td>
<td>• Team decision-Making</td>
<td>• Contribution to society is valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned with Survival</td>
<td>• Efficiency emphasized</td>
<td>• Growth opportunities are sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confidence in personal abilities</td>
<td>• Goal setting and planning occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal control</td>
<td>• Systematic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scott: Strategy and Structure (1973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• One-man rule</td>
<td>• Functional specialization</td>
<td>• Diversified product markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paternalistic reward system</td>
<td>• Institutionalized procedures</td>
<td>• Search for new products and growth opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subjective evaluation criteria</td>
<td>• Systematic reward system</td>
<td>• Semi-autonomous divisionalized structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No formal structure</td>
<td>• Formalized structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Greiner: Problems Leading to Evolution and Revolution (1972)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creativity Stage</th>
<th>Direction Stage</th>
<th>Delegation Stage</th>
<th>Coordination Stage</th>
<th>Collaboration Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasis on producing a product</td>
<td>• Functional structure established</td>
<td>• Decentralization of structure</td>
<td>• New systems arise</td>
<td>• Team action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long hours or work with modest reward</td>
<td>• Accounting system set up</td>
<td>• Decision making pushed lower in the hierarchy</td>
<td>• Product groups form</td>
<td>• Spontaneity in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Informal communication and structure</td>
<td>• Specialization of tasks</td>
<td>• Management by exception</td>
<td>• Long term planning</td>
<td>• Confrontation in interpersonal problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formalized rules and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Profit sharing programs</td>
<td>• Self discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Galbraith: Relationship of Organization to Environment (1973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 - Invent</th>
<th>Stage 2 - Develop</th>
<th>Stage 3 - Create</th>
<th>Stage 4 - Reduce</th>
<th>Stage 5 - Mutate</th>
<th>Stage 6 - Cope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rules</td>
<td>• Hierarchical positions</td>
<td>• Overarching goals</td>
<td>• Number of Communications</td>
<td>• Form vertical information systems</td>
<td>• Liaisons between people in other departments stressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procedures</td>
<td>• Hierarchical referral system</td>
<td>• Broad goals for each department and divisions</td>
<td>• channels necessary to make decisions</td>
<td>• Consolidate accounting and statistical reporting</td>
<td>• Integrator rules established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job descriptions</td>
<td>• Exceptions to rules and job descriptions</td>
<td>• Simplifications of processes</td>
<td>• Interconnections among departments and divisions</td>
<td>• Decisions made only at the top regarding allocation of resources</td>
<td>• Human contact preferred mechanism to deal with turbulence and complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Formalized rules and policies</td>
<td>• Management by exception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aldrich: Environmental Factors - the Nature and Distribution of Resources (1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Error</td>
<td>• Criteria</td>
<td>• Organization form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chance</td>
<td>• Resources</td>
<td>• Socialization processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Luck</td>
<td>• Information</td>
<td>• Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict</td>
<td>• Technology</td>
<td>• Ideological legitimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by utilizing case-study examples of organizations going through the stage being discussed and its response to the organizational crises associated with that stage. Lippitt and Schmidt in presenting their model fail to address and clarify several issues.

1. Were the cases being presented real-life cases or fictional entities used to dramatize the model’s theoretical assumptions?

2. Were the cases if based on real-life examples representative of the total population studied or are they selected examples?

3. Were the organizations presented if they are based on real-life situations, studied throughout their organizational development?

4. Were the organizations studied by the authors to be reflective of all types of organizations or of a specific type of organization?

**The Scott Model**

The Scott Model (1973) is perhaps the most popular and widely quoted of the life cycle theories. It represents the research efforts of Scott over an eight-year period (1963-1971) at formalizing and testing a developmental model governing corporate evolution. Scott incorporated Chandler’s (1962) pioneering work *Strategy and Structure* and its historical analysis of 70 large U.S. companies and their developmental characteristics. Additional data were used from a study conducted by Scott of the 86 largest manufacturing companies in the United Kingdom, the 76 largest manufacturing companies in France, the 78 largest manufacturing
companies in West Germany, and the 61 largest manufacturing companies in Italy, from 1950-1970, which analyzed the evolution of organizational structure and strategies.

Altogether, Scott's model presents findings based on the analysis of strategy and structure of over 200 of the Fortune "500" industrials in the United States and over 300 of the largest industrials of Western Europe from 1950-1970. Two basic research methods were used in the formulation of the model's stages of corporate development: (a) case studies, based on intensive field research, (b) analyses of trends in the changes in the population of corporations, through both field and library research.

The model states that as an organization grows, it will move through three stages of growth: Stage I - small, Stage II - integrated, and Stage III - diversified. The Stage I company is often run as a "one-person show," generally a simple, one-unit concern with a single or united product line and with most people working under the direct supervision of the owner/manager. The Stage II organization is distinguished by having evolved to become an integrated multi-functional entity and staffed by professional managers. This type of organization grows through both product and geographical diversification. The Stage III organizations have a large, multi-unit structure, each unit having a general office and decentralized product divisions. Each stage is considered to represent not just a phase of historical transition but a "way of moving." The Scott Model suggests that an organization's strategy shapes its structure, rather than vice versa (Figure 1).
The Greiner Model

The Greiner Model (1972) is based on numerous case studies of corporate development and is essentially a theory of organizational adjustment. Greiner argues that organizations move through five phases of development: (a) individual leaderships, (b) autonomy, (c) control and diversification, (d) coordination and organizational procedures, and (e) interpersonal collaboration. Each phase is comprised of periods of calm (evolutionary stage) and a period of crisis (revolution stage). In the Greiner Model, there are five key dimensions that are associated with the organization's development: (a) organizational age, (b) organizational size, (c) stage of evolution, (d) stage of revolution, and (e) the growth rate of the organization's task environment. Each evolutionary period is characterized by a dominant management style, and each revolutionary stage has a dominant problem that must be solved before growth can continue (Figure 1).

Greiner contends that the future of an organization may be less determined by outside forces than it is by the organization's history. In developing the model Greiner drew up the theoretical legacies of European psychologists whose thesis stressed that previous events and experiences do more to shape behavior than by what lies ahead. Greiner examined and incorporated elements from the studies of Starbuck (1965) and Fouraker and Stopford (1968). Starbuck's (1965) organizational metamorphosis approach to organizational change was derived from a 30-year time-series
manufacturing firms. The data generated by Starbuck’s work indicated that the structural and functional changes that occurred in the organizations studied appeared to be the results of both the managerial strategies pursued and the externally determined problems to be solved. Starbuck’s work served to underscore the very important fact that organizational growth can continue only so long as the goals of an organization are met or the goals of at least some of its members are achieved. Fouraker and Stopford’s (1968) research suggested that the organizations that had been the most successful in meeting new challenges had been those that had previously acquired the ability to develop general managers capable of controlling and guiding a heterogeneous, diverse enterprise. So, in the end the questions of the characteristics of the organization is a question of management’s choice between sets of problems.

Like both the Lippitt-Schmidt model and the Scott model the Greiner model is clearly a paradigm intended to underscore the problems that organizations encounter in the process of evolution. Greiner’s model draws upon case studies taken exclusively from organizations in the private sector. It may thus be reasonably argued that the problems associated with the processes of development in the model would differ significantly in public-sector organizations.

While Greiner stresses that his work is in part an extension and analogy of the work of several European psychologists on individual development to the problems of organizational, no mention is made as to
which psychologists were studied and what determined the inclusion of their efforts into his model, and what specific elements of their theoretical views were selected.

The Galbraith Model

The Galbraith Model (1973) of organizational change and evolution holds that the forms and structures that emerge in organizations are contingent upon the degree of turbulence or complexity in the environment. This necessitates an organization's structure and processes "fit" the external environment, or it will stagnate or die. As organizations are born and grow, they pass through stages of life, each more complex. As the organization moves through its various life stages, it migrates into an unknown and unsettled environment. A crisis develops at the end of each stage. The organization, if it is to survive and prosper, must change its organizational form and decision-making structure so that it fits the new complexities encountered. Galbraith argued that six stages of organizational development and evolution will occur (Figure 1).

In Stage I organizations cope by inventing rules, job descriptions, programs, and procedures. As more constituencies are dealt with and more activities occur inside the organization, the initial organizational structures, procedures, and policies become obsolete. Stage II organizations develop a set of hierarchical positions that make judgments about the exceptions to job descriptions, rules, procedures, and policies. Those leading the organization
attempt to seek the means to "make sense" out of everything. Stage III organizations seek orderliness through overarching goals. To simplify things, the organization develops broad goals for each of its units, and lets each unit work out its own solutions.

Stage IV organizations attempt to bring about a system of decentralized, self-contained units operating with a full complement of the materials and resources required to achieve goals and objectives. Consequently, the number of connections between organizational units is reduced, thereby reducing the number of mechanisms required to make decisions. Yet organizational units still encounter conflicts with each other. The organization is subject to an environmental imperative: as it grows; adds complexity, uncertainty, and stress which leads to scarce resources, and conflicts concerning how such resources will be allocated among the organizational units. This set of circumstances leads to Stage V.

Upon reaching Stage V, organizations must seek to evolve into a form which allows for a "vertical information system" to take place so that standardized reporting and communication processes in the organization can be developed. In the Stage V organization decisions are consolidated at the top management level in an attempt to effectively allocate resources between various organizational units. But, such efforts generally are unable to handle all the complex data and information by such systems. Finally, organizations reach Stage VI, a stage in which various human contacts
between people and organizational units serve as the primary mechanisms for determining organizational structure and form (Figure 1).

In developing the model, Galbraith drew upon his own experiences extending over a ten-year period working with a number of manufacturing organizations. These organizations were often dealing with identifying and determining the appropriate types of organizational forms required to meet new environmental complexities being encountered. Along with his own research efforts Galbraith also drew upon were the works of Burns and Stalker (1961), which observed 20 British and Scottish firms, and those factors that made some organic and others mechanistic in their organizational form. Woodward's (1965) study of 100 British firms, and the relation between organizational structure and effectiveness through selecting the appropriate technologies required was also utilized in formulating Galbraith's model. Galbraith utilized Lawrence and Lorsch's (1967) studies of ten organizations in three different industries and the extent to which subtasks variability and predictability required different organizational structures being used, as well as the need for integration of the differentiated subtasks to achieve successful completion of the whole task. Galbraith argues that the above-mentioned studies leads to the conclusion that the best way to organize is contingent upon the uncertainty and diversity of the basic tasks being performed by the organizational unit.

While the theoretical and research orientation for Galbraith's model is based on numerous cases, it should be noted that all are drawn from a
single type of organization—manufacturing organizations. Thus, Galbraith's model and its application to other types of organizations is not known and consequently its relevancy made questionable.

The Aldrich Model

Aldrich's (1979) model represents an attempt to explain the process underlying organizational change. The model is not intended to account for short-run changes, which are temporary responses to local conditions, but rather for long-term changes brought about through natural selection. The model is based on the natural selection model of biological ecology and seeks to explain organizational change by examining the nature and distribution of resources in organization's environment. This model focuses on the tactics and strategies used by organizational members in seeking to manage their environments as well as their organizations. Aldrich argues that organizations change through three stages—variation, selection, and retention (Figure 1).

Variation within an organization is the first requirement for organizational change. Two types of variation create the pressures affecting the direction of organizational change. There are variations between organizations in their overall form. This type of variation is likely to occur whenever new organizations are created. Variations can also take place within organizations. Growth is a common source of within-organization variation.
Selection refers to the organizational forms used to fit the environmental resources and constraints encountered. Organizations that can find an appropriate fit with environmental criteria are positively selected and survive, while others either fail or change to match environmental requirements. Changes that add or remove constraints and resources from environments will affect organizational diversity, cognitive functioning, and member's perceptions of their environment.

Retention in this model focuses how specific structures and activities with an organization is affected by environmental and organizational characteristics. In the retention stage, stability in the structure and activities of the organization becomes institutionalized; the incorporation of ideological legitimation takes place—culture; the manner in which information and communication is developed—organizational charts, informal and formal network systems is determined, and political stability—standardization of roles, official policies, chain of command is established.

Variation, selection, and retention thus constitute the three stages of the organizational change process. Variation generates the raw materials from which selection by the environment or internal criteria is made; retention mechanisms preserve the selected form. The model can be applied to the selective retention or elimination of entire organizations or their components.
Aldrich's model draws heavily upon the work of Campbell (1969) dealing with variation and selective retention in sociocultural evolution, and which outlined a three-stage process for the study of social organizations.

Some methodological issues and problems came into play when dealing with the Aldrich model of organizational change. Critics have questioned whether its evolutionary focus is a valid way to build explanations since it must be retrospectively constructing rationales for changes that have already occurred. The Aldrich model does not deal with the elements of chance and luck in the survival of organizations and their ability to adapt to their environments. Finally, there is a large element of uncertainty as to whether the characteristics that contribute to reorganizational fitness in one environment, contribute to success in any other organizational environments.

The Process of Organizational Change

If there is one thing of which researchers are certain, it is that organizations are likely to change when they are under pressure (Beckhard, 1969; Greiner, 1972). Although change is a universal and inevitable phenomenon, it rarely occurs in a smooth and balanced fashion. Beer (1980) noted that there is substantial evidence that organizations rarely make major changes in a smooth and consistent manner, and this unevenness has become particularly evident in recent years as rapid changes in the external environment have demanded rapid changes within the organization.
Organizations fall far short of being idealized adaptive and coping systems. Crisis often provides the motivation to change. It raises dissatisfaction with the status quo to overcome resistance caused by the costs of change to organizational members. Does change occur only as a result of crisis? The answer seems to be no. Camman, Lawler, and Nadler (1980) provided evidence that people in organizations are motivated to act on problems before they become a crisis if they are provided information about these problems. The fundamental reason some crisis or pressure seems so important in setting the stage for change is that it creates a state of readiness to change. Lewin (1947) called this the "unfreezing" state in the process. It is the stage in which old organizational group and/or individual beliefs, values, and behaviors lose credibility and strength in the face of information that disconfirms the view of organizational effectiveness. The "unfreezing" itself is the source of the energy for change.

Change: Sources of Organizational Support

For the patterns of organizational change to be permanent, a number of complementary changes within the organization must typically occur. At least four sources or organizational support must exist for organizational changes to become permanent (Beer & Huse, 1972). These sources of organizational support are:

1. Formal Systems: Structures and formal systems of the organization must become consistent with new behaviors.
2. Exercise of Formal Authority: The manner in which management administers and translates the formal systems to subordinates must be consistent with the direction of change.

3. Primary Work Group: Change must be supported by an individual’s peer-support group if it is to become permanent. Groups throughout the organization must support the norms governing their behavior.

4. Cultural Emergence: The persistence of organizational-wide change depends on members perceiving that the organization’s identity and values have changed. A shift in perception is necessary for new behavior to be reinforced.

As Peters (1979) noted, important changes in an organization involve a process of psychological transformation. The leader(s) of the organization must find new ways to present organizational members with information that helps the organizational members understand the internal and/or external pressures which have led to dissatisfaction with the status quo. Through the articulation of a new direction, the leader sets expectations for those desired behaviors and attitudes when worthy of reward.

An organization’s ability to cope with its environment will not be improved unless its members alter their relations with one another. Thus, a major objective of organizational change is to achieve modifications in the behavioral patterns of organizational personnel. Consequently, in order for
organization-wide affects to be felt, new behavioral patterns consistent with the organization's environment must also be developed.

**Approaches to Organizational Change**

Leavitt (1965) viewed the organization as a complex system composed of four interacting variables (task, people, technology, and structure), and contends that specific approaches to change can be directed toward the alteration of these interdependent variables. These variables are highly interdependent in nature; a change in any one usually results in a compensatory (or retaliatory) change in others (Figure 2).

Adapted from *Applied Organizational Change in Industry: Structural, Technical, and Human Approaches*, by H. Leavitt.

Figure 2  Leavitt's Four Variable Conception of Organizational Change

Greiner (1972) argued that organizational change can be initiated by using various power distributions which may be more important than the variable itself in determining the outcomes. He identified four major approaches most frequently used to introduce organizational change in terms of their position along a power distribution continuum. While
originally proposed in the context of business organizations, Greiner’s scheme seems equally applicable to introducing change into all forms of complex systems. It highlights the type of resources and facilities necessary to undertake major organizational modifications, as well as underscoring the degree of personal commitment that is necessary to ensure a successful change effort (Figure 3).

Adapted from “Patterns of Organization Change” by L.E. Geiner,

Figure 3  
Dynamics of Successful Organizational Change

The organizational learning and development approach to change focuses on improving organizational adaptativeness by clearly defining the psychological and/or sociological problems within the organization.

Among the more prominent advocates of this approach are: Beckhard
(1969) who called for organizational change through planned, organization-wide managed efforts using behavioral science knowledge to increase organizational effectiveness; Schein (1969) who focused on communication processes, functional roles in groups, group norms, and leadership; and Argyris (1962, 1970, 1976) and Argyris and Schon (1974, 1978) who stressed analyzing organizational norms and behavioral modes that can accelerate or inhibit adaptation in organizations and/or groups.

Andrews and Karlens (1972) viewed organizational change as the outcome of the pattern, policies, and plans adopted by the organization. He argued that organizational change is a manifestation of the personality of an organization. Management's intentions for the organization are reflected in the manner in which it addresses the change process. This orientation implies that the personal aspiration, values, and ideals held by organizational members significantly affect the organization's actions toward change.

Maruyama (1963, 1982) argued that changes in organizations unfold through circular patterns of interaction. Organizations evolve through the use of positive and negative feedback in shaping system dynamics. Maruyama perceived organizational change in terms of loops rather than in a linear manner. Organizational change is approached as a phenomenon occurring through mutual causality, rather than through mechanistic causality. Together, the positive and negative feedback mechanisms to be found operating in organizations account for how organizational forms and
processes can be transformed over time, as well as explaining how the organization as a social system preserves a given form.

For Maruyama, no single factor causes organizational change. Therefore, it is not possible to exert unilateral control over any set of causal variables. Social systems will vary, depending on the nature of the problem being dealt with. The logic of a mutual causality system of change rests in the network of relations that define and sustain patterns of causality. The contextual analysis brought forth by cybernetic nature of mutual causality allows the user to often spot the events and actions that set an organization moving in a particular direction. It stresses that events and actions are not causal, but merely trigger transformations embedded in the logic of the system.

**Organizational Change and Social Networks**

Tichy's (1983) TPC model was selected for its ability to provide a systematic analysis of events and activities that trigger large-scale organizational and programmatic change. By allowing for the development of solutions addressing the multiple and interrelated problems that beset and challenge organizations, the TPC model offers a valuable conceptual tool to those managing organizational change and adaptation. The TPC framework seeks to find the degree to which the organization fits or is aligned with its environment. It aims to:
1. Integrate an organization's three core systems: technical, political, and cultural into the change process;

2. Indicate and point to pragmatic diagnostic questions that need to be addressed by the organization;

3. Help in the formation of specific change strategies for the organization.

The dynamic interplay between an organization's internal systems and its environment is analyzed from a multitude of perspectives by the TPC model. This is done because the TPC approach to managing change assumes that organizational effectiveness is a function of the characteristics of each of the principal components of the organization as well a function of how they interrelate and align into a functional system (Tichy, 1983).

As one might suspect from the preceding discussion, there are a number of factors that necessitate organizational responses to change. Implementing successful organizational change is a much more complex process than merely selecting a particular method. In introducing change, organizations must distinguish between the content of what is being changed (the variables) and the process of how change is initiated and implemented.

**Change Strategies**

The change strategies selected by organizations will increasingly depend upon the ability of key organizational staff to predict, analyze, and
adjust to events and actions that trigger organizational uncertainty. An effective assessment process can provide a wider range of relevant alternatives leading to organizational responses more likely to produce the organizational and programmatic goals being sought. As Kovach (1984) noted, a knowledge of one's own personality and an understanding of one's organization are the tools with which management may shape the process of organizational change. The rewards for individuals and organizations will come from handling the change process well and from creating organizations that respond to the challenges of change.

Organizations: The Biological Referent

Over the past half century, many of the most influential and important developments in organizational theory have embraced the biological view of organizations. The biological model has provided valuable insights in such areas as organizational survival, organizational effectiveness, and the nature and type of relationship established between organizations and their environments.

Social Needs in the Work Place

The Hawthorne Studies, conducted and directed by Elton Mayo during the 1920s and 1930s, showed the importance of social needs in the work place and the idea that employees have a complex set of social needs that must be satisfied if they are to perform effectively. These studies
demonstrated that work activities are influenced as much by the nature of
the personnel involved as by the technical and formal structures to be found
in an organization. Mayo's work pushed forward the idea that individuals
and groups, like biological organisms, operate most effectively when their
essential needs are satisfied.

Maslow's theories of motivation (1968) explored the idea that humans
are psychologically and physiologically driven organisms who struggle to
obtain the means to satisfy their needs in a lifelong quest for survival,
growth, and personal development. Maslow depicted the needs that
humans require and seek through a hierarchical structure. Organizational
theorists were quick to see the practical implications generated by Maslow's
work. Greater attention began to be paid to the development and design of
job and organizational relations in order to create the means to achieve an
integration of personal growth and the goals of the organization.

Human Resource Management

The organizational theories and research efforts of Argyris (1982),
McGregor (1960), and Herzberg and Mausner (1959) provided a conceptual
framework for developing "enriched" work environments, so that workers
can exercise their creativity, and sense of control of their organizational
roles. A whole new repertoire of methodological and technical approaches
have come about through the introduction of human resource management
(HRM). Employees in the HRM approach are seen as being valuable
organizational resources which if properly motivated can contribute in numerous ways to an organization's aspirations and goals.

The Systems Approach

The biological approach to organizational theory was further influenced by the systems approach. Theorists such as Von Bertalanffy (1956, 1972) and Boulding (1956) viewed organizations as entities composed of "systems." The systems approach to organizations is based upon the principle that organizations like organisms are "open" to their respective environments and must seek the means to create appropriate relations with those environments.

The systems approach finds its theoretical focus by dealing with the following issues:

1. Concentrating on the environment in which the organization exists;

2. Concentrating on the various subsystems that exist within the organizations (divisions, departments, groups), and how they are interrelated and interdependent upon one another; and

3. Concentrating on the means to create and establish congruencies between various organizational systems, while identifying, diagnosing, and eliminating potential dilemmas and dysfunctions.
The Socio-Technical Aspects of Work

Organizational theorists recognize the need to integrate technical efficiency and individual needs. The "socio technical" aspects of work are seen as being inseparable and interdependent qualities of organizational life. The resolution of organizational problems and dilemmas are addressed by achieving maximum efficiency between the technical resources and the personal needs of the employees. The work done by Trist, Higgin, Murray, and Pollack (1963), Trist (1972), Bamforth and Trist (1951), and Rice and Miller (1967) influenced the way and manner by which human needs were viewed as an aid in achieving high technical levels of proficiency within organizations.

Contingency Theorists

Burns and Stalker (1961) stressed that there is no one best way of organizing. The appropriateness of an organizational form is dependent upon the kind of task and/or environment being dealt with by a social system. The achievement of a "good fit" between task(s) and environment(s) is seen as being the paramount responsibility of management. The contingency approach to organizations was further advanced by the work of Lawrence and Lorsch (1967). Their research efforts indicated that: (a) different kinds of organizations are needed to deal with different market and technological conditions, and (b) organizations operating in uncertain and turbulent environments require different managerial and organizational
styles than those social systems operating in stable environments. Lawrence and Lorsch stressed that different technologies and different environments impose different demands on individuals and organizations. Effective organizations are those that achieve a balance or compatibility between strategy, structure, technology, the needs and demands of its participants, and the external environment.

The ideas generated by the contingency theorists stressed the dynamic quality of organizational styles, contexts, and relevant courses of action available to organizations. Therefore, the successful adaptation of organizations to their environments depends upon the ability of top management to interpret environmental uncertainties and stresses facing their organization, and to adopt relevant structural, strategic technological, and behavioral approaches.

**The Nature, Number and Distribution of Organizations**

The population ecology view of organizations argued that the environment is the critical factor in determining which organizations succeed and which fail. The nature, number, and distribution of organizations at any given time is dependent on resource availability and on competition within and among different types/species of organizations. This approach advocates focusing on the way environments "select" organizations—a process accomplished by an analysis of populations and their wider ecology.
Among the main works developing the population ecology view of organizations are those of Aldrich (1979), Hannan and Freeman (1977), and Freeman and Hannan (1989), all of which have developed ideas regarding the impact of resource dependency on organizations and selecting appropriate organizational responses to the populations being encountered. The work of Kimberley and Miles (1980) and Freeman (1982) has also produced some interesting ideas on organizational life cycles, tracing the birth, growth, development, and decline of organizations, based on the population ecology view of organizations.

The perspectives that are emphasized in the population ecology view of organizations see organizations as active shapers of their environment, especially when acting in concert with other organizations. It holds, as in nature, collaboration frequently operates along with competition. The ecological perspective that emphasizes how to understand and manage the collaborative effort of organizations is developed in the theoretical works of Bateson (1972), Joyce and Van de Ven (1981), Vickers (1983), Fombrun, Tichy, and DeVanna (1984), and Astley (1985).

Organizational Development

Translating the need to adapt organizations to internal and external environmental factors in an integrative manner has become the focus for those working in the field of organizational development (OD). The OD practitioners attempt to ask questions which can identify present or future
dilemmas encountered by the organization. The information gathered from such efforts can then become the basis to prescribe some form of remedy for organizational difficulties, which allow the organization to achieve a "good fit" with its internal and external environment.

**Consultancy Based Research**

Questions such as: "What is the value of an organization’s environment?; What kind of strategy is being employed?; What kind of technology is being used?; How is the organization structured?; and What are the dominant managerial philosophies? form the basis for conducting the diagnostic processes stressed in consultancy-based research." This type of analysis can be conducted at various levels within the organization. Consultancy-based research and OD activities can help the organization to outline patterns of organizational behavior and to offer possible solutions to the problems revealed through its diagnostic processes and orientation.

**Action Research**

Lewin (1951) stated, there can be no action without research, and no research without action. The organizational development (OD) process is basically an action research program directed and designed to address the functioning of a particular organization. The action research aspect of organizational development generates and utilizes information about the organization to provide a base for the organization’s prescriptive actions for
resolving the organization's dilemmas. French and Bell (1984) argue that the nature of organizational development and action research are quite similar. Both approaches are action oriented; they are both data based; they both call for collaboration between researcher, practitioner, and client; and they are problem-solving processes directed toward dealing with social systems.

Beckhard (1969) described the action research model as both an approach to problem solving and a problem-solving process. The steps involved in action research replicate the methods involved in the scientific method of inquiry. Data collection, feedback of data to those involved, and action planning based on the data generated, constitute the major processes involved in action research. These processes are emphasized because the action research model holds that effective improvement programs for organizations requires a data base that is systematically obtained through empirical facts so that actions can be planned, taken, and evaluated.

The desirability of action research in dealing with events and activities that trigger change, lies in the strong orientation it places on diagnosing problems from a collaborative framework. It seeks to generate a body of knowledge on the effects of the actions taken so that they may be incorporated into and advance the development of better social science and behavioral theories. The diagnostic action research approach with its orientation on the researcher entering a problem situation, diagnosing it, and making recommendations for remedial treatment are incorporated
within Tichy's TPC model of Strategic Change management and will form
the basis to direct the research practices of this study (Figure 4).

The Community College

The beginnings of the American community college movement has its
roots in the social, political, and economic forces that followed the creation
of land grant colleges and the development of public universities during the
latter half of the 1800s in America. With the legislative and financial
support given by the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, higher education
became a mechanism for addressing and serving a wide range of social and
economic needs.

The Emergence of the Junior College

In the 1890s, the junior college first emerged as an aspect of American
higher education. Often, it served as an adjunct of a nearby university
which frequently accredited and supervised the junior college's curriculum.
During the first half of the 1900s, the term junior college applied to
institutions which offered "strictly collegiate grade" level of instruction. As
early as 1925, the American Association of Junior Colleges expanded the
definition to include the statement, "The junior college may, and is likely to,
develop a different curriculum suited to the larger and ever changing civic,
social, religious, and vocational needs of the entire community in which the
college is located. It is understood that in this case, also, the work offered
Research Strategies

1. Settings in natural systems
2. Contrived and created settings.
4. No observation of behavior required

A. Point of maximum concern with generality over actors.
B. Point of maximum concern with precision of measurement of behavior
C. Point of maximum concern with system character of context.

Adapted from Runkel and McGrath, 1972
shall be at a level appropriate for high school graduates" (Bogue, 1950, p. 22). In their functions and programs the junior colleges emulated the university; however, their policies, administrative functions, and style were a reflection of the local public school system. The junior college was often controlled by a local board or committee. The utilitarian emphasis of the land grant college and university was incorporated into its academic offerings.

The junior college, for many communities, provided opportunities for higher education that had not existed before. Many communities had, for the first time, their own college as well as an educational and cultural center for the community. To accommodate and facilitate such a role, the community college adapted curricular functions that included academic transfer preparation, vocational education, continuing education, remedial education, and community service.

The Emergence of the Community College

Until the 1940s, two-year colleges were known most commonly as junior colleges. The term junior college, during the 1950s and 1960s began to be applied more to private two-year institutions while the term "community college" became an acknowledged title for comprehensive, publicly supported institutions.

The rapid social and technological changes following World War II helped to redefine higher education. Community-based colleges were
increasingly providing educational services based on the interest and needs of "adult" students. This new clientele was little concerned with traditional academic forms. Adults were seeking programs attuned to the natural forms and cycles found in their lives. The nature of the services and programs of the community-based college began to change from a purely academic to one serving the life-long learner.

Redefining Higher Education

The importance of the role that the community college can play in the growing demands placed on the educational system was seen in the efforts of the 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education. It stressed the value of providing access to the general populace. Bogue (1950) cites the Commission's findings that such an approach would be of value and likely beneficial to half of the young adult population in the United States as a means to portray the importance of the role it could play in the higher education system.

In a little over 30 years, the recommendation made by the Truman Commission on Higher Education (1947)—that the door to higher education be swung open—has been achieved. Now, community colleges are almost everywhere. Most significantly, a whole new sector of higher education came into being: the locally sponsored two-year community college. In 1955 there were about 596 two-year colleges. In 1974 there were 973 two-year colleges, and by 1982 that figure had reached 1,250. From 1965 to 1980,
the number of public two-year colleges nearly doubled, and their enrollments quadrupled (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 10). Small wonder then, that the community college became an important and essential component to the publicly supported system of higher education in America (Figure 5).

Community College Programming

As Luskin and Small (1980-81) noted, considerable latitude in programming decisions is made available to the community college. Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) claim that the community college best exemplifies the ideal of lifelong learning. There is virtually no person, no subject, no educational method that falls outside the range of the community college endeavor. Community colleges often provide programs for a vast array of special interest groups, professional associations, governmental agencies, and profit and non-profit organizations. Edmund Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1958-81) emphasized that "the institution was a resource to be used by individuals throughout their lifetimes and by the general public as an agency assisting with community issues" (Gleazer, 1980, p. 20). Harlacher and Gollatscheck (1978) urged that the community college be an institution that participates in the total renewal process of the community. Gleazer (1980) argued that the community college is uniquely qualified to serve as the focal point of a community's learning system. Much of the community education orientation to be found in the
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community college rests on the notion that it encompasses an area of service that knows no limits on clients.

Commumity Education

The leaders of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) have been vigorous in their support for community education (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 252). Of all the community college’s academic activities, community education has the broadest range of curricular functions: adult education, community-based education, adult based education, continuing education, and community services. Many of these functions may be sponsored by the community college, or jointly with other organizations using their institution’s facilities.

The educative aspects of community education—its short course, courses for institutionalized populations, and courses offered on job sites—are its strengths (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 282). For Harlacher and Gollattscheck (1978), the hallmark of the community-based community college found in it is making appropriate educational experiences available, through a diversity of programming, planning, organization, and delivery systems. To achieve this status two major entities must be represented within an institution’s value system: (a) the community college should make a significant and positive difference in the quality of life in these communities being served by it and (b) the community college has a
responsibility to function as an integral part of the fabric and rhythm of the communities it serves.

Management of the Community College: The Vortex

Adizes (1979) stressed that those who lead and manage community colleges are placed in a vortex between the dynamics of the internal environment and the dynamics as the external and internal environments facing community colleges (Figure 6). Being placed in such a role, argued Rumelt (1979) requires that the management of the community college be able to frame uncertain situations into comprehensive strategies that fall within the competence of the organization. Groff (1983) argues that the future of the community colleges cannot be predicted by management, but it is possible for management to develop and use anticipatory and speculative skills to improve institutional foresight. By articulation and instituting processes that involve the capacity to collect and analyze information on a broad range of variables in their environments, those who manage community colleges can effectively develop a desirable and feasible future for their institutions.

Myran (1983) states that the key concern of the next decade for community colleges will not be whether they can survive, but whether they can continue to be vital to the students, employers, and communities that they serve. As the pace of technological, economic, political, and social change continues to accelerate, community colleges must choose among the
### STRATEGIC FORCES IMPACTING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

#### Environmental Factors

- Federal, state, and local government (funding, regulation)
- Local business and industry (student source, support)
- Other educational institutions (coordination, competition)
- Constituency groups (recruitment, service)
- Local interest groups (advice, funding, Pressure)
- Taxpayers (support, funding, Pressure)

#### Opportunities

#### Threats

#### Competition

#### Management

- Goals
- Commitment
- Conflict

#### Organizational Sub-Systems

- Staff unions
- Student groups
- College departments
- Faculty and staff coalitions
- Informal staff relationships
- Governance groups

External and internal variables Influencing the Function of the Community College

---
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external and internal stimuli that demand institutional attention and analysis. Naisbitt (1982) argued that although we live in a time of great uncertainty, it is time filled with opportunity. In such a period, community colleges must be able to steer a course that allows them to grasp emerging opportunities more than in the past. Community college leaders will create the future of their institutions by the choices they make, and choose they must.

Oregon’s Community Colleges

Oregon’s first organized effort to provide publicly supported post-secondary education occurred in 1868, when the state college of Oregon was founded under authority of the Morrill Act. That institution is now known as Oregon State University. After passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, vocational education programs began to appear in many high school districts. These programs in many instances, formed the nucleus around which community colleges were organized many years later.

Junior College Legislation

In the 1920s, "junior college" legislation was being considered in Oregon. The Roberts Bill, introduced in 1927, divided the state into 13 districts, but required that the voters in the designated districts give an affirmative vote before a junior college could be established. This bill failed
to become law. It was not until 1959 that legislation such as that found in the Roberts Bill would surface again.

In 1949, with the passage of the "Dunn Bill," school districts through a contract with the General Extension Division of the State System of Higher Education could initiate extension centers offering collegiate level courses. Under this law, Extension Centers were established in Baker, Bend, and Klamath Falls. In addition to the Dunn Bill, the 1949 session also saw the authorization of an Interim Committee study, which resulted in a community college plan for Oregon. House Bill A3, a community college bill, was introduced during the 1951 legislative session and became a law, but it was not until 1957 after a series of amendments were enacted that any community colleges were formed.

Within a few months after the adjournment of the 1957 legislative session, the Bend School District board called an election which formed a community college as part of the public school system. Central Oregon Community College became the only such college formed under the legislation enacted by the 1957 Assembly.

The Establishment of Community College Districts

State Senator Donald Husband, from Eugene, was instrumental in the drafting of Senate Bill 260 for the 1959 Legislative Assembly. The provisions of Senate Bill 260 provided a process through which the establishment of community college districts could occur, each with its own
elected board. No colleges were organized under 1959 legislation. Nevertheless, the provisions of Senate Bill 260 outlined the need to offer comprehensive community college programs, having the following components: (a) vocational education, (b) counseling and guidance services, (c) adult education programs, and (d) lower division collegiate courses.

Unlike the 1959 Legislative Assembly, which had put forth little in the way of incentives, the 1961 Assembly sought the means to bring about the actual formation of community colleges. Senate Bill 440, which was enacted during the 1961 Legislative Assembly, was a landmark piece of legislation. It appropriated significant amounts of money to Oregon's community colleges. Operating funds were distributed to the colleges based on the full-time equivalent enrolled at the school. Construction monies were appropriated. Those school districts that met the requirements as to size and facilities and offered a community college and/or vocational education program were allowed to organize either a community college or an educational center, depending on the nature of the program. With the passage of Senate Bill 440, a flood of activity across the state of Oregon took place, releasing a series of actions that superseded what had happened in the previous three decades. The founding of a statewide system of community colleges took place during the decade 1961-71, when 13 community colleges were created in Oregon (Figure 7). The first five comprehensive community colleges organized under Senate Bill 440 were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date, Formation Election</th>
<th>Chair Org. Committee</th>
<th>First Board Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain</td>
<td>Pendleton</td>
<td>June 8, 1962</td>
<td>Ralph McEwen</td>
<td>Ralph McEwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Oregon</td>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>January 30, 1962</td>
<td>Owen Panner</td>
<td>Owen Panner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemeketa</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>September 23, 1969</td>
<td>Ron Blundell</td>
<td>J. Earl Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>May 1966</td>
<td>Charles Zacur</td>
<td>Rev. Herbert Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>October 19, 1964</td>
<td>Dr. Bill Jones</td>
<td>William &quot;Bill&quot; Bristow, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn-Benton</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>December 6, 1966</td>
<td>Herb Hammond</td>
<td>Dan Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hood</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>June 12, 1965</td>
<td>Betty Schdeen</td>
<td>Richard F. Deich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>June 5, 1968</td>
<td>John Matthew</td>
<td>Dr. Howard Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Oregon</td>
<td>Coos Bay</td>
<td>May 1, 1961</td>
<td>Henry Hansen</td>
<td>Henry Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillamook Bay</td>
<td>Bay City</td>
<td>March 31, 1981</td>
<td>Roy Mason</td>
<td>Elwood Statt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Valley</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>October 9, 1961</td>
<td>Dr. John Easily</td>
<td>Dr. John Easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty Oak</td>
<td>The Dales</td>
<td>November 2, 1976</td>
<td>Norm Soots</td>
<td>Carolyn Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua</td>
<td>Roseburg</td>
<td>March 30, 1964</td>
<td>Wayne Crooch</td>
<td>Wayne Crooch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Treasure Valley, Southwestern Oregon, Blue Mountain, Clatsop, and Central Oregon.

**The Era of Expansion**

For most of the period 1961-71, community colleges in Oregon were required in general as a branch of the public school system. One significant factor created by this perception was the differing of interpretations that grows when dealing with the community colleges, as opposed to elementary and secondary levels of education. It was apparent that a more realistic and workable set of statutes be enacted to address the nature and purpose of the community college in Oregon. A new codification of the community college statutes was structured during the 1969 Legislative Assembly, resulting in the creation of Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS Chapter 34) (Appendix A).

The era of rapid expansion in the creation of two-year colleges in Oregon came to an end with the organization of Rogue Community College in 1970. There have been no community college districts formed since then, but there has been a series of community college service districts organized, and there may well be more in the future. Treaty Oak at The Dalles in 1976, Tillamook Bay at Tillamook in 1981, and the Oregon Coast Community College at Newport in 1986 are the only such districts formed to date. About 55 percent of the state's area and 85 percent of its population are now included in districts providing at least some community
college services (Hakanson, 1986, p. 5). (See Figure 8 for an illustration showing the current geographical area covered by each district.)

Oregon over the last quarter century, has created a vital network of community colleges. Although the number of community colleges ceased to grow after 1970, except for the introduction of three service districts, community college enrollment increased from a total FTE of 2,418 in 1961-62, to 50,189 in 1985-86 (Table 1) (Oregon Department of Education, 1987).

**Meeting Expressed Needs: The Latest Manifestation**

"Perhaps the latest manifestation of the community college's ability to meet expressed needs is the creation of a statewide system of Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs)" (Hakanson, 1987, p. 8). These small business centers offer advice, counseling, and training to both potential and current business owners from Oregon's over 65,000 small businesses. In Oregon, 95 percent of the businesses have 50 or fewer employees, employing almost 80 percent of the private sector work force (Oregon Department of Education, 1984). The community colleges in Oregon have become one of the state's most valuable economic assets. Their cooperative and responsive orientation in dealing with the needs of Oregon's business community has helped broaden their role both educationally and economically.

The degree of importance to which the small business development centers have ascended since their inception in 1983, is reflected in their
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Table 1
Statewide FTE and UHC, Selected Years by Major Program: and by Institution in 1984-85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LDC FTE</th>
<th>LDC UHC</th>
<th>Voc &amp; Voc Supp FTE</th>
<th>Voc &amp; Voc Supp UHC</th>
<th>Other Reimb. FTE</th>
<th>Other Reimb. UHC</th>
<th>Non Reimb. &amp; Sep Cont. FTE</th>
<th>Non Reimb. &amp; Sep Cont. UHC</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
<th>Total UHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>18,878</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>19,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>4,963</td>
<td>14,136</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>22,911</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>7,214</td>
<td>12,316</td>
<td>48,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>13,175</td>
<td>29,480</td>
<td>15,238</td>
<td>48,441</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>27,922</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>24,026</td>
<td>33,271</td>
<td>129,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>16,870</td>
<td>42,032</td>
<td>20,055</td>
<td>70,349</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>68,139</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>27,435</td>
<td>45,508</td>
<td>207,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>22,176</td>
<td>74,924</td>
<td>21,784</td>
<td>77,517</td>
<td>10,340</td>
<td>75,972</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>18,142</td>
<td>56,877</td>
<td>246,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>22,922</td>
<td>72,054</td>
<td>20,828</td>
<td>75,069</td>
<td>8,967</td>
<td>71,319</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>17,574</td>
<td>55,114</td>
<td>236,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>22,126</td>
<td>77,054</td>
<td>19,475</td>
<td>77,766</td>
<td>9,039</td>
<td>64,136</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>19,251</td>
<td>52,921</td>
<td>238,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>20,615</td>
<td>78,803</td>
<td>18,282</td>
<td>76,110</td>
<td>9,184</td>
<td>68,473</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>18,789</td>
<td>50,268</td>
<td>242,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1984-85:

BMCC   | 584     | 1,486   | 582                | 2,013              | 264              | 2,929           | 3                        | 98                       | 1,433     | 6,526     |
COCC   | 795     | 3,084   | 373                | 2,136              | 280              | 3,304           | 12                       | 417                      | 1,460     | 8,941     |
CHEM   | 2,192   | 9,001   | 2,341              | 10,089             | 978              | 7,255           | 338                      | 2,371                    | 5,849     | 28,716    |
CLAK   | 1,423   | 6,246   | 1,127              | 5,753              | 589              | 6,713           | 198                      | 1,434                    | 3,337     | 20,146    |
CLAT   | 350     | 1,903   | 343                | 1,248              | 229              | 2,455           | 7                        | 42                       | 929       | 5,648     |
LANE   | 3,232   | 13,272  | 2,914              | 13,309             | 1,802            | 9,588           | 231                      | 341                      | 8,199     | 32,910    |
LBCC   | 1,601   | 7,016   | 1,558              | 5,250              | 1,000            | 11,048          | 43                       | 1,012                    | 4,202     | 24,326    |
MHCC   | 2,282   | 7,639   | 1,766              | 5,361              | 663              | 3,222           | 139                      | 811                      | 4,851     | 17,033    |
PCC    | 5,615   | 19,689  | 5,036              | 20,884             | 1,379            | 11,464          | 994                      | 7,965                    | 13,024    | 60,002    |
RCC    | 611     | 3,389   | 578                | 2,033              | 671              | 1,187           | 134                      | 3,191                    | 1,994     | 9,800     |
SWOCC  | 587     | 830     | 503                | 4,045              | 336              | 3,146           | 10                       | 0                        | 1,436     | 8,021     |
TBCC   | 48      | 278     | 52                 | 320                | 83               | 1,435           | 9                        | 55                       | 192       | 2,088     |
TVCC   | 459     | 2,113   | 357                | 1,234              | 140              | 1,186           | 2                        | 0                        | 958       | 4,533     |
TOCC   | 130     | 899     | 78                 | 546                | 216              | 1,582           | 19                       | 609                      | 443       | 3,636     |
UCC    | 689     | 1,858   | 673                | 1,889              | 551              | 5,759           | 49                       | 443                      | 1,962     | 9,949     |

FTE = Full Time Equivalency
UHC = Unduplicated Head Count
selection as one of the 14 principal educational issues to be brought before the 64th Legislative Assembly (1987-88) for legislative action and funding.

Small Business Development Centers

In the American economy, small business is a significant force. According to the Federal Small Business Administration (1984), small business enterprises account for 55 percent of all private sector jobs; over half of all industrial innovations and inventions; almost half of the Gross Business Output; and slightly over 40 percent of the Gross National Product. The President's 1984 Report on the State of Small Business shows clearly the importance of the contributions made by small business to the American economy. The following are some highlights of that report:

1. Small businesses dominate the fastest growing industries in the number of new enterprises being created;

2. Small businesses employ 47.8 percent of the private non-farm work force;

3. As of 1984, there were 14.3 million non-farm businesses in the United States; and

4. Approximately 97 percent of businesses in the United States are small by the U.S. Small Business Administration's size definition and standards.

The Small Business Development Center program, when first initiated in 1975 as a federal/state partnership, was given most of its leadership by
land grant universities, with very minor participation by two-year colleges in New Jersey and Georgia. Annually developed cooperative agreements fund the delivery of SBDC program services, and each state must match federal allocations on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The SBDC programs have sought to increase their impact while serving small business needs in more cost-effective manners. Since its inception, new models for the management and delivery of small business assistance programs have emerged and taken shape. Subsequently, greater emphasis has been given to the role that the community college can play in assisting small businesses.

A Unique Partnership

In 1983 the Oregon Legislature passed Chapter 825, ORS 1983 (HB 3002), the "Small Business Training Assistance Act" (Appendix B). This bill provided financial support for the development of a network of community college-based centers offering small business assistance. The goals of the OSBDC network are: (a) to reduce significantly the failure rate of small businesses in the State of Oregon, (b) to assist small businesses in the State of Oregon to improve significantly their ability to generate profit, and (c) to provide advisement to potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their ventures prior to investing capital (Appendix C).

Oregon's Small Business Development Center (SBDC) program represents the first statewide network of community college-based SBDCs in the nation. Through these centers small businesses are linked with the
community college's resources, expert resource personnel in the local business community, and training resources throughout the state of Oregon. In addition to state support, the U.S. Small Business Administration also contributed funds to the Oregon Small Business Development Center Network (OSBDCN). The community colleges participating in the program contribute their facilities, personnel, and financial support to the centers as well (Figure 9).

These SBDCs function as a place where potential and/or current business owners can receive free, or at low cost, information, counseling, or programs that provide them with the knowledge to begin and/or operate a small business. The centers are responsible for providing business counseling, guidance, seminars, workshops, and continuing education courses in the center's service area. They have established a complex mosaic of support and assistance and created numerous connections with other economic support and assistance programs in communities across the state (Table 2).
Community Colleges Serving as SBDC's or SBDC Satellites, International Trade Center

1. Blue Mountain CC
2. Central Oregon CC
3. Chemeketa CC
4. Clatsop CC
5. Lane CC
6. Linn-Benton CC
8. Mount Hood CC
9. Portland CC
10. Rogue CC
11. Southwestern CC
12. Treasure Valley CC
13. Umpqua CC
14. Tillamook Bay CCSD
15. Treaty Oaks CCSD
C.O.D. Contracted Out-of-District

Figure 9
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Oregon Small Business Development Center Network
Table 2

Milestones in the Development of Oregon's Small Business Assistance Development Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2, 1983</td>
<td>Passed by House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 1983</td>
<td>Passed by Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9, 1984</td>
<td>Signed by Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27, 1983</td>
<td>Meeting of community college representatives to discuss fund allocation and program plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 1983</td>
<td>Advisory Council appointed by State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 1983</td>
<td>First meeting of Small Business Assistance Center Advisory Council; framework for criteria discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29, 1983</td>
<td>Draft of &quot;Request for Proposals&quot; based upon Council recommendations mailed to Council members for their reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 1983</td>
<td>Small Business Assistance Center Request for Proposal mailed to all eligible recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14, 1983</td>
<td>Deadline for receipt of proposals by Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 1983</td>
<td>Proposals distributed to review committee by mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 1983</td>
<td>SBAC proposal review committee meets to discuss proposals and recommend grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 1983</td>
<td>Second meeting of SBAC Advisory Council to review committee recommendations for grants to be awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 1983</td>
<td>Meeting of interested institution representatives at OCCVA Conference on Small Business, Eugene; discussion of progress of grants and development of network concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 1983</td>
<td>Subcommittee of Council meets to plan steps to develop proposal and seek SBA grant for $350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14, 1983</td>
<td>Grants approved by State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 1983</td>
<td>Lane Community College notified of approval of project to provide networking services to statewide system of small business assistance centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7, 1983</td>
<td>First inservice meeting of Center Directors held at Lane Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 1983</td>
<td>Grant proposal submitted to Portland Office of Small Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22, 1984</td>
<td>Grant approved by U.S. Small Business Administration for $350,000; Lane Community College approved as control center and &quot;lead institution&quot; for SBA sponsored &quot;Small Business Development Centers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 1984</td>
<td>Grant awards mailed to approved small business assistance center institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 1984</td>
<td>Small Business Development Center Directors Meeting--Chemeketa Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 1984</td>
<td>Reported to Emergency Board on progress of HB3002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Included in this chapter is a restatement of the problem, a description of the sample studied, the rationale for methodology chosen, the research design, the statistical issues and concerns, the data collection approaches used: procedures and instruments and data categories for collecting diagnostic information.

Problem Restatement

The purpose of this study is to conduct a careful examination of four Oregon community college-based Small Business Development Centers, and the events that triggered large-scale programmatic and/or organizational change within them. The SBDC's have actively engaged in the realization of the revitalization of the Oregon economy. However, data describing the forces and factors that shaped and influenced the SBDC's are limited. As a consequence, little is known regarding the events that trigger changes in the structures, processes, patterns of learning and decision making that occurred as the SBDC's moved from their inception to organizational maturity.
Rationale for Methodology

Miles and Huberman (1984) laud the qualitative method as it provides a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in specific contexts. They stress the fact that qualitative research methods can preserve chronological flow, assess causality for a localized viewpoint, and provide rich and detailed explanations. Strauss (1987) argued that making sense of complex data generated by qualitative methods requires three things: (a) the interpretations and data collection are guided by successively evolving interpretations made during the course of the study; (b) that to avoid a simplistic rendering of the phenomena under study, the information being utilized must be conceptually dense, providing many concepts and many linkages within it; and (c) that it is necessary to do detailed, intensive examination of data in order to bring out the complexity that lies in, behind, and beyond those data. Each of these factors is found and expressed through the use of qualitative research methods. Qualitative research methods allow for subjects to be studied from a historical perspective in the gathering of data, and permitting the incorporation of revisions in the model under study.

This exploratory study will be field based, relying principally upon qualitative research methods. Pearson (1987) noted that the qualitative, field-based case study appears to be the soundest research tool for dealing with fluid organizations responding to numerous constituencies and environments. The strength of the field study is in its inductive procedure,
its potentiality for discovering significant variables, and its basic relations which cannot be found if research were confined and dictated by a hypothetic-deductive model.

The TPC model by its theoretical assumptions, empirical referents, and mode of logical inference provides a means to generate multiple sources of evidences, a more rounded holistic and complete account of issues and processes, and the means to collect multiple sets of data. "The use of multiple methods, sets of data, and theories in field based case studies can provide flexibility, cross validations, and theoretical relevance" (Burgess, 1982, p. 166).

The TPC model provides guidelines for selecting diagnostic information and arranging that information into meaningful patterns. This information can form the basis for evaluating the current state of organizational affairs. The TPC model provides the researcher with an in-depth diagnostic plan for the ongoing evaluation and monitoring of organizational and programmatic change.

By combining qualitative research methods and the TPC model's strategic framework for diagnosing and managing change, three crucial issues regarding organizational assessment and large-scale change can be addressed. First, the ability to review and examine whether common elements can be identified and associated with events that trigger large-scale organizational and/or programmatic change. Second, the ability to examine whether the data generated by the TPC model can accurately detail whether
predictable patterns occurring in the emergence and formation of large-scale organizational and/or programmatic change. The third is the ability to examine and identify what criteria can be used to determine appropriate organizational and/or programmatic responses to the events that trigger large-scale change.

Sample

Four Oregon community college-based SBDCs were chosen for the study. They included: Chemeketa, Linn-Benton, Mt. Hood, and Umpqua Community College. These colleges extend from the southern to the northern boundaries of western Oregon. Their service areas range from densely populated metropolitan areas to sparsely populated rural areas.

The following considerations were used in selecting the four Oregon community college-based SBDCs found in this study:

1. The need logistically and financially to have a sample population found within the Willamette Valley area of Oregon.

2. The need to have representativeness and diversity as it related to the size of the community college’s student population.

3. The need to have representativeness and diversity as it related to the college’s service district socio-geographic area—urban, semi-rural, rural.

4. The need to have representativeness and diversity as it related to the community college’s ability to manage the operations of its SBDC program.
5. The need to have representativeness and diversity as it related to the economic base of the community college's service district area.

6. The need to have representativeness and diversity as it related to the community college's ability to achieve the goals and objectives established for its SBDC program.

7. The ability of the community college's staff and administration dealing with its SBDC program to commit to and participate in a long-term research project.

8. The recommendations of the statewide director of Oregon's SBDC programs concerning the above-mentioned characteristics and the community colleges most likely to reflect them.

Mt. Hood Community College

Mt. Hood Community College (MHCC) is located in the Portland metropolitan area just east of the city of Portland. Founded in 1965, Mt. Hood Community College began offering classes in 1966. Mt. Hood's main campus is located in Gresham, Oregon (population 38,000). The college's service district covers 950 square miles in East Multnomah County and portions of Clackamas and Hood River counties, including the cities of Gresham, Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, Sandy, Maywood Park, Boring, Corbett, and Cascade Locks. More than 200,000 people live in the college's service district.
Mt. Hood Community College offers 70 vocational-technical programs and 68 college transfer programs. The college employs 432 full-time faculty and staff, and 466 part-time faculty and staff. The college served 25,517 students during the 1987-88 year and had a FTE enrollment in 1987-88 of 5,626.

In 1983, MHCC created the Center for Community and Economic Development. The Center acts as an umbrella organization with eight separate but interrelated programs with each program responding to a targeted technical and/or economic sector in its service area. The Small Business Development Center at MHCC was instituted in December 1983 and was incorporated into the college's Center for Community and Economic Development. The Small Business Development Center was created to assist new businesses in starting out and to help existing businesses to grow.

Umpqua Community College

Umpqua Community College was founded on March 4, 1964, by a vote of the people of greater Douglas County. Douglas County is located in southwestern Oregon. The college's service district covers a land area of 5,071 square miles. Umpqua Community College's central campus is 100 acres and is located five miles north of the city of Roseburg (16,000), the largest city in Douglas County. More than 80,000 people live in the college's service district.
Umpqua Community College offers 70 academic transfer programs and 22 vocational-technical programs. The college employs 134 full-time faculty and staff, and 426 part-time faculty and staff. The college served 11,832 students during the 1987-88 academic year and had a FTE enrollment of 2,113 in 1987-88.

The college has historically played an important role in community activities. In recent years, Umpqua Community College (UCC) has functioned as an important community resource providing economic development and assistance to local businesses and industry. The Umpqua SBDC officially began its operation in January 1984. During its first year of operation, the SBDC was located on the central campus of Umpqua Community College. Since 1985, the SBDC has been in downtown Roseburg. The center is on the first floor of a restored house that is on the National Historic Landmark Registry, the Willis House.

Chemeketa Community College

Chemeketa Community College is located in northwestern Oregon and serves an educational district composed of Polk, Marion, most of Yamhill, and a part of Linn Counties. The college provides its services to a 2,600 square mile district with a population of approximately 300,000. Currently, the college has over 563 full-time faculty and staff employees and employs 700 part-time faculty and staff members. Chemeketa Community
College served 35,667 people in the 1987-88 academic year, and had a FTE enrollment in 1987-88 of 6,654.

The central campus for Chemeketa Community College is located in Salem, Oregon (population 97,000). The college has community centers in McMinnville, Dallas, Woodburn, and Stayton, Oregon. Additionally, the college offers classes at 24 different locations throughout its district. Chemeketa Community College offers 39 college transfer programs and 40 technical-vocational programs.

The college's origins can be traced to 1955, when the Salem Public School District began offering adult vocational and technical programs through the establishment of the Salem Technical Vocational School. In September 1969, the Chemeketa Community College District was established and was formed to serve the district with a comprehensive educational program.

Chemeketa Community College's Small Business Development Center is a part of the College's Training and Economic Development Center (TED). The TED Center operates to serve the needs of the district's businesses, organizations, and individuals by providing a variety of instructional and technical assistance services. The SBDC at Chemeketa began its operation in January 1984 on the central campus. Since the fall of 1985, the SBDC has been located in downtown Salem.
Linn-Benton Community College

Linn-Benton Community College was formed in 1966. It began to serve the residents of Linn and Benton counties in 1967. Linn-Benton Community College's central campus is located on a 104-acre campus two miles south of downtown Albany (27,900) and eleven miles east of Corvallis (41,580). The college service district covers 2,965 square miles. More than 153,000 people live in the college's service district.

Linn-Benton Community College offers 13 college transfer programs and 38 vocational-technical programs. The college employs 328 full-time faculty and staff, and 466 part-time faculty and staff. The college served 23,350 students during the 1987-88 academic year, and had a FTE enrollment in 1987-88 of 4,138. Linn-Benton Community College operates four community-based centers, located in Corvallis, Sweet Home, Lebanon, and on the central campus in Albany. Classes are also held on a regular basis in many of the district's smaller communities.

The Small Business Development Center is incorporated into the college's Training and Economic Development (TED) Center, located in LBCC's College Center Building, on the central campus. The TED Center began operating in September 1983. The college's SBDC Center began its operation in January 1984.
Data Collection

The choice of data collection procedures utilized in this study was guided by the diagnostic process proposed in Tichy's TPC model of strategic large-scale organizational change (Appendix D). This entailed the employment and the use of multiple methods of data collection. Within this study, three basic approaches for collecting diagnostic information will be utilized, including: (a) interviews (structured), (b) questionnaires (open and closed ended), and (c) documents and records (narrative and statistical). This in keeping with Tichy's admonishment that it is generally desirable to use multiple diagnostic techniques when carrying out an organizational diagnosis. The overall organizational diagnosis begins with an analysis of the organization's environment and an assessment of its history and past performance. When this is completed, the diagnostic focus is directed toward its core systems and key organizational components (Appendix D).

Documents and Records

Organizations maintain voluminous accounts of individual and group behavior and actions through the records that they generate and accumulate. Organizational records offer a means to study and assess the structure and functioning of the formal organization, and the institutional arrangements that taken collectively constitute behavior in organizations. In this research effort, the documents and records that were utilized are: SBDC Quarterly Performance Reports (1984 to 1985), Annual Reports for

**Interviews**

In this study the interview served a number of purposes: It provided an exploratory device, allowing the researcher to identify variables and their relationship, it served as the main instrument used in data collection, thus providing the principal evidence in the study, and it supplemented other data-collection procedures, thus providing incidental, specialized, or background information.

In this study, the core questions addressed by all the informants dealt with identifying the critical events in the organization's history: Were there identifiable phases of development?, What is the SBDC formal mission?, Does the SBDC have a formal strategy?, What are the perceived goals for the SBDC?, What are the characteristics of decision making in the SBDC and in its sponsoring community college?, and What are the characteristics of communication in the SBDC and in its sponsoring community college?

**Type of Interview Conducted**

In this study, the face-to-face interview was used. This was done because it gave the researcher greater flexibility and adaptability in application than the other two types. With it, the researcher could make
on-going inferences about the data and/or respondents, probe for further information, do on-the-spot checking and referencing of the information being provided, probe for further information, and explain questions about the phenomenon being studied that respondents might not understand.

The Structural Aspects of Interviews

Given the systematic informational orientation of the TPC's Diagnostic Plan in providing the data base needed to assess the events triggering change and in selecting an appropriate organizational change approach, the researcher conducted the interviews in a structured manner. This was done in order to get comprehensive and accurate information from all respondents. The specific information being sought in the interviews came directly from the series of structured inquiries detailed within the TPC's Diagnostic Plan (Appendix D). The structured questions used in this research effort resembled the format of an objective questionnaire, thus allowing clarification and elaboration only within narrow limits.

Interviews: Selection of Informants and Sample Size

Interviews were conducted with 26 informants: Mt. Hood Community College - 8; Linn-Benton Community College - 7; Chemeketa Community College - 6; and Umpqua Community College - 5. Limiting informants to that number was based on several considerations. First, it took time to gather the organizational change data required from the
informants, a factor critical to obtaining the meanings that organizational personnel had for these events. Second, developing these understandings requires an examination of what was being said, identifying "native" themes and, then, returning to the informants to ask clarifying questions. Third, the goal of this study was to develop "thick descriptions" which communicate to outsiders the full context and meaning of organizational change.

The initial grouping of informants was identified through referrals from the State Director of the Oregon Small Business Development Center’s Network. The subsequent inclusion of other informants came through personal contacts made by the researcher. Random selection of informants was rejected for two reasons. First, gaining the confidence of informants was regarded as problematic due to the "intrusive" nature of the study; that is, informants were asked to reveal what to many might be regarded as "organizational secrets." Hence, the influence of personal references contributed substantially to the development of a trust relationship between researcher and informants. Second, informants were sought who possessed direct knowledge and involvement with the SBDCs, during their first two years of operation (1984, 1985). It is argued that by studying the experiences of these individuals, the researcher might be better able to ascertain the tacit knowledge characteristic of those involved in the creation and early operation of organizations.
Interviews: Site Selection and Structure

Most of the interviews were conducted at the informant's work place, although some interviews did occur at other sites. The decision to conduct the majority of the interviews at the informant's work place was based both on informant request and the researcher's discovery that informants were far more willing to share information when they were at their jobs. The structure of the interview questions served to both "break the ice" and to identify themes that the researcher could subsequently explore. Fifty-five interviews were conducted over a 12-month period, the total interview time for all informants was approximately 100 hours. A handwritten record was made of all interviews. Written records were selected over audio tapes, because in the researcher's pilot study, informants demonstrated reluctance to provide spontaneous and candid information when a tape recorder was used. Transcripts of the interviews were labeled with a three-digit code, the first number corresponding to the informant interviewed, the second number representing the number of the interview session in an interview sequence with a specific informant, and the third number represented the informant's institution.

The TPC Model and Organizational Assessment Instruments (OAI)

The use of questionnaires represents one of five basic approaches for collecting diagnostic information in Tichy's TPC's Diagnostic Plan.
Unfortunately, the issue of which questionnaires are to be used is left unanswered in the TPC model's Diagnostic Plan. The potential user is given only reference to Price's (1972) *Handbook of Organizational Measurement* in determining questionnaire selection.

After carefully viewing and evaluating the various instruments presented in Price's *Handbook of Organizational Measurement*, a pilot study was carried out at Umpqua Community College's SBDC (September-October 1987), using the following questionnaires: (a) Assessment of Innovative Behavior (Forehand, 1963), (b) Centralization Questionnaire (Aiken & Hage, 1968), (c) Communication and Organizational Effectiveness Questionnaire (Georgopoulos & Mann, 1962), and (d) Organizational Consensus Questionnaire (Tagiuri, 1965).

Overall, the pretesting effort indicated that the questionnaires available in the *Handbook of Organizational Measurement* presented significant barriers to their application in this study. In some cases, difficulties arose through differences found in language and terminology used in the questionnaires and that found in the TPC model. Some of the questionnaires failed to provide a technically adequate level of information for the variables under study. Subsequently, the researcher undertook an extensive review of the literature regarding other references regarding organizational measurement and assessment. This lead to an examination of the following works: Oscar Buros, *Mental Measurements Yearbook* - 9th edition (1985); Lake (1973), *Measuring Human Behavior*; Miller (1970),
Van de Ven and Ferry's Organizational Assessment Instruments (OAI) are comprehensive in their coverage, firmly grounded in organizational theory, and supported by a detailed and sophisticated methodology, and that the measures used in the OAI are generally applicable and useful for comparison between organizations and for detection of organizational changes over time (Appendix D).

For basic research, the OAI provided a set of measures that can be used to develop and evaluate organizational context, design, and process. To test the applicability of the OAI to this research study, the researcher conducted a pilot study at Linn-Benton Community College's SBDC (January-February 1988). Additionally, the researcher met with members of the Survey Research Center at Oregon State University on several occasions.
to evaluate the OAI and its utilization in this study. Where grammatical, format, or presentational modifications were required, OSU Survey Research staff evaluated the possible impact made on the validity and structural of the OAI and made recommendations to deal with such modifications. Those recommendations were incorporated in this study.

Considerable attention was paid toward selecting OAI instruments which provided clarity and specificity in their questions; which would not require special literacy regarding the concepts they presented; which would be most likely to preserve subject anonymity; and which provide the opportunity for cross-classification of variables seen to influence organizational change.

From the pretesting pilot study and the input provided by the OSU Survey Research Center, the OAI instrument selected for the study of contextual factors (social and economic issues) affecting the organization was Domain Uncertainty. This questionnaire consists of two components: The Consensus on Operating Goals Index and Clarity of Operating Strategies. The information generated by this instrument was used to provide diagnostic data for the TPC’s Mission and Strategy, and Input (Environment and History) components (Appendix D).

**Domain Uncertainty**

Domain Uncertainty is a broad theoretical referent that deals with the degree to which decision makers clearly understand the mission or goals of
their organizations and the means for achieving them. Operationally, domain uncertainty is reflected in the degree of agreement on the operating goals and priorities of the organization and the perceived clarity in predicting and knowing how to respond to events and activities occurring within and outside the organization that are relevant to the organization’s domain.

Consensus on Operating Goals

Consensus on Operating Goals is a construct which acts as an indicator of the degree to which organizational decision-makers clearly understand the goals of their organization and the degree of agreement on the operating goals and priorities of the organization. This instrument consists of ten goal statements for the community college-based Small Business Development Centers in Oregon. Statements for the SBDCs were developed through the goal collaborative effort that summarized the input of key SBDC personnel, the director of the state-wide SBDC network, the contract provisions resulting from the center’s cooperative agreement with the U.S. Small Business Administration, and legislative guidelines found in HB 3002 which created the OSBDCN system.

Clarity of Operating Strategies

Clarity of Operating Strategies is a construct which focuses on the extent to which management clearly know how to deal with events that
occurred in different domain sectors of their SBDCs during the years 1984 and 1985. In this research effort, the operating strategies selected by the SBDCs were dealt with by examining the following domain sectors: (a) the economic conditions of the local and/or regional area found in the SBDC's service area, (b) the actions taken by the OSBDCN administrative office, (c) the impact of other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within the SBDC's service area, (d) the administrative and institutional actions of community college sponsoring and supporting the SBDC, and (e) the events that occurred within the SBDC. From the data generated by this questionnaire, specific events in an organization's domain can be identified that affected the operation of the SBDC, and what strategies were available to deal with them.

To study the structure and patterns of organizational tasks and functions in the SBDCs, the OAI instrument selected was the Task Difficulty Questionnaire. This instrument is directed toward measuring the analyzability and predictability of work undertaken by an organizational unit. Information provided by this instrument was used to provide data on the Task and Formal organizational components in the TPC model (Appendix D).

**Task Difficulty**

The Task Difficulty questionnaire is a construct defined by two terms, the analyzability and predictability of an organizational unit's work. Task
difficulty directly affects the amount of expertise, discretion, and adjustment required to carry out assigned tasks. The tasks assigned to an organizational unit determine how work activities are organized and structured. When tasks are nonvarying, adjustments can generally be handled through standardized operating procedures and written plans and schedules. When work tasks vary greatly, work adjustments come through spending more time in frequent personal and group discussion which are needed to coordinate and control work activities.

The analyzability of the work undertaken by an organizational unit refers to the ease and clarity of knowing the nature and order of the tasks to be performed. Predictability refers to the ease in determining in advance the sequence of tasks required and their outcome. Questions 1, 4, and 5 in the Task Difficulty questionnaire address the issue of analyzability, and questions 2 and 3 deal with the issue of predictability.

The OAI instrument selected to study intraunit, intraorganizational, and interorganizational relations, was the Direction and Frequency of Information Flows Questionnaire. This instrument is directed toward providing data related to the development of communication processes and social networks in and amongst organizational units, and/or with outside organizations. Information provided by this instrument was used to provide data for the TPC's Organizational Processes, Emergent Networks, and Formal Organizational components (Appendix D).
Direction and Frequency of Information Flows

The Information Flow and Direction questionnaire focuses on the communication interface between personnel within and outside an organization, and the manner in which the communication process occurs. This instrument provides a means of viewing the social systems within an organization. By understanding how an organization goes about structuring its communication network, the dynamic nature of change responses needed by organization units as they relate to their environment, the amount of information, the intensity of the information, and the variability of the information required for its operation are examined.

To study how the SBDCs related to their environments and the amount of time allocated to maintaining external unit relationships, the OAI instrument selected was the Time Spent in Coordination Questionnaire. This instrument is directed towards providing information on the average numbers of hours per day that unit personnel report spending time coordinating work activities with other units, levels, and organizations. Information provided by this instrument was used to provide data on the Formal Organization, Emergent Networks, and Organizational Processes components found in the TPC model (Appendix D).

Time Spent in Coordination

The Time Spent in Coordination questionnaire is an indicator of the time SBDC members invested in maintaining relations with other
organizational units, levels, and with outside organizations. This instrument provides data concerning how the SBDC went about performing task activities, as well as establishing communication and organizational processes. As a construct, the questionnaire provides a means to view the direction of interactions, the amount of time invested to maintain and/or develop relations, and the degree of adaptation required over time to maintain them. All these qualities are manifested in the organizational unit's attempts to deal with the various factors that cause disruptions, stress, and uncertainty within it.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The data collected in the research study were reported within the structure of the Diagnostic Plan proposed in Tichy’s TPC model for managing strategic change in organizations (Appendix D). The data from the findings were organized into four case studies. In each case study, the findings of the research are reported in the following manner:

1. Chronology of Events at the Community Colleges.
   a. Economic Hardships and Institutional Response.
   b. Small Business Programs at the Institution.

2. Diagnostic Data Collected Through Interviews.

3. Task Difficulty.

4. Time Spent in Coordination.


7. Change Graphs.

   a. Consensus on Goals.
b. Clarity of Operating Strategies.

The events and activities under investigation were described at each institution and then were summarized into three primary findings. The three primary findings were analyzed and charted for each institution and on a cumulative basis.

Case Study 1: Triggering the Change Process at Umpqua’s SBDC 1984 to 1985

Chronology of Events

Economic Hardships and Institutional Responses

Since its founding in 1964, Umpqua Community College has played an important role in attempting to meet the educational, vocational, and cultural needs of its service district. The college has been an active citizen in its community, cooperating with industrial, governmental, and other educational agencies. Historically, the college has actively engaged in community leadership activities. From its founding in 1964 to the late 1970s the college experienced a period of rapid growth and reasonably predictable funding from the state level. From 1979, with the advent of a severe national economic recession, to well into the mid 1980s, the college entered into a period of financial hardship combined with decreasing enrollments in college transfer and vocational preparatory program offerings.

The economy of the college’s service district, Douglas County, was and is close to being a "one industry" economy, heavily dependent on
lumber and wood products. The Research and Statistics Section of the State of Oregon’s Employment Division, estimated in 1986 that wood products and paper manufacturing industries accounted for nearly one-half the entire payroll of private firms in Douglas County. Population estimates indicated that between the 1980 Census and July 1983 the official county population fell by over 3.5%, or roughly 3,300 people. Most of the loss is directly attributable to the economic forces that Douglas County experienced.

The severe economic recession being experienced by the region was also accompanied by the state’s inability to provide funding at expected levels to the community colleges. These factors impacted Umpqua’s ability to meet all identified needs and provide all of the services sought by its internal and external constituencies. Programs were terminated or cut back, and all academic departments were required to function with extremely conservative budgets.

Small Business Programs at Umpqua Community College

Since 1975, the college has made available a Farm Business Management program staffed by a full-time faculty position. In 1977, Umpqua Community College began providing a Small Business Management program, offered through the college’s business department. The college’s business department, in terms of student numbers, is its largest department, and reaches the broadest spectrum of the district’s residents, because of the variety of its offerings.
For two years, prior to the inception of the Small Business Development Center (1981 to 1983), the college's President and Board of Directors had discussed the benefits which could be derived with a coordinated Small Business Assistance Center. With the availability of state funds (H.B. 3002) and federal grant monies from the Small Business Administration, the college's commitment to a Small Business Assistance Center brought about the development of such a program, which became staffed and functional in early 1984.

The college's Small Business Management instructor and Accounting instructor were hired in late 1983 as the center's director. During the center's first two years of operation, the director's position was funded as a nine-month position, with office personnel managing the center's operation during the summer months. The center's sole support staff member was thrust into the role of providing on-going services while continuing to manage the production and performance of the college's SBDC efforts, during the summers of 1984 and 1985.

Umpqua's SBDC: Collecting Diagnostic Data Through Interviews

Between September 1987 and April 1988, 13 interviews were conducted. Those participating included the director of Umpqua's SBDC (four interviews); the administrative assistant for the SBDC (three interviews); the college's past president (two interviews); the college's Vice President for Instruction (two interviews); and the college's current
President (two interviews). The duration of the interviews ranged from 45 minutes to one and one-half hours. Questions utilized in the interviewing format were taken from Tichy’s Diagnostic Plan and formed the basis for the diagnostic focus for this portion of the research.

Survival: What Are We a Part of and What Do They Want?

A common and recurring perception expressed in the interviews was the center's struggle for legitimacy within the community, and whether it could survive the internal and external demands placed upon it. The Center's first year was seen as a time of hectic adaptations and frenetic actions filled both with excitement and confusion. Both Umpqua Community College and Douglas County were experiencing a period of considerable turbulence and uncertainty brought about by the massive instability in the region's principal economic element—the lumber industry.

The President for Umpqua Community College during the majority of the first two years of the SBDC's operation, described the center as being a "life jacket" to a community awash in a sea of job layoffs, plant closures, and hard times. The local economic environment was going through a phase of volatile transition and adjustment. The need to diversify the region's economic base through the development of its small businesses was considered an important component in the area's economic strategy. The community and college's economic hardships helped create a regional and
institutional receptivity for a program which would address small business creation and profitability.

The administrative staff interviewed at Umpqua Community College, identified several common problems encountered by the SBDC during its first two years of operation, these being: moving from campus to a downtown location; becoming proficient in dealing with state (OSBDCN) and federal (SBA) bureaucracies; determining the SBDC’s service niche within the already existing small business services being provided, and settling a "turf" dispute with the local SCORE (Service Corps of Retired Executives) chapter.

The relocation problem was addressed shortly after the center's first year of operation by relocating it to a downtown location. Since 1985, the college's SBDC has been located at 744 S.E. Rose Street, a site shared with the Coos, Curry, and Douglas County Business Development Corporation. The corporation, established in 1971, provides an organizational apparatus for developing business loans, facilitating financing for industrial development, providing specialized management consulting, and matching regional vendors to business buyers and sellers. The director of the CCD Business Development Corporation indicated that he initiated contact with the Umpqua's SBDC very early on in its operation. For him, the SBDC represented a valuable addition to Douglas County's ability to provide small businesses with training and assistance, thereby decreasing the number of
small business failures, while increasing the likelihood of survival for those using its services.

The lack of availability of adequate work space at the campus, the need to establish an organizational identity separate from the "academic orientation" associated with the college, and greater accessibility to the local small business community made the transition to the downtown site a highly desirable action to take. Administratively, the program continued to be directed by the business department on campus, but the SBDC director was given considerable autonomy for the center's day-to-day operations. By virtue of being a new and innovative program, the center was not tightly bound by historical and/or institutional allegiances. This situation allowed for the SBDC to market itself as a community-oriented service best served and operated within the environment of the small business community, and not the campus community.

It became apparent to the SBDC director within the first six months of the program's operation that the demands for services outstripped the ability of the on-campus site to provide them adequately. Seminars, training sessions, and counseling services required a working environment far removed from the typical instruction facilities provided by the college to meet the specialized center's needs of the small business constituency. Early on, a decision was made to emphasize the linkage within the business community, and to focus on networking with existing business-related services and agencies.
Little resistance or opposition was encountered by SBDC personnel when dealing with on-campus administrators. Both the college's president and board of directors emphasized and supported the need for the SBDC and were keenly interested in proving that the center was a worthwhile investment of institutional resources. The SBDC director commented that from the beginning of the center's operation he was given great autonomy and had for the most part excellent and direct availability to the human and financial resources needed for the center's operation.

It should be noted that both the center's director and support staff commented on how careful they were regarding the image they projected on campus of their program, for the center operated with a good deal more autonomy and flexibility than most college programs, let alone for a newly created one. Because the center was interdependent upon campus services for many of its efforts, arousing envy and resentment among institutional personnel could be disastrous to its ability to carry out its mission. The program's uniqueness and differences were a two-edged sword—on one side it was not bound by rigid bureaucratic standards and practices, while on the other, it lacked procedural guidelines for determining the appropriateness and timeliness of its actions.

The Umpqua Community College SBDC, like all other OSBDCN governed sites is funded by three separate sources; these being: the college, the State of Oregon—originally through the State Department of Education, and presently the Department of Economic Development, and the federal
government through the Small Business Administration. This situation created a complex and at times confusing multi-tiered system of reporting and program accountability. The SBDC director for the Umpqua program expressed a sense of being overwhelmed during the first nine months of the Center’s operation by the sheer number of forms and reports that needed to be generated and maintained. The need for numbers was something readily apparent. Each funding source had its own reporting mechanisms, reporting cycles, and reporting formats. Sorting out and maintaining reporting schedules and criteria required a considerable investment of time and energy.

**Umpqua’s SBDC: Task Difficulty**

In 1984, the center director indicated in his responses to the Task Difficulty questionnaire that he operated with no clearly known way to do the major types of work normally encountered. During that same period, the center’s support staff member indicated that she operated to a little extent with a clearly known way to do the major types of work normally encountered in her position. The center’s director, in 1985, indicated that he was able to a little extent to operate with a clearly known way to do the major types of work encountered. For the support staff, in 1985, a clearly known way to do the major types of work normally encountered was operating to some extent (Figure 10).
a. Extent to which a clearly known way to do major types of work encountered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBDC Director</th>
<th>SBDC Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = To no extent  
2 = To a little extent  
3 = To some extent  
4 = To a great extent  
5 = To a very great extent

b. Extent to know whether work done correctly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBDC Director</th>
<th>SBDC Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Not at all easy  
2 = Not too easy  
3 = Somewhat easy  
4 = Quite easy  
5 = Very easy

Figure 10  
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c. Sure of outcomes of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40% or less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41 - 60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61 - 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>76 - 90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>91% or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. How often did difficult problems arise with no apparent or immediate solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Once a week or less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 to 4 times a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Once a day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 to 4 times a day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 or more times a day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Time spent solving work problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 1 hour per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 to 4 hours a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>About 1 hour-a-day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>About 2 to 3 hours-a-day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 hours or more a-day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 continued
In 1984, the center's director indicated in his response to the questionnaire that it was not easy at all to know whether the work he was carrying out was being done correctly. During that same time, the support staff indicated that it was somewhat easy to know whether the work they were doing was being done correctly. The responses listed by the center's director in 1985 reflected that it was not easy to know whether the work he was doing was being done correctly. The responses of the support staff for 1985 indicated that it was quite easy to know whether the work being done was carried out correctly (Figure 10).

The center's director indicated in 1984 that between 41 to 60% of the time he was generally sure of the outcome of his work efforts. For the support staff, in 1984, the percentage of time she was generally sure of the outcome of her efforts ranged from 61 to 75% of the time. During 1985, the second year of operation for the SBDC, the Center's director saw the percentage of the time he was generally sure of the outcome of his work efforts rise to 61 to 75% of the time. For the support staff, the percentage of time she was generally sure of the outcome of her efforts remained constant at 61 to 75% of the time in 1985 (Figure 10).

The center's director indicated in 1984 that the frequency of difficult problems arising for which there was no immediate or apparent solutions occurred at a rate of once a week or less. A similar rate of occurrence was reported by the support staff in 1984. For both the center director and
support staff, the frequency of occurrence for such events remained the same in 1985 (Figure 10).

In 1984, the center's director stated that about 1 to 4 hours a week were being spent solving work problems for which there were no apparent or immediate solutions. In 1984, the support staff indicated that less than an hour a week was being spent on solving work problems for which there were no apparent or immediate solutions. The center director reported that in 1985, he was spending less than an hour a week on solving work problems for which there were no apparent or immediate solutions. For 1985, the support staff's involvement in work problems for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions remained the same as 1984, less than one hour per week (Figure 10).

Summary: Task Difficulty

In general, the impression created by Umpqua's SBDC Director and support staff regarding task difficulty reflects a greater level of variability and uncertainty being associated with the work functions of the center's director. As a consequence, the center director was obliged in carrying out the functions of that position to exhibit a high degree of expertise, discretion, and adjustment in the performance of his tasks. In order to bring about creative solutions and problem-solving techniques, the center director engaged in numerous personal relationships. This was done to decrease the
frequency of conflict among individuals who might disagree about the appropriate strategies for Umpqua’s SBDC.

Umpqua’s SBDC: Time Spent in Coordination

The Director and the support staff member of Umpqua’s SBDC were asked six questions regarding how many hours per day they averaged performing the following activities: keeping track of work activities through recordkeeping and reports on organizational performance, talking informally to people, coordinating work activities with other units within their college, coordinating work activities with the OSBDCN office, coordinating work activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN, and providing direct service to current and/or potential clients (Tables 3, 4 & 5).

Summary: Time Spent in Coordination

The mean time spent keeping track of work activities from 1984 to 1985 dropped from an average of 1 hour per day to 37.8 minutes, representing a 37% decrease in time spent carrying out this activity. No change was reflected in the mean scores between 1984 and 1985 as it related to time spent talking informally to people. From 1984 to 1985 the mean time spent coordinating activities with other college units increased an average of 11.4 minutes per day, representing a 30% increase in the amount of time spent carrying out this activity. The mean time spent coordinating activities with the OSBDCN from 1984 to 1985 increased 7.8 minutes,
### Table 3  Time Spent in Coordination: Umpqua’s SBDC Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1984 Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
<td>.13 hrs = 8 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate activities with OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Providing direct services</td>
<td>3.00 hrs = 180 min</td>
<td>5.00 hrs = 300 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.50 hrs = 330 min</td>
<td>7.13 hrs = 428 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4  Time Spent in Coordination: Umpqua’s SBDC Support Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1984 Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities</td>
<td>1.50 hrs = 90 min</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>1.25 hrs = 75 min</td>
<td>1.25 hrs = 75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>1.50 hrs = 90 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate activities with OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Providing direct services</td>
<td>3.00 hrs = 180 min</td>
<td>4.00 hrs = 240 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.25 hrs = 495 min</td>
<td>9.75 hrs = 585 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5  Time Spent in Coordination: Umpqua’s SBDC Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1984 Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities</td>
<td>1.000 hrs = 60.0 min</td>
<td>.625 hrs = 37.8 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>1.125 hrs = 67.8 min</td>
<td>1.125 hrs = 67.8 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>.625 hrs = 37.8 min</td>
<td>.815 hrs = 49.2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate activities with OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.500 hrs = 30.0 min</td>
<td>.625 hrs = 37.8 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
<td>.625 hrs = 37.8 min</td>
<td>.750 hrs = 45.0 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Providing direct services</td>
<td>3.000 hrs = 180 min</td>
<td>4.500 hrs = 270 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.875 hrs = 413 min  8.440 hrs = 507.6 min

representing 26% increase in time spent carrying out this activity. From 1984 to 1985, the mean time spent coordinating activities with organizations outside of the OSBDCN increased an average of 7.2 minutes a day, representing a 16% increase in time spent carrying out this activity. The time spent providing direct services to clients from 1984 to 1985 increased by 90 minutes, representing a 50% increase in time spent carrying out this activity, from 3 hours per day to 4-1/2 hours a day (Figure 11a-11b)).
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Umpqua's SBDC: Direction and Frequency of Information Flows

SBDC Director

Umpqua's SBDC director indicated that during the center's first year of operation (1984) that he received or sent written reports or memos from other people at Umpqua Community College about one to three times a week. In 1985, the frequency of such communication decreased to one to three times per month. For both 1984 and 1985, the SBDC director indicated that he received or sent written reports or memos from people in the OSBDCN office about one to three times per day. The frequency of such communication with people in other organizations remained constant at about one to three times per month for the SBDC during its first year (1984) and second year (1985) of operation (See Figure 12a-12c).

Work-related discussions on a one-to-one basis with individuals in other units of the college remained constant for the center's direction in both 1984 and 1985, at about one to three times per day. The SBDC director indicated that in 1984, one-to-one work-related discussions with individuals in the OSBDCN office took place about one to three times per week. In 1985, the frequency of one-to-one work-related discussions decreased to about one to three times a month for the director when dealing with personnel in the OSBDCN office. During its first year of operation (1984), the director indicated that one-to-one work-related discussions with individuals in other organizations occurred about one to three times per
a. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from people in other units of the college.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

b. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from the OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

c. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from people in other organizations.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

Figure 12  Direction & Frequency of Information  
Umpqua Community College's SBDC
d. Work related discussions (face to face or by telephone) with individuals in other units of college.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

Figure 12 continued
g. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from other units in college.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

h. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

i. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

Figure 12 continued
month. By 1985, the frequency of one-to-one work-related discussions with individuals in other organizations increased to about one to three times per week (Figure 12d-12f).

Umpqua's SBDC director indicated that in 1984 he was involved in work-related problem-solving meeting with two or more people from other units in the college about every two weeks. During 1985, the frequency of such meetings had decreased to about once a month. In 1984, the frequency of work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from the OSBDCN office was listed as occurring about once a month for the director. The director indicated that not once during 1985 did such meetings take place. Work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations or agencies were listed as taking place about once a month in 1984 for the center's director. By 1985, the frequency of such work meetings had increased to about once a week for the director (Figure 12g-12i).

**SBDC Support Staff**

The center's support staff indicated that during the center's first year of operation (1984), she received or sent written reports or memos from people in other units in the college about one to three times a week. In 1985, the frequency of such communication had decreased to about one to three times per month. For both 1984 and 1985, the center's support staff indicated that she received or sent written reports or memos from people in
the OSBDCN office about one to three times per month. The frequency of written reports or memos received or sent to people in other organizations or agencies remained constant at about one to three times per month in 1984 and 1985 for the center’s support staff (Figure 12a-12c).

Work-related discussions on a one-to-one basis with individuals in other units of the college remained constant at about one to three times per day for the center’s support staff in 1984 and 1985. The center’s support staff listed work-related discussions conducted on a one-to-one basis with individuals in the OSBDCN office as remaining constant in 1984 and 1985 at about one to three times per month. During both 1984 and 1985 work-related face-to-face discussions with individuals in other organizations was listed as taking place about one to three times per month by the center’s support staff member (Figure 12d-12f).

The center’s support staff member listed work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other units in the college as taking place in 1984 and 1985 at about once a month. Not once during either 1984 or 1985 did a work-related problem-solving meeting with two or more people from the OSBDCN take place for the center’s support staff. Work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations or agencies were listed as not having taken place in 1984 and 1985 for the support staff (Figure 12g-12i).
In its first quarterly report (March through May 1984), Umpqua’s SBDC noted that among the initial problems it encountered were the issues of territoriality concerning the programs and services being offered by the center and those being provided by other agencies and organizations, the time-consuming nature of filling out the reports, and the questioning of the need for certain reporting forms. These problems were not mentioned again in any subsequent quarterly reports for 1984. First quarter accomplishments centered on getting the center fully staffed and functional, obtaining technical resources (a microcomputer) and making contact with various community groups.

The next set of problems detailed were in the September through December 1984 report, which mentioned that the center’s initial attempts to move to an in-town location was met by a negative response margin of 2:1 from its advisory board. During the September to December quarter of 1984, the significant accomplishments noted in the narrative section included the preparation of a proposal for an in-town location for the SBDC, the compiling of a mailing list of over 1600 businesses and individuals in the college’s service district, co-sponsoring workshops with various non-profit
agencies and professional associations, and working with various organizations and agencies on economic development projects.

The center's first quarter in 1985 (March through May) saw the SBDC's director describing and identifying the following significant accomplishments: the development of a slide presentation shown initially to the college's budget committee; prepared mass mailing materials sent throughout Douglas County describing classes being offered by the SBDC in cooperation with the S.B.A.; the hiring of a part-time instructor for SBDC programs to meet the demand for the instructional services; and the recognition by the college's administration that the SBDC had outgrown its on-campus site.

During the second quarter of 1985 (June through August), the center purchased a hard-disc drive IBM PC XT to speed up operations and functions. The SBDC entered into a working relationship with two important local economic and business development organizations: the Douglas County area Chamber of Commerce, and the Coos-Curry-Douglas (CCD) Business Development Corporation. The SBDC director also expressed an opinion that, "Our center has been accepted by the county."
The second quarter in 1985 also saw a recommendation by the SBDC's Advisory Committee to move the center from its on-campus location to a location in downtown Roseburg. The center subsequently leased a site providing more space for its operations and its counseling and training services. A $4,000 grant from the City of Roseburg's Economic
Development program was applied for and received by Umpqua’s SBDC to upgrade equipment and materials.

The final quarter in 1985 saw the SBDC’s involvement in the Douglas County Entrepreneurship Conference, the center’s ability to meet all its operational goals, and the first quarter of full operation in its downtown location.

Umpqua’s SBDC: Final Report Summary—
July 1, 1983 - June 30, 1985

Umpqua Community College’s SBDC officially began its operations in January 1984. The center began to account for and report on its efforts from March 1, 1984. From March 1, 1984, to March 1, 1985, workshops and conferences were presented to 343 business people, 132 businesses were counseled on a long-term or short-term basis, and microcomputer training and assistance were provided to 22 businesses. By mid-1985, Umpqua’s SBDC had positioned itself as a state-of-the-art microcomputer assistance center for the businesses in its service district, having provided 140 hours of direct one-to-one microcomputer training and assistance.

A major change took place in the staffing requirement for the SBDC during its first two years of operation; the Small Business Management instructors’ position went from a part-time to full-time position; the hiring of an additional part-time instructor also occurred. The director’s position became a 12-month position, no longer requiring the center’s staff assistant
to operate it during the summer months, and the hiring of a part-time workshop development specialist also took place at Umpqua's SBDC.

Umpqua's SBDC: Change Graphs

Four informants at Umpqua Community College were asked to identify the type of events that triggered organizational change within their SBDC. After identifying the triggering events, they were asked to graphically represent on a horizontal axis the duration of the triggering event, and on a vertical axis the degree of organizational stress and uncertainty it generated within their SBDC.

This projective instrument provided a means to view the perceptual orientations held regarding organizational change by individuals at various levels with the community college as well as in the SBDC. The change graphs also provided data on the degree of variability concerning the change events identified by organizational personnel, the manner in which organizational members processed information regarding organizational change in their SBDC's, and the extent of their awareness regarding the nature and scope of the changes taking place in the SBDC.

Change Graphs for Umpqua Community College: Selected Administrative Personnel

The data generated by Umpqua Community College's president and vice president yielded a total of 3 different categories of events triggering change. The president and vice president shared the perception that
changes had been triggered in the college’s SBDC by environmental factors, and by cultural core system changes. They differed in that the president perceived technical core system changes having triggered change, while the college’s vice president indicated political core system changes were involved in triggering change within the SBDC.

Environmental Triggering Events

Umpqua’s President’s Change Graph depicted environmental triggering events as creating a very high level of organizational uncertainty for the SBDC. This condition continued until June 1984. From that point on, the level of organizational uncertainty was seen as experiencing a slow and steady decline, ending in December 1985, at a level depicted as having little organizational uncertainty. Organizational stress, like organizational uncertainty, started in January 1984 at a very high level. This situation continued until approximately September 1984. After September 1984, the organizational stress level associated with technical events triggering change in the college’s SBDC are depicted as experiencing a steady decline, ending in December 1985 at a level associated with little organizational stress being present (Figure 13).

The college’s Vice President’s Change Graph indicated that environmental events triggering change in the SBDC at Umpqua C.C. began at a moderate level of uncertainty in January 1984, and by March of 1984, it had reached its apex at a moderately high level. Thereafter, organizational
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Triggering Events: Environmental Changes
uncertainty declined at a steady rate so that by June 1985, it was listed as no longer in existence within the SBDC, by the vice president of the college.

Organizational stress triggered by environmental change was seen as being at a level with little stress being present in January 1984. From that point, it moved to a level of slight stress by April of 1984. After April 1984, the level of organizational stress decreased steadily, so that by December 1984, it was seen as no longer occurring in the SBDC (Figure 14).

Cultural Core System Change

Cultural core system triggering events were shown by the president as creating a moderate level of uncertainty beginning in January 1984, and remaining at that level until July 1984. From July 1984 until November 1985, when it was seen as operating at a level of little uncertainty, these triggering events experienced a slow, but steady, decline. Like organizational uncertainty, organizational stress started out in January 1984 at a moderate level, but moved steadily upward to reach its apex at a high level of stress by September 1984. From September 1984 until December 1985, organizational stress associated with political and cultural triggering change events was shown as experiencing a slow and steady decline, ending at a level where little organizational stress was considered present (Figure 15).

The vice president of the college indicated that two sets of cultural events triggering change occurred within the SBDC between January 1984
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and December 1985. The first set occurred in January 1984, with a slight level of organizational uncertainty being present. It moved upward, so that by April 1984, it was shown as operating at a moderate level of uncertainty. Shortly after that, it began to move downward so that by June 1984, it was seen as no longer being present by the college’s vice president. The organizational stress present in January 1984 was depicted as being present at a low level. From that point it was shown as moving slightly upward, reaching its apex in February 1984, then quickly dropping down to a level where no organizational stress was indicated as being present by April 1984. (Figure 16).

The second occurrence of change triggered by cultural or related events was shown as beginning in October 1984 at a low level of organizational uncertainty, but quickly moving upward, reaching its apex in April 1985, operating at a high level of uncertainty. From that point, organizational uncertainty was shown as moving downward at a rapid pace, ending in mid-September 1985 at a level where no organizational uncertainty was shown as being present in Umpqua’s SBDC by the college’s vice president. The organizational stress generated by the second set of cultural-related triggering events at Umpqua’s SBDC was seen as appearing in mid-January 1985 at a slight level of uncertainty. The level of organizational stress was seen by the vice president as rising quickly, reaching its apex in April 1985 at a moderate level of stress. From there it quickly dropped, being shown as descending to a level associated with little
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organizational stress being present by July 1985. No organizational stress generated by cultural changes is indicated as being present in Umpqua’s SBDC after July 1985 by the college’s vice president (Figure 16).

Technical Core System Change

The college’s president depicted technical events triggering change in the SBDC as creating a moderate level of organizational uncertainty beginning in January 1984 and continuing at that level until September 1984. From September 1984 to April 1985, the organizational uncertainty associated with technical change was shown as moving rapidly downward, ending at a point in April 1985 where it was perceived as no longer existing by the college’s president. The level of organizational stress created by technical change events was shown in the president’s graph in January 1984 as operating at a high level. Quickly thereafter, it moved to a level skirting a very high amount of uncertainty, reaching its apex in June 1984, and sustaining itself at that level until September 1984. After September 1984, the level of organizational stress associated with technical change triggering events was shown as rapidly decreased in intensity, so that by March 1985 it was seen as being present at a level with little organizational stress. After April 1985, it is no longer shown being present by the college’s president (Figure 17).
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Administrative Comments: Triggering Events

Both the president and vice president were asked, following the drawing of their change graphs, to discuss and/or comment on the events that they categorized as having triggered change in Umpqua's SBDC. Operational definitions of the four previously mentioned triggering events (as well as illustrative quotations associated with them) are presented below.

Environmental Changes

Those changes triggered by uncertainty regarding the availability of critical resources, linkage with critical constituencies, and/or the ability to control desired organizational outcomes in the environment.

"College needed to make recommitment to help people in the community. The economy in the region was in significant turbulence, its impact on the community was great. Ideal time to start a SBDC - gut-wrenching economic recession going on."

Cultural Core System Changes

Those changes triggered by shifts in the organization's shared values, what beliefs to commit to, and/or those objectives worth striving for organizationally.

"As the SBDC continued to operate it was seen more as a community-based service versus a campus directed service."
"A recognition arose that the SBDC director required considerable discretion in carrying out duties. Director’s position is one with high visibility, involvement with a considerable number of public relations activities, and deals with politically sensitive issues. The college’s board of directors and upper level management incorporated several empowerment strategies to help the SBDC director deal with these issues."

Technical Core System Changes

Those changes triggered by shifts in the data and behavioral requirements of the organization as it attempts to utilize its social and technical resources to produce desired output.

"By its second year of operation, the SBDC needed to upgrade its own computer systems as well as those used in training in order to address its own information processing needs and respond to the growing number of small business operators seeking the center’s computer training services."

Change Graphs for Umpqua Community College: SBDC Staff

The data generated by Umpqua’s SBDC Director and Support Staff yielded a total of four different categories of events triggering change. The SBDC Director and Support Staff shared the perception that changes had been triggered in the college’s SBDC by political core system changes, and
that changes had been triggered by shifts in agreement over the goals of the SBDC. They differed in that the SBDC Director saw environmental triggering events taking place, while the support staff member saw change in the SBDC also being triggered by changes in personnel.

Political Core System Change

Political change was depicted by Umpqua’s SBDC Director as beginning with a very high degree of organizational uncertainty in January 1984, and then steadily going down, so that by December 1985, it was shown as being at a level of very little uncertainty. The director indicated that in January of 1984, there was a slight level of organizational stress. By November of 1984, the organizational stress level had risen to a moderate level. Between November 1984 and March 1985, the organizational stress level was shown as dropping off very rapidly, so that it ended the 1985 year at a level where no organizational stress was perceived by the SBDC director (Figure 18).

The center’s support staff member indicated that the center experienced a short, but intense, politically-generated triggering event between March 1985 and July 1985. Organizational uncertainty in March 1985 was depicted as being present at a slight level. By June 1985, it had shot up to a moderately high level of uncertainty. Almost as quickly, it dropped down again, so that by July 1985, it was shown as being at a level of little uncertainty being present. After July 1985, the staff member
Figure 18: Organizational Uncertainty Level and Organizational Stress Level over time for UCC SBDC Staff.

Triggering Events: Political Core System
indicated that organizational uncertainty was no longer present. The
duration of the organizational stress created by the political triggering event
was identical to that of organizational uncertainty. Whereas organizational
uncertainty was shown as reaching a moderately high level, organizational
stress was depicted as reaching a very high level by June 1985. Just as with
organizational uncertainty, organizational stress quickly descended to a level
where little stress was being seen by July 1985, and none by the end of 1985,
by the center's support staff (Figure 19).

Goal Change and Environmental Change

Umpqua's SBDC director depicted goal change and environmental
change triggering events as occurring at the same time and with similar
intensity and duration. They began at a level with little uncertainty being
present in the organization in January 1984, and continued at that level until
May 1985. From May 1985 to August 1985, organizational uncertainty
moved up to a level where a slight degree of uncertainty was seen as
occurring. Shortly thereafter, it was depicted by the center's director as
dropping down to a level where there was little or no organizational
uncertainty taking place. Organizational stress virtually mirrored the
intensity, duration, responses exhibited by organizational uncertainty
throughout the two-year period charted by the center's director (Figure 20.
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Figure 20
Goal Change and Personnel Change Triggering Events

The center's support staff member depicted goal change and personnel change triggering events as occurring at the same time and with similar intensity and duration. The first appearance of these triggering events was shown as taking place in July 1984, where they were shown as creating organizational uncertainty at a slight level. Organizational uncertainty reached its apex by January 1985, where it was shown as operating at a moderate level of uncertainty. Organizational stress, like uncertainty, is shown as first taking place in July 1984, but moving more quickly and reaching a high level of stress by August, and quickly thereafter dropping to a level where there is little stress occurring by December of 1984.

The second occurrence of these triggering events began in June 1985, and lasted until September 1985. Organizational uncertainty in June 1985 was shown as being present at a slight level, then moving to a level slightly below the moderate level by August 1985, then quickly dropping down to a slight level by September 1985. After September 1985, there is no indication of organizational uncertainty occurring. Organizational stress, like uncertainty, is shown as taking place again in June 1985 at a level where there was a slight level of stress occurring. By August 1985, organizational stress was shown as being present at a high level, then quickly dropping off to a slight level by September 1985. After September 1985, there is no indication of organizational stress occurring in the SBDC as perceived by the center's support staff member (Figure 21).
Organizational Uncertainty Level

Very High 5
High 4
Moderate 3
Slight 2
Little 1
None 0

Uncertainty
Stress

UCC SBDC Staff

Figure 21

Triggering Events: Personnel Changes & Goal Changes
SBDC Staff Comments: Triggering Events

Both the SBDC's director and office support staff member were asked, following the drawing of their change graphs, to discuss and/or comment on the events that they categorized as triggering change in Umpqua's SBDC. Operational definitions of the four previously mentioned triggering events (as well as illustrative quotations associated with them) are presented below.

Environmental Changes

Environmental change events are triggered by uncertainty regarding the availability of critical resources, linkage with critical constituencies, and/or the ability to control desired organizational outcomes in the environment.

"Beginning the SBDC on campus hurt us. In the beginning many people didn't know what we were about. Moving to the downtown location helped a lot."

"The recessionary environment caused a good deal of uncertainty in the community, but created a need for assistance."

Political Core System Changes

Political core system change events are triggered by shifts in the ability to allocate and use power and resources in the organization in the pursuit of goals, the manner in which work is done, and determining who will benefit from the actions taken.
"The college had problems with former president, regarding procedures he wanted to use and the manner in which financial affairs were handled on campus."

"When the new president came on board, we no longer reported to the Business Department, but directly to the president's office."

Changes in Personnel

Changes in personnel events are triggered by actions which bring about different organizational configurations (social networks, people, and processes). These changes include the characteristics of the members of the organization (educational background, motivational patterns, and managerial style).

"The SBDC director allowed me to experience a good deal of professional and personal growth. I have been reclassified five levels above where I started."

"During the first two years of our operation, the director's position was for only the academic year. I ran the center during the summer."

The director's position became a 12-month position late in 1985.

Changes in Goals

Changes in goals events are triggered by shifts in agreement among organizational members over the goals of the organization.
"After our first year of operation, one of our goals was to become state-of-the-art when it came to using computer technology in our office, and in training small businesses to use computers."

"Proving that the investment in the SBDC was worthwhile was a very important goal for the center during its first year of operation."

Umpqua’s SBDC: Domain Uncertainty

Umpqua’s SBDC Staff: Consensus on Goals

The center’s staff selected promoting the small business community’s awareness of the SBDC as the most important goal for it during its first year of operation (1984). Coordinating activities and services with other agencies and organizations became the most important goal for the center staff in 1985. It did not appear among the four top goals for 1985 by the staff. For 1984, assisting SB’s abilities to generate profits represented the second most important organizational goal for center staff. In 1985, it was listed as the fourth most important goal by the center support staff. Providing short-term guidance and assistance to SB’s was listed as third in importance by the center’s support staff in 1984. It did not appear among the top four goals in 1985 selected by the support staff. Coordinating services with other agencies and organizations represented the fourth most important goal for the center staff in 1985 (Figure 22).

Promoting the SB community’s awareness of the SBDC represented the most important goal for Umpqua’s SBDC director in 1984. It did not appear
1984

**SBDC Staff:**

**SBDC DIRECTOR**
1. Promote awareness of SBDC
2. Assist SB's served to increase profits
3. Provide short-term services
4. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations

**SBM INSTRUCTOR**
1. Promote awareness of SBDC
2. Provide short-term services
3. Pursue and gain off-campus location
4. Select and train SBDC staff

**Umpqua Administration:**

**PRESIDENT**
1. Promote awareness of SBDC
2. Reduce failure rate of SB's
3. Advise on feasibility of intended venture
4. Provide short-term services

**Vice President**
1. Advise on feasibility of intended venture
2. Select and train SBDC staff
3. Reduce failure rate of SB's
4. Improve and raise profitability of SB's in community

1985

**SBDC Staff:**

**SBDC DIRECTOR**
1. Assist SB's served to increase profits
2. Pursue and gain off-campus location
3. Develop awareness of SBDC in community
4. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations

**SBM INSTRUCTOR**
1. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations
2. Provide long-term counseling
3. Reduce failure rate of SB's
4. Assist SB's abilities to generate profits

**Umpqua Administration:**

**PRESIDENT**
1. Reduce failure rate of SB's
2. Select and train SBDC staff
3. Provide long-term services
4. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures

**Vice President**
1. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
2. Reduce failure rate of SB's
3. Select and train SBDC staff
4. Increase ability of SB's to increase profitability

Figure 22

Goal Consensus

SBDC - Umpqua Community College
among the top four choices selected by the director in 1985. In 1985, the center’s director selected as the most important goal for the SBDC assisting SB’s in their ability to generate profits. Providing short-term guidance and assistance to SB’s was listed in 1984 as being the second most important goal for the SBDC to pursue. Providing the means to gain an off-campus site for the SBDC was listed as the second most important goal for the center in 1985.

Pursuing and gaining an off-campus site for the SBDC was listed as the third most important goal for the center by the director in 1984. In 1985, developing and promoting the SB community’s awareness of the SBDC was listed as the third most important goal for the center. For 1984, selecting and training center staff represented for the director the fourth most important goal for the SBDC. Coordinating services with other agencies and organizations assisting SB’s in the area, became in 1985 the fourth most important goal for the SBDC, as seen by the center’s director (Figure 22).

UCC's SBDC Staff: Goal Agreement for the SBDC

The only common point of agreement in ranking organizational goals for the director and support staff in 1984 and 1985 was the selection in 1984 of promoting the SBDC to the SB community. It was listed by both parties as the most important organizational goal for the center in 1984.

In 1984, providing short-term guidance and assistance to SB’s was seen as being the second most important goal for the center’s director, while for
the support staff, it represented the third most important goal in 1984. All
the other organizational goals selected in 1984 by the director and support
staff differed not only in ranking, but also in what was selected.

In 1985, the center’s director selected assisting SB’s in their profitability
as being the most important goal for the SBDC, while the center’s support
staff saw it as being fourth, in importance. The center’s support staff saw in
1985 coordinating SBDC services with other agencies and organizations
servicing the SB’s as being the most important goal for the center, while the
center’s director saw it as being fourth in importance for the college’s SBDC.

**Umpqua’s Administrative Staff: Consensus on Goals**

The college’s president saw advising potential small business owners
about the feasibility of their intended ventures represented the most
important goal for the SBDC in 1984. It remained as the top goal for the
SBDC in 1985 for the college’s president. Selecting and having center staff
members was seen by UCC’s president as the second most important goal
for the SBDC in 1984. It did not appear among the top four choices selected
by the president in 1985. Reducing the failure rate of small businesses in
the community was listed as being third in importance among the goals of
the SBDC in 1984 by the college’s president. In 1985, its ranking was seen
as the second most important goal for the SBDC by the president. In 1984,
improving the ability to generate profits in the small business being served
was listed as the fourth most important goal for the SBDC by the college's president.

In 1985, the college's president saw the goal of advising potential small business owners of the feasibility of their ventures remained as the most important goal for Umpqua's SBDC. Reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community was ranked second in importance for the SBDC in 1985 by the president. Selecting and training the staff of the SBDC was seen as being third in importance for the SBDC in 1985 by the president. In 1985, the college's president selected increasing the profitability of the small businesses being served by the SBDC as fourth in importance (Figure 22).

The college's vice president selected promoting an awareness of the SBDC to the SB community as being the most important goal for the center in 1984. It did not appear among the top four choices selected by the college's vice president in 1985. For 1984, reducing the failure rate of SB's in the community ranked as the second most important organizational goal for the SBDC. In 1985, it was selected as the most important goal for the SBDC at Umpqua. Advising potential SB owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures was listed by the vice president in 1984 as being the third most important organizational goal. Advising potential SB owners about their venture's feasibility dropped to fourth place in goal importance to the vice president in 1985. Providing short-term guidance and assistance
to SB owners ranked fourth in importance to the vice president in 1984, and was not listed among the top four goals for the SBDC in 1985.

Reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community was listed as the top goal for Umpqua’s SBDC in 1985 by the college’s vice president. Selecting and training SBDC staff became the second most important goal for the vice president in 1985. The third most important goal selected by the vice president in 1985 for the SBDC was providing long-term guidance and assistance to the SBs. The vice president ranked advising potential SB owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures as being fourth in importance to the SBDC in 1985 (Figure 22).

UCC Administrative Staff: Goal Agreement for SBDC

Neither the college’s president nor vice president in 1984 or 1985 shared a common ranking for their top four organizational goals for the SBDC. The reduction of the failure rate of small businesses in the community was seen being second in importance to the SBDC in 1984 by the vice president of the college, while it was listed as being third in importance by the college’s president. Advising potential small business owners about the feasibility of their ventures was seen as being the most important organizational goal for the SBDC in 1984 by the college’s president, whereas the vice president ranked it as being third in importance in 1984.
The college's vice president shifted the issue of reducing the failure rate of small business to being the most important goal of SBDC in 1985. For the college's president, it occupied a ranking as the second most important goal to the SBDC in 1985. Selecting and training SBDC staff ranked as being the second most important goal to the SBDC in 1985 by the vice president, while the college's president selected it as being third in importance in 1985.

The two administration respondents had a reversal on the top and bottom of their four most important goals for the SBDC in 1985, with the college's president seeing the advising of potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended venture as being the most important goal, while the vice president of the college viewed it as being fourth in importance.

**Umpqua's SBDC: Clarity of Operating Strategies**

Economic Conditions

For Umpqua's SBDC in 1984 there was a 75% agreement that events in the economic conditions of the local and/or regional economy had affected the operation of the SBDC. In 1985, the level of agreement had dropped to a level of 50% agreement on whether economic events had affected the operation of Umpqua's SBDC. Those agreeing with the occurrence of economic change events in 1984 affecting the SBDC varied in their opinions about the strategies from having a strategy but not knowing if it would
work, to having a clear strategy for dealing with this kind of event. In 1985, those agreeing with the occurrence of economic events affecting the SBDC's operation, the clarity of agreement about the development of strategies to deal with them varied from having a strategy but not knowing if it would work, to having a clear strategy to deal with economic change events (Figure 23a).

OSBDCN Events

In 1984, there was a 50% agreement that events in the OSBDCN administration office in Eugene, Oregon, had affected the operation of Umpqua's SBDC. The agreement rate rose to 75% in 1985 regarding events in the OSBDCN office affecting the operation of Umpqua's SBDC. Those agreeing with the occurrence of the OSBDCN office having brought about major changes in the SBDC, described having a clear strategy for dealing with this kind of event. In 1985, those agreeing with the occurrence of the OSBDCN office generating change events described the strategy as ranging from having a tentative strategy developed, to having a clear strategy to deal with this kind of event (Figure 23b).

Other Small Business Programs

There was a 50% agreement rate in 1984 regarding events in other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within the SBDC's service area having affected the operation of Umpqua's SBDC.
a. Event(s) in the economic conditions of the local and/or regional economy of your SBDC’s service area that affect the operation of your SBDC.

- 50% STAFF - event occurred
- 0% ADMIN - event occurred

- 0% STAFF - event occurred
- 0% ADMIN - event occurred

25% acknowledgment that event occurred

1984

0% acknowledgment that event occurred

1985

Comments of events, 1984...
- layoffs (1982) - Champion plant in Salem

Comments of events, 1985...
- N/A

Perception of available strategies: (N=1)

1 Had no idea how to deal with this
2 A tentative strategy developed but still remained unclear
3 Had a strategy but didn’t know if it would work
4 Had a clear strategy for dealing with this kind of event
5 Had a very clear tried and tested strategy to deal with this kind of event

Perception of available strategies: (N=0)

Figure 23
Clarity of Operating Strategies:
Umpqua Community College's SBDC
b. Events in the OSBDCN administrative office in Eugene that affect the operation of the SBDC.

100% STAFF - event occurred
0% ADMIN - event occurred

50% acknowledgment that event occurred 1984

Comments of events, 1984...
- availability of grants
- SBA rules changing
- OSBDCN office required to implement new regulations

50% acknowledgment that event occurred 1985

Comments of events, 1985...
- SBA procedures caused some adjustments in operation

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

Figure 23 continued
c. Events in other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within your SBDC’s service area that affect the operation of your SBDC.

0% STAFF - event occurred
50% ADMIN - event occurred

25% acknowledgment that event occurred

1984

50% acknowledgment that event occurred

1985

Comments of events, 1984...
- SEDCOR perceived to be ineffective

Comments of events, 1985...
- change in SEDCOR
- C.C.C./SBDC actively involved with its efforts

Perception of available strategies: (N=1)

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

Figure 23 continued
d. Events that happened within the community college sponsoring and supporting your SBDC that affect the operation of the SBDC.

- 0% STAFF - event occurred
- 100% ADMIN - event occurred

50% acknowledgment that event occurred

1984

0% acknowledgment that event occurred

1985

Comments of events, 1984...
- C.C. organizational structure change - new VP and new dean
- change in dean level administration

Comments of events, 1985...
- N/A

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

Perception of available strategies: (N=0)
e. Events that happened within your own SBDC that affect the operation or your SBDC.

100% STAFF - event occurred
50% ADMIN - event occurred

75% acknowledgment that event occurred
1984

Comments of events, 1984...
- change in T.E.D. Center Administration
- SBDC director on sabbatical/SBM counselor took over administration
- brought together three programs to make up the T.E.D. Center

Perception of available strategies: (N=3)

50% STAFF - event occurred
0% ADMIN - event occurred

25% acknowledgment that event occurred
1985

Comments of events, 1985...
- new director, a real entrepreneur

Perception of available strategies: (N=1)

Figure 23 continued
In 1985, there was a 75% agreement rate that no events had been generated by other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within the SBDC's service area. For those agreeing with the occurrence of change events being brought about in the SBDC by other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs in 1984, the type of strategy in place to deal with such an event ranged from having a tentative strategy developed to having a strategy but not knowing if it would work. In 1985, the strategy in place to deal with such change events was described as being a clear strategy for dealing with it, by the only respondent who perceived such a change event as having taken place (Figure 23c).

Institutional Events at Umpqua Community College

In 1984, there was a 75% agreement rate regarding the recognition that no events within the Umpqua Community College affected the operation of its SBDC. For 1985, the level of agreement regarding such events occurring was 50%. The respondent who saw institutional events affecting the operation of the SBDC in 1984 indicated that there was a strategy to deal with such an event, but it was not known if it would work. Those respondents who agreed with the occurrence of events at Umpqua affecting the operations of the SBDC in 1985 described the strategy in place as ranging from being clear to being a very clear, tried and tested strategy for dealing with this type of event (Figure 23d).
Events Within the SBDC

There was a 75% agreement rate in 1984 regarding the recognition that events within the SBDC had affected its operation. In 1985, there was a 25% agreement rate that events within the SBDC had affected its operation. For those agreeing with the occurrence of such an event in 1984, a clear strategy was perceived to deal with it. In 1985, the strategy in place dealing with such an event was perceived as being developed but it was not known if it would work (Figure 23e).

Case Study 2: Triggering the Change Process at Linn-Benton’s SBDC 1984 to 1985

Chronology of Events

Economic Hardships and Institutional Responses

Linn-Benton Community College district covers 2,989 square miles in Oregon’s Willamette Valley area. It includes Linn and Benton Counties. More than 152,000 people live in the district’s service area. The two principal cities in the district are Corvallis (40,870 in 1986) in Benton County, and Albany (27,950 in 1986) in Linn County (Portland State University, 1989).

From 1980 to 1983, Linn-Benton Community College was significantly impacted by the state and national pattern of deep recession. However, the
two counties served by the college, by the nature of their respective economic structures, responded to the recession very differently.

The stable and diversified economic base found in Benton County gave it unemployment rates consistently among the lowest in the state of Oregon. The stability lent to Benton County by the presence of Oregon State University, high tech electronic manufacturing, and service industries enabled the county to come through the 1980 to 1983 recession in very good economic shape. The economy of Linn County, being tied more closely with Oregon’s, in that it relied on lumber and wood products-based industries, underwent a severe and prolonged economic downturn.

For Benton County, the annual average unemployment rate between 1980 to 1983, was listed at 6.45%. Over that same period, the unemployment rate for Linn County was listed at 12.95% (State of Oregon Employment Division, 1987). These figures indicate that the recession hit much harder in Linn County than in Benton County. At its peak in 1982, the recession contributed to a situation where more than one of every six workers in Linn County were looking for work. In 1986, three years into the national economic recovery, Linn County’s labor force was listed at 28,340, nearly 3,700 below the 1979 level of 31,030, indicating that Linn County’s overall economy was still showing scant evidence of recovery (Portland State University, 1989).
Small Business Programs at Linn-Benton Community College

Throughout much of its history, Linn-Benton Community College has offered programs designed to meet the unique needs of the citizens of Linn and Benton Counties. The college provided a variety of short-term training programs in cooperation with Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA), professional groups, civic organizations, businesses, and industry. The college's economic development efforts prior to 1983 were provided principally through three programs: the Farm Management Program, the Occupational Skills Training Program, and the Small Business Management Training Program. The delivery of these programs was provided by either the college's business division or by the community education division. By 1983, these programs had been significantly reduced through budgetary restraints, the departure of key faculty and staff, and the difficulty encountered in coordinating efforts among institutional departments and/or personnel.

Throughout 1982, and extending into early 1983, the college's president, the vice-president of instruction, and the director of community education began efforts to re-evaluate the role of the college in meeting the economic needs of Linn and Benton Counties. A number of on-campus discussions took place to deal with the redirection of resources, programs, structures and curricula to respond to this newly formed and emerging organizational priority. The Community Education Director, in March 1983, presented an outline for a proposal to create, within the college's
Community Education Division, a center for the college's economic development efforts. The general parameters of this proposal were:

1. To utilize as much as possible existing staff in creating the center.
2. To minimize the impact that the center would have on the college's general budget.
3. To create a flexible organization with the capability to quickly implement short-term training programs.
4. To create a center with a strong focus on assistance to small businesses.
5. To create a center with the means to coordinate economic development efforts with other college departments.

This proposal served as a conceptual tool and as a stimulus for discussions which would lead to the implementation of the eventual organizational structure to be utilized.

By September 1983, the college had created the Training and Economic Development Center (TED) to meet the economic development needs of existing businesses and industry in the college's service district. The TED center was visualized as an "umbrella" organization which would pull together a variety of programs and components within the college in order to better serve the needs of the business and industrial entities in the district. The center would include the College Work Experience (CWE) placement program, the in-house training efforts for the college, the farm management program, the short-term training programs offered by the
college, and the SBDC. The SBDC at LBCC was seen as a component of the TED center. It was designed to provide comprehensive management training and technical assistance to small businesses. The primary goal of LBCC's SBDC was to make a significant economic impact in the community by helping small businesses survive, and in the long-term, help them to grow and create jobs. By the latter half of 1983, the college was able to acquire funding from the state of Oregon, and the Small Business Administration (SBA), which, along with its own commitment of financial and human resources, allowed it to establish its SBDC. In September 1983, Linn-Benton Community College’s SBDC began providing services and resources to the small businesses in Linn and Benton Counties.

Linn-Benton’s SBDC: Collecting Diagnostic Data Through Interviews

Between November 6, 1987 and April 20, 1988, 19 interviews were conducted. Those participating included the college’s president (two interviews), the vice-president for instruction (one interview), the former director of Community Education Division (two interviews), the former business department chair (one interview), the SBM instructor (three interviews), the assistant to the TED Center (one interview), the short-term training coordinator (one interview), the director of the TED Center and the first SBDC director (five interviews), the college’s second SBDC director (two interviews), and the business department chair in 1988 (one interview). The duration of the interviews ranged from 45 minutes to two hours in
length. Questions utilized in the interviewing format were taken from Tichy’s Diagnostic Plan and formed the basis for the diagnostic focus of this portion of the research (Appendix D).

Survival: Who’s Calling the Shots?

The establishment of the TED Center and the SBDC represented a philosophical and programmatic departure for Linn-Benton Community College (LBCC). The college’s willingness to develop an organization which could bring together a variety of college resources and expertise to address the economic realities of its district came into being with the growing realization that new approaches were required to deal with a turbulent and unstable external environment. The college’s internal environment was beset with a declining enrollment base and a growing need to look at alternate methods of enrollment maintenance and growth.

To a large extent, the college was seen as being not in touch with the needs of a significant constituency in the district—the business community. A growing number of the work force in the region were being displaced without the means to be retrained or to be upgraded in their skills. The college was finding itself increasingly having to deal with unstable monetary resources, and budgetary constraints.

To be successful in its economic development efforts required that LBCC reevaluate and re-examine the type of organization it wanted to be, and the parameters under which it operated. This effort was spearheaded
by the college’s president and vice-president for instruction. The ability of
the college to respond in a timely fashion to the development and operation
of its SBDC and TED Center can in part be traced to the strong and
consistent support they provided.

During the initial months of its operation, the SBDC was seen as an
extension of the business department rather than as an integrated unit
within TED Center’s economic development programs. This orientation
clashed with ideas and approaches of the TED Center director who felt that
being a part of the Community Education Division would provide the SBDC
with an organizational structure and process more likely and willing to
change than that found in the business department. Community education
had historically been the most innovative arm of the college. It had the
historical and experiential background to deal with the formation and
operation of new programs and understand how to respond to community-
based needs. After several months of efforts aimed at separating the SBDC
from the business department, the SBDC achieved an organizational
restructuring which brought the SBDC under the control of the Community
Education Department.

The TED Center and the SBDC acted as a conduit to the community,
and allowed the college to determine whether its existing programs and
services were effective. These efforts represented a statement to the
community of what the college valued and what it could be to the
community. Probably more so than in any other SBDC in this research
effort, the SBDC and TED center represented the expression of the college's upper level of management's philosophical and operational definition of what a community college could and needed to be for its community.

Linn-Benton's SBDC: Task Difficulty

Linn-Benton's SBDC director indicated that in 1984, she was able to operate to a "little extent" with a clearly known way to do the major types of work normally encountered. The center's director indicated that in 1985, she was able to operate to some degree with a clearly known way to do the major types of work encountered. The assistant to the director saw to some extent a clearly known way to do the major types of work encountered in 1984. For 1985, this individual indicated that to a great extent she was able to clearly know how to do the major types of work encountered. The SBM instructor, like the assistant to the director, operated in 1984 to some extent with a clearly known way to do the work required, and moved to a level in 1985 where to a great extent there was a clearly known way to do the major types of work normally encountered (Figure 24a).

The Center's director indicated that during the SBDC's first year of operation (1984), it was not too easy to know whether the work being done by her was done correctly. In 1985, the director indicated that it was somewhat easy to know whether her work was being done correctly. The assistant to the director indicated that in 1984, it was somewhat easy for her to know whether the work being carried out by her was done correctly. By
a. Extent to which a clearly known way to do major types of work encountered.

1 = To no extent
2 = To a little extent
3 = To some extent
4 = To a great extent
5 = To a very great extent

b. Extent to know whether work done correctly.

1 = Not at all easy
2 = Not too easy
3 = Somewhat easy
4 = Quite easy
5 = Very easy

Figure 24: Task Difficulty
Linn-Benton Community College SBDC.
c. Sure of outcomes of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>SBM INST.</th>
<th>ADM. ASST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 = 40% or less
- 2 = 41 - 60%
- 3 = 61 - 75%
- 4 = 76 - 90%
- 5 = 91% or more

d. How often did difficult problems arise with no apparent or immediate solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>SBM INST.</th>
<th>ADM. ASST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 = Once a week or less
- 2 = 2 to 4 times a week
- 3 = Once a day
- 4 = 2 to 4 times a day
- 5 = 5 or more times a day

e. Time spent solving work problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>SBM INST.</th>
<th>ADM. ASST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 = Less than 1 hour per week
- 2 = 1 to 4 hours a week
- 3 = About 1 hour-a-day
- 4 = About 2 to 3 hours-a-day
- 5 = 4 hours or more a-day

Figure 24 continued
the second year of the Center's operation (1985), this individual saw it as being quite easy for her to know if she was doing her work correctly. The responses provided by the SBM instructor reflect that for this individual it was not too easy in 1984 to know whether the work being done by him was carried out correctly. Knowing whether his work was being done correctly was seen by the SBM instructor as being somewhat easy to determine in 1985 (Figure 24b).

For 1984, the SBDC's director listed that she was generally sure of what the outcomes of her efforts would be about 40% or less of the time. During 1985, the percentage of time that the director was generally sure of what the outcomes of her efforts would be had increased to between 41-60% of the time. During the Center's first year of operation (1984), the assistant to the director indicated that between 76-90% of the time she was generally sure of the outcome of her work efforts. This same level of assurance was indicated as being present in 1985, by the assistant to the director. For the SBM instructor, the percentage of time that he was generally sure of the outcomes of his work in 1984 was listed as being between 61-75% of the time. In 1985, this individual indicated that between 76-90% of the time was he generally sure of what the outcomes of his work efforts would be (Figure 24c).

The frequency at which difficult work problems arose in which there were no immediate or apparent solutions was seen by the SBDC director as taking place for her about two to four times a week in 1984. For 1985, the
frequency of such situations was seen by the director as dropping to once a week or less in their occurrence. The assistant to the director indicated that for both 1984 and 1985, the frequency at which difficult problems arose in her work for which there were no immediate or apparent solution was once a week or less. The SBM instructor also indicated that during the Center’s first two years of operation (1984 and 1985), that once a week or less was he involved in dealing with difficult work problems for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions (Figure 24d).

For 1984, the SBDC’s director indicated that about two to three hours a day were spent dealing with work problems. In 1985, the amount of time spent in such activities was listed by the director as being about one hour a day. The assistant to the director listed that less than one hour a week was being spent by her in 1984 and 1985 trying to solve work problems for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions. The Center’s SB instructor indicated that in 1984 he was spending about one hour a day in attempting to solve work problems. That figure shifted in 1985, to about one to four hours a week being spent in attempting to solve work problems for which there were no apparent or immediate solutions (Figure 24e).

Summary: Task Difficulty

In general, the responses reported by Linn-Benton’s SBM instructor and by the assistant to the director indicated that they were able to achieve a greater level of predictability and analyzability in the performance of their
work activities than the SBDC's director. The data would seem to indicate that the director's work activities were carried out in an environment with more variability and turbulence. This can in part be attributed to the lack of institutional experience in dealing with an entity such as the SBDC. The director, to carry out the function associated with the work-related activities, needed to adapt and respond to the realities encountered with a considerable degree of discretion and flexibility. The greatest degree of task analyzability and predictability was achieved by the assistant to the director. This may in part be explained by the fact that in carrying out work functions, the assistant responded to and was directed primarily by the director's actions. The parameters of the assistant's activities were established and guided by the director, whereas the director frequently was required to negotiate with multiple levels of demands and realities imposed by both internal and external constituencies. As such, there were no standardized sets of management processes for the director to address and deal with the Center's operation.

The Center's SBM instructor's scores would seem to indicate that the degree of task predictability and analyzability for that position was less turbulent than the director's, but not as placid and concrete as that of the assistant to the director. The SBM instructor was required to respond to a selected constituency, but was not required to initiate or create the organizational processes or mechanisms required to deliver and provide these services. The characteristics and functions associated with providing
the services of the SBM instructor remained generally constant throughout the first two years of the SBDC’s operation (1984 and 1985). What did change was the ability of the SBM instructor to respond more quickly to the demands generated by the clientele he served. To a considerable degree, this came about through his growing familiarity with the nature and type of problems and issues being presented. As time passed, a high level of job effectiveness was achieved by the SBM instructor, and he was able to accurately gauge the work patterns required to carry out the essential activities associated with his position.

Linn-Benton’s SBDC: Time Spent in Coordination

The Center’s director, the assistant to the director, and the SBM instructor were asked six questions in the Time Spent in Coordination questionnaire as a means to provide data concerning how the SBDC went about performing essential tasks, as well as dealing with establishing communication and organizational processes. The work activities they were asked to provide data on were: recordkeeping and report writing, talking informally to people, coordinating work activities with other units in the college, coordinating work activities with people in the OSBDCN office, coordinating work activities with other organizations outside the OSBDCN, and providing direct service to current and/or potential small business owners (Tables 6-9).
Table 6  **Time Spent in Coordination: Linn-Benton’s SBDC Director**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>1984 Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of work activities</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 00 min</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 00 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>3.00 hrs = 180 min</td>
<td>4.00 hrs = 240 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate work activities with other units in college</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate work activities with the OSBDCN office</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate work activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
<td>5.00 hrs = 300 min</td>
<td>6.00 hrs = 360 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services (counseling, guidance, and/or training)</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 00 min</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 00 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 hrs = 660 min</td>
<td>12.50 hrs = 750 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: Time Spent in Coordination: Linn-Benton’s SBDC Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1984 Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of work activities</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>1.50 hrs = 90 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate work activities with other college units</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate work activities with the OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 00 min</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 00 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate work activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
<td>2.50 hrs = 150 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services (counseling guidance and/or training)</td>
<td>4.00 hrs = 240 min</td>
<td>5.00 hrs = 300 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 8.00 hrs = 480 min
- 8.50 hrs = 510 min
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time Spent in Coordination: Linn-Benton’s Assistant to the Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Keeping track of work activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Talking informally with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Coordinate work activities with other units in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Coordinate work activities with the OSBDCN office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Coordinate work activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Provide direct services (counseling, guidance, and/or training)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.50 hrs = 450 min 8.00 hrs = 480 min
Table 9  
**Time Spent in Coordination: Linn-Benton's SBDC Mean Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>1984 Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of work activities</td>
<td>.08 hrs = 4.80 min</td>
<td>.08 hrs = 4.80 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>1.67 hrs = 100.20 min</td>
<td>1.67 hrs = 100.20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>2.75 hrs = 165.00 min</td>
<td>2.75 hrs = 165.00 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate activities with the OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.33 hrs = 20.00 min</td>
<td>.33 hrs = 20.00 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate work activities with organizations outside of OSBDCN</td>
<td>2.33 hrs = 140.00 min</td>
<td>2.83 hrs = 169.80 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services (counseling, guidance, and/or training)</td>
<td>1.67 hrs = 100.20 min</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120.00 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Summary: Time Spent in Coordination**

The mean time spent keeping track of work activities remained constant, averaging 4.80 minutes per day for 1984 and 1985. No change was reflected in the mean scores as it related to the time spent talking informally...
to people for both 1984 and 1985, the time spent in this activity averaged 1.67 hours per day. For Linn-Benton’s SBDC, the mean time spent coordinating work activities with other units in the college averaged 2.75 hours per day in 1984 and 1985. The mean time spent coordinating work activities with the OSBDCN office in 1984 and 1985 averaged 20 minutes per day. The mean time spent coordinating work activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN increased to 2.83 hours in 1985, from an average of 2.33 hours per day. This represented a 22% increase in the time spent carrying out this activity. A 19.8% increase was indicated for 1985 as it related to the mean time spent providing direct services to clients, going from an average of 1.67 hours per day to 2.00 hours per day. The total mean time for all six activities increased from an average of 8.83 hours per day to 9.66 hours a day, representing a 9% increase in time spent for this activity (Figure 25a-25b).

Linn-Benton’s SBDC: Direction and Frequency of Information Flows

SBDC Director

Linn-Benton’s SBDC director indicated that for both 1984 and 1985, the rate of frequency for receiving and/or sending written reports or memos to coordinate the work of the Center with people in other units of the college took place on the average about one to three times a week (Figure 26a).
Figure 25: Time Spent In Coordination
Linn-Benton Community College - SBDC
(N=3)

a. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from people in other units of the college.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

b. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from the OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

c. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from people in other organizations.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

Figure 26  Direction & Frequency of Information:
Linn-Benton Community College's SBDC
d. Work related discussions (face to face or by telephone) with individuals in other units of college.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

Figure 26 continued
g. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from other units in college.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

h. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

i. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

Figure 26 continued
For the Center’s director, receiving and/or sending written reports or memos to coordinate the work of the Center with people in the OSBDCN office on the average occurred about one to three times a week in 1984 and 1985. Coordinating the work of the SBDC by receiving and/or sending written reports or memos with people in other organizations or agencies took place at the rate of about one to three times a week for the Center’s director in 1984 and 1985 (Figure 26a-26c).

Work-related discussions conducted face to face or by telephone based on a one-to-one dialogue with other individuals in the SBDC center took place on the average about every hour for the director during 1984 and 1985. In 1984, work-related discussions with individuals in the OSBDCN based on face-to-face or telephone contacts took place at a rate of frequency of between one to three times a week for the director. During 1985, the rate of occurrence for this type of communication dropped to about one to three times per month for the Center’s director. For both 1984 and 1985, the director entered into work-related discussions with individuals in other organizations either face-to-face or by telephone, about every hour (Figure 26d-26f).

Work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other units in the college on the average, took place about once a week for the SBDC’s director in 1984 and 1985. In 1984, the frequency of work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from the OSBDCN office occurred about once a month for the director of the
program. The director indicated that not once in 1985 did meetings of this type take place. The Center’s director indicated that for both 1984 and 1985, work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations or agencies took place at a rate of about once a week (Figure 26g-26i).

SBDC’s Support Staff

SBM Instructor

The Center’s SBM instructor indicated that during 1984 and 1985, that the rate of frequency for receiving and/or sending written reports or memos to coordinate the work of the Center with people in other units of the college took place about one to three times per month. In 1984 and 1985, the SBM instructor indicated that receiving or sending written reports or memos to coordinate the work of the Center with people in the OSBDCN office took place about one to three times a month. In 1984, about one to three times a month, the SBM instructor would receive and/or send written reports or memos to people in other organizations or agencies, to coordinate the work of the Center. For 1985, the rate of frequency for this type of communication increased to about one to three times a week, for the SBM instructor (Figure 26a-26c).

The SBM instructor indicated that work-related discussions conducted face-to-face or by telephone on a one-to-one basis with individuals in the SBDC took place about one to three times a month in both 1984 and 1985.
Work-related discussions with individuals in the OSBDCN office which were conducted on a one-to-one basis, and done either face-to-face or by telephone occurred about one to three times a month for the SBM instructor in 1984. This individual listed no such contacts being made in 1985, with individuals in the OSBDCN office. The SBM instructor indicated that in 1984 work-related discussions conducted on a one-to-one basis either face-to-face or by telephone took place with individuals in other organizations about one to three times a week in 1984. For 1985, the frequency of such communication processes increased to about one to three times per day for the SBM instructor (Figure 26d-26f).

Not once during the Center's first two years of operation (1984 and 1985), was the SBM instructor involved in work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other units in the college. The SBM instructor indicated that not once in 1984 or 1985 did there occur for him a work-related problem-solving meeting with two or more people from the OSBDCN office. For 1984, the SBM instructor indicated that work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations or agencies took place about once a month. In 1985, the frequency of such meetings had increased to about every two weeks for the Center's SBM instructor (Figure 26g-26i).
Assistant to the Director

For the assistant to the director in both 1984 and 1985, the frequency of receiving and/or sending written reports or memos to coordinate the work of the Center with other people in other units of the college took place at a rate of about one to three times a day. During both 1984 and 1985, this individual indicated that written memos or notes were received and/or sent to people in the OSBDCN office about one to three times a week, in an effort to coordinate the work of the SBDC. For both 1984 and 1985, this individual indicated that about one to three times a week written memos or reports were received and/or sent to people in other organizations or agencies to assist in the coordination of the Center’s efforts (Figure 26a-26c).

Work-related discussions conducted on a one-to-one basis, either face-to-face or by telephone with individuals in other units of the college were listed as taking place about once every work hour for the assistant to the director in 1984 and 1985. This person indicated that such discussions were entered into with individuals in the OSBDCN office about one to three times a week in 1984 and 1985. About one to three times a week, during both 1984 and 1985, work-related discussions took place on a one-to-one basis, either by telephone or face-to-face with individuals in other organizations for the assistant to the director (Figure 26d-26f).

During the Center’s first two years of operation (1984 and 1985), the assistant to the director entered into work-related problem-solving meetings
with two or more people from other units in the college about once a week. Both in 1984 and 1985, work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from the OSBDCN office took place at a rate of about once a month for the assistant to the director. This individual indicated that in 1984 and 1985, about once a week they were involved with two or more people from other organizations or agencies in work-related problem-solving meetings (Figure 26g-26i).

Linn Benton's SBDC: Collecting Diagnostic Data Through Narrative and Statistical Documents


Linn-Benton's SBDC noted in its first quarterly report (March through May 1984), that the largest problem it encountered was the marketing of its services. It listed the initiation of its Advisory Committee, and the starting of its Small Business Management (SBM) program as the significant accomplishments during that period.

In its second quarterly report (June through August 1984), the college listed the inability to utilize volunteers to meet short-term counseling requests as a significant operational problem. Significant accomplishments for the Center for this period were seen as being developing 14 new workshops, assisting the Salem Economic Development Corporation in responding to a business needs survey, and dealing with short-range
planning for workshops and classes, hiring additional support staff, and marketing Center services.

No quarterly report data were available concerning the Center's third quarter report (September through November 1984).

Linn-Benton's Community College's SBDC listed as a significant problem in its fourth quarter of operation (December 1984 through February 1985), that the procedural reporting requirements being imposed by the Small Business Administration (SBA) regarding SBM participants in the Center's courses did not fit the manner in which the courses were taught or maintained. Among the accomplishments noted for this period were the completion of a Business Plan Workbook, the preliminary planning efforts to redesign the SBM program, the development of an evaluation instrument for the SBM program, and the significant increase in the number of short-term counseling cases being dealt with by the Center.

During the Center's first quarter of operation in 1985 (March 1985 through May 1985), the lack of research materials on specific markets or products, and a three-week waiting period for business counseling due to the demands for the Center's services were listed as the significant problems being encountered by the Center. The Center indicated that its significant accomplishments during this time were the development of an excellent rapport with the local press, and the approval of 45 small business owners to enter into the Center's SBM program.
For the second quarterly report of 1985 (June 1985 through September 1985), the Center did not list any significant operational problems encountered. The SBDC listed as its significant accomplishments the sponsoring of 12 small business classes attended by 171 students, an increase in the number of drop-in clients, and the starting of an export workshop with 13 participants enrolled in it.

The third quarter report for 1985 (September 1985 through November 1985) indicated that no major problems were encountered. It listed among its significant accomplishments the establishment of an agreement between the SBDC, the District Four Council of Governments, and Cascades West Financial Services, the active involvement of the SBDC with the Albany Enterprise Development Team, the development of a proposal for a seven-month Entrepreneurial Assistance Training program with the Community Services Consortium, and the SBDC director making numerous presentations to organizations related to Small Business incubators.

No quarterly report data was available concerning the Center's 1985 fourth quarter report (December 1985 to February 1986).

**Linn-Benton's SBDC: Final Report Summary—December 1, 1983 to June 30, 1985**

Beginning in January 1984, the college began operating its SBDC. From March 1, 1984, to June 30, 1985, 35 workshops and seminars were presented to a total of 748 participants, 185 short-term counseling sessions were provided, and 29 long-term counseling cases were handled. The
average number of hours devoted to short-term counseling was 1.97 hours, and the average time devoted to long-term counseling was 1.50 hours. No figure was available concerning the total number of counseling hours provided by the SBDC. LBCC’s Final Report for its SBDC did not contain any information concerning the problems it encountered or its significant accomplishments during this period reporting.

What emerges from the final report is that, during the first two years of its operation (1984 and 1985), Linn-Benton’s SBDC experienced a major problem in relation to achieving its long-term counseling goals, that the marketing of its services in the community was a consistent and important activity for the Center’s staff, that a considerable amount of time and effort was taken to resurrect the SBM program and to get it operational again, and that the SBDC often lacked research data on the markets or products found in its service area.

Linn-Benton’s SBDC: Change Graphs

Six informants from Linn-Benton Community College were asked to identify the type of events that triggered organizational change within the SBDC. After identifying the triggering events, they were asked to graphically represent on a horizontal axis the duration of the triggering event, and on a vertical axis the degree of organizational stress and uncertainty it generated within the SBDC.
The graphs provide a means to examine how personnel at various levels within the college and the SBDC viewed organizational changes with the SBDC. These graphs also provide data on the degree of variability experienced by the respondents concerning the change events being identified. The manner in which organizational personnel processed information regarding organizational changes is also provided by these graphs. Finally, the change graphs provide the opportunity to examine the extent of the personnel's awareness regarding the nature and scope of the changes taking place in the SBDC.

**Change Graphs for Linn-Benton Community College: Selected Administrative Personnel**

The data generated by Linn-Benton's president, vice-president of instruction, and director of community education yielded a total of four different categories of triggering events that brought about large-scale change with the SBDC. The college's president, vice-president, and director of community education all agreed that political core system change events had triggered large-scale changes in the SBDC. Both the president of the college and the community education director agreed that environmental events had triggered changes in the SBDC. They differed in that only the vice-president saw changes in personnel as a triggering event, while only the president saw cultural core system events as triggering change with the SBDC.
Political Core System Change Events

The college's president indicated that organizational uncertainty was created within the SBDC by events triggered by political core system changes, beginning in January 1984. The degree of uncertainty present in January 1984 was seen as operating at a moderate level by the president. From January 1984 to September 1984, that level of uncertainty was portrayed as remaining essentially constant. In September 1984, it was seen as slowly decreasing in intensity, reaching a level where it was operating to only a slight degree by May 1985. The president of the college indicated that the level of uncertainty generated by political core system changes continued to drop, so that by year's end, it was seen as being present to only a little degree within the SBDC. The organizational stress that was triggered with the SBDC by political core system changes was seen by the president as being essentially the same in duration and intensity as that of organizational uncertainty throughout the Center's first two years of operation (Figure 27).

Linn-Benton's vice-president for instruction indicated that from the SBDC's inception in January 1984, political core system change events were present and generating a high level of uncertainty within the SBDC. That level of uncertainty was seen by the vice-president as being maintained until March 1985. After March 1985, it was portrayed as quickly dropping in intensity. By May 1985, it was at a moderate level. In July 1985, it was seen as only slightly present. It continued to move downward, ending the year
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Triggering Events: Political Core System
at a level where it was seen by the vice-president as being present to only a little degree within the SBDC. Throughout the Center’s operation in 1984 and 1985, the vice-president portrayed the organizational stress generated by political core system change events as essentially the same in duration and intensity level to those present in organizational uncertainty (Figure 28).

Political core system changes were seen by the director of community education at Linn-Benton Community College as being present from the SBDC’s creation in January 1984. The level of organizational uncertainty present at that time was seen by this individual as operating at a moderate level. From January 1984 to January 1985, the director of community education saw a moderate level of uncertainty operating in the college’s SBDC. Beginning in January 1985, it began to drop in intensity. By mid-March 1985, it was seen as dropping below a moderate level of intensity. It steadily dropped in intensity, so that by June 1985, the director of community education indicated that it was operating to only a slight degree. Dropping steadily downward by year’s end, it was portrayed as being present to only a little degree within the SBDC. Organizational stress within the SBDC generated by political core system changes was indicated by the director of community education as being present in January 1984, and operating at a high level of intensity. That level of organizational stress was portrayed as remaining constant throughout the next 12 months. Beginning in January 1985, the level of stress present was seen as dropping. By mid-March of 1985, it was seen as operating at a moderate level of
Figure 28

Triggering Events: Political Core System
intensity. In June 1985, the director of community education indicated that it was present to only a slight degree within the SBDC. It continued to move downward so that, by December 1985, the level of organizational stress was seen as being present to only a little degree within the SBDC (Figure 29).

Environmental Changes

Environmentally-triggered changes with the college’s SBDC were seen as first occurring in January 1984 by the college president. The level of organizational uncertainty generated by such events was seen as being present at a moderate level in January 1984. Organizational uncertainty was seen by him as staying at a moderate level until late June 1984. From that point, it began a steady decline. By January 1985, it was portrayed as being present to only a slight degree in the SBDC. Moving steadily downward: organizational uncertainty by July 1985 was seen as operating to only a little degree within the college’s SBDC. Throughout the remaining months of 1985, it remained at that level. The organizational stress generated by environmental events was seen as beginning in January 1984. From that point, until October 1984, it was portrayed as being present to only a little degree with the SBDC. After October 1984, organizational stress was perceived as moving downward in its impact upon the SBDC. From May 1985, it was seen for all intents and purposes by the college president as essentially being non-existent within the SBDC (Figure 30).
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Figure 29
Linn-Benton Community College's Director of Community Education indicated that environmentally-triggered changes were present from the Center's inception in January 1984. The organizational uncertainty generated by such events was seen as being present at a high level with the SBDC in January 1984. That level of intensity was seen as being maintained until September 1984. Moving downward after September 1984, the level of uncertainty dropped to a moderate level by April 1985. It reached in August 1985 a position where it was perceived to be generating only a slight level of uncertainty in the SBDC. By December 1985, this individual indicated that very little organizational uncertainty was being experienced because of environmentally-triggered events within the college’s SBDC. As for the organizational stress generated by environmental events, the director of community education saw it as first occurring in January 1984, creating a moderate level of stress within the SBDC. From that point until December 1984, it was perceived as remaining at a moderate stress level. Slowly, over the next several months the organizational stress level was seen as diminishing by the director of community education at the college. By June 1985, it was seen as being present to only a slight degree in the SBDC. In October 1985, it was portrayed as operating to a very little degree. Organizational stress generated by environmentally-triggered events ended 1985 as an element creating little or no impact upon the college's SBDC (Figure 31).
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Triggering Events: Environmental Changes
Changes in Personnel

The college's vice-president for instruction saw changes in personnel as creating both organizational uncertainty and stress within the college's SBDC. Beginning in January 1984, the level of uncertainty was seen as operating at a high level. From that point until November 1984, it was portrayed as being present at a high level within the SBDC. After November 1984, it began to decline in intensity. By mid-March 1985, it was portrayed as being present at a moderate level in the SBDC. The downward movement of organizational uncertainty continued until June 1985. At that point, it leveled off. From June 1985 until the end of the year, it was seen by the college's vice-president of instruction as generating a slight level of uncertainty within the SBDC. Organizational stress generated by changes in personnel was portrayed by the vice-president as being a virtual mirror image in its intensity and duration as that of organizational uncertainty throughout the Center's first two years of operation (Figure 32).

Cultural Core System Change Events

The college president indicated that cultural core system change events were present from January 1984 within the SBDC. The level of organizational uncertainty generated by such events was seen as beginning in January 1984, and being present at a moderate level. That level of organizational uncertainty was portrayed as being maintained until November 1984. After that point, it began to decline in its intensity. By
Figure 32

Triggering Events: Change in Personnel
May 1985, the college president perceived that it was operating to a slight degree within the SBDC. Organizational uncertainty continued to be seen as declining in the SBDC by the college president throughout the remaining months of 1985. It ended the year as an entity which was seen as having little or no effect upon the SBDC. Throughout the Center’s first two years of operation, the college president saw the organizational stress levels generated by cultural core system changes as essentially being the same as those of organizational uncertainty in duration and intensity (Figure 33).

Administrative Comments: Triggering Events

The college’s president, vice-president for instruction, and its director of community education were asked, following the drawing of their change graphs, to discuss and/or comment on the events that they portrayed as having triggered organizational change with Linn-Benton’s SBDC. Operational definitions of the four previously mentioned triggering events (as well as illustrative quotations associated with them) are presented below.

Environmental Changes

Environmental change events are triggered by uncertainty regarding the availability of critical resources, linkage with critical constituencies, and/or the ability to control desired organizational outcomes in the environment.
Figure 33

Organizational Uncertainty Level

Organizational Stress Level

Triggering Events: Cultural Core System
"External forces were creating multiple pressures on the college. The president of the college was attempting to respond to the high number of small business failures and loss of jobs in the area."

"The economic condition of the college and the community was highly stressed. The college needed to respond to a community whose economy was in bad shape and getting worse."

Cultural Core System Changes

Cultural core system change events are triggered by shifts in the organization’s shared values, what beliefs to commit to, and/or those objectives worth striving for organizationally.

"The college needed to establish a position of being innovative in its delivery of services."

"We needed to assess our organizational resources and determine the best utilization of the college’s programs and services."

"Both the president and vice-president felt there was a gap between what the college was doing for business and industry and what it could do."

Political Core System Changes

Political core system change events are triggered by shifts in the ability to allocate and use the power and resources in the
organization in the pursuit of goals, the manner in which work is done, and/or in determining who will benefit from the actions taken. "The board and president were willing to shift institutional resources and funds to the SBDC."

Changes in Personnel

Changes in personnel events are triggered by events and/or actions which bring about different organizational configurations (social networks, people, and processes). These changes include the characteristics of the members of the organization (educational background, motivational patterns, and managerial style).

"The college's president was relatively new and was willing to do things differently from the previous individual in that position. The college became more responsive under his guidance."

"The selection of the SBDC's director was very important to the Center's success. The director had a high level of visibility in the community and on campus. The internal leadership of the college stood behind the director's actions."

"The Center's director was perceived as being capable and competent by the college's administration."
Change Graphs for Linn-Benton Community College: SBDC Director and Support Staff

The data generated by Linn-Benton’s SBDC director and support staff yielded a total of three different types of triggering events that brought about large-scale changes in the college’s SBDC. The Center’s director indicated that changes in the SBDC had been triggered by political core system changes, cultural core system changes, and changes in personnel. The assistant to the director indicated that cultural and political core system changes had triggered change within the Center. The SBM instructor for the Center concurred with the two other SBDC staff members in believing that political and cultural core system change events had been experienced by the college’s SBDC.

Cultural Core System Changes

The Center’s director depicted political core system changes taking place in the SBDC beginning in July 1984. At its inception, this event was portrayed as generating a high level of organizational uncertainty within the Center. Very quickly thereafter it began to be seen as declining in its intensity, although it would take until February 1985 before it would drop down to a moderate level of uncertainty. Moving steadily downward, organizational uncertainty was seen by the director as being present to only a slight degree by July 1985. By the end of the year, the organizational uncertainty generated by cultural core system change events was seen as
being experienced to only a little degree within the SBDC. Beginning in July 1984, like organizational uncertainty, the level of organizational stress generated by cultural system change events was seen as being experienced at a high level within the SBDC. The level of organizational stress was depicted as falling soon after its inception. The SBDC was seen as experiencing a high level of stress until March 1985. From March 1985 until September 1985, it was seen as being present to a moderate degree within the Center. Organizational stress continued to move downward, dipping below a slight level of stress being generated in mid-September 1985. It was shown by the director as ending in early November 1985 (Figure 34).

The assistant to the Center’s director indicated that cultural core system changes had triggered large-scale changes within the SBDC beginning in January 1984. Throughout the Center’s first two years of operation in 1984 and 1985, this individual depicted it as generating only a very little organizational uncertainty in the SBDC. Organizational stress generated by cultural core system triggering events was also seen as beginning in January 1984, and being experienced to only a very little degree in the SBDC. The SBDC was seen as slowly, but steadily, growing in its intensity. From January to July 1985, it inched its way up to being seen as generating a slight level of stress within the SBDC. After reaching that level of intensity, it leveled off, and from July 1985 to the end of December 1985, it remained at a slight level of organizational stress (Figure 35).
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Triggering Events: Cultural Core System Changes
The SBM instructor for the Center portrayed organizational uncertainty generated by cultural core system changes as being present beginning in January 1984. This event was seen as creating a high level of uncertainty within the SBDC. From January 1984 until August 1984, the level of uncertainty was portrayed as being present at a high level. Beginning in August 1984 and lasting until March 1985, it was seen as generating a moderate level of organizational uncertainty. Organizational uncertainty continued to move downward in its intensity. By April 1985, it was seen as present to only a slight degree. Over the next several months, it would occupy that same level of intensity. It would end the year at a level where little organizational uncertainty was perceived as being present.

The organizational stress associated with cultural core system change events was portrayed by the SBM instructor as beginning in March 1984, and operating at a moderate level. A steep decline began shortly thereafter, reaching its nadir in December 1985. From December 1984 until year's end in 1985, organizational stress was seen by the SBM instructor as being present to little or no extent within the SBDC (Figure 36).

Changes in Personnel

The Center’s director depicted organizational uncertainty generated by changes in personnel as first being experienced in October 1984, at a moderate level. It began a precipitous drop in its intensity quickly thereafter. In December 1984, it was portrayed as being present to only a
Organizational Uncertainty Level vs. Organizational Stress Level over time from December 1984 to December 1985.
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**Figure 36**: Triggering Events: Cultural Core System Changes
slight degree within the SBDC. By January 1985, the Center's director indicated that it was no longer present in the SBDC. The organizational stress generated by changes in personnel was seen as first occurring in October 1984 at a moderate level. It, like organizational uncertainty, moved quickly downward in intensity. Organizational stress was seen as being present by mid-December 1984 to only a slight degree within the SBDC. By February 1985, organizational stress associated with changes in personnel was depicted by the Center's director as no longer existing in the SBDC for Linn-Benton Community College (Figure 37).

Political Core System Changes

The director of the SBDC indicated that political core system changes triggered organizational uncertainty within the Center beginning in July 1984, and generated a high level of uncertainty in the SBDC. During the next several months, the degree of organizational uncertainty moved downward in its intensity. By mid-December 1984, it was seen as being present at a moderate level. That level of intensity was maintained over the next six months. As of mid-June 1985, organizational uncertainty was portrayed as being present to only a slight degree in the SBDC. The Center's director indicated that it continued to diminish in its intensity, to that by November 1985, it was seen as no longer being present in the Center. The organizational stress created by political core system changes was seen as first occurring in July 1984 by the Center's director. At that
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Triggering Events: Change in Personnel

Figure 37
point, it was seen as being present at a high level within the Center. From July 1984 until March 1985, it would continue to operate at that level. Over the next six months, the level of organizational stress was seen as operating at a moderate level within the SBDC. From mid-September 1985 to early November 1985, it continued to move downward in intensity. The Center’s director indicated that after early November 1985, it no longer was present within the SBDC (Figure 38).

For the assistant to the director, political core system changes first appeared in the Center in January 1984. From that point on, and throughout the next two years of its operation, it was seen as being present to only a little degree within the SBDC. Organizational stress, like organizational uncertainty, was seen as beginning in January 1984. Although the level of intensity for organizational stress did not rise above being seen as being present to only a little degree in the SBDC, the assistant to the director portrayed it as continuing to move upward in its intensity over the full period of the Center’s first two years of operation (Figure 39).

Political core system changes were depicted by the Center’s SBM instructor as beginning in January 1984 and lasting throughout the next two years of the Center’s operation. At its inception, the level of organizational uncertainty was seen as being present to a high degree within the SBDC. Between January and May 1984, it was seen as staying at a constantly high level. Between May 1984 and June 1984, it was portrayed as steeply dropping in its intensity. By June 1984, it was seen as being present to a
Figure 38
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Triggering Events: Political Core System Changes
moderate level in the Center. Over the next four months it would maintain a consistent level of moderate uncertainty within the SBDC. October 1984 saw it drop very slightly in intensity. From October 1984 until June 1985, organizational uncertainty was portrayed as leveling off at a level mid-point between moderate and slight in its degree of intensity. Another steep decline occurred between June 1985 and July 1985, as it related to organizational uncertainty within the SBDC. Here again, it was seen by the SBM instructor as leveling off quickly, and being maintained in the remaining months of 1985 at a level mid-point between being experienced at a slight to little degree by the Center. Organizational stress generated by political core system changes was seen as first occurring in January 1984 by the SBM instructor. The level of intensity associated with it at that point was seen to be high. For the next four months, it would remain at a plateau of similar intensity. Between May and June 1984, it would undergo a significant drop in its intensity. Once again, it would level off in its intensity, remaining at a point mid-distance between a high and moderate level of stress. In September 1984, another drop occurred in the level of organizational stress being encountered. By October 1984, it was portrayed as being present to only a slight degree in the SBDC. It would remain at that level for the next seven months, before experiencing another drop. During the time between June 1985 and July 1985, organizational stress generated by political core system changes was seen as dropping to a level where it was present to a very little degree within the SBDC by the SBM
instructor. That level was seen as being present throughout the remaining months of 1985 (Figure 40).

**SBDC Staff Comments: Triggering Events**

The SBDC's director, the SBM instructor, and the assistant to the director were asked following the drawing of their graphs to discuss and/or comment on the events they perceived as triggering large-scale change within Linn-Benton's SBDC. Operational definitions of the three triggering events identified (as well as illustrative quotations associated with them) are presented below.

**Changes in Personnel**

Changes in personnel events are triggered by actions which bring about different organizational configurations (social networks, people, and processes). These changes include the characteristics of members of the organization (educational background, motivational patterns, and managerial style).

"There was a struggle for leadership in the college as it related to the SBDC. We needed to know who would be calling the shots. "In the beginning, we didn't have the right players in the ring."
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Figure 40
Cultural Core System Changes

Cultural core system change events are triggered by shifts in the organization's shared values, what beliefs to commit to, and/or those objectives worth striving for organizationally.

"We were asking ourselves for a long time what are we? How do we fit into the mission of the college and the OSBDCN?"

"The SBDC fit right into the president's plan as to what the college should be doing."

"The college was struggling to develop a new vision. It was important for it to look at the "real world," and become more accountable to the community's needs."

Political Core System Changes

Political core system change events triggered by shifts in the ability to allocate and use the power and resources in the organization in the pursuit of goals, the manner in which work is done, and/or determining who will benefit from the actions taken.

"The Center is as participative as you want it to be. There is open access to management. You are responsible for what you want to do."

"There's a focus here on task accomplishment. A lot of communication and interaction takes place between us. Decision-
making here is characterized by a high level of trust and personal credibility."

"Decisions are sometimes made but not known equally by all of the staff members."

"The director strives for a power-sharing and open-door policy style of management."

"Lots of participation in Center's activities. You need to be self-directed to work here."

"Staffing, planning, and strategic decisions are done by the director."

"Over the years, we've become more proficient in communicating with each other. We've developed better formal and informal communication processes."

"Communication is generally through the director passing information on to us. It's more of an information-funneling process than a dialogue."

Linn-Benton's SBDC: Domain Uncertainty

Linn-Benton's SBDC Staff: Consensus on Goals

The Center's director selected providing assistance to those businesses being served by the SBDC to generate greater profits as the most important operating goal for the Center in both 1984 and 1985. For the Center's SBM instructor, providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to
current and/or potential small business owners in 1984 was the most important for the Center. In 1985, the SBM instructor indicated that providing long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners was the Center’s most important goal. For 1984 and 1985, assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits was seen by the assistant to the director as the most important goal for the SBDC (Figures 41 & 42).

Reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community was chosen by the Center’s director in 1984 and 1985 as the Center’s second most important operating goal. The second most important goal for the Center in 1984 was seen by the SBM instructor as being reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community. For the SBM instructor in 1985, the second most important goal for the Center was coordinating the SBDC’s services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the Small Business community. Providing long-term counseling, training, and/or guidance to current and/or potential small business owners was selected by the assistant to the director in 1984 and 1985 as the second most important goal for the SBDC (Figures 41 & 42).

In 1984 and 1985, the Center’s director indicated that the third most important goal for the SBDC was coordinating its services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the Small Business community. For both 1984 and 1985, the third most important operating
### SBDC Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBDC DIRECTOR</th>
<th>SBM INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>ADMIN. ASST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assist SB's served to increase profits</td>
<td>1. Provide short-term services</td>
<td>1. Assist SB's served to increase profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduce failure rate of SB's</td>
<td>2. Reduce failure rate of SB's</td>
<td>2. Provide long-term services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations</td>
<td>3. Promote awareness of SBDC</td>
<td>3. Promote awareness of SBDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures</td>
<td>4. Provide long-term services</td>
<td>4. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Linn-Benton Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESIDENT</th>
<th>VICE PRESIDENT</th>
<th>DIR. COMM. ED.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide short-term services</td>
<td>1. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations</td>
<td>1. Select and train SBDC staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations</td>
<td>2. Reduce failure rate of SB's</td>
<td>2. Reduce failure rate of SB's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Select and train SBDC staff</td>
<td>4. Provide long-term services</td>
<td>4. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 41**

Goal Consensus:

SBDC — Linn-Benton Community College
SBDC Staff:

**SBDC DIRECTOR**
1. Assist SB's served to increase profits
2. Reduce failure rate of SB's
3. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations
4. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures

**SBM INSTRUCTOR**
1. Provide short-term services
2. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations
3. Promote awareness of SBDC
4. Provide short-term services

**ADMIN. ASST.**
1. Assist SB's served to increase profits
2. Provide long-term services
3. Promote awareness of SBDC
4. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations

Linn-Benton Administration

**PRESIDENT**
1. Promote awareness of SBDC
2. Select and train SBDC staff
3. Provide short-term services
4. Select and train SBDC staff

**VICE PRESIDENT**
1. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations
2. Reduce failure rate of SB's
3. Provide short-term services
4. Provide long-term services

**DIR. COMM. ED.**
1. Select and train SBDC staff
2. Reduce failure rate of SB's
3. Promote awareness of SBDC
4. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations

Figure 42

Goal Consensus:
SBDC — Linn-Benton Community College
goal for the Center was seen by the SBM instructor as being to develop and promote the small business community’s awareness of the SBDC’s services and programs. The assistant to the director, like the SBM instructor, selected in 1984 and 1985 the promotion of the small business community’s awareness of the SBDC’s services and programs as the Center’s third most important operating goal (Figures 41 & 42).

The director of Linn-Benton Community College’s SBDC selected advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures as the fourth most important operating goal for the center in 1984 and 1985. The SBM instructor selected in 1984 as the fourth most important goal for the Center providing long-term counseling, training, and/or guidance to current and/or potential small business owners. In 1985, that individual listed as providing short-term guidance, training, and/or counseling to current and/or potential small businesses as the fourth most important goal for the Center. Both in 1984 and 1985, the assistant to the director selected as the fourth most important operating goal for the SBDC coordinating the SBDC’s services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the small business community (Figure 41 & 42).

Linn-Benton’s SBDC Staff: Goal Agreement for the SBDC

Both the SBDC’s director and the director’s assistant selected assisting businesses being served by the Center in improving to a significant degree
their ability to generate profits as being the SBDC's most important operating goal in 1984 and 1985. In 1984, the SBM instructor and the Center's director selected reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community as the second most important operating goal for the SBDC. The assistant to the director and the SBM instructor selected developing and promoting the small business community's awareness of the SBDC's services and programs as the third most important goal for the Center for both 1984 and 1985. No common agreement was reached among SBDC staff personnel regarding the Center's fourth most important goal in either 1984 or 1985 (Figures 41 & 42).

Linn-Benton's Administrative Staff: Consensus on Goals

The college's president indicated that in 1984 providing short-term guidance, training, and/or counseling to current and/or potential small business owners was seen by him as being the most important operating goal for the Center. For 1985, the most important goal for the SBDC was seen by the college's president to be helping to develop and promote the small business community's awareness of the SBDC's services and programs. To coordinate the SBDC's services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the small business community was selected by the college's vice president of instruction as being the Center's most important goal for both 1984 and 1985. For 1984 and 1985, the director for community education selected as the Center's most
important goal the selecting and training of Center staff members (Figures 41 & 42).

In 1984, the college president selected as the second most important goal for the SBDC the ability to coordinate its services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the small business community. Selecting and training Center staff members capable of providing a consistently high level of service was seen by the president of the college as being the Center's second most important goal in 1985. Both the college's vice-president for instruction, and its director of community education selected reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community as being the Center's second most important operating goal for 1984 and 1985 (Figures 41 and 42).

Advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures was seen by the college's president in 1984 as being the Center's third most important operating goal. In 1985, the president of the college selected providing short-term guidance, training, and/or counseling to current and/or potential small business owners as the third most important goal for the SBDC. For the vice-president of instruction and director of community education in 1984, the third most important goal for the Center was providing short-term counseling, guidance, and/or training to current and/or potential small business owners. The vice-president of instruction selected in 1985 again as the third most important goal for the SBDC providing short-term guidance, training, and/or counseling to current
and/or potential small business owners. In 1985, the director for community education selected the promotion of the SBDC’s services and programs to the small business community as the Center’s third most important operating goal (Figures 41 & 42).

To select and train Center staff members capable of providing a consistently high level of service was seen as the Center’s fourth most important goal in 1984 by the college’s president. For 1985, the president of the college indicted that reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community was for him the Center’s fourth most important goal. In 1984 and 1985, the SBDC’s fourth most important goal was seen by the vice-president of instruction at Linn-Benton Community College as being to provide long-term guidance, training, and/or counseling to current and/or potential small business owners. The director of community education indicated that for both 1984 and 1985, the fourth most important goal for the SBDC was seen as being its efforts to coordinate its services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the small business community (Figures 41 & 42).

Linn-Benton’s Administrative Staff: Goal Agreement for the SBDC

No common agreement was reached by the administrative respondents at Linn-Benton Community College when it came to select the SBDC’s most important goal in either 1984 or 1985. Both the vice-president of instruction and director for community education selected reducing the
failure rate of small businesses in the community as the second most important goal for the SBDC in 1984 and 1985. The third most important goal for the SBDC was seen by the director of community education and the vice president of instruction in 1984 as being providing short-term guidance, training, and/or counseling to current and/or potential small business owners. In 1985, the college’s president and vice-president of instruction also selected this goal as being the SBDC’s third most important goal. No common agreement was reached among the administrative respondents when it came to selecting the Center's fourth most important goal in either 1984 or 1985.

Clarity of Operating Strategies

Economic Conditions

There was a 100% agreement level (N=6) among respondents at Linn-Benton Community College that events generated by the economic conditions of the local and/or regional economy had affected the operation of the college’s SBDC in 1984. In 1985, the level of agreement had dropped to 83% regarding economic events and their impact on the SBDC's operation during that year. The perceived strategies available in 1984 were evenly divided among those who saw them as being tentative in nature, or having been clearly developed. For 1985, the perceived strategies available range from being tentative to clearly developed in their content and nature (Figure 43a).
a. Event(s) in the economic conditions of the local and/or regional economy of your SBDC's service area that affect the operation of your SBDC.

100% STAFF - event occurred
105% ADMIN - event occurred

100% acknowledgment that event occurred 1984

Comments of events, 1984...
- continuing of economic recession
- high unemployment
- economic stress
- mill closures in timber industry

Perception of available strategies: (N=6)

83% STAFF - event occurred
100% ADMIN - event occurred

83% acknowledgment that event occurred 1985

Comments of events, 1985...
- unstable economy
- unemployment remained high
- continuing of recession
- economic environment slowly improving

Perception of available strategies: (N=5)

LEGEND
1 Had no idea how to deal with this
2 A tentative strategy developed but still remained unclear
3 Had a strategy but didn't know if it would work
4 Had a clear strategy for dealing with this kind of event
5 Had a very clear tried and tested strategy to deal with this kind of event

Figure 43
Clarity of Operating Strategies:
SBDC Linn-Benton Community College
b. Events in the OSBDCN administrative office in Eugene that affect the operation of the SBDC.

- **100% STAFF - event occurred**
- **33% ADMIN - event occurred**

**67% acknowledgment that event occurred**

1984

- infusion of SBA dollars
- working model for SBDC
- unclear rules
- constant changes

1985

- **33% STAFF - event occurred**
- **33% ADMIN - event occurred**

**33% acknowledgment that event occurred**

Comments of events, 1984...
- OSBDCN became more active and arbitrary
- continued changing of rules

Comments of events, 1985...

Perception of available strategies: (N=4)

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

Figure 43 continued
c. Events in other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within your SBDC's service area that affect the operation of your SBDC.

- 0% STAFF - event occurred
- 66% ADMIN - event occurred
- 33% acknowledgment that event occurred

1984
- development of Albany Center for Economic Development
- more funds made available

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

1985
- Corvallis and Benton County formed economic development group
- SBDC incorporated and accepted as part of economic strategy
- greater involvement with Chamber of Commerce.

Perception of available strategies: (N=4)

Figure 43 continued
d. Events that happened within the community college sponsoring and supporting your SBDC that affect the operation of the SBDC.

66% STAFF - event occurred
66% ADMIN - event occurred

67% acknowledgment that event occurred
1984

33% STAFF - event occurred
33% ADMIN - event occurred

33% acknowledgment that event occurred
1985

Comments of events, 1984...
- President and V.P. of instruction became concerned about economic conditions
- unclear whether SBDC was part of Business Department or Training and Economic Development Center
- move SBDC to TED Center

Comments of events, 1985...
- change in V.P.
- change in reporting structure

Perception of available strategies: (N=4)

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

Figure 43 continued
e. Events that happened within your own SBDC that affect the operation or your SBDC.

33% STAFF - event occurred
66% ADMIN - event occurred

50% acknowledgment that event occurred

Comments of events, 1984...
- expanding roles and goals
- brought new staff in from other areas
- new person brought in to do training and development
- added research assistant

Perception of available strategies: (N=3)

Comments of events, 1985...
- growth in personnel
- changes in goals, funding, and projects involved with SBDC
- increase in funding for SBDC
- new location for SBDC office on campus

Perception of available strategies: (N=4)

Figure 43 continued
OSBDCN Events

A 67% agreement rate was reached among the respondents (N=6) from Linn-Benton Community College regarding the acknowledgement that events in the OSBDCN’s administrative office had affected the operation of the college’s SBDC in 1984. The rate of agreement dropped significantly in 1985, with only a 33% acknowledgement figure being reached. Those agreeing with the occurrence of such events in 1984 were evenly divided on what the perceived strategies available were: half saw them as being tentative, while the other half perceived them as being clearly developed in nature. For 1985, the perceived strategies available were seen as being either developed but it was not yet known whether they would be workable, or being clearly developed and capable of dealing with this kind of event (Figure 43b).

Other Small Business Programs

There was a 33% agreement among respondents (N=6) at Linn-Benton Community College that in 1984 events in other small business assistance or economic development programs in the college’s service district had affected the operation of the college’s SBDC. In 1985, a 67% level of agreement was reached among respondents regarding the recognition that events in other small business assistance and/or economic development programs in the college’s service district had affected its operation. The perceived strategies available to deal with such events in 1984 were listed as being clearly
developed and capable of handling these events. The strategies perceived available in 1985, ranged from being seen as tentative in nature and content to being seen as clearly developed (Figure 43c).

Institutional Events at Linn-Benton Community College

The respondents from Linn-Benton Community College (N=6) achieved a 67% rate of acknowledgement that events within the college had affected the operation of the Center in 1984. The level of acknowledgement dropped to 33% in 1985. The perceived strategies available to deal with such events ranged from being seen as tentative to being clearly developed in 1984. As for 1985, the perceived strategies available were seen as being clearly developed (Figure 43d).

Events Within the SBDC

For 1984, 50% of the respondents acknowledged that events within the SBDC had affected its operation. The rate of acknowledgement rose to 67% among the respondents regarding the recognition that events within the SBDC in 1985 had affected its operation. All those who agreed that such events had taken place in 1984 perceived the strategies available as being clearly developed and capable of dealing with this kind of event. As in 1984, all those who saw such events taking place in 1985 perceived the strategies available as being clearly developed (Figure 43e).
Case Study 3: Triggering the Change Process at Chemeketa’s SBDC 1984 to 1985

**Chronology of Events**

Economic Hardships and Institutional Responses

The Chemeketa Community College district covers over 2,600 square miles in Oregon’s mid-Willamette Valley. It includes Marion, Polk, most of Yamhill, and a small part of Linn counties. This area has an economic base closely tied to agriculture and related food processing, forest products, and state government. Throughout the 1970s, Marion, Polk, and Yamhill counties followed a path similar to Oregon’s general population, experiencing a population boom. But, by 1981, regional and national economic difficulties had taken a toll on the economies of the mid-valley. The severity of the recession in Oregon could be seen in its out-of-state-migration figures in which Marion and Polk counties sustained a 6,000 decrease in population between 1981 and 1983.

The economies of Marion and Polk counties have an economic base closely tied to agriculture, food processing, forest products, and state government. Yamhill County’s economy is more closely tied to durable goods manufacturing, including lumber and wood products, metals, and medical and dental equipment. Agriculture and food products, paper manufacturing and service industries are also important. The economic sectors within the Yamhill, Marion, and Polk counties which suffered the
greatest adverse impacts in the 1980 to 1983 recession were lumber and wood products and residential building construction. Recreational vehicle manufacturing and local government were also casualties. The severity of the recessionary forces was compounded by the out-flow of unemployed workers and their families, thus contributing to a three-year economic tailspin (1980 to 1983), where the whole spectrum of non-manufacturing suffered the greatest adverse impacts in the 1980 to 1983 recession were lumber and wood products and residential building construction. Recreational vehicle manufacturing and local government were also casualties. The severity of the recessionary forces was compounded by the out-flow of unemployed workers and their families, thus contributing to a three-year economic tailspin (1980 to 1983), where the whole spectrum of non-manufacturing industries led by trade, services, and government either reduced employment levels, or at best, were very slow to expand.

**Small Business Management Programs at Chemeketa Community College**

Small business assistance has been offered by Chemeketa since 1974 through its Small Business Management (SBM) program and later via periodic small business workshops. Chemeketa also established the first college based SBA resource center in Oregon. Additionally, Chemeketa has, since 1971, offered management and small business assistance to farm families in its service district.
In June 1982, the college's president proposed that the college offer some solutions to the economic problems of the mid-Willamette Valley by establishing the Cooperative Career and Economic Development Center. The center was directed toward providing three basis services: (a) funding jobs for unemployed and displaced workers, (b) to start new businesses, and (c) to expand and/or strengthen existing businesses. From October 1982 to September 1983, the center served over 628 clients.

Following an evaluation of the center's first year of operation, it was reorganized and renamed the Cooperative Training and Economic Development Center. Two staff members were reassigned from the Business Management department to facilitate the coordination and promotion of its services. The college's stated intentions toward the establishment of the Cooperative Training and Economic Development Center were to create better job opportunities, to make small business enterprises in the district more viable, and to improve the economic viability of the local economies.

Aided by the receipt of monies from the Oregon Department of Education and from the Small Business Administration, the college began operating its SBDC program in March 1984. The SBDC was incorporated into the already existing programs being offered by the Cooperative Training and Economic Development Center, located on the college's main campus.
Chemeketa's SBDC: Collecting Diagnostic Data
Through Interviews

Between November 1987 and June 1988, 14 interviews were conducted. Those participating included the director of Chemeketa's SBDC (two interviews); the SBM instructor (two interviews); the director of the college's TED Center in 1984 and 1985 (one interview); the current TED Center director (two interviews); the college's President (also president at the inception of the college's SBDC) (two interviews); the SBDC director during the sabbatical leave of the SBDC's normally assigned director (two interviews); the SBDC's Small Business Management instructor and advisor (two interviews); and the college's current Dean of Business, Health and Industry (one interview). The duration of the interviews ranged from one hour to one and one-half hours. Questions utilized in the interviewing format were taken from Tichy's Diagnostic Plan and formed the basis for the diagnostic focus of this portion of the research (Appendix D)

Survival: Learning the Necessary Truths

More so than any of the other SBDC's found in this study, Chemeketa's SBDC was able to base its efforts on an extensive experiential foundation. By the time the SBDC began its operation in March 1984, the college had the opportunity for nearly two years to examine, evaluate, and refine its economic development efforts and put together a well-defined plan of action.
Chemeketa's presidents from 1980 to 1985 and a number of key administrators on campus had participated in and/or chaired almost every major economic development planning effort in the three counties it served. The college had demonstrated its commitment to serve the business and economic development needs over an extended period of time, so that when the SBDC began its operation it was seen as a continuation of an already existing and on-going institutional process. This permitted the center to be seen initially on-campus and later in the business community as a key player in any activity aimed at helping small business.

Despite the strong support provided by the college's presidents and upper-level administrators, the SBDC did encounter several instances of resistance from internal groups within the college. The SBDC director felt that some quarters of the college envied the operational latitude afforded the center. Another issue that the SBDC director felt took place was that some personnel on campus did not share the center's willingness to tailor its programs toward the specific needs of its clients.

The center's approach to meeting community needs first as opposed to institutional and instructional needs had its philosophical roots established through the fact that the Community Education Division of the college and not the Business Management Instructional Department had been used to deliver the college's economic assistance programs. In most cases, the services and programs on campus weren't designed to be operated with the degree of responsiveness required by the SBDC and the
environment in which it operated. A good deal of internal public relations and education was required by the SBDC to gain acceptance from the other college services and programs during the first two years of operation.

Chemeketa's SBDC was able to provide from among the four sites studied the highest overall hours of direct service to its clients during 1984 and 1985, even though it experienced numerous personnel changes throughout its staff. Within its first two years of operation, the SBDC went through three changes in directorship, the addition of two full-time support staff, the resignation of the director for the Training and Economic Center under which it operated, as well as the resignation of the supervisor for its community support efforts with the city of Salem. An explanation for the center's ability to sustain itself in such an internally turbulent environment may be found in the extensive effort undertaken by the college over several years to understand and work with the area's small business community. This had a significant impact on the ability of the SBDC to conduct its activities in an appropriate and effective manner. It was not dependent on any single individual to provide stability and/or management skills to its operations. The college could be confident to a large degree that the decision makers for the SBDC had a detailed plan to follow, providing a cohesive, and integrated focus to the center's purpose.

The college realized by late 1984 that its economic development efforts needed to establish a stronger business image and become more convenient to its clientele. In the fall of 1985 the center relocated in
downtown Salem. The City of Salem and the college cooperated on the relocation effort, providing a site with considerably greater office and classroom area and space to accommodate other economic development organizations. The City of Salem contributed $75,000 in remodeling the space to the SBDC’s specifications.

Chemeketa’s SBDC: Task Difficulty

Chemeketa’s SBDC director indicated in her response to the Task Difficulty questionnaire that she operated to some extent with a clearly known way to do the major types of work normally encountered. The center’s support staff member, the Small Business Management SBM instructor indicated that he operated to a great extent with a clearly known way to do the major types of work encountered in his position. In 1985, the director indicated that to a great extent she was able to operate with a clearly known way to the major types of work encountered in that position. For the SBM instructor, in 1985, the extent to which there was a clearly known way to do the major types of work encountered remained constant to the level achieved in 1984 to a great extent (Figure 44a).

The center’s director indicated that during the first year of the SBDC’s operation (1984) that it was not too easy to know whether the work being carried out by her was being done correctly. During that same time the SBM instructor indicated that it was very easy for him to know whether his work was being done correctly. By the center’s second year of operation
a. Extent to which a clearly known way to do major types of work encountered.

- 1 = To no extent
- 2 = To a little extent
- 3 = To some extent
- 4 = To a great extent
- 5 = To a very great extent

**Figure 44**
Chemeketa Community College's SBDC Task Difficulty
c. Sure of outcomes of work.

- 1 = 40% or less
- 2 = 41 - 60%
- 3 = 61 - 75%
- 4 = 76 - 90%
- 5 = 91% or more

---

d. How often did difficult problems arise with no apparent or immediate solutions.

- 1 = Once a week or less
- 2 = 2 to 4 times a week
- 3 = Once a day
- 4 = 2 to 4 times a day
- 5 = 5 or more times a day

---

e. Time spent solving work problems.

- 1 = Less than 1 hour per week
- 2 = 1 to 4 hours a week
- 3 = About 1 hour-a-day
- 4 = About 2 to 3 hours-a-day
- 5 = 4 hours or more a-day

Figure 44 continued
(1985), the director indicated that it was somewhat easy to know whether her work was being done correctly. The response of the SBM for 1985 indicated that he still found it very easy to know whether his work was being done correctly (Figure 44b).

In 1984, the center director indicated by her response to the Task Difficulty questionnaire that she was generally sure of what the outcome of her efforts would be between 61 to 75% of the time. During 1984, the SBM instructor indicated that he saw the percentage of time he was generally sure of the outcome of his work efforts as being between 76-90%. In the center’s second year of operation (1985), the percentage of time it was known to the director whether her work was being done correctly had risen to 76-90% of the time. For the SBM instructor, the percentage of time he was generally sure of the outcome of his efforts remained constant at 76-90% of the time in 1985 (Figure 44c).

The frequency of difficult problems arising for which there was no immediate or apparent solutions in 1984, was seen by the director of the SBDC as being at a rate of once a week or less. A similar rate of occurrence was reported by the SBM instructor in 1984. For both the center director and support staff, the frequency of occurrence for such events remained the same in 1985 (Figure 44d).

In 1984, the director of Chemeketa’s SBDC stated that about 1 to 4 hours a week were being spent solving work problems for which there were no apparent or immediate solutions. The SBM instructor indicated that in
1984, he was spending 4 hours or more a day solving work problems. The center director reported that in 1985, she was spending about 1 hour a day solving problems for which there was no apparent or immediate solutions. For 1985, the SBM instructor's response remained the same as 1984, that being 4 or more hours a day was being spent solving work problems for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions (Figure 44e).

Summary: Task Difficulty

In general, the responses reported by Chemeketa's SBDC director and SBM instructor indicate that it was much easier for the SBM instructor to carry out and perform his work-related duties than it was for the director during the center's first two years of operation. It would seem that the center's director perceived having to operate in an environment with more difficulty and variability in the work being performed than the SBM instructor encountered. The director, in carrying out her job functions, would seem to have operated at a higher amount of work-related discretion and flexibility. This in part can be attributed to the fact that the SBDC was a unique and newly created entity, and as such there was no standardized set of management processes to deal with the center's operation. Over a period of time, there developed a greater level of congruency between the structure of the organization and the structure of the director's job. The instructor's ability to achieve a better overall level of predictability and analyzability in his work efforts can probably be traced to the fact that his
activities as a SBM instructor for the college remained essentially the same in the SBDC as they had been in the five years preceding his incorporation into the SBDC's activities. The characteristics and functions associated with providing his services remained constant, only the reporting process required any significant changes on his part. The high level of job effectiveness achieved by the SBM instructor occurred to a large degree because there existed an internal consistency in the work pattern and relationships experienced by the SBM instructor.

Chemeketa's SBDC: Time Spent in Coordination

The center's director and the SBM instructor of Chemeketa's SBDC were asked six questions in the Time Spent in Coordination questionnaire as a means to provide data concerning how the SBDC went about performing essential tasks, as well as establishing communication and organizational processes. The activities they were asked to provide data on were: record keeping and report writing, talking informally to people, coordinating with other units in the college, coordinating work activities with people in the OSBDCN office, coordinating work activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN, and providing direct service to current and/or potential clients (Tables 10-12).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984 Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate activities with OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services (counseling and/or training)</td>
<td>4.00 hrs = 240 min</td>
<td>4.00 hrs = 240 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00 hrs = 420 min</td>
<td>7.00 hrs = 420 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11  
**Time Spent in Coordination: Chemeketa’s SBDC Instructor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984 Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 0 min</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 0 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate activities with OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 0 min</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 0 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 0 min</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 0 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services (counseling and/or training)</td>
<td>6.00 hrs = 360 min</td>
<td>5.00 hrs = 300 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00 hrs = 480 min</td>
<td>8.00 hrs = 480 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities</td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day: .75 hrs = 45 min</td>
<td>1985 Hrs/Day: 1.25 hrs = 75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day: .25 hrs = 15 min</td>
<td>1985 Hrs/Day: .25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day: 1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>1985 Hrs/Day: 1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN</td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day: .25 hrs = 15 min</td>
<td>1985 Hrs/Day: .25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services (counseling and/or training)</td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day: 5.00 hrs = 300 min</td>
<td>1985 Hrs/Day: 4.50 hrs = 270 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day: 7.50 hrs = 450 min</td>
<td>1985 Hrs/Day: 7.50 hrs = 450 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary: Time Spent in Coordination

The mean time spent keeping track of work activities from 1984 to 1985 increased from an average of 45 minutes per day to 1 hour and 15 minutes, representing a 67% increase in time spent carrying out this activity. No change was reflected in the mean scores between 1984 and 1985 as it relates to time spent talking informally to people. From 1984 to 1985, the mean time spent in coordinating activities with other college units remained constant at an average of 1 hour per day. Coordinating work activities with the OSBDCN office averaged about 15 minutes per day for both 1984 and 1985. The mean time spent coordinating activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN averaged about 15 minutes per day for the center’s staff in 1984 and 1985. From 1984 to 1985, the mean time spent providing direct services to clients (training and/or counseling) dropped by 10% from an average of 5 hours per day to 4-1/2 hours a day (Figure 45a & 45b).

Chemeketa’s SBDC: Direction and Frequency of Information Flows

SBDC Director

Chemeketa’s SBDC director indicated that, during the center’s first year of operation (1984), she received or sent written reports or memos from other people at Chemeketa Community College about 1 to 3 times a month. The frequency of such communication from these sources remained constant in 1985, at about 1 to 3 times a month. For both 1984 and 1985, the
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frequency of receiving or sending written reports or memos to people in the OSBDCN office remained at about 1 to 3 times a month. The receiving or sending of written reports or memos from the center's director to people in other organizations or agencies remained at about 1 to 3 times a month for 1984 and 1985 (Figure 46a-46c).

Work-related discussions on a face-to-face basis or by telephone with individuals in other units of the college took place at a rate of about 1 to 3 times a day in 1984. In 1985, the director indicated that such discussions were taking place at a rate of about 1 to 3 times a week. In 1984, and 1985, work-related discussions conducted face-to-face or by telephone with individuals in the OSBDCN office occurred at a rate of about 1 to 3 times a month. During both 1984 and 1985, the frequency of such work-related discussions with individuals in other organizations was maintained at a level of about 1 to 3 times a month (Figure 46d-46f).

Work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other units in the college took place at a frequency of about once a month for the SBDC director in both 1984 and 1985. The center's director indicated that work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from the OSBDCN office occurred at a rate of about once a month in 1984 and 1985. In both 1984 and 1985, the center's director indicated that work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations or agencies took place about once a month (Figure 46g-46i).
(N=2)

a. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from people in other units of the college.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

b. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from the OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

c. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from people in other organizations.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour
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d. Work related discussions (face to face or by telephone) with individuals in other units of college.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

![Graph for work related discussions with individuals in other units of college.]

---

e. Work related discussions (face to face or by telephone) with individuals in OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

![Graph for work related discussions with individuals in OSBDCN office.]

---

f. Work related discussions (face to face or by telephone) with individuals from other organizations.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

![Graph for work related discussions with individuals from other organizations.]

---

Figure 46 continued
g. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from other units in college.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

h. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

i. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations.

1 = Not once  
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month  
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week  
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day  
5 = About every hour

Figure 46 continued
SBDC Support Staff

The center's SBM instructor indicated that during both 1984 and 1985, he received or sent written reports or memos to people in other units of the college not once. In 1984, the SBM instructor indicated that not once did he receive or send written reports or memos from people in the OSBDCN office. The frequency of such communication increased to about 1 to 3 times a month in 1985 for the center's SBM instructor. For both 1984 and 1985, the receiving or sending of written reports or memos from others in organizations outside the OSBDCN was shown as not taking place (Figure 46a-46c).

Work-related discussions conducted on a face-to-face basis or by phone occurred with a frequency of about 1 to 3 times a week for the center's SBM instructor during 1984 and 1985. The SBM instructor indicated that not once during 1984 did he have work-related discussions with individuals in the OSBDCN office. For 1985, the frequency of such work-related discussions had increased to about 1 to 3 times a month. The SBM instructor indicated that in both 1984 and 1985, he not once had a work-related discussion either face-to-face or by phone with individuals in other organizations (Figure 46d-46f).

During the center's first two years of operation (1984 and 1985), the SBM instructor indicated that not once did a work-related problem-solving meeting take place with two or more people from other units at Chemeketa Community College. For 1984, work-related discussions with two or more
people from the OSBDCN office did not occur for the SBM instructor. The frequency of such communications in 1985 increased to about once a month. Finally, the SBM instructor indicated that not once in either 1984 or 1985 did he meet with two or more people from other organizations or agencies (Figure 46g-46i).

Chemeketa’s SBDC: Collecting Diagnostic Data Through Narrative and Statistical Documents

Chemeketa’s SBDC Quarterly Performance Reports: A Summary 1984 Through 1985

In its first quarterly report (March through May 1984), Chemeketa’s SBDC noted that among the initial problems it encountered were a two-to-three week waiting period for Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) volunteers to provide business counseling to center clientele. It was also noted that the college had overestimated the center’s counseling capacity, and had encountered difficulty in being able to submit all the data requested in the quarterly report.

Chemeketa’s SBDC reported in its second quarter performance report (June through August 1984) that it had not yet been able to gain access to the numbers of SCORE volunteers required to meet the short-term counseling requests being made. This problem did not appear in any subsequent quarterly reports for 1984 and 1985 (September 1984 through December 1985).
The SBDC in its third quarter report (September through November 1984) did not list any problems encountered during that reporting period. It did provide a brief narrative of several significant operational accomplishments: establishing a distribution network for center-related informational materials, co-sponsoring several business-related forums and workshops, and developing organizational linkages with other small business assistance programs in its service area.

No narrative data were detailed in the center's quarterly report for the period covering December 1984 through February 1985, as it related to significant accomplishments and/or problems encountered by the SBDC.

For the period March through May 1985, the center's quarterly report listed among its significant accomplishments the ability to offer seven different business-related seminars with a combined total of 280 attendees. This report noted that the SBDC had been working extensively with several small communities in the district to assist them in their economic development efforts. Finally, the report commented that the center staff achieved 282% of its short-term counseling goals for that quarter.

For the second quarter of 1985 (July through September), the SBDC continued to state that it had not encountered any significant problems regarding its operation. It stated that the summer quarter had essentially been uneventful regarding significant organizational accomplishments. Most of its activities were directed toward monitoring and maintaining
existing programs, and examining what its efforts would be in the
upcoming academic year (September 1985 through June 1986).

The quarterly report for October through December 1985 did not list
any information regarding significant accomplishments and/or operational
problems encountered by the center.

Chemeketa’s SBDC Final Report Summary:
July 1, 1983 - June 30, 1985

Chemeketa’s SBDC began its operation in March, 1984. From
March 1, 1984, to February 28, 1985, 91 workshops and seminars were
presented to a total of 1,060 business people, 358 short-term counseling
sessions were provided, and 31 long-term counseling cases were handled.
The average number of hours devoted to the short-term counseling cases
equaled 1.8 hours. Long-term counseling sessions for Chemeketa’s SBDC
averaged 6.13 per case.

Among the major accomplishments noted were the implementation
and use of a new logo and brochure design as part of the center’s marketing
strategy, the development and improving of various mailing lists for target
populations, and exceeded attendance goals (134%) for its workshops and
seminars, and exceeded its short-term counseling goals (117%).

A significant challenge faced by the center was informing the small
business community in the college’s service district. A marketing plan was
designed and implemented which included presentations at meetings of
economic development groups, civic and professional organizations,
Chambers of Commerce, and interested groups. These activities were done with the intent of making the various constituencies being served to see the SBDC as a key player in any activity aimed at helping small business. An additional challenge encountered was the availability of qualified counseling staff. This issue was dealt with in part by the addition of part-time business counselors through an agreement with the college’s Business and Management Division.

During the first two years of operation (1984 and 1985), Chemeketa’s SBDC became more focused and cohesive in its purpose. Because it served a three-county district and provided training and technical assistance to both managers and employees, the center evolved into an integral part of the area’s economic development, in the fall of 1985, the center relocated from its on-campus site to one in downtown Salem. This was done to establish a stronger business image and to make the center more convenient to its small business clients.

Chemeketa’s SBDC Change Graphs

Six informants from Chemeketa Community College were asked to identify the type of events that triggered organizational change within their SBDC. After identifying the triggering events, they were asked to graphically represent on a horizontal axis the duration of the triggering event, and on a vertical axis the degree of organizational stress and uncertainty it generated within the SBDC.
The change graphs provide a means to examine how organizational personnel at various levels within the community college and SBDC viewed organizational change. It also provided data on the degree of variability concerning the change events being identified. The manner in which organizational personnel processed information regarding organizational change is also provided in the change graphs. Finally, the change graphs provide the opportunity to examine the extent of the personnel’s awareness regarding the nature and scope of the changes taking place in the SBDC.

Change Graph for Chemeketa Community College: Selected Administrative Personnel

The data generated by Chemeketa Community College’s president and vice president yielded a total of four different categories of events triggering change. The president and vice president shared the perception that changes had been triggered in the SBDC by political core system changes. They differed in that the president perceived changes in personnel having triggered change, while the college’s vice president indicated that environmental changes and cultural core system changes were involved in triggering change within the college’s SBDC.

Political Core System Change Events

Chemeketa’s president indicated that organizational uncertainty created by events triggered by political core system changes began in early November 1984 and continued to exist throughout the following year, which
was beyond the chronological scope of this study. At its inception, the degree of uncertainty being experienced was shown as operating at a level of little uncertainty being present. From that time onward, it quickly escalated upward, reaching a slight level of uncertainty by April 1985, obtaining a moderate level of uncertainty by late July 1985, and reaching a level of high uncertainty being present by the end of December in 1985. Organizational stress with the college's SBDC being triggered by political core system change events was seen as originating at the same time as organizational uncertainty, that being November 1984. Like organizational uncertainty, the organizational stress level was first depicted as operating at a level with little stress being present. By May 1985, it had risen to a level where a slight amount of organizational stress was seen as existing. Within two months (July 1985), the stress level was shown as being present at a moderate level. By December 1985, organizational stress associated with change events triggered by political core system changes was indicated as operating at a very high level, by the college's president (Figure 47).

The college's vice president indicated that political core system change events were present from the center's inception in January 1984, and were creating a moderate level of uncertainty within the SBDC. The uncertainty generated by political core system change events escalated steadily, reaching its apex in August 1984, where it was seen as functioning at a high level of uncertainty. From August 1984, organizational uncertainty began declining slowly over the next 11 months. By July 1985,
Figure 47
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organizational uncertainty was seen as operating again at a moderate level. This level of organizational uncertainty was seen as being maintained the rest of 1985 by the vice president of the college. Organizational stress was seen by the college's vice president as being present shortly after the center began operation in January 1984. Like organizational uncertainty, organizational stress was depicted as being present at its inception at a moderate level. By August 1984, it had risen to a high level of stress; from that point onward it was seen as slowly diminishing. It leveled off at a moderate level of stress in May 1985. That level of stress was maintained throughout the remainder of 1985 (Figure 48).

Changes in Personnel

The change events triggered by changes in personnel were portrayed by the college's president as occurring in November 1984. At its inception, his triggering event was seen as creating a high level of organizational uncertainty within the SBDC. This level of uncertainty was determined by the college's president to have been maintained until March 1985. After March 1985, organizational stress associated with changes in personnel began to be seen as diminishing, so that by July 1985, it was portrayed as operating at a moderate level. By December 1985, organizational uncertainty was characterized as being present at a slight level (Figure 49).

Like organizational uncertainty triggered by changes in personnel, organizational stress produced by such an event was first seen as occurring
Figure 48
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Triggering Events: Changes in Personnel
in November 1984. At its initial stage, organizational stress was depicted as operating at a very high level. That level of organizational stress was seen as continuing until May 1985. From that point onward, organizational stress was portrayed as quickly dropping in intensity. By July 1985, its level of operation was depicted at a high level. In September 1985, it was described as being present at a moderate level. The level of organizational stress triggered by changes in personnel within the college’s SBDC was seen as being present at a slight level by the end of 1985 (Figure 49).

Environmental Change

Environmentally triggered changes within the college’s SBDC were seen as first occurring in January 1984, by the college’s vice president and as operating at a moderate level. From that point, the level of organizational stress continued to move in an upward fashion, reaching its apex and maintaining a high level of uncertainty throughout the months of July and August 1984. After August 1984, organizational stress was portrayed as moving in a downward fashion, leveling off at a moderate level by June 1985. Organizational uncertainty was seen as being maintained at a moderate level throughout the latter half of 1985. Like the organizational uncertainty generated by environmental change events, organizational stress was seen as being present in January 1984, and operating at a moderate level. It quickly moved in an upward fashion, reaching a high level of stress by June 1984, and sustaining that level until August 1984. From
August 1984, organizational stress began to decline until May 1985, when it leveled off at a moderate level. It was essentially seen by the college’s vice president as operating at that level throughout the remaining months of 1985 (Figure 50).

Cultural Core System Change Events

The college’s vice president indicated that cultural core system change events were present from January 1984, and were creating a moderate level of uncertainty within the SBDC. The level of uncertainty escalated steadily, reaching its apex in August 1984, operating at a high level. From that point onward, the level of uncertainty slowly began to decline. This decline took place over an 11-month period. By July 1985, organizational uncertainty was seen by the vice president as operating at a moderate level. This level of uncertainty was portrayed as remaining at a moderate level throughout the remaining months of 1985. Organizational stress was seen as being present shortly after the center began its operation in January 1984. Organizational stress was seen as being present at that time at a moderate level. Over the next several months, the stress level was depicted as rising. By August 1984, it reached a high level of stress. After August 1984, it was portrayed as slowly diminishing. Organizational stress generated by cultural core system changes leveled off at a moderate level by May 1985. That level of stress was to remain constant throughout the remainder of 1985 (Figure 51).
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Triggering Events: Cultural Core System Changes
Administrative Comments: Triggering Events

Both the college’s president and vice president were asked, following the drawing of their change graphs, to discuss and/or comment on the events that they portrayed as having triggered organizational change within Chemeketa’s SBDC. Operational definitions of the four previously mentioned triggering events (as well as illustrative quotations associated with them) are presented below.

Environmental Changes

Environmental change events are triggered by uncertainty regarding the availability of critical resources, linkage with critical constituencies, and/or the ability to control desired organizational outcomes in the environment.

"College needed to form a rapid response team to deal with the poor economy and plant closures. Legislative action and financial assistance allowed college to develop SBDC concept and make it operational, and provide college with a new format for its services."

Cultural Core System Changes

Cultural cores system change events are triggered by shifts in the organization’s shared values, what beliefs to commit to, and/or those objectives worth striving for organizationally.
"If the SBDC was to be accepted by the business community, it needed to be perceived as being business oriented and not as another academic program. The SBDC had to break the rules in order to get things done. The SBDC had to be able to respond much more quickly to clients' needs than the typical college activity."

"We had to make the SBDC operate on a proactive basis, seeking out opportunities. This approach required the college to become much more marketing oriented. I perceive that the college wants the SBDC out in the forefront of offering training and economic development activities in our service district."

Political Core System Changes

Political core system change events are triggered by shifts in the ability to allocate and use the power and resources in the organization in the pursuit of goals, the manner in which work is done, and determining who will benefit from the actions taken.

"There is an ongoing problem of determining the type of program accountability to be used with SBDC, because it operates so differently from the other things we do."

"The higher levels of administration at the college solidly behind SBDC, but some departments resented the latitude given the SBDC in its operate."
"The campus doesn’t understand what we’re doing so there is little awareness of what is required. The SBDC staff works outside the normal channels of accountability; they have a lot more levels to deal with than most other programs."

Changes in Personnel

Changes in personnel events are triggered by actions which bring about different organizational configurations (social networks, people, and processes). These changes include the characteristics of the members of the organization (educational background, motivational patterns, and managerial style).

"It became apparent during the first year of the center’s operation that we needed a change in the directorship of the T.E.D. Center. The director did not have direct business experience, and suffered from an image problem. This operation (SBDC) requires people to be able to take risks and to be able to take charge. Those involved with SBDC have to operate closely with each other, basically, those who couldn’t or wouldn’t do this did not stay long with the SBDC."

"In the beginning, the SBDC needed a management approach that stressed a participative style. The center’s second director brought a creative approach to the use of resources and personnel."
Change Graphs for Chemeketa Community College:
SBDC Director and Support Staff

The data generated by Chemeketa’s SBDC Director and support staff yielded a total of three different types of change events in the SBDC. The SBDC director indicated that changes in the center had been triggered by technical core system changes. The support staff member (SBM instructor) indicated that two events had triggered change in the SBDC, these being cultural core system changes and changes in personnel.

Technical Core System Change

As the center began its operation in January 1984, the center’s director depicted organizational uncertainty generated by a technical core system change as operating at a moderate level. During the next nine months it dropped steadily, reaching by September 1984 a level it was seen as being present only slightly. The stress level was seen by the director to continue to drop, so that in July 1985 it was portrayed as generating little stress. By the end of the year, it was shown as no longer being present within the center. The SBDC director indicated that as of January 1984 organizational stress generated by technical core system changes was operating at a moderately high level. By June 1984, it was portrayed as being present at a moderate level. It was depicted as continuing to decline, reaching by March 1985 a level where it was seen as being present at a slight level. Organizational stress generated by the technical core system
change ended the year (1985) at a level where it was essentially seen as no longer being present (Figure 52).

**Cultural Core System Change**

Organizational uncertainty generated by a cultural core systems change was seen by the SBM instructor as being present in January 1984 and was described as creating a high level of uncertainty. Over the next three months, the level of uncertainty was depicted as experiencing a steep drop in severity, ending in April 1984 at a moderate level. By June 1984, the level of intensity was seen as being present at a slight level. It continued to drop, reaching by September 1984, a level where it was perceived as generating little uncertainty. From September 1984 until the end of 1985, organizational uncertainty was seen by the SBM instructor as being experienced at a level where little or no uncertainty was present. As the center began its operation in January 1984, the SBM instructor portrayed the organizational stress generated by cultural core system changes as being at a very low level. It very quickly moved upward, so that by mid-March of 1984, it was depicted as creating a slight level of stress. By late April 1984, organizational stress was seen operating at a moderate level. It continued to move upward, reaching a high level of stress in August 1984. Organizational stress steadily moved upward in intensity, reaching its apex in December 1984, at a very high level, and maintained that level of stress over the next four months. From April 1985, until the end of that year,
Figure 52
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organizational stress generated by cultural core system changes, was seen as slowly declining, reaching a moderate level of stress by the year's end (Figure 53).

Changes in Personnel

The SBDC's SBM instructor indicated that when the SBDC began its operation in January 1984, changes in personnel were not generating any organizational uncertainty. By March 1984, the organizational uncertainty being created by personnel changes was seen as being present at a moderate level. Within two months, organizational uncertainty was depicted as operating at a very high level. Throughout May, June, and July of 1984, it sustained this level of uncertainty. Beginning in August 1984, organizational uncertainty began a slow but steady decline in intensity. In January 1985, the level of uncertainty generated by personnel changes was portrayed at a high level. By April 1985, it was seen as operating at a moderate level of intensity. From that point onward, it declined quickly, so that by July 1985, it was seen by the SBM instructor as being present at only a slight level. It remained at this level throughout the remainder of 1985. Organizational stress generated by changes in personnel was depicted by the SBDC's SBM instructor as operating at a slight level throughout the two-year period of this study (January 1984 through December 1985) (Figure 54).
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Figure 54
SBDC Staff Comments: Triggering Events

Both the SBDC director and SBM instructor were asked, following the drawing of their change graphs, to discuss and/or comment on the events they portrayed as having brought about change in Chemeketa's SBDC. Operational definitions of the three triggering events (as well as illustrative quotations associated with them) are presented below.

Technical Core System Changes

Technical core system change events are triggered by shifts in the data and behavioral requirements of the organization as it attempts to utilize its social and technical resources to produce desired output.

"The SBDC had a limited capacity to deal with the demands for its services in the business community. The center is very dependent upon other college departments and services to operate its program."

"Moving off-campus gave us the opportunity to expand our services and become more diversified. The downtown site allowed us to upscale our resource library considerably."

Cultural Core System Changes

Cultural core system change of events are triggered by shifts in the organization's shared values, what beliefs to commit to, and/or those objectives worth striving for organizationally.
"Moving off-campus allowed us to become more closely identified with our clientele—the business community. It took some time for the college to become aware that our demands are worlds apart from the typical academic department."

"The college now recognizes that the SBDC has to be market oriented and not institutionally based. We are a lot more aware of our constituency than any other program the college offers. We've had to educate the people on campus about our requirements and our time lines. They (on-campus personnel) have become more aware of how highly unpredictable our work environment is."

Changes in Personnel

Changes in personnel events are triggered by actions which bring about different organizational configurations (social networks, people, and processes). These changes include the characteristics of members of the organization (educational background, motivational patterns, and managerial style).

"The SBDC staff has been together for a long time, we don't tend to play games, we're pretty open and direct with each other."
Chemeketa’s SBDC: Domain Uncertainty

Chemeketa’s SBDC Staff: Consensus on Goals

The center’s director selected providing short-term guidance, training, and/or counseling as the most important goal for its operation in both 1984 and 1985. For the center’s SBM instructor advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures was seen as being the SBDC’s top goal in 1984 and 1985 (Figure 55).

In 1984 and 1985, the director of the SBDC indicated that the second most important goal for the center was to advise potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures. Providing long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential business owners was seen as being the second most important goal for the SBDC by its SBM instructor (Figure 55).

The SBDC’s director selected providing long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners as being the third most important goal for the center in both 1984 and 1985. Providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners was seen as being the third most important goal for the SBDC by the SBM instructor for both 1984 and 1985 (Figure 55).

Coordinating the SBDC’s services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the small business community was selected by the center’s director as its fourth most important goal in 1984.
1984

SBDC Staff:

SBDC DIRECTOR
1. Provide short-term services
2. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
3. Provide long-term services
4. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations

SBM INSTRUCTOR
1. Assist SB's served to increase profits
2. Provide long-term services
3. Provide short-term services
4. Promote awareness of SBDC

Chemeketa Administration:

PRESIDENT
1. Provide short-term services
2. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
3. Reduce failure rate of SB's
4. Assist SB's served to increase profits

VICE PRESIDENT
1. Advise on feasibility of intended venture
2. Assist SB's served to increase profits
3. Provide short-term services
4. Select and train SBDC staff

1985

SBDC Staff:

SBDC DIRECTOR
1. Provide short-term services
2. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
3. Provide long-term services
4. Promote awareness of SBDC

SBM INSTRUCTOR
1. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
2. Provide long-term services
3. Provide short-term services
4. Promote awareness of SBDC

Chemeketa Administration:

PRESIDENT
1. Assist SB's served to increase profits
2. Reduce failure rate of SB's
3. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
4. Provide short-term services

VICE PRESIDENT
1. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
2. Assist SB's served to increase profits
3. Provide short-term services
4. Promote awareness of SBDC

Figure 55  Goal Consensus
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In 1985, the center's director selected developing and promoting the SBDC's services to the small business community as the fourth most important goal for Chemeketa's SBDC. For both 1984 and 1985, the SBM instructor selected developing and promoting the SBDC's services to the small business community as the fourth most important goal for the center to pursue (Figure 55).

Chemeketa's SBDC Staff: Goal Agreement for the SBDC

With the exception of selecting the developing and promoting of the SBDC's services to the small business community as the fourth most important goal for the center in 1985, no other points of agreement on the ranking of goals were achieved by the center's director or SBM instructor. Generally, they selected the same sets of goals for the center, but chose to prioritize them different. The director's selection in 1984 of coordinating the SBDC's services with other public and/or private agencies to meet the needs of the business community represents the only departure among the staff on what goals should be utilized by the center in its first two years of operation (Figure 55).

Chemeketa's Administrative Staff: Consensus on Goals

The college's president saw providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners as the most important goal for the SBDC in 1984. In 1985, the president selected as
the SBDC's most important goal assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC to improve significantly their ability to generate profits. The college's vice president in 1984 and 1985 saw advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures as the center's most important goal (Figure 55).

In 1984, advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures was seen as the second most important goal for the SBDC by the college's president. To reduce the failure rate of small businesses in the community was selected in 1985 by the college's president as the second most important goal for the SBDC. To select and train SBDC staff members capable of providing a consistently high level of service was selected by the college's vice president as being the second most important goal for the SBDC in 1984. For 1985, the vice president selected as the second most important goal for the SBDC assisting those businesses being served by the college's SBDC to improve to a significant degree their ability to generate profits (Figure 55).

To reduce the failure rate of small businesses in the community was seen by the college's president as being the third most important goal for the SBDC in 1984. Advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures was selected in 1985 as the third most important goal for the SBDC by the president of the college. In both 1984 and 1985, the vice president of the college saw providing short-term
guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners as the center's third most important goal (Figure 55).

To assist those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits was selected by the college's president as the fourth most important goal for the center in 1984. For the president of the college providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and potential small business owners became the fourth most important goal for the SBDC in 1985. The vice president for the college selected assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits as the fourth most important center goal in 1984. To develop and promote the small business community's awareness of the SBDC's services became fourth most in importance in 1985 for the center as seen by the college's vice president (Figure 55).

Chemeketa's Administrative Staff: Goal Agreement for SBDC

Selecting and assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in 1984 to improve to a significant degree their ability to generate profits as the center's fourth most important goal represents the sole area of agreement regarding the center's goal priorities as seen by the college's president and vice president in the center's first two years of operation. There was displayed in these respondents' selection of goals for the SBDC a
considerable degree of variability regarding the importance associated with the center's goals (Figure 55).

For the president of the college the goals selected for the SBDC in both 1984 and 1985 emphasized the end results of the center's actions, as opposed to the nature, type, and quality of the center's services. The college's vice president's goal selections were in 1984 and 1985 evenly divided between the intended outcomes of the SBDC's services and in the nature, type and quality of services being provided (Figure 55).

**Clarity of Operating Strategies**

**Economic Conditions**

There was a 25% agreement level (N=4) among respondents at Chemeketa Community College that events generated by the economic conditions of the local and/or regional economy had affected the operation of the college's SBDC in 1984. In 1985, the level of acknowledgement dropped to 0% regarding economic events and their impact on the SBDC. The respondent who saw economic events affecting the SBDC in 1984, perceived that the available strategy was tentatively developed and remained unclear (Figure 56a).

**OSBDCN Events**

In 1984 and 1985, a 50% agreement level among respondents (N=4) was recorded regarding the recognition that events in the OSBDCN
a. Event(s) in the economic conditions of the local and/or regional economy of your SBDC's service area that affect the operation of your SBDC.

50% STAFF - event occurred
0% ADMIN - event occurred

25% acknowledgment that event occurred

Comments of events, 1984...
- layoffs (1982) - Champion plant in Salem

Comments of events, 1985...
- N/A

Perception of available strategies: (N=1)

1. Had no idea how to deal with this
2. A tentative strategy developed but still remained unclear
3. Had a strategy but didn't know if it would work
4. Had a clear strategy for dealing with this kind of event
5. Had a very clear tried and tested strategy to deal with this kind of event

Figure 56 Clarity of Operating Strategies: Chemeketa Community College's SBDC
b. Events in the OSBDCN administrative office in Eugene that affect the operation of the SBDC.

100% STAFF - event occurred
0% ADMIN - event occurred

50% acknowledgment that event occurred 1984

Comments of events, 1984...
- availability of grants
- SBA rules changing
- OSBDCN office required to implement new regulations

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

Figure 56 continued
c. Events in other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within your SBDC's service area that affect the operation of your SBDC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SEDCOR perceived to be ineffective
- C.C.C./SBDC actively involved with its efforts

Comments of events, 1985...
- change in SEDCOR
- C.C.C./SBDC actively involved with its efforts

Perception of available strategies: (N=1)

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

Figure 56 continued
d. Events that happened within the community college sponsoring and supporting your SBDC that affect the operation of the SBDC.

0% STAFF - event occurred
100% ADMIN - event occurred

50% acknowledgment that event occurred
1984

0% acknowledgment that event occurred
1985

Comments of events, 1984...
• C.C. organizational structure change - new VP and new dean
• change in dean level administration

Comments of events, 1985...
• N/A

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

Perception of available strategies: (N=0)
e. Events that happened within your own SBDC that affect the operation or your SBDC.

100% STAFF - event occurred
50% ADMIN - event occurred

75% acknowledgment that event occurred

1984

50% STAFF - event occurred
0% ADMIN - event occurred

25% acknowledgment that event occurred

1985

Comments of events, 1984...
- change in T.E.D. Center Administration
- SBDC director on sabbatical/SBM counselor took over administration
- brought together three programs to make up the T.E.D. Center

Perception of available strategies: (N=3)

Comments of events, 1985...
- new director, a real entrepreneur

Perception of available strategies: (N=1)

Figure 56 continued
administrative office in Eugene had affected the operation of Chemeketa’s SBDC. Those agreeing with the occurrence of the OSBDCN office having brought changes in the operation of the SBDC in 1984 listed the perceived strategies available as being developed, but didn’t know if they would work, and having a clear, tried and tested strategy. For 1985, the perceived strategies available were listed as being tentatively developed, but they remained unclear, and having strategies but not knowing if they would work (Figure 56b).

Other Small Business Programs

There was a 25% agreement rate in 1984 among respondents (N=4) at Chemeketa Community College that events in other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development programs in the SBDC’s service area had affected the operation of the SBDC. The respondent who saw such an event happen in 1984 perceived that the SBDC had no idea how to deal with this type of situation. In 1985, a 50% agreement rate was reached among respondents (N=4) regarding the recognition that events in other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs in the SBDC’s service area had affected its operation. The perceived strategies available listed as being available to deal with such events were seen as being: having a strategy, but not knowing if it would work, and having a clear strategy for dealing with this kind of event (Figure 56c).
Institutional Events at Chemeketa Community College

A 50% agreement level was reached by respondents at Chemeketa Community College regarding the recognition that events within the college had affected the operation of the SBDC in 1984. The respondents who had acknowledged such events occurring perceived the available strategy be a clear strategy for dealing with this kind of event. In 1985, a 0% agreement level was recorded by the respondents (N=4) regarding such events as having occurred (Figure 56d).

Events Within the SBDC

In 1984, a 75% agreement rate (N=4) was achieved among respondents at Chemeketa Community College that events within the SBDC had affected its operation. Those who acknowledged the occurrence of such events perceived the strategies available to deal with the event as being either clearly developed or being very clear, and tried and tested in its ability to deal with this kind of event. For 1985 a 25% agreement rate (N=4) was reached concerning events occurring in the SBDC which affected its operation. For this respondent the perceived strategy available was seen as being developed, but it was not known whether it would work (Figure 56e).
Chronology of Events

Economic Hardships and Institutional Responses

The Mt. Hood Community College district covers 950 square miles in Oregon's Western Columbia River Basin. It includes East Multnomah County and portions of Clackamas and Hood River Counties. More than 200,000 people live in the district's service area.

The college's service district area from 1980 to 1983 experienced unemployment levels not seen since before World War II. Unemployment reached a post-World War II jobless rate of 9.7%. With a diversified industrial base of manufacturing, high technology, and numerous distribution and retail centers, the region weathered the depressed economic conditions of the early 1980s in much better shape than most of the other areas in Oregon which were more dependent on recession-sensitive lumber and wood products based industries. The economy in the area stopped experiencing significant turbulence and unpredictability by late 1983, and began to grow very slowly thereafter. The slow growth of employment in the region kept the area's jobless rate at a high level until 1987, when the unemployment rate showed substantial improvement.

Mt. Hood Community College, like its sister institutions in Oregon, began in the late 1970s and early 1980s to experience declining enrollments,
voters becoming increasingly resistant to providing the revenues necessary to accommodate the college’s efforts, and a regional population being uprooted socially, psychologically, and emotionally by the ravages of a nationwide recession. The decline of resources at the college made the availability of funds for the SBM program questionable, and the ability to provide program continuity speculative.

Small Business Programs at Mt. Hood Community College

Mt. Hood Community College began offering small business assistance through its Small Business Management (SBM) program in 1974. This program provided assistance to the area’s small businesses throughout most of the 1970s at a modest level of institutional involvement and serving a relatively small number of participants. As the college entered the 1980s it decided to continue to offer its SBM program, and also entered into a cooperative effort with the Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce to provide a series of workshops, conferences, and community planning sessions on economic development. Beginning in the early 1980s, the college also began offering contracted training services to various business and industrial organizations in its service area, as well as providing institutional research to assist the community to develop data related to work force demographics.

Institutionally, Mt. Hood Community College made a decision in 1984 to incorporate the SBDC as a part of the college’s Center for Economic
and Community Development (CECD) which serves as an umbrella-like organization for several separate but interrelated programs. Each CECD program is responsible for a particular demographic or economically-targeted population. The center was created as a means for the college to be able to maximize its economic development efforts through the minimization of expenditures and by avoiding unnecessary duplication of efforts.

Mt. Hood’s SBDC was created to provide free services for people with an idea for a business and for existing business people who needed to overcome problems encountered in the operation of their businesses. The college’s president in 1985 stated, "In our community, small business development is economic development." The college’s SBDC offered business-related counseling, audio-visual and reference materials, and low-cost workshops and seminars in an attempt to help individuals to organize and start their own businesses and to assist existing businesses in operating more effectively. Through its activities and services, the SBDC made itself a major part of MHCC’s efforts to continue to provide economic development in the college’s service district.

Mt. Hood’s SBDC: Collecting Diagnostic Data Through Interviews

Between February 5, 1988, and February 26, 1988, ten interviews were conducted. Those participating included the first director of the college’s SBDC (one interview); the second director of the SBDC (one interview); the
third director of the SBDC (one interview); the fourth director of the SBDC (three interviews); the Director of the Center for Community and Economic Development (one interview); the SBDC’s administrative assistant (one interview); the college’s former Divisional Director of Business and Technology (one interview); and the college’s President (one interview). The duration of the interviews ranged from one hour to two hours in length. Questions utilized in the interviewing format were taken from Tichy’s Diagnostic Plan and formed the basis for the diagnostic focus of this portion of the research (Appendix D).

**Survival: Two Steps Forward, One Step Back**

Despite the college’s extensive experiential background in economic development efforts, MHCC’s Small Business Development Center went through a three year period of considerable change and turbulence in its management. Between March 1984 and December 1986, four different individuals occupied the position of director for the college’s SBDC. This level of management change exceeded anything experienced by any of the three other SBDCs in this study.

During the first 18 months of its operation, Mt. Hood’s SBDC was plagued by a number of counter opposing forces from both internal and external sources. Interview data indicated that a mission statement for the SBDC was not formulated until the arrival of the center’s second director, nearly six months into the center’s operation. One of the center’s directors
stated that, "The college had lots of ideas about economic development, but no agenda. The college didn’t know what an SBDC was, what to do with it, or what it was doing."

Part of the difficulty the college experienced in dealing with the SBDC was explained by some of the respondents as a by-product of an extensive system-wide restructuring of the college’s organization, the departure of the college’s president of over 10 years, and the political pressure brought to bear on the SBDC by other college programs and/or personnel who resisted its efforts and activities. One of the respondents commented that even though the center had gained the support of the college’s upper levels of management, after four years of operation it was still dealing with the issue of being accepted by some of the college’s personnel and/or academic departments.

The college’s new president commented that for a while he chose to disassociate himself from the SBDC. This, he believed, was necessary in order to gain a perspective separate from that of his predecessor regarding the SBDC’s role in the college and in the community. Once that perspective was gained, the new president began to actively shape a new identity for it and wholeheartedly support the functions of the SBDC. The college’s president commented that for MHCC, the introduction of the SBDC into the college’s delivery of services and programs was a timely and necessary response to the economic development needs of the college’s service district.
In addition to the internal turbulence experienced by the SBDC, there were a number of external forces that impacted its operation and delivery of services. Nearly all the respondents interviewed mentioned that the college experienced considerable difficulty in being able to identify and target which constituencies and geographic areas to be responsive in its service district. As one of the center's directors put it, "We service a number of diversified communities, with no central political, social, or economic focus point. It is difficult to do things for one area and not take a shot at being looked at as playing favorites."

The SBDC at MHCC was the recipient of an organizational history and philosophy which often sought to change things after personnel left rather than while they were still present. Historically, the college has developed an identity as first and foremost a transfer-oriented institution, secondly as a provider of vocational and technical-based programs, and then as being responsive to community education needs. A common theme expressed by the SBDC directors at MHCC was the need to get the SBDC away from the traditional academic power bases on campus and move to a community/consumer-based site. The SBDC and the Center for Community and Economic Development of which it is a part, tend to act as a catch-all organization response by the college for all non-traditional programs.

During the course of this research effort, the college underwent an accreditation process. That institutional review indicated that the SBDC was underfunded, and lacked the proper physical space to carry out its various
functions. The lack of available space was also seen as a critical factor in the future development of the college’s SBDC by several of the MHCC personnel interviewed in this research effort. The lack of space prevented the SBDC from expanding its services instructionally and technically, as well as limited the resources that could be made available to its clients. Despite a long-standing recognition that an off-campus site for the SBDC was needed and warranted, funding sources had not been secured for such a move to take place. Additionally, the college was deeply concerned about the potential political ramifications concerning the placement of the center. The end product of these factors was that the SBDC was entering its fourth year of operation with more requests for its services, while having a steadily decreasing physical capacity to provide them. By the 1985-1986 academic year, the SBDC was serving approximately 200 businesses a year, while its service district supported a business community with nearly 3,600 small businesses. The rising expectations of the college and the business needs of the community have placed a considerable burden on the community-oriented and based services provided by MHCC. Even with the considerable effort put forth by the college’s upper levels of administration and the community education based personnel at MHCC, the college’s economic development activities were perceived in many quarters on campus as an unwanted adjunct, taking away from the college’s historical and traditional directed on-campus classroom activities.
Mt. Hood’s SBDC: Task Difficulty

Mt. Hood’s first SBDC director indicated that in 1984, he operated to a great extent with a "clearly known" way to do the major types of work normally encountered. For the second SBDC director at MHCC in 1984, the level at which a "clearly known" way to do the major types of work normally encountered was seen as being present to no extent. The center’s support staff member, the office manager, indicated that in 1984 she operated to some extent with a "clearly known" way to do the major types of work encountered in her position. By 1985, the center’s first director had resigned his position and had entered the private business sector. For the center’s second director in 1985, there existed, to some extent, a "clearly known" way to do the major types of work normally encountered. The third director for the college’s SBDC indicated that in 1985 he operated to a great extent with a "clearly known" way to do the major types of work normally encountered. The center’s support staff member in 1985 saw herself being able to operate to a great extent with a "clearly known" way to do the major types of work she normally encountered (Figure 57a).

The SBDC’s first director indicated that it was "somewhat easy" in 1984 to know whether he was doing his work correctly. During 1984, the second director indicated that it was "not at all easy" to know whether his work was being done correctly. For the center’s support staff member in 1984, it was "somewhat easy" to know whether she was doing the work correctly. The center’s first director was not involved in its second year of
(N=4)

a. Extent to which a clearly known way to do major types of work encountered.

1 = To no extent
2 = To a little extent
3 = To some extent
4 = To a great extent
5 = To a very great extent

b. Extent to know whether work done correctly.

1 = Not at all easy
2 = Not too easy
3 = Somewhat easy
4 = Quite easy
5 = Very easy

Figure 57
Task Difficulty: Mt. Hood Community College's SBDC
c. Sure of outcomes of work.

1 = 40% or less
2 = 41 - 60%
3 = 61 - 75%
4 = 76 - 90%
5 = 91% or more

d. How often did difficult problems arise with no apparent or immediate solutions.

1 = Once a week or less
2 = 2 to 4 times a week
3 = Once a day
4 = 2 to 4 times a day
5 = 5 or more times a day

e. Time spent solving work problems.

1 = Less than 1 hour per week
2 = 1 to 4 hours a week
3 = About 1 hour-a-day
4 = About 2 to 3 hours-a-day
5 = 4 hours or more a-day

Figure 57 continued
operation (1985), and no responses were required for that period from him. As for the center’s second director, in 1985, he indicated that it was “not too easy” for him to know whether he was doing his work correctly. In 1985, the center’s third director saw it as being “very easy” for him to know whether he was doing his work correctly. The center’s support staff member in 1985 also portrayed it as being “very easy” for her to know whether she was doing her work correctly (Figure 57b).

In 1984, the SBDC’s first director indicated that he was “generally sure” of the outcomes of his work efforts between 61 to 75% of the time. During the center’s first year of operation (1984), the SBDC’s second director felt that between 41 to 60% of the time was he "generally sure" of the outcome of his work efforts. The support staff member for the SBDC in 1984 indicated that between 76 to 90% of the time was she "generally sure" of what the outcome of her work efforts would be. Having left the center before its second year of operation (1985), the SBDC’s first director did not record a response for that year. The SBDC’s second director indicated that in 1985, he was "generally sure" of the outcome of his work efforts between 61 to 75% of the time. The center’s third director indicated that in 1985, the level of assurance for the outcome of his work efforts was also between 61 to 75% of the time. In the center’s second year of operation (1985), the support staff member for the SBDC portrayed the percentage of time that she was "generally sure" of the outcome of her work as being between 91% to 100% of the time (Figure 57c).
The frequency of difficult problems arising for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions was listed by the center's first director as taking place in 1984 at a rate of once a week or less. A similar rate of occurrence was listed by the center's second director in 1984. This rate of occurrence was also duplicated by the center's support staff member in 1984. In 1985, the center's first director was no longer affiliated with the program or the college. The SBDC's second director's rate of occurrence for difficult problems arising in the work for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions remained at once a week or less in 1985. That rate of occurrence was also recorded by the center's third director in 1985, as well as by the center's support staff member (Figure 57d).

In 1984, Mt. Hood's first SBDC director stated that less than one hour a week was being spent solving work problems for which there were no apparent or immediate solutions. For the center's second director, about 1 to 4 hours a week were being spent solving work problems in 1984 for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions. The center's support staff member also indicated that in 1984, about 1 to 4 hours a week were being spent solving work-related problems. The departure of the center's first director prior to 1985 negated any responses for the center's second year of operation. For the center's second director, about 1 hour a day was spent in 1985 attempting to solve work problems for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions. In 1985, the SBDC's third director indicated that he was spending less than an hour a week solving work
problems for which there were no immediate or apparent work solutions. About 1 to 4 hours a week were being spent by the center's support staff member in 1985 solving work-related problems, a rate constant with that being experienced in 1984 by her (Figure 57e).

Summary: Task Difficulty

In general, during the center's first two years of its operation, the center's first and third directors found it much easier to carry out and perform their work-related duties than it was for the SBDC's second director. Overall, it would seem that the SBDC's support staff member enjoyed the highest level of task proficiency and certainty during the center's operation in 1984 and 1985. As for the center's first director, his approach to the SBDC was to see it as an extension of the already existing Small Business Management (SBM) program. His efforts were essentially oriented toward establishing a more diversified and extensive classroom/academic related service to the business community. This approach was probably chosen, since it closely paralleled his own efforts on behalf of the college in earlier SBM programs. The SBDC's second director came into the center with an approach based on utilizing his own small business background as well as his experience as an attorney. For the first director, the end product of his continuation of the SBM approach was a failure to provide the full range of services required in the SBDC's mission statement and by its funding sources. Not until the arrival of the third
director did the college secure an individual capable of providing the necessary mix of academic and business acumen required to deliver the services of the SBDC. Unlike his predecessors, the third director helped fashion the center's domain, values, and intended outcomes, as opposed to having the college imposing them upon him.

The high level of job effectiveness achieved by the center's support staff can probably be traced to a combination of having a highly developed set of technical skills as well as having an acute and sophisticated knowledge of the college's formal and informal operating processes and patterns prior to assuming her duties in the SBDC. The high level of stability and consistency brought by the staff member to her position helped to provide a much needed level of predictability and analyzability to the center's operation during its first two years of operation.

Mt. Hood's SBDC: Time Spent in Coordination

The center's directors during its first two years of operation (1984 and 1985), and office manager were asked six questions in the Time Spent In Coordination questionnaire as a means to provide data concerning how the SBDC went about performing essential tasks, as well as establishing communication and organizational processes. The activities they were asked to provide data on were: record keeping and report writing, talking informally to people, coordinating with other units in the college, coordinating work activities with personnel in the OSBDCN office,
coordinating work activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN office, and providing direct services to current and/or potential clients (Tables 13-16).

Summary: Time Spent in Coordination

The mean time spent keeping track of activities (record keeping and/or reporting) from 1984 to 1985 went from an average of 4.80 minutes per day to 20 minutes per day, representing a 417% increase in the time spent carrying out this activity. From 1984 to 1985, the mean time spent talking informally to people went from 55.2 minutes per day to 40.2 minutes per day, representing a 17% decrease in the time required for this activity. Coordinating work activities with other units in the college remained constant at 75 minutes per day for both 1984 to 1985. The mean score for time spent coordinating work activities with OSBDCN office personnel went from 48.8 minutes in 1984 to 69.0 minutes in 1985, representing a 41.4% increase in time spent doing this activity. The time spent coordinating work activities with organizations outside the OSBDCN went from an average of 60 minutes per day in 1984 to an average of 100.2 minutes per day in 1985, representing an increase of 67% in the amount of time spent doing this activity. From 1984 to 1985, the mean time spent providing direct services to clients (training and/or counseling) increased by 20.0 minutes per day, going from 3.0 hours/180 minutes to 3.3 hours/200 minutes, representing a 11% increase in the time spent providing this service (Figure 58a & 58b).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time Spent in Coordination: Mt. Hood's SBDC Directors—1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984 1st Director Hrs/Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities (record keeping &amp; reports)</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate with people in OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate with organizations outside of OSBDCN</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services</td>
<td>5.00 hrs = 300 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.75 hrs = 465 min

6.25 hrs = 375 min
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>1985 2nd Director Hrs/Day</th>
<th>1985 3rd Director Hrs/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities (record keeping &amp; reports)</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate activities with other college units</td>
<td>.75 hrs = 45 min</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate with people in OSBDCN office</td>
<td>.25 hrs = 15 min</td>
<td>.20 hrs = 12 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate with organizations outside of OSBDCN</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
<td>4.00 hrs = 240 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.25 hrs = 315 min</td>
<td>8.70 hrs = 522 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day</td>
<td>1985 Hrs/Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities (record keeping &amp; reports)</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 0 min</td>
<td>.00 hrs = 0 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally with people</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
<td>.50 hrs = 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate with other college units</td>
<td>21.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate with OSBDCN office personnel</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>3.00 hrs = 180 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate with organizations outside of OSBDCN</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60 min</td>
<td>3.00 hrs = 180 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services</td>
<td>2.00 hrs = 120 min</td>
<td>4.00 hrs = 240 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7.50 hrs = 450 min</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.50 hrs = 750 min</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>1984 Hrs/Day</td>
<td>1985 Hrs/Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping track of activities (record keeping &amp; reports)</td>
<td>.08 hrs = 4.80 min</td>
<td>.33 hrs = 20.00 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking informally to people</td>
<td>.92 hrs = 55.20 min</td>
<td>.67 hrs = 40.20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinate with other college units</td>
<td>1.25 hrs = 75.00 min</td>
<td>1.25 hrs = 75.00 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate with OSBDCN office personnel</td>
<td>.83 hrs = 49.80 min</td>
<td>1.15 hrs = 69.00 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate with organizations outside OSBDCN</td>
<td>1.00 hrs = 60.00 min</td>
<td>1.67 hrs = 100.20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide direct services</td>
<td>3.00 hrs = 180.00 min</td>
<td>3.33 hrs = 200.00 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

7.50 hrs = 450.00 min

8.40 hrs = 504.00 min
Figure 58  
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Mt. Hood’s SBDC: Direction and Frequency of Information Flows

**SBDC Directors**

Mt. Hood’s first SBDC director indicated that during his tenure in 1984, he received or sent written reports from/to other units at the college about 1-3 times a month. For the center’s second director, that same rate of frequency took place in 1984. By 1985, the center’s first director had left the program, consequently no scores were recorded for 1985. No change in frequency for this type of communication was recorded by the center’s second director during his tenure in 1985. In 1985, the SBDC’s third director indicated that he received or sent written reports or memos from and to personnel in other units in the college an average of 1-3 times per day (Figure 59a).

For the center’s first director, the frequency of receiving or sending written reports or memos from and to people in the OSBDCN office averaged about 1 to 3 times per month in 1984. No scores for the first director are recorded for 1985, since he had left the program by then. In 1984, the second director for Mt. Hood’s SBDC also recorded a level of frequency which averaged about 1 to 3 times per month. That level of frequency remained the same in 1985 for the SBDC’s second director. No change in the frequency for this type of communication was shown by the center’s third director in 1985 (Figure 59b).
a. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from people in other units of the college.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

b. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from the OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

c. Receive or send written reports or memos to or from people in other organizations.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

Figure 59 Direction & Frequency of Information: Mt. Hood Community College's SBDC
d. Work related discussions (face to face or by telephone) with individuals in other units of college.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

![Bar Chart]

Director 1
Director 2
Director 3
Office Manager

e. Work related discussions (face to face or by telephone) with individuals in OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

![Bar Chart]

Director 1
Director 2
Director 3
Office Manager

f. Work related discussions (face to face or by telephone) with individuals from other organizations.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

![Bar Chart]

Director 1
Director 2
Director 3
Office Manager

Figure 59 continued
g. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from other units in college.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

h. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from OSBDCN office.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

i. Work related problem solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations.

1 = Not once
2 = About 1 to 3 times a month
3 = About 1 to 3 times a week
4 = About 1 to 3 times a day
5 = About every hour

Figure 59 continued
For 1984, the center's first director indicated that he received or sent written reports or memos from or to people in other organizations or agencies about 1 to 3 times per month. This individual left before 1985, consequently, no scores were required for in 1985. The center's second director indicated that a similar level of frequency was maintained in receiving or sending written reports or memos from or to people in other organizations or agencies for both 1984 and 1985. The level of frequency for this type of communication remained constant as well as for the center's third director in 1985 (Figure 59c).

During the first year of operation (1984), work-related discussions conducted face-to-face or by telephone with individuals in other units of the college took place about 1-3 times per week for the center's first director. Having left the program in 1984, no scores were required for this individual for 1985. In 1984 and 1985, the center's second director also recorded a level of frequency for this category of information exchange identical to that of the center's first director; 1-3 times per week. Work-related discussions conducted face-to-face or by telephone with individuals in other units of the college were listed as occurring about 1-3 times per day by the center's third director in 1985 (Figure 59d).

Work-related face-to-face or telephone discussions with individuals from the OSBDCN were listed by the first director as taking place at a rate of about 1-3 times per month in 1985. No scores were required for this respondent in 1985. The center's second director had in both 1984 and 1985
a level of frequency identical to that of the first director; about 1-3 times a month with individuals in the OSBDCN office. In 1985, the center’s third director indicated a frequency of occurrence consistent with that of his two predecessors. The center’s first three directors indicated that for both 1984 and 1985, they were involved with work-related face-to-face or telephone discussions with individuals in other organizations about 1-3 times per week (Figure 56e & 59f).

Work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other units in the college took place for the center’s first director at a rate of about once a week in 1984. No scores were required by this individual for 1985. In 1984 and 1985, the center’s second director indicated that the frequency of such contacts occurred at a rate of about 1-3 times per week. The center’s third director also indicated that in 1985, meeting in work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other units in the college took place about 1-3 times per week (Figure 59g).

The center’s first director indicated that he was involved in work-related problem solving meetings with two or more people from the OSBDCN office at a rate of about once a month in 1984. No scores for the center’s director were sought, since he resigned prior to 1985. In both 1984 and 1985, the SBDC’s second director was involved with two or more people from the OSBDCN office in work-related problem-solving meetings at the rate of about once a month. In 1985, the center’s third director’s frequency of involvement in work-related problem solving meetings was the
same as his two predecessors, about once a month. About every two weeks in 1984, the center's first director met with two or more people from other organizations or agencies. No scores were required for this individual in 1985. As for the center's second director, the frequency of involvement in work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations or agencies was about once a month for both 1984 and 1985. Work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations or agencies were about once a month in 1985 for the center's third director (Figure 59h & 59i).

**SBDC's Support Staff**

The center's office manager indicated that in both 1984 and 1985, that she received or sent written reports or memos from people in other units in their college at a rate of about 1-3 times a week. In 1984, that individual received or sent written reports or memos from people in the OSBDCN office about 1-3 times a month. The frequency of contact for 1985 in receiving or sending written reports or memos from people in the OSBDCN office changed to about 1-3 times a week for the center's office manager. In both 1984 and 1985, the center's office manager received or sent written reports or memos from people in other organizations or agencies at the rate of about 1-3 times a week (Figure 59a-59c).

Work-related discussions conducted on a face-to-face basis or by phone with individuals in other units of the college took place about 1-3
times per day in 1984 and 1985 for the center’s office manager. The center’s office manager indicated that in 1984, work-related face-to-face or telephone conversations took place with individuals in the OSBDCN office about 1-3 times a week. In 1985, the rate of occurrence for such communications had dropped to about 1-3 times a month. During 1984 and 1985, the center’s office manager portrayed the level of frequency for meeting on a face-to-face basis or by telephone to discuss work-related problems with people in other organizations was about 1-3 times per month (Figure 59d-59f).

For 1984, the center’s office manager indicated that she was involved in work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other units in the college about once a month. The frequency of these meetings increased to about every two weeks in 1985 for this individual. Work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from the OSBDCN office took place about once a month in 1984 and 1985 for the center’s office manager. During 1984 and 1985, the center’s office manager was involved in work-related problem-solving meetings with two or more people from other organizations about once a month (Figure 59g-59i).

Mt. Hood’s SBDC: Collecting Diagnostic Data Through Narrative and Statistical Documents

Mt. Hood’s Quarterly Performance Reports: A Summary 1984 Through 1985

Mt. Hood’s SBDC noted in its first quarterly report (March through May 1984), that it experienced no significant operational problems. It listed
its significant accomplishments as being hiring a clerical staff member for the center, establishing a record-keeping system, creating guidelines for its advisory committee, and developing a slide and videotape presentation to be used in marketing the SBDC's services.

In its second quarterly report (June 1984 through August 1984), the college listed as a significant problem encountered, the ability to track down additional funding sources for the SBDC. Significant accomplishments for the center during this period of time were seen as being the addition of more office space for the center, and acquiring a more powerful computer system for the center.

During the center's third quarter of operation (September 1984 to November 1984), no significant problems were listed as having taken place. Center accomplishments were seen as being related to increasing short term counseling services, and beginning an aggressive marketing campaign. Mt. Hood's SBDC listed in its fourth quarterly report (December 1984 to February 1985), that it encountered a significant problem in marketing the services of the center, because the college's service district was perceived as a series of fragmented business districts without a central community and/or economic focal point. The center indicated that its significant accomplishments during this period were the initiation of its advisory committee, and the college's reintroduction of the Small Business Management program.
Mt. Hood's SBDC listed in its first quarterly report for 1985 (March through May 1985) that a combination of activities (doing workshops, attending OSBDCN functions, and taking time off for a vacation) caused the director to fall into a catch-up mode in dealing with the center's activities, and presented significant problems in its operation. Among the accomplishments noted for this time period were the sponsoring of 12 small business classes attended by 171 individuals, a continued increase in the number of clients seeking short term business counseling from the center, and being able to offer an export workshop for small businesses in the district.

For the second quarterly report of 1985 (June 1 through June 30, 1985), the problems encountered by the SBDC were listed as being those associated with the amount of time required for responding to the RFP from the State of Oregon. It was commented as being an exercise in "busy work." The center's director suggested that the OSBDCN office should attempt to work at providing a method for having the grants required from the federal government (SBA) and from the State of Oregon (Department of Education) coincide with each other to avoid duplication of effort. During this period, the center had 16 new short-term counseling cases, and was able to continue a satisfactory level of enrollment in its SBM program. Both activities were seen as being significant accomplishments for the center.

The third quarter report for Mt. Hood's SBDC (July 1985 through September 1985), indicated that among the significant problems encountered
by it was the need to find and select a new director for the center (the center's third in less than two years). The ability of the center to provide 10 business assistance seminars, six professional development seminars, and two workshops related to international business issues were seen as significant accomplishments for the SBDC during this reporting period.

The SBDC's fourth quarter report for 1985 (October 1985 through December 1985) noted that it met with several significant problems during this period: not being able to complete long and short-range assigned operational goals, not being able to offer the planned for number of business classes scheduled, having difficulty in finding qualified instructors to teach its classes, and not having a definite marketing plan. Significant accomplishments for the center were seen as the hiring of a new director, starting an outline of the SBDC's marketing plan, preparing an extensive mailing list on small businesses in the college's service district, and starting to develop a closer relationship with the Gresham Chamber of Commerce.

Mt. Hood's SBDC: Final Report Summary—
July 1, 1983 to June 30, 1985

Mt. Hood's SBDC program was instituted in December 1983, and began offering its services in March 1984. From March 1, 1984, to June 30, 1985, 52 workshops and seminars were presented to a total of 755, 203 short-term counseling sessions were provided, and 47 long-term counseling cases were handled. In the Final Report, no data were made available that would allow this researcher to detail the average number of hours devoted
to either short-term or long-term counseling sessions. The total number of counseling hours was listed as being 1,717. Among the major accomplishments noted for the center in this report were the establishment of a business library of approximately 200 books, the development of a marketing plan for the center, the reinstitution of the Small Business Management (SBM) program, and the offering of 45 business assistance classes. No data were provided in the Final Report that would indicate whether the center was able to meet or exceed the goals established related to its counseling and/or training functions.

Among the significant problems faced by the center, that were documented in this report, were the maintaining of the operational and management continuity of the SBDC. During a 20-month period, three individuals occupied the role of director for the SBDC at Mt. Hood Community College. Another issue that impacted the center was the length of time required to establish an advisory committee for the center. This is of particular importance, given that a common complaint voiced in various interviews and documents from MHCC was the fragmented social and economic nature of the college's service district. Nearly a year elapsed before the center had the means to integrate the input from a community based advisory group. It was also noted that not until late in 1985 did the college move toward being able to incorporate a definite and comprehensive marketing plan for its services.
What emerges from these reports was that: during the first two years of its operation (1984 and 1985), Mt. Hood’s SBDC experienced a series of personnel and institutional difficulties, the college was in the midst of reorganizing its structure, a new president was coming on board, the function of the SBDC was not firmly established within its parent body (The Center for Community and Economic Development) at the college.

Mt. Hood’s SBDC: Change Graphs

Six informants at Mt. Hood Community College (the college’s president, the director for the division of business and technology, the director for the Center for Community and Economic Development, and the three directors of Mt. Hood Community College’s SBDC from 1984 through 1985) were asked to identify those events that triggered large-scale change within the college’s SBDC. After identifying the triggering events, they were asked to graphically represent on a horizontal axis the duration of the triggering event, and on a vertical axis the degree of organizational stress and uncertainty it generated within the college’s SBDC.

The change graphs provided a means to examine how organizational personnel at various levels in the college viewed large-scale organizational change. The charts provided data on the degree of variability concerning the change events being identified. The manner in which organizational personnel processed information regarding organizational change was also provided through the graphs. Finally, the change graphs provided the
opportunity to examine the extent of the respondent's awareness regarding the nature and scope of the changes taking place in the SBDC.

**Change Graphs for Mt. Hood Community College: Selected Administrative Personnel**

The college's president, director of business and technology, and director for the Center on Community and Economic Development generated a total of five different change event graphs. The president of the college and the director for business and technology both perceived large-scale changes having been triggered by changes in personnel as well as by cultural core system changes. The director for business and technology also indicated that large-scale changes in the SBDC had been triggered by the environment, and by political core system changes. Finally, the director of the Center for Community and Economic Development indicated that large-scale change had been triggered by changes in the goals of the SBDC.

Changes in Personnel

The beginning of events triggering changes in personnel was portrayed by the president as commencing in January 1984. At its inception, this triggering event was seen as creating a slight level of uncertainty within the SBDC. By March of 1984, organizational uncertainty had risen to a moderately high level. From that point, it decreased so that by November of 1984 it was seen as being present at a level slightly below a moderate degree of uncertainty. From November of 1984 it began to rise
once again in a slow but steady manner so that by December of 1985 it was seen as being present at a high level. The president’s graph portrayed the level of organizational stress triggered by changes in personnel as being identical in strength and duration as those of organizational stress (Figure 60).

For the divisional director of business and technology, changes in personnel began triggering changes in the SBDC beginning in January of 1984. The level of organizational uncertainty generated by these events was portrayed as being present at a slight level. From January to May of 1984, it remained at this level. After May 1984, organizational uncertainty began to increase, so that by March of 1985, it was portrayed as operating at a high level. After reaching its apex in mid-March of 1985, it quickly descended in intensity, so that by August of 1985, it was seen as being present at a slight level. It remained at that level throughout the remainder of 1985. Like organizational uncertainty, organizational stress generated by changes in personnel was seen as beginning in January of 1984, by the college’s director of business and technology. From January to May of 1984, it was seen as being present at a slight level. From that point it began a slow but steady upward climb in intensity, reaching its zenith in mid-June of 1985 at a high level of organizational stress. The level of stress from that point onward was shown as declining, so that by December of 1985, it was portrayed as being present at a moderate level (Figure 61).
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Political Core System Change Events

Mt. Hood's divisional director of business and technology indicated that organizational uncertainty created by political core system changes began in January of 1984. At its inception, it was seen as being present at a moderate level. That level of uncertainty remained relatively constant from January of 1984 to September of 1984. After that point, it moved upwards, reaching a high level of uncertainty by April of 1985. It stayed at that level until the end of May in 1985, when it began to decline, so that by December of 1985 it was portrayed as being present at a slight level. Organizational stress, like uncertainty, was seen as beginning in January of 1984, at a slight level of intensity. Between January and June of 1984, organizational stress stayed at a slight level. From that point, it began a slow upward movement, reaching in December of 1984 a moderate level of intensity. It continued to grow in intensity so that by August of 1985 it reached a high level of stress. Shortly thereafter, it began to wane in intensity, ending the year at a moderate level of stress (Figure 62).

Cultural Core System Changes

The college's divisional director for business and technology indicated that cultural core system change events were present in January of 1984, and were creating a slight level of uncertainty in the SBDC; that level of uncertainty remained essentially unchanged until August of 1984. Within two months, it reached a moderate level of intensity. From October of 1984
Figure 62

Triggering Events: Goal Changes
until May of 1985, organizational uncertainty continued to rise, reaching a high level of intensity in the SBDC by May of 1985. From that point, the level of organizational uncertainty associated with cultural core system changes was portrayed by the divisional director as quickly diminishing, ending the year at a point mid-distance between a slight and moderate level of intensity. Organizational stress associated with events triggered by cultural core system changes was seen as being present in January at a slight level. Over the next six months, the stress level was seen as remaining essentially unchanged. From July of 1984, the level of organizational stress began a 12-month climb, reaching its apex at a high level of intensity in July of 1985. It began to decline in late August of 1985, and finished the year at a moderately high level of stress (Figure 63).

Mt. Hood's president indicated that cultural core system change events were present in the SBDC from January of 1984. At that point, they were portrayed as creating a slight level of organizational uncertainty for the SBDC. Within four months, organizational uncertainty was seen by the president as operating at a moderately high level. Organizational uncertainty was then seen by the president as diminishing in strength over the next six months, reaching a level slightly below moderate intensity in October of 1984. Once again, the level of intensity increased, so that by July of 1985, it had reached a moderately high level of intensity. The level of organizational uncertainty continued to rise throughout the remainder of 1985, reaching a high level of uncertainty by year's end. The level of
Figure 63

Triggering Events: Cultural Core System
organizational stress created by cultural core system changes was seen by the college's president as a virtual "mirror image" in its duration and intensity to that of organizational uncertainty in both 1984 and 1985 (Figure 64).

Goal Changes

Both the divisional director for business and technology and the director of the Center for Community and Economic Development indicated that large-scale change in the SBDC had been triggered by events related to changes in the goals for the SBDC. The director of the Center for Community and Economic Development stated that the change in direction for the SBDC was the one significant event impacting the SBDC, but he did not see it bring about any large-scale change in its operation. As such, he did not believe it warranted being portrayed in a graphic format.

The division director for business and technology indicated that change within the SBDC had been triggered by changes in its goals. For him, such changes began in January of 1984, and they were seen as creating a slight level of organizational uncertainty. From January to May of 1984, that same level of uncertainty was seen as being in effect. From May of 1984 until March of 1985, it gained in intensity, reaching in March of 1985 a high level of organizational uncertainty. Shortly thereafter, it was seen as diminishing in strength, reaching, by September of 1985, a level of slight intensity. From September of 1985, until the end of the year, it remained at
Figure 64

Triggering Events: Changes in Cultural Core System
that same level of organizational uncertainty. Organizational stress being generated by goal changes was portrayed as being present in January of 1984, and operating to a slight degree within the SBDC. From January of 1984 to May of 1984, it was seen as remaining present at a slight level. During the next 11 months, it grew in intensity, reaching, by April of 1985, a high level of stress. This level of organizational stress was seen as being maintained over the next three months. Beginning in July of 1985, it was quickly dissipating. By year's end, organizational stress generated by goal changes was seen by the divisional director as operating at a moderate level (Figure 65).

Environmental Changes

Environmentally triggered changes within the college's SBDC were seen as first occurring in January of 1984, by the divisional director of business and technology, and operating at a level where they were seen as creating a slight level of organizational uncertainty for the SBDC. From that point, it remained relatively constant. After May of 1985, the level of organizational uncertainty being generated by any such changes moved upward. By October of 1984, it was seen as being present at a moderate level. Organizational uncertainty was shown to have continued to climb so that by March of 1985, a high degree of uncertainty was seen as being present in the SBDC. Quickly thereafter, the degree of uncertainty was seen as diminishing, reaching its nadir in September of 1985, where it was listed
as being only slightly present. From September of 1985 to the end of that year, it remained at that level (Figure 66).

Administrative Comments: Triggering Events

Mt. Hood's president, divisional director for business and technology, and the director of the Center for Community and Economic Development were asked, following the drawing of their change graphs to discuss and/or comment on the events that they portrayed as having triggered organizational change with the college's SBDC. Operational definitions of the previously mentioned triggering events (as well as illustrative quotations associated with them) are presented below.

Environmental Changes

Environmental change events are triggered by uncertainty regarding the availability of critical resources, linkage with critical constituencies, and/or the ability to control desired organizational outcomes in the environment.

"The region was experiencing a severely depressed economy. A considerable number of dislocated workers were present in the area's work force. The college had experienced a significant decline in enrollment, and was operating with a tax base insufficient to meet the needs. During a good deal of the early 1980s, people in our area were being uprooted socially and culturally by the declining economy."
Figure 66

Triggering Events: Environmental Changes
Cultural Core System Changes

Cultural core system change events are triggered by shifts in the organization's shared values, what beliefs to commit to, and/or those objectives worth striving for organizationally.

"The college had lots of ideas about economic development, but no agenda."

"New president provided a vision for the evolutionary changes occurring throughout the college."

"The college is in the midst of changing its mind-set about getting involved in economic and community development when SBDC started."

Political Core System Changes

Those changes triggered by shifts in the ability to allocate and use the power and resources in the organization in the pursuit of goals, the manner in which work is done, and/or in determining who will benefit from the actions taken.

The college went through a number of structural changes in its reporting structure, and with the processes used for attaining organizational and personal accountability. "When the former president left, a power vacuum was created in the college."

"The president was behind the SBDC concept from the beginning, but some elements on the campus were resistant to the
SBDC. The political system at MHCC dominated the SBDC's first year of operation."

Changes in Personnel

Those events triggered by actions which bring about different organizational configurations (social networks, people, and processes). These changes include the characteristics of the members of the organization (educational background, motivational patterns, and managerial style).

Goal Changes

Those events triggered by shifts in agreement among organizational members over the goals of the organization.

"The mission for SBDC was not formulated until the arrival of the second director of SBDC; goals were a long time coming."

Change Graphs for Mt. Hood Community College: SBDC Directors and Support Staff

The data generated by Mt. Hood's first three SBDC directors yielded a total of three different types of events that triggered large-scale change in the college's SBDC, these events being: changes in personnel, shifts in agreement over the organization's goals, and changes in the political core systems of the organization.
Change in Goals

As the center began its operation in January of 1984, the SBDC's first director indicated that organizational uncertainty was present at a slight level within the SBDC, and it was being generated by shifts in agreement over the center's goals. By March of 1984, it had escalated to a high level. Over the next five months, that level of uncertainty was seen as remaining constant. The first director's tenure had ended by August of 1984, and no further representations were made. Like the organizational uncertainty generated by changes in agreement over goals, organizational stress was seen as starting out in January of 1984 to a slight degree. Within two months, the level of stress had skyrocketed to a very high level, where it remained over the remaining five months of the first director's tenure in the SBDC (Figure 67).

The SBDC's third director also saw changes brought out in the SBDC by shifts in agreement over its goals. For him, these events began in October of 1985, and created a very high level of organizational uncertainty within the SBDC. From that point, it quickly fell, ending the year at a level portrayed by him as being practically nonexistent. The level of organizational stress generated by these events also appeared in October of 1985, at a level where they were seen as generating a moderate level of stress. Like organizational uncertainty, organizational stress quickly dissipated in its intensity, so that by year's end, it too was seen as essentially nonexistent, by the center's third director (Figure 68).
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Changes in Personnel

Organizational uncertainty generated by changes in personnel was seen by the center’s third director as beginning in September of 1985 and existing at a level where it generated a very high degree of uncertainty within the SBDC. Over the next three months, it was seen as dropping quickly in intensity. By the end of 1985, the SBDC’s director indicated that there was very little uncertainty present. The center was seen as first experiencing organizational stress generated by personnel changes in September of 1985, by its third director. The level of intensity was portrayed as being present at a moderate level. Within one month, it had dropped to a level where it was being experienced in a slight way. It ended the year as being listed as no longer existing within the SBDC at Mt. Hood, by the center’s third director (Figure 69).

Political Core System Changes

Mt. Hood’s first SBDC director indicated that organizational uncertainty was being created by political core system changes in the center beginning in January of 1984. At its inception, the level of uncertainty was seen as being experienced at a very high level. This degree of uncertainty persisted through the tenure of the first director; during the next seven months. Organizational stress paralleled in its duration and intensity to that of organizational uncertainty throughout the period of time the first director was with the SBDC at Mt. Hood (Figure 70).
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Triggering Events: Changes in Personnel
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Triggering Events: Political Core System
Organizational uncertainty generated by political core system changes was also seen as being present by Mt. Hood's second SBDC director. For him, it first appeared in August of 1984, and was seen as existing at a very high level. Quickly thereafter, it began to decline in intensity. By the end of 1984, it had taken a significant drop, existing to only a moderate degree within the center. It continued to drop, so that by mid-April of 1985, it was portrayed as generating a slight degree of uncertainty within the SBDC. After that point, this respondent saw it as continuing to move downward. It reached its nadir in mid-July of 1985, being seen as present to a very small degree. The director indicated that then it went quickly and suddenly upward in intensity. The respondent's final notation shows it being present at a very high level once again within a month of its lowest degree of intensity. Organizational stress associated with political core system changes was seen by this director as being present in August of 1984 at a very high level. From August of 1984 to early November of 1984, it remained at that level of intensity. The level of stress in the SBDC then took another significant drop in intensity, so that by mid-December of 1984, the second director indicated it was only present to a slight degree. It continued to move downward throughout the remaining seven months of this director's tenure. Its final position was shown as being present to only a small degree in the SBDC by mid-July of 1985 (Figure 71).

Mt. Hood's third SBDC director, like his two predecessors also indicated that political core system changes had triggered both
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Triggering Events: Political Core System
organizational stress and uncertainty with the center. For him, organizational uncertainty generated by such events first appeared in November of 1985, at a level where a very high degree of uncertainty was present within the SBDC. This continued the remainder of 1985. Like uncertainty, organizational stress was indicated as first being present in November, but to only a very slight degree, and finished the year at that same level (Figure 72).

**SBDC Staff Comments: Triggering Events**

The first, second, and third directors for Mt. Hood’s SBDC as well as its office manager were asked to discuss and/or comment on those events they perceived as having brought about large-scale change in the college’s SBDC. All three of the directors did produce change graphs, but the office manager expressed an opinion that no such events had taken place during the center’s first two years of operation. Operational definitions of the three triggering events (as well as illustrative quotations associated with them) are presented below.

**Goal Changes**

Changes in goals are events triggered by shifts in agreement among organizational members over the goals of the organization.

"Very early on it became apparent that numbers and not quality was important."
Figure 72

Triggering Events: Political Core System
"We went from an academic oriented service to one more economically directed."

"The Center for Community and Economic Development and the SBDC became in part a response by the college to a steadily decreasing enrollment of full-time students."

"The college needed to develop a link to the business community. It depends on the SBDC to provide a visible example of its commitment to that element in the community."

"It's important for the college to develop as many linkages as possible with community based organizations . . . the SBDC is an important vehicle in achieving that."

"The SBDC is moving away from a crisis-oriented approach to small businesses and is seeking to develop an entrepreneurial program . . . the college sees this as being a preventative approach to dealing with small business issues."

Changes in Personnel

Changes in personnel events are changes triggered by actions which bring about different organizational configurations (social networks, people, and processes). These changes include the characteristics of the members of the organization (educational background, motivational patterns, and managerial style).
"The center's third director brought a lot of knowledge about computer usage in small businesses, a stronger consulting background, and he was able to exceed past performances."

"A critical event in this place was me coming on board. The center hadn't been doing anything for some time. It lacked leadership."

"I tried to get the SBDC director's position to be seen as a management position. College opposed to idea of upgrading the position . . . concerned about image of having too many management personnel."

"The second director sought to make contact with small businesses through involvement with various social and service groups and clubs, rather than through direct counseling services."

A lot of the people who work in the Center for Community and Economic Development are non-traditional in their approach to educational services. We've gone after new markets."

"Each SBDC director has created his own strategy for it."

"We've had four SBDC directors in four years. There has been a definite lack of continuity around here."
Mt. Hood’s SBDC: Domain Uncertainty

Mt. Hood’s SBDC Staff: Consensus on Goals

The center's first director selected reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community as the most important goal for its operation in 1984. This individual left prior to 1985, consequently no scores for that year were obtained. The center's second director selected providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners as the most important goal for the center in both 1984 and 1985. The third director of Mt. Hood's SBDC selected assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits as the most important goal for the center in 1985. The center's office manager selected, as did the first SBDC director, reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community as the most important goal for the center in 1984. In 1985, the most important goal selected for the SBDC by the office manager had changed to providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners (Figures 73 & 74).

The center's first director indicated that the second most important goal for the SBDC in 1984 was to select and train center staff members capable of providing a consistently high level of service. No scores were required of this individual for 1985. For the SBDC's second director in both 1984 and 1985, the second most important goal for the center to provide
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SBDC Staff:

1st SBDC Director
1. Reduce failure rate of SB's
2. Select and train SBDC staff
3. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
4. Promote awareness of SBDC

2nd SBDC Director
1. Provide short-term services
2. Provide long-term services
3. Reduce failure rate of SB's
4. Assist SB's served to increase profits

Support Staff
1. Reduce failure rate of SB's
2. Provide short-term services
3. Provide long-term services
4. Assist SB's served to increase profits

Mt. Hood Administration

Past President
1. Provide long-term services
2. Provide short-term services
3. Select and train SBDC staff
4. Develop and maintain resources

Current President
1. Provide long-term services
2. Provide short-term services
3. Develop and maintain resources
4. Assist SB's served to increase profits

Director - Business Technology
1. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures
2. Provide long-term services
3. Reduce failure rate of SB's
4. Advise on feasibility of intended ventures

Director - CCED
1. Provide short-term services
2. Select and train SBDC staff
3. Assist SB's served to increase profits
4. Provide short-term services
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Mt. Hood Community College's SBDC
**SBDC Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBDC Staff</th>
<th>1st SBDC Director</th>
<th>2nd SBDC Director</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Provide short-term services</td>
<td>1. Assist SB's served to increase profits</td>
<td>1. Provide short-term services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Provide long-term services</td>
<td>2. Provide short-term services</td>
<td>2. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Assist SB's served to increase profits</td>
<td>4. Reduce failure rate of SB's</td>
<td>4. promote awareness of SBDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mt. Hood Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past President</th>
<th>Current President</th>
<th>Director - Business Technology</th>
<th>Director - C.C.E.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide long-term services</td>
<td>1. Provide long-term services</td>
<td>1. Promote awareness of SBDC</td>
<td>1. Provide short-term services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide short-term services</td>
<td>2. Coordinate SBDC's services with other organizations</td>
<td>2. Select and train SBDC staff</td>
<td>2. Provide long-term services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Select and train SBDC staff</td>
<td>3. Assist SB's served to increase profits</td>
<td>3. Reduce failure rate of SB's</td>
<td>3. Provide long-term services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 74**

Goal Consensus:
Mt. Hood Community College's S.B.D.C.
long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners serviced by the SBDC. In 1985, the center’s third director selected providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners as being the second most important goal for the center. Providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners was chosen by the SBDC’s office manager as its second most important goal in 1984. For this individual, the center’s second most important goal changed in 1985 to coordinating the SBDC’s services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the Small Business community (Figures 73 & 74).

Advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures was in 1984 selected by the center’s first director as the third most important operating goal for the SBDC. For 1985, no scores were required of this individual. The SBDC’s second director selected helping to reduce the failure rate of small businesses in the community as the third most important operating goal for the center in both 1984 and 1985. In 1985, the center’s third director indicated that the third most important goal for the center was providing long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners. The center’s office manager selected for both 1984 and 1985 providing long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners as the third most important for the SBDC at Mt. Hood.
For 1984, the SBDC's first director indicated that developing and promoting the small business community's awareness of Mt. Hood's SBDC services and programs was the fourth most important operating goal for it. For both 1984 and 1985, assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits was seen by the second director as being the fourth most important goal for the center. Reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community was selected as the fourth most important goal for the SBDC in 1985 by its third director. The center's office manager in 1984 selected as the fourth most important goal for the SBDC assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits. In 1985, this person's selection for the fourth most important goal shifted to developing and promoting the small business community's awareness of SBDC services and programs (Figures 73 & 74).

Mt. Hood's SBDC Staff: Goal Agreement for the SBDC

Both the center's first director and office manager selected reducing the failure rate of small businesses in the community as the most important goal for the center in 1984. The next area of agreement among SBDC staff members for 1984 was the selection by the center's second director and office manager of assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits as the fourth most important operating goal for the center in 1984. The center's
second director and office manager indicated that in 1985, providing short-
term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small
businesses was the SBDC’s most important operating goal. Agreement on
ranking occurred again when the SBDC office manager and the third
director for the SBDC at Mt. Hood selected providing long-term counseling,
training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners as
the third most important operating goal for the SBDC in 1985. The center’s
second director and office manager selected the same set of goals in 1984,
but differed in their respective rankings of them. Only one of the type of
goals selected by the center’s first director for 1984 matched with those
selected by the SBDC’s second director and office manager; that being—for
1985, the center’s office manager and its second director agreed that
providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or
potential small business owners was the SBDC’s most important operating
goal. The next point of agreement for that year came when both the office
manager and the center’s third director selected providing long-term
counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small
business owners as the center’s third most important goal (Figures 73 & 74).

Mt. Hood’s Administrative Staff: Consensus on Goals

Both the college’s present and past president selected providing long-
term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small
business owners as the center’s most important operating goal for 1984 and
These individuals were also in agreement regarding the center’s second most important goal for 1984 by selecting providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners. The college’s current president selected coordinating the SBDC’s services with other public and/or private agencies as being the second most important goal for the center in 1985. The college’s past president continued in 1985 to choose providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners as the second most important goal for the center. For both 1984 and 1985, the director of the Center for Community and Economic Development at Mt. Hood selected providing short-term guidance, training, or counseling to current and/or potential small business owners as the SBDC’s most important goal. For the college’s divisional director of business and technology, advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures ranked as the center’s most important goal in 1984. This director’s choice for the most important goal shifted in 1985 to developing and promoting an awareness in the small business community regarding the college’s SBDC and its services. The director of the Center for Community and Economic Development in both 1984 and 1985, selected providing long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners as the center’s second most important operating goal. Selecting and training SBDC staff members capable of providing a consistently high level of service was seen by the
divisional director for business and technology in both 1984 and 1985 as the SBDC’s second most important goal (Figures 73 & 74).

For both 1984 and 1985, the college’s past president ranked as the third most important goal for the SBDC selecting and training SBDC staff members capable of providing a consistently high level of service. The current president of the college selected in 1984 developing, maintaining, and updating meaningful resources for the center staff and its clients as the third most important goal for the SBDC. This changed in 1985, when he selected assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits as the third most important goal for the SBDC. The director of the Center for Community and Economic Development remained constant in his rankings, selecting as the third most important goal for the SBDC in 1984 and 1985 being able to assist those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits. For both 1984 and 1985, the third most important goal for the SBDC as seen by the divisional director for business and technology was seen as being to reduce the failure rate of small businesses in the community (Figures 73 & 74).

The fourth most important goal for the SBDC in 1984 and 1985 was seen as being able to develop, maintain, and update meaningful resources for center staff and its clients by the college’s past president. The current president of Mt. Hood saw in 1984 the fourth most important goal for the SBDC as being its ability to assist those businesses being served by the
center in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits. For 1985, he, like the college's past president, selected developing, maintaining, and updating meaningful resources for center staff and clients as being the center's fourth most important goal. Advising potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures was selected by the director of the Center for Community and Economic Development as being the center's fourth most important goal for both 1984 and 1985. The divisional director for business and technology ranked as the fourth most important goal for 1984 and 1985, the center providing short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners (Figures 73 & 74).

Mt. Hood’s Administrative Staff: Goal Agreement

Both the current and past president at the Mt. Hood Community College selected providing long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners as the most important operating goal for the SBDC in 1984 and 1985. They also agreed that in 1984, the second most important goal for the center was to provide short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business. In 1985, they both selected assisting those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving to a significant degree their ability to generate profits as the third most important operating goal for the SBDC.
For the college's presidents, there appeared to be a good deal of concern regarding the types of services being provided and the operational goals that would support their achievement. What occurred within the counseling, guidance and/or training provided by the SBDC seems to be of secondary importance as it related to the SBDC's operating goals. Those goals which were oriented toward improvements within the center and/or coordinating the SBDC's services with other organizations occupied the lowest tier of goals for these two individuals.

The two divisional directors displayed in their responses regarding the goals of the SBDC little or no agreement on the importance of its goals, nor did they seem to agree with each other on their respective importance during 1984 and 1985. The divisional director of business and technology indicated that the two primary issues in his selection of the goals for the SBDC were directed toward: (a) having a demonstrable impact on the performance and viability of the small businesses, and (b) providing the center with the physical and human resources required to make it operate effectively. As for the director of the Center for Community and Economic Development, the focus for the center's goals seem to be directed toward the following: (a) the type of services being provided by the SBDC, and (b) the ability of the SBDC to enhance the small business profitability and/or viability.
Mt. Hood's SBDC: Clarity of Operating Strategies

Economic Conditions

There was an 83% agreement level (N=6) among the respondents at Mt. Hood Community College that events generated by the economic conditions of the local and/or regional economy had affected the operation of the SBDC in 1984. In 1985, the level of agreement dropped to 67%, concerning the acknowledgement of such events and their impact on the SBDC. The perceived strategies available to deal with such events ranged from being seen as being nonexistent to being tried and tested in their content and scope (Figure 75a).

OSBDCN Events

In 1984 and 1985, a 17% agreement level among respondents at Mt. Hood (N=6) was reached regarding the recognition that events in the OSBDCN administrative office in Eugene had affected the operation of the college’s SBDC. The respondent who listed the occurrence of such events in 1984 and 1985 perceived the strategies available as being unclear in content and scope (Figure 75b).

Other Small Business Programs

The respondents at Mt. Hood Community College (N=6) indicated a 33% agreement rate that events in other small business programs in the
a. Event(s) in the economic conditions of the local and/or regional economy of your SBDC's service area that affect the operation of your SBDC.

- 100% STAFF - event occurred
- 75% ADMIN - event occurred

83% acknowledgment that event occurred in 1984

Comments of events, 1984...
- unemployment rate high
- economy showing signs of becoming stronger
- business failures continuing
- out-migration of population

Perception of available strategies: (N=5)

- 50% STAFF - event occurred
- 75% ADMIN - event occurred

67% acknowledgment that event occurred in 1985

Comments of events, 1985...
- high business failures
- continued unemployment
- large retail grocery warehouse center locating in area.

Perception of available strategies: (N=4)

LEGEND
1 Had no idea how to deal with this
2 A tentative strategy developed but still remained unclear
3 Had a strategy but didn't know if it would work
4 Had a clear strategy for dealing with this kind of event
5 Had a very clear tried and tested strategy to deal with this kind of event

Figure 75  
Clarity of Operating Strategies:  
Mt. Hood Community College's SBDC
b. Events in the OSBDCN administrative office in Eugene that affect the operation of the SBDC.

0% STAFF - event occurred
25% ADMIN - event occurred

17% acknowledgment that event occurred

1984

17% acknowledgment that event occurred

1985

Comments of events, 1984...
- OSBDCN provided new resources and program strategies, materials and coordination efforts

Comments of events, 1985...
- funding resources questionable not stable

Perception of available strategies: (N=1)

Perception of available strategies: (N=1)

Figure 75 continued
c. Events in other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within your SBDC's service area that affect the operation of your SBDC.

0% STAFF - event occurred
50% ADMIN - event occurred
33% acknowledgment that event occurred

1984

Comments of events, 1984...
- develop information center for international trade
- more involvement with Portland Development commission
- promote the Columbia River Industrial Development Corridor

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

1 2 3 4 5

100% STAFF - event occurred
25% ADMIN - event occurred
50% acknowledgment that event occurred

1985

Comments of events, 1985...
- introduction of State Lottery Funds
- seen as threat to SBA
- reinstitute SBM program

Perception of available strategies: (N=2)

1 2 3 4 5
d. Events that happened within the community college sponsoring and supporting your SBDC that affect the operation of the SBDC.

50% STAFF - event occurred
75% ADMIN - event occurred

67% acknowledgment that event occurred

1984

50% STAFF - event occurred
50% ADMIN - event occurred

50% acknowledgment that event occurred

1985

Comments of events, 1984...
- establish Center for community and Economic Development
- new administrator
- new reporting structure
- change in personnel

Comments of events, 1985...
- change in personnel
- reorganization of college
- change in college president
- change in SBDC director

Perception of available strategies: (N=4)

Perception of available strategies: (N=3)

Figure 75 continued
e. Events that happened within your own SBDC that affect the operation or your SBDC.

0% STAFF - event occurred
75% ADMIN - event occurred

50% acknowledgment that event occurred
1984

Comments of events, 1984...
- changes in SBDC personnel
- developed new client/counseling program
- SBDC Director left

100% STAFF - event occurred
75% ADMIN - event occurred

83% acknowledgment that event occurred
1985

Comments of events, 1985...
- change in SBDC personnel
- SBDC Director resigned
- program goals expanded
- conflict over goals and objectives

Perception of available strategies: (N=4)

Perception of available strategies: (N=5)

Figure 75 continued
college's service district had affected the SBDC's operation in 1984. In 1985, the rate of agreement regarding such events had increased to 50% among the respondents. The perceived strategies available to deal with such events in 1984 and 1985 ranged from being seen as being nonexistent to being clearly developed in their content and scope (Figure 75c).

Institutional Events at Mt. Hood Community College

A 67% agreement rate was reached by respondents at Mt. Hood regarding the recognition that events with the college had affected the operation of the SBDC in 1984. In 1985, the level of agreement dropped to 50% regarding the occurrence of such events. The respondents who acknowledged such events in 1984 perceived the strategies available to deal with them as ranging from being nonexistent to being clearly developed in their content and scope. In 1985, all the respondents acknowledging such events saw the strategies available as being clearly developed in content and scope (Figure 75d).

Events Within the SBDC Events

The respondents at Mt. Hood (N=6) reached a 50% agreement level that events within the SBDC had affected its operation in 1984. For 1985, the agreement rate increased to 83% regarding the occurrence of such events. The strategies available to deal with such events in 1984 ranged from being seen as non-existent to being clearly developed in content and
scope. In 1985, the range of perceived strategies available ranged from being seen as tentative in nature to being clearly developed in content and scope (Figure 75e).

Summary of Findings

The TPC model and its in-depth diagnostic plan allowed this researcher to conduct an analysis of the organizational components and environments of four SBDC’s in this study. The research data produced three findings related to organizational change, and the manner and means by which it was perceived, managed, and dealt with by each of the SBDC’s studied.

The three primary findings were these:

1. The role played by key individuals as initiators of organizational change is to a large degree dependent upon the congruence between the situation(s) being faced and their backgrounds, personalities, and leadership characteristics;

2. The different roles and hierarchical levels existing in an organization significantly influenced how individuals perceived the nature, type, properties, and characteristics of the change process; and

3. The recognition that when there is no agreement among key organizational decision-makers on the nature or type of change taking place, social power, influence, and/or bargaining is used in selecting the strategy used to deal with strategic change management.
The Role of Key Individuals as Initiators of Change

Linn-Benton Community College had endured years of significant enrollment declines (1980-1983), reductions in its staff and faculty, and the repeated rejections of ballot measures for its operating levy. The college was operating in an organizational climate replete with self-doubt and introspection. This set of circumstances prompted the college's president and vice-president of instruction to spearhead an institution-wide effort to re-examine the college's priorities, values, and purpose. What emerged from this effort was a restructuring of the college, the incorporation of new organizational processes, and the establishment of new organizational priorities. This is in keeping with Tichy (1983) who contended that the change process in an organization takes place when the dominant coalition of an organization makes a decision to deal with the uncertainty and stress it triggers by making decisions to respond to it.

Among the more important measures affirmed by the efforts initiated by the college's president were the college's commitment to becoming a principal player in the region's economic development. This represented a radical operational and philosophical departure for the college. The business and industrial interests in the region were constituencies which the college had seldom dealt with in a coordinated and ongoing programmatic manner. Prior to 1983, economic development, small business assistance,
and specialized training programs were concepts that the college as a whole had little familiarity with.

The environment in which LBCC’s SBDC operated placed a great burden on personal and group modes of coordination. A considerable degree of time required to develop and sustain boundary spanning and relationship building functions was required by the SBDC’s director. No other SBDC director in this study invested the amount of time as did LBCC’s SBDC director in maintaining external and internal relationships in order to establish a stable environment for the SBDC.

The SBDC’s director lobbied for and by May 1984, convinced the college’s vice-president to operate the SBDC as an integrated unit of the TED Center’s programs, rather than an extension of the business department. The SBDC’s director and vice-president of instruction were the major players and leaders in this coalition which stressed the development of organizational structures and processes more in keeping with a community-education based approach for the SBDC. This was done in large part based on their belief that such an organization would be more likely and willing to deal with the needs of the business community.

The actions of the SBDC director, vice-president of instruction, and the president of the college helped to establish and communicate to the college’s internal and external constituencies its willingness to address community-based concerns, its commitment to shift institutional resources,
funds, and power for the benefit of the SBDC, and what the institutional vision for the SBDC would be.

MHCC

Mt. Hood Community College during the early and mid-1980's like many of its sister institutions in Oregon, initiated a series of efforts designed to scrutinize its services and organizational values. Among the more significant entities to emerge from the organizational restructuring taking place during this period was the creation of the Center for Economic and Community Development (CECD). With the funds provided by state and federal sources in 1983 for the development of the OSBDCN, Mt. Hood chose to incorporate the SBDC into the already existing CECD.

Despite the considerable effort the college put into fabricating a unified and integrated set of economic development programs, Mt. Hood's SBDC would experience a series of disruptive and counter-opposing forces during most of the SBDC's first two years of operation. The level of organizational disruption and management uncertainty created during the first two years of Mt. Hood's SBDC's existence was based on a series of separate but interrelated and interdependent set of circumstances and situations. Little or no institutional time or energy was spent monitoring and/or protecting the struggling efforts of the SBDC. The unfortunate and very likely unintended by-product of this situation was to leave the SBDC in a vulnerable position when it came to seeking the support and access of top
level management in dealing with the numerous problems that beset its
development and operation. Little or no institutional nurturing or concern
was available for it. Once the college's president stepped forward and
became actively involved with the SBDC, a new identity was shaped for it,
it was wholeheartedly supported by the college's administration, and a
director was selected whose orientation, goals, and characteristics were in
keeping with the college's own outlook.

When Chemeketa's SBDC began its operation in March 1984, it was
seen by many on campus as a continuation of an already existing and on-
going institutional commitment to the region's business community.
Chemeketa's SBDC was able to base many of its efforts on the already
extensive experiential foundation gained in its previous economic
development programs. The college wanted and needed a risk taker to
guide its TED Center and SBDC. It sought, hired, and for nearly three years
(1983 through 1986), supported a director for the TED Center that would
give the college's economic development efforts a high degree of visibility
and credibility on and off campus.

The college's upper levels of administration recognized and
supported the business-oriented approach to the delivery of the SBDC's
services offered by the TED Center director. The TED Center director was
first and foremost a proponent of meeting and understanding the private
sector's needs first, then dealing with academic and institutional-based issues.

The college's administration showed some insight into the unpredictability and difficulty encountered by the SBDC and TED Center in providing their services and the need for a more entrepreneurial manner in their management than had historically been present in most of its programs. By giving it a considerable degree of latitude in how it went about its business, critical decisions concerning the SBDC could be made in a more direct and timely manner. By taking this approach, the college's administration allowed the SBDC and TED Center to shift quickly in dealing with changes.

UCC

For two years prior to the inception of its SBDC in 1984, Umpqua's president and board of directors had struggled to find the resources to develop a business assistance program for the college. A common perception amongst the board (several of which were small business owners) was that the establishment of a business assistance center would be good in general for the college and for the region. With the inclusion of the funds from the state of Oregon and the SBA, in late 1983, the college began to provide small business training and support services through the SBDC basis throughout the business communities of Douglas County.
The SBDC benefitted from having the close support of the college's president and the vice-president of instruction. Often during the center's first years of operation, these individuals acted as buffers and boundary spanners from and to the college's management and personnel, as well as with the general community. The SBDC's director was given strong administrative support on campus, good access to its institutional services, and an adequate financial base in which to operate the center.

Unlike the directors of the other SBDC's studied in this research effort, Umpqua's director was able to focus his efforts almost totally on addressing the business community and not have to contend with campus politics. There was a noticeable absence of disruption and rancor with the college regarding the SBDC, and the college had developed a realistic and reachable agenda for the SBDC.

Umpqua's SBDC's director sought to influence environmental changes by setting up numerous partnerships with governmental, institutional, business, and service organizations throughout the region and in particular in the area's largest city, Roseburg. His efforts gained the SBDC greater accessibility to the business community and over time, acceptance as a principal player in the economic development efforts for the region.
Linn-Benton Community College’s president, vice-president of instruction, and director of community education all agreed that political core system events had triggered large-scale changes in the SBDC. The college’s president and director of community education agreed that environmental events triggered changes in the SBDC. While these two events were commonly recognized, each respondent placed a special meaning and interpretation on what they believed took place concerning that event.

The environmental change events affecting Linn-Benton’s SBDC were seen by its president as being brought about by the economic difficulties affecting the region, and the college’s response for more involvement in dealing with the community’s problems. The director of community education portrayed environmental change events in a fashion similar to that of the college’s president; economic conditions created multiple pressures upon the college, and it was placed in a situation that stressed a timely response to the community’s problems.

The center’s director and the assistant to the director perceived their respective political and cultural system change events taking place concurrently and being identical in duration and intensity. The center’s SBM instructor portrayed political and cultural change events as two distinct
and separate entities, with very distinctive and separate patterns of duration and intensity. The political and cultural change events perceived by the director took place at a later time than the SBM instructor, but mirrored the other in duration and intensity. For the SBM instructor, political core system changes consisted of three plateaus (lasting three to nine months in length), followed by short, but steep decreases in intensity.

MHCC

There were two commonly acknowledged triggering events selected by the administrative personnel at MHCC. The president and director of business and technology shared a common agreement regarding personnel changes and cultural core system change events having taken place, but disagreed regarding their origin and impact.

Both the president and the director of business and technology at Mt. Hood saw personnel and cultural core system changes as occurring simultaneously and with identical levels of intensity, and for a similar time duration. For the president, each change in personnel (directors for the SBDC) brought with it a subsequent change in values, beliefs, and purpose for the SBDC. The director for business and technology saw personnel and cultural change events as more broadly based beginning with the resignation of the college's president of ten years, and the subsequent selection of an interim president, the moving of a program manager from the college's Maywood Center into the directorship of the Center for
Community and Economic Development, and the coming and going of three SBDC directors for the center during its first two years of operation.

All three of the college’s SBDC directors acknowledged that political core system changes had triggered large-scale changes within the SBDC. The center’s first and third director also agreed that shifts in the goals for the center had produced large-scale changes it in.

For the first SBDC director, political core system changes were associated with the interactions taking place between him and the college president regarding the control and direction of the center. The SBDC’s second director indicated that political core system changes began in August 1984, and were present throughout his tenure (August 1984 to September 1985). These changes were perceived to be associated with who would be calling the shots regarding the center’s operation, and with his inability to perceive and influence environmental and institutional constituencies.

Political core system change events for the center’s third director were associated with his concerns about the interactions between him and his immediate supervisor: the director of the Center for Community and Economic Development.

Changes in organizational goals triggered large-scale changes in the SBDC for the center’s first director associated with whether the college was interested in producing higher numbers of clients or stressing quality of effort in the SBDC. For the third SBDC director at Mt. Hood, goal changes would be associated with a shift to a more business and economy-oriented
approach to the delivery of its services as opposed to operating with a more traditional academic oriented.

CCC

The change graph data generated by the president and vice-president of Chemeketa Community College produced only one commonly acknowledged change event, this being political core system changes. For the president such changes did not take place until he became involved in pursuing an off-campus site for the college’s SBDC and TED Center. The vice-president’s perception was associated with the college’s restructuring efforts and the shifting of key personnel into and out of the SBDC and TED Center.

There was no commonly acknowledged change event agreed upon by the center’s staff. What changes that did take place within the center was seen in two very distinct and different ways by its personnel.

The director’s perception was fixed on technical core system changes originating in those issues related to having the means and resources to operate the center, and being able to reach its goals and objectives. For the SBM instructor, the cultural core system change and personnel changes that took place set into motion a set of rollercoaster fluctuations in the SBDC.
Umpqua’s SBDC faced in its first two years of existence (1984 and 1985) a number of events which affected and changed its operation. Some of these events were commonly acknowledged by several of the respondents included in this study, yet each respondent placed a special meaning and interpretation upon the event unique and distinctive to their organizational position at Umpqua Community College. Each informant chose to measure and define the properties of organizational change in the SBDC in a unique and subjective manner. Often supervisors and subordinates did not agree on the nature of the events taking place, their impact, the role they played in the operation of the SBDC, and the strategies available to deal with them.

The environmental events that triggered change in the college’s SBDC were associated with the region’s economy by the president, while the vice-president’s view was fixed on whether state and federal funding sources would make available the resources necessary to create the OSBDCN, and in turn, the college’s SBDC. Not only were the views of these two individuals fixing upon different elements of the environment, but they also portrayed the intensity and duration of these events in very different ways.

The college’s president and vice-president showed significant differences in how cultural core system change events were perceived and acknowledged. Here again, the college’s president selected a different set of criteria than the vice-president when viewing and recognizing the origin of such events.
Umpqua’s SBDC director and support staff agreed that political core system change events and changes in the SBDC’s organizational goals had triggered large-scale changes in the SBDC but differed in perception regarding the events that produced such changes. The duration of the political core system changes were also portrayed as being present for different periods of time by the SBDC’s personnel.

Social Power and Influence in Decision Making and Strategy Selection

LBCC

The complex process of adaptation experienced by the college’s SBDC was disrupted and directed a number of inter- and intra-organizational generated events. Throughout the center’s first two years of operation it struggled to organize the interface between the SBDC’s functions, the college’s agenda for it, and understanding the needs of its chief external constituencies (current and potential small business owners).

After nearly a year of operating the SBDC, there was little or no agreement on the domain or goals of the center, and the means to achieve them existing between key organizational decision-makers. In this case, rational choices and decision-making processes were supplanted by the exercising of social power and influence. The center’s director sought and obtained the support of an important internal coalition (the vice-president of instruction and director of community education) in attempting to achieve
the ends selected by her for the center. The SBDC's director was successful in negotiating a new status for the SBDC and the influence and power given to the director. What emerged from this action was the establishment of a new basis for future organizational actions on behalf of the SBDC. The center was able to develop different norms about its organizational behaviors, goals, and the structuring of its activities. Its uniqueness and diversity were acknowledged and secured by the power shift that took place. The degree of choice and flexibility offered the SBDC allowed it innovations denied to other existing programs. It was allowed to exploit new markets and diversify its services, because in part the director was able to "piggyback" the SBDC operations onto that of the college, by convincing top management that the SBDC served the central and vital interest of the college.

MHCC

Overall, the goals sought for MHCC and its SBDC emphasized the type of services to be provided (short and long-term counseling, training and/or guidance), and a focus on two specific and intended outcomes from the services provided (to assist small businesses in their profitability, and to reduce the failure rate of small businesses in the community). When it came to dealing with potential small business owners and advising them on the feasibility of their intended ventures (service outcome), coordinating the SBDC's services with organizations, promoting it to the small business
community (marketing), and providing meaningful resources as well as selecting and training capable staff (physical, institutional, and human resources), Mt. Hood’s personnel showed little inclination to consider them among the SBDC’s most important goals in 1984 and 1985.

A careful review of the quarterly and annual reports submitted by the college’s SBDC during 1984 and 1985, showed that it consistently was unable to meet its projected number of cases, and that its directors were frequently unsure of their impact in the community. Also, the center was not able to put together a functional community advisory board (mandated in the terms of their contract) until the center’s second year of operation.

An institutional accreditation review conducted in 1988 indicated that the physical space available to the center restricted the amount, type, and nature of services it could offer. Yet, after nearly five years of operation (1988), the college was still struggling with determining whether the center should be moved off campus.

When examining the research data generated by the Mt. Hood respondents, what comes into view is a trend to express much greater confidence in the development and availability of strategies capable of addressing those change events generated within the college than for those events generated by outside entities. There was also a tendency to have less variability expressed in the range of strategies developed when addressing institutionwide related events and/or those generated within the college. Those events affecting the whole college or perceived to be generated within
it were often defined in a very similar fashion. Again, those events taking place outside the college's own domain showed the greatest degree of variability in how they were defined and perceived.

The management structure at the college and the hierarchical barriers it created often prevented the exchange of ideas regarding the center's goals and its operation. There was no broad base of interlocking organizational authority which could encourage wide-spread participation in the SBDC's decision at the operational level. A sparse and inadequate exchange of ideas and perceptions took place which prevented any well-defined and accepted form of understanding to take place. Consequently, personnel directly associated with the SBDC's operation and having more first-hand experience were not utilized effectively in making the decisions necessary to insure the long-term health and survival of the SBDC.

CCC

The homogeneity of operational goals for Chemeketa's SBDC and the type of services it would provide were in large measure fashioned out of the college's previous evolutionary efforts (The Cooperative Career and Economic Development Center and the Cooperative Training and Economic Development) servicing the region's business community and economic development interests. The selection and retention of previously examined and tested approaches used to deal with the business community limited the organizational resources and time spent in selecting an appropriate set
of operational goals for the SBDC. The college and key SBDC staff members had learned to a large extent the proper way to structure and manage an organization like the SBDC, as well as how to go about enhancing its efficiency and effectiveness.

The selection criteria used for the SBDC operational goals was the result of political and cultural decisions made over a long period of time, and influenced by all the dominant decision makers concerned with the SBDC’s operation. As such a great deal of faith existed concerning the SBDC’s purpose and aims, in the efficiency of the established institutional order in which it would operate, and its position and level of importance to the existing hierarchy on campus. In the case of Chemeketa’s SBDC, there was little difference between what the college had created, what the community wanted, and what was possible for the SBDC to provide. All these dimensions produced an opportunity to create an organization for the SBDC which could act as a focal point for the interest of the college and community. By coupling the SBDC’s goals to previous economic development efforts done at Chemeketa, the center was able to move into its domain with a "halo of expertise" attached to its efforts. There was little need for coercive strategies or management practices to be adopted. Advice and consultation rather than power plays by individuals, coalitions, and/or organizations were used in the decision-making process and to ensure operational efficiency for the SBDC. The SBDC for Chemeketa Community College achieved and maintained a high degree of operational effectiveness
by having an articulate understanding of what it was to do, and a commonly understood and supported set of concrete objectives for its operation.

UCC

For UCC, the SBDC needed to address those issues which would deal with the number of existing small businesses in the community (reducing the failure rate of small businesses), and which would increase the likelihood of new businesses succeeding (advising potential small business owners on the feasibility of their intended ventures). These goals expressed a concern over the tenuous economic state of the region.

For Umpqua Community College, a view emerges which clearly contrasts two very distinctive and different set of views concerning the most important operational goals for the center in 1984 and 1985. The administrative respondents to the survey show a definite interest in seeing that the center's goals be directed toward impacting the small business community. The type of services, how they are to be delivered, and the resources available to provide them are of secondary importance. This is in stark contrast to the center's staff, whose goals for the SBDC are heavily biased toward achieving the resources required to provide its services, and its ability to integrate and coordinate its services with existing services and efforts taking place in the sponsoring college and with other agencies and organizations in the region providing services to the small business
community. A bifurcation of interest emerges when the goals of these two groups of organizational respondents are examined.

The college's administrative respondents' goals show a limited understanding and appreciation of the mundane day-to-day tasks required to sustain the SBDC's operation. Rather, their interest seems to be related to goals which project to the business community that the college has an organizational apparatus in place which can impact, enhance, and support the business community. Their goals were those which showed a concern for being responsible to a constituency wider than just the membership of its own organization.

What the staff's goals for the SBDC were is not a reflection of the administration's goal orientation, but their interpretation of how the SBDC's services and resources could be best used to validate the goals of the college. The SBDC's staff selected those goals which they believed would best support the operational strategies sought by the college, and the performance standards imposed upon it by the organizations funding its operation.

There never existed a significant gap between the SBDC's view of what needed to be done to deal with the economic realities of the region and how the college wanted the SBDC to address them. The extensive network of relationships fostered by the SBDC permitted it to perform ongoing reliability checks on its efforts, and to access information and data throughout its operational domain. Umpqua's SBDC's efforts produced far
less ambiguity when it came to making strategic changes. The SBDC was able to reference its actions to the interorganizational networks it had forged. It was able to interpret environmental uncertainty quickly and accurately across a broad spectrum of the community. This provided a very high overall reliability of judgment concerning the center's operation and organizational efforts.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to conduct a careful examination of four community college based Small Business Development Centers in Oregon and the events that triggered large-scale organizational changes within them during their first two years of operation (1984 and 1985). Tichy's TPC model for strategic change management was used to provide a conceptual framework for analyzing the events that triggered organizational change in the four sites studied.

Research Questions

Research Question I. To study the nature and type of events that trigger strategic changes in four community college-based Small Business Development Centers in Oregon.

Tichy’s (1983) TPC model for managing strategic change provided the analytical structure to systematically identify events triggering large-scale changes in the four community college-based SBDC’s in this study. The TPC model also provided a means to examine and analyze a number of triggering events and the organizational changes that they initiated, but it was found that the TPC model did not adequately describe the full range and types of events that triggered large-scale changes in the four
community college-based SBDCs studied. The set of triggering events classified in the TPC model was found to be too broadly defined and specified. This made the diagnostic capabilities of the model somewhat suspect and limited when applied to community college settings.

Several key external environmental factors that can act as triggering events for change in a community college-based setting, such as, changes in societal values, the interaction and frequency of contact with other organizations and institutions in the college’s service area, the nature and type of interaction that the college has with governmental and quasi-governmental agencies and organizations, and changes in the demographic composition of the college’s demographic and/or economic constituencies were found to be present and influential in triggering change events but not accounted for by the TPC model. Key internal environmental factors affecting community colleges, such as, the attitudes of governing boards, the attitudes of key administrators, the attitudes of faculty members, the location of the programs and/or services, the physical resources available, and the financial resources available, are also absent from the set of triggering events identified in the TPC model yet were found to be important to the study of the events that triggered strategic change in the SBDCs.

Research Question II. To determine if the strategic management changes brought about in the four sites of this study were initiated by a common set of triggering events.
The In-Depth Diagnostic plan proposed in Tichy’s (1983) TPC model provided the analytical structure for determining how strategic management changes were brought about and the events that triggered such actions.

Consistently found in the research data was how commonly identified triggering events were attended to differently by organizational members depending on their hierarchical and/or social role in the organization. The research data indicated that the process and means of identification were often as important as the ultimate strategic management change decisions made, because how the change was perceived influenced the nature and type of collegial and/or institutional responses selected to deal with the change event.

The research data indicated that different organizational members and coalitions will have differing priorities when acknowledging events that trigger strategic change and the ways of reaching what is determined to be the important aspects of the change on the organization’s environments. The data suggested that because the forces that bring about organizational change are so complex and the categories of change are so varied, the process of change can never be totally comprehended, represented, and/or attended.

The cases studied produced data which consistently showed that organizational members were reluctant or seldom saw the need to actively and vigorously pursue the development of diagnostic and informational referents required to create and define a means to acknowledge the events
triggering large-scale organizational change. Neither top-level administration nor operational personnel sought to address the potential generators of large-scale change by consistently consulting and exchanging their perceptions on the types of events that would necessitate organizational adjustments and/or changes. As a consequence of this type of approach to diagnosing the events capable of triggering change, the four community college-based SBDCs often managed change from a reactive modality, thereby seldom being able to challenge and reshape the forces triggering the change process.

Research Question III. To provide community colleges with data that will enable them to identify those events which can trigger strategic management changes within new and innovative small business assistance programs, particularly during the early developmental stages of their organizational existence.

The data generated by the four case studies provided an image of organizational environments being populated with many events that can trigger large-scale changes. Considerably more research will be needed regarding the nature and origins of those events that can trigger the change process in community college-based programs before the incorporation of cognitive rationality can be applied to managing the change process. Error and random interpretation rather than a conscious and organized frame-of-reference often formed the basis for dealing with the organizational changes
that were triggered in the four community college-based small business assistance programs studied.

By failing to develop an extensive network of informational gathering liaisons and relationships within the colleges, the SBDCs and their environments, little was permitted in the way of ongoing reliability checks on the nature and origin of change events being experienced and encountered.

For a satisfactory set of diagnostic data to be made available to community college personnel to address and manage strategic change, a more sensitive, detailed, and comprehensive strategic change model than that espoused in Tichy's TPC model will have to be developed. In its current form, the TPC model provides little opportunity to address the range and variability of events that can generate strategic change in a community college.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this investigation, the following conclusions were reached concerning the nature and type of events triggering large-scale organizational change in four community college-based Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs).

1. The analytical framework developed through the use of the TPC model serves as a exploratory referent providing an initial step toward future research in examining those events that can trigger large-scale
organizational change in community colleges and/or the programs that they sponsor and support.

As discussed in the literature review, qualitative research involves exploratory methodology. Case study research, as was used in the present study, is a first step in the research of organizational change processes.

The analytical framework developed in the TPC model provided a basis for initial research in understanding the process of large-scale organizational change as it relates to community colleges and/or to the programs that they sponsor and support. The purpose of this study was to conduct a careful examination of the events that triggered large-scale organizational change in four community college-based Small Business Development Centers in Oregon. Both organizational development concepts and theoretical referents concerning the process of organizational design and adaptation provided valuable inputs into understanding those events and activities triggering the change process in the four SBDCs studied and in the community colleges sponsoring and supporting them. The TPC Strategic Change management model was refined and modified through the process of assessing the data collected in the research design (field-based case studies). The study of the events triggering large-scale organizational change in the SBDCs and their sponsoring community colleges provided a foundation for future research involving confirmation, expansion, or revision of the diagnostic process used in the TPC model to conduct a
systematic analysis of the types of events triggering change in community college-based organizations and/or programs.

2. The events that trigger the change process in organizations are evolutionary, circular, fluid, and dynamic in nature.

In most change situations multiple factors are involved, making it hard to clearly identify causes. When strategic change occurs, problems, crises, or opportunities related to one or more of the following areas are taking place: environmental changes, shifts in technology, shifts in personnel, shifts in the domain in which the organization operates, and the goals of the organization. The process of change is made dynamic and complex to a large extent by the mixture of forces which come into play.

The range of possible answers to the question "How do we account for change," is matched by the question of "what tactics and strategies do organizations choose to deal with the problems and/or dilemmas created by change events?" Tichy (1983) argued that because organizations are perpetually in flux, undergoing shifts and changes, none of the events that bring about change are ever resolved. Change is an ongoing dilemma for organizations. It is a universal and inevitable phenomenon which rarely occurs in either a smooth or balanced fashion.

Those variables that bring about change are highly interdependent in nature; a change in one usually results in a compensatory change in others. Maruyama (1982) argued that changes in organizations unfold through circular patterns of interaction. Organizational change is most clearly
perceived in terms of loops rather than in a linear fashion. The mutual causality of change makes any attempt to seek unilateral responses to any set of causal variables associated with the change process unrealistic and untenable.

3. Qualitative research techniques provided an effective means to research the change events detailed in the TPC model.

The methodology provided by qualitative research provided the means to examine the multiple factors and systems involved in organizational change. The diagnostic methods of understanding change events, especially related to the perspectives and responses developed by organizational personnel, were preferred over prediction models. Taylor and Bogdan (1984) emphasized qualitative methodology for understanding people within their own frame of reference. They stressed that the different perceptions accumulated in a case study provide a cross-check in explaining and describing a situation as it really exists. This was evident in all four case studies when it came to organizational members describing commonly acknowledged change events in ways that reflected their operational, social, and/or hierarchical position within the organization. The case studies gave substance to the TPC’s analytical framework and defined the processes used.

4. The TPC model needs to be substantially transformed to become an effective tool for identifying and responding to those events triggering organizational change in community college settings.
The eight stages of the In-Depth Diagnostic Plan found in the TPC model facilitated a basic understanding of the change process in the four SBDCs studied. The TPC model provided a means to collect and use different data sets in order to identify and examine a variety of substantive issues and problems. This orientation is in keeping with the literature in emphasizing diversity of method, strategy, and tactics.

The TPC model makes no mention as to the manner in which the data sets generated by its In-Depth Diagnostic Plan are to be integrated, whether data gathered for one stage and/or component of the diagnostic plan can also be used in assessing other components of the model, or the manner in which the results of the diagnostic plan should be organized and/or presented so as to improve the overall assessment process. In its present form, the TPC model suffers from what Bell and French (1984) identify as an all too common problem associated with OD-based approaches to research that being: global treatments and global effects, used as means to describe independent and dependent variables and their cause and effect linkages.

Analysis of the data suggested that a number of the diagnostic steps presented in the TPC’s diagnostic plan were not relevant and/or helpful in identifying the events and activities that triggered change in the SBDCs studied. Additionally, while the TPC model stresses the use of multiple data collection procedures, more specific information needs to be provided when applying the five basic data collection procedures: questionnaires,
observations, interviews, documents and records, and workshops and diagnostic meetings. The TPC model does not provide guidelines for the potential user to choose the diagnostic procedures best suited to the specific information being sought. What is unknown or not expressed in the TPC model is in what cases certain analytical and diagnostic steps can be shortened, modified, or eliminated in order to provide the opportunity for individual/institutional differences and creativity.

5. The process of interpreting the information on triggers for change was as important as acknowledging and identifying the trigger events or activities.

While gathering data through interviews, graphic representations, questionnaires, documents, and archival sources, it became evident that the process of acknowledging and interpreting change events was influenced in a significant way by the individuals' hierarchical and social positions in the organization. The individuals' informational sources and knowledge base concerning the college's operation provoked significantly different responses to commonly acknowledged and identified trigger events. Frequently, organizational members expressed the intensity and duration of the uncertainty and stress generated by commonly identified trigger events in a way seldom congruent to that of others. There existed a tendency for different operational and/or social elements in the college to foster a particular focus for addressing change events. This perceptual restrictiveness, created by adhering to a particular informational base or
viewing only specific operational levels, often prevented those involved in addressing change events from exploring and recognizing significant new perspectives and insights about the SBDCs and how they were affected by those events that triggered changes within them.

Within its present structure and focus, the TPC model pays little attention to the relation between the respondents' "position" within the organization and their perceptions. The concept of uncertainty, which is central to much of Tichy's (1983) TPC model and understanding the change process, is not linked in any fashion to how it may be acknowledged, identified, perceived, or reacted to by organizational members in different roles and hierarchical levels within the organization.

Organizations exist in multidimensional and segmented environments, and different organizational units and roles are exposed to different environments. As Aldrich (1979) noted, the greater the number of environments an organization has internally and externally, the greater the divergence between the motives and objectives of its various factions and interest groups. This condition makes it very likely that the researcher will obtain differing perceptions of the environment from members in widely separated positions.

In its present form, the TPC model makes little distinction in the relationship between social position, organizational roles, or hierarchical levels and how the differential exposure to the organization's environment
that they create develop biased reporting and disparate perceptions of environmental and organizational characteristics.

Recommendations for Further Research

It is recommended that further research be conducted in the area of diagnosing those events that trigger strategic change within community colleges. There are several areas where further research could be developed using quantitative and/or qualitative research methodologies.

1. Use and refinement of the TPC model for research on the events that trigger strategic organizational change should be continued.

2. Further research should be done concerning the strategic change process in community colleges and/or the programs they offer.

3. Further research should be undertaken to identify and diagnose those events that trigger the strategic changes in community colleges and/or the programs they offer.

4. A study should be done to determine the diagnostic approaches used in community colleges to analyze and address the events that trigger strategic changes within them and/or the programs they offer.

5. Strategic change management should be examined on a longitudinal basis to determine the effects of change events over the life cycle of a community college and/or the programs it offers.

6. Research should be done to determine if there is a relationship between the role played by key individuals as innovators of organizational
change in the community college and their educational work backgrounds, personalities, and leadership characteristics.

7. A study should be done to see what the effects of organizational size, structure, and/or stage of development are upon community colleges and/or the programs they offer when dealing with the events that trigger the strategic change process.

Recommendations for Action Items

1. Community college leaders should review the modified TPC model and relate it to their diagnostic procedures for assessing the events that trigger strategic changes within the college and/or its programs.

2. The modified TPC diagnostic plan should be used to work through the analysis of the strategic change process at several community college field sites.

3. Staff development should be undertaken which would provide training in developing a systematic diagnostic procedure for dealing with those events that trigger change for all administrative staff.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the following ways which may affect the ability to generalize its findings.

1. The four community college-based SBDCs selected for the study are located in the Willamette Valley area. They may not be
organizationally, operationally, or philosophically similar to community
college-based SBDCs of differing sizes or locations.

2. The background and training of those interviewed may be
different from others throughout the nation.

3. Some key personnel involved in the creation and development of
the community college-based SBDCs selected for the study refused to
participate in the study.

4. The statistical and narrative records sought at the community
college-based SBDCs selected for the study were incomplete.

5. The response and cooperation from the originator of the
theoretical model used (TPC model of Strategic Organizational Change)
were not secured regarding the appropriateness of data collection
methodologies utilized in this study.

6. Two community college-based SBDCs located in the Willamette
Valley refused to participate in this study.

Delimitations of the Study

This study is delimited in the following ways which may affect the
ability to generalize its findings.

1. The study was delimited to four Oregon community college-based
Small Business Development Centers. They are Mt. Hood Community
College, Gresham, Chemeketa Community College, Salem, Linn-Benton
Community College, Albany, and Umpqua Community College, Roseburg.
2. The researcher decided to study a sample (N=4) smaller than the total Oregon community college-based Small Business Development Center population (N=15).

3. The researcher relied upon the recommendations made by the statewide director for the SBDCs regarding which SBDC sites should be applicable to the study in the Willamette Valley.

4. The researcher imposed limitation on the number of key external personnel to be interviewed and the number of key external personnel to interview.

5. The organizational and management-related assessment instruments selected for use in the study were: Time Spent in Coordination, Task Difficulty, Direction and Frequency of Information Flows, and Domain Uncertainty Questionnaire.
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The Legislative Assembly finds that:

341.009 Policy.
ORS Chapter 341.009 (1) (18) Policy.

9. It should be the policy of the community college to open
8. The community college should offer as comprehensive a
7. There should be close cooperation between those direct-
5. The community college should continue to be prohibited
4. The community college is a post-high school institution
3. The community college should not follow the established
2. Each community college should be so located as to be
1. The community college is an educational institution

10. To establish programs designed to meet the needs of the
area served, surveys of the educational and service needs
of the district should be made. Specific technical and
vocational courses should be related not only to the
employment opportunities of the area but of the state and
nation as well. Such determination should be made in consul-
tation with representatives of labor, business, industry, agriculture and other interested groups.

11. The State Board of Education should be responsible for
coordinating the community college program of the state
and should have general supervisor responsibilities for the
program. The State Board of Education should prepare
estimates and make the request so for legislative appro-
priations for a reasonable and consistent basis of support
and establish standards for the distribution of the support.

12. The initiative for the establishment of new community
colleges should come from the localities to be served, as a
response to demonstrated educational needs of an area.
However these localities must not only be willing to
assume the responsibility for the institutions but must be
able to provide resources needed for an adequate educa-
tion and service program.

13. The governing board of the community college should be
charged with the policy-making function. With respect
to educational programming, the governing board should in
cooperation with the State Board of Education: (a) Identify educational needs of the district; and (b) bring
together the resources necessary to meet the needs.

14. The state should maintain a policy of substantial state
participation in community college building costs and the
maintenance of an adequate level of state support for
operation. However, no state funds should be appropri-
ated for buildings such as dormitories or athletic facilities
for spectator sports. In the event that students from
beyond commuting distance attend a community college,
housing should be noncampus. The operating district
should provide a substantial portion of the funds for
capital improvement as well as for operation of a com-
munity college.

15. State appropriations for community colleges should be
made separately from those for other segments of educa-
tion.

16. The formula for the distribution of funds for operating
costs should reflect the heavier operating costs and capital
outlay for certain vocational-technical training should be
used for that purpose only and be distributed separately
from funds appropriated by the state and should be ex-
empted from the computations of the present distribution
formula for operating costs.

17. The cost of education to the individual should be suffi-
ciently low to permit students of low-income families to
attend. This is particularly true of tuition costs. How-
ever, students should pay an amount sufficient to provide
an incentive to profit from the instructional program
offered.

18. Any eligible Oregon resident should have the right to
attend a community college even though not residing in
the district operating one, subject to the right of the
governing board to limit the size of classes and to give
preference to students residing in the district. Local
districts should have the authority to negotiate the terms
and conditions with the governing boards for the enroll-
ment of students residing in such local districts.

(1971 c.513 s.97)
House Bill 3002

Sponsored by Representatives BRADBURY, AGRONS, BELLAMY, BENNETT, BROGOITTI, CALOURI, CEASE, COURTNEY, FARMER, GOLD, HANLON, HANNEMAN, J. HILL, L. HILL, HOOLEY, HOSTICKA, HUGO, JOLIN, D. HONES, LEEK, LINDQUIST, MARKHAM, McCracken, MILLER, MYERS, OTTO, PRIESTLEY, RIJKEN, B. ROBERTS, L. ROBERTS, SCAVERA, SHIPRACK, SPRINGER, THROOP, Senators BROWN, DAY, GARNER, HAMOEY, HANLON, HENDRIKSEN, JERNSTEDT, McFarland, MONROE, RIPPER, RYLES, SIMMONS, STARKOVICH, TROW, WYERS, Representative BURROWS

SUMMARY

The following summary is not prepared by the sponsors of the measure and is not a part of the body thereof subject to consideration by the Legislative Assembly. It is an editor's brief statement of the essential features of the measure as introduced.

Authorizes Department of Education to make grants to community colleges and area education districts to establish a state-wide network of small business assistance centers.

Appropriates $___________ to department of biennium.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

Relating to small business assistance centers; and appropriating money.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. This Act shall be known and may be cited as the "Small Business Training Assistance Act."

SECTION 2. (1) The purpose of this Act is to establish a state-wide network of community college-based small business assistance centers.

(2) The Legislative Assembly finds that it is in the state's interest to help small businesses develop and improve skills in such areas as marketing, management and capital formation through a network of small business assistance centers because:

(a) Small business employers create most of the new jobs in Oregon and are vital to Oregon's long term economic recovery;

(b) Community colleges present the possibility of a state-wide network able to link small business with college resources, expert resource people in the business community and with other training resources throughout the state; and

(c) While many factors affect the vitality of small business, training assistance in a form, location and time directly related to the problem to be solved is chief among them.

SECTION 3. (1) The Department of Education may make available to community college and area education districts on a justified need basis grants to assist in the formation and improvement of small business assistance centers. The grant application shall include:

(a) Evidence of the potential demand for assistance;

(b) Plans for involving other training resources and expert resource people from the business community in the program;
An outline of training options to be available, including time of day, length of training, training location and other considerations to the small business community.

A budget for the year for which a grant is requested, including college, client and Department of Education grant shares; and

A plan for evaluating the effect of the program on small business clients served.

The grants made under subsection (1) of this section are to be used by the community college or area education district to:

(a) Provide funds for small business assistance center staff and support staff;

(b) Provide funds to retain expert resource persons from the business community;

(c) Provide funds to community colleges with existing small business assistance centers so staff can be released to help other community college districts establish centers;

(d) Provide funds to retain other training resources as necessary to enhance the training capability of the centers in certain skill areas or areas of the state; and

(e) Provide funds for other costs related to operation of the centers and provision of training to small business clients.

SECTION 4. (1) There is established within the Department of Education a Small Business Assistance Center Advisory Council, appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The council shall include representatives of the small business community, community colleges, area education districts and other providers of training assistance to small business.

(2) The Small Business Assistance Center Advisory Council shall advise the Superintendent of Public Instruction on administration of the grants program, including establishment of the criteria by which grants shall be awarded.

SECTION 5. There is hereby appropriated to the Department of Education, for the biennium ending June 30, 1985, out of the General Fund, the Sum of $_________ for the purposes of carrying out this Act.

Note. Matter in bold face in an amended section is new; matter [italic and bracketed] is existing law to be omitted.
APPENDIX C

YEARS 1-2 OPERATIONAL
GOALS FOR OSBDCN
### Operational Plan - Year: 1-2

**Small Business Assistance Center**

**GOAL:** To maintain accurate records and reports for the OSBDCN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SBA Inst</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>State Grant</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compile monthly</td>
<td>* Short-term counseling records</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Periodic Check of files and records</td>
<td>OSBDCN Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Long-term counseling records</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintain Client Profiles-SBA 1062</td>
<td>Compile</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Record number of clients served</td>
<td>* Compile monthly 888 records</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintain training unit reports - SBA 888</td>
<td>* Compile and reconcile monthly</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maintain fiscal records of state expenditures</td>
<td>* Compile information</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prepare and distribute quarterly report of OSBDCN activities</td>
<td>* Distribute</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 1986</td>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prepare and distribute annual report of OSBDCN activities</td>
<td>* Compile information</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 1986</td>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL:** To conduct a statewide "needs assessment" to determine the current needs of small businesses in Oregon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine &quot;needs&quot; of small businesses throughout Oregon</td>
<td>* Work with NFIB, OEDD</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Jan. 1986</td>
<td>State Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Conduct statewide &quot;needs assessment&quot; of small business needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb. 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Survey small business owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Survey SBDC Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Survey SBDC Advisory committee members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Analyze results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Distribute results to SBDC's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL: To maintain accurate records and to develop new resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Upgrade the network speakers/seminar list</td>
<td>* Compile monthly</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Total number of seminar speakers, used how often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop new small business curriculum</td>
<td>* Solicit additional resources individual for inclusion</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Number of new curriculums developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Produce and distribute NFIB/LOC &quot;Small Business Legal Issues&quot; Video tapes</td>
<td>* Research existing curriculum</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Obtain private sector funding for specified OSBDCN projects</td>
<td>* Compile list of potential private sector funding sources</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Amount of private sector support received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Seek additional grant funding for OSBDCN</td>
<td>* Identify potential funding sources</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Amount of grants awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assist Oregon Department of Education with administration Distribution of lottery funds allocated for OSBDCN</td>
<td>* Review lottery funds proposal</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Mar. 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Develop new resources to assist small businesses a. Tourism b. Federal Procurement c. International Trade d. SBIR</td>
<td>* Identify specific needs of small businesses</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Work with OEDD Tourism Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Work with SBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Work with WWVTC, Mt. Hood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* International trade Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Work with Oregon Innovation Network, peat Marwick, SBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL: To upgrade existing OSBDCN services and to develop new services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SBA Inst.</th>
<th>BUDGET Comnty.</th>
<th>State Grant</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Responsibility Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Conduct on-site visits to all SBDC’s | * Schedule 2 visits per year  
* Conduct on-site visit                  | ✓         |                | ✓           | by-yearly  | number of visits         | State Director       |
| 2. Develop statewide computer network | * Research possible computer network configurations  
* Solicit input from all SBDC’s & college administrators  
* Secure funding  
* Implement network | ✓         |                | ✓           | June 1987  | Network operational      | State Director       |
| 3. Increase assistance available to inventors | * Secure funding to increase contract with Innovation Institute | ✓         |                | ✓           | June 1986  |                          |                      |
| 4. Conduct Quarterly Directors meetings | * Schedule meeting  
* Provide funds for meetings  
* Provide staff training | ✓         |                | ✓           | Quarterly  | Directors evaluation of meeting | State Director       |
| 5. Develop Venture Capital Network | * Research existing VCN in New Hampshire  
* Secure statewide approval for VCN  
* Secure funding  
* Implement VCN | ✓         |                | ✓           | June 1986  | VCN operational          | State Director       |
GOAL: To maintain public awareness activities and to develop new public awareness activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SBA</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>Comnty.</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue “Small Business of the Month” feature in <em>Oregon Business Magazine</em></td>
<td>* Solicit articles from SBDC’s</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td>Article published</td>
<td>OSBDCN staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Submit to Oregon Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prepare and distribute news releases about OSBDCN activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>News releases published</td>
<td>OSBDCN staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Publish Quarterly OSBDCN Newsletter</td>
<td>* Prepare newsletter</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>Newsletter published</td>
<td>OSBDCN staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Print newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Distribute newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Submit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Make presentations to business &amp; professional organizations about OSBDCN</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Presentations made</td>
<td>OSBDCN staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL: To serve as a liaison between the business community, the Oregon Department of Education, and the Small Business Administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SBA</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>AGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Assist with 1986 house Conference on Small Business | * Contact OEDD  
* Assist with Oregon State Conference on Small business | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Mar. 1986 | Project completion | State Director |
| 2. Assist Oregon Department of Education with State Advisory meeting | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ongoing | " | OSBDCN staff |
| 3. Work with SBA to develop new small business program | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | New programs developed | " | |
| 5. Assist Oregon Department of Education with Oregon Entrepreneur Task Force | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ongoing | ODE evaluation | State Director |
Operational Plan - Year: 1-2  
Small Business Assistance Center

GOAL: To maintain accurate records and reports for the OSBDCN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SBA Budget</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Maintain Client profiles - SBA 1062 | Compile monthly  
* short-term counseling records  
* Long-term counseling records | ✓ | ✓ | ongoing | Periodic Check of files and records | OSBDCN Assist. Director |
| 2. Record number of clients served | Compile | ✓ | ✓ | ongoing | “” | “” |
| 3. Maintain training unit reports - SBA 888 | Compile monthly 888 records - tabulate quarterly | ✓ | ✓ | monthly | “” | “” |
| 4. Maintain fiscal records of state expenditures | Compile and reconcile monthly | ✓ | ✓ | monthly | “” | “” |
| 5. Prepare and distribute quarterly report of OSBDCN activities | Compile information  
* Distribute | ✓ | ✓ | quarterly | “” | “” |
| 6. Prepare and distribute annual report of OSBDCN activities | Compile information  
* Distribute | ✓ | ✓ | June 1986  
June 1987 | “” | “” |

GOAL: To conduct a statewide “needs assessment” to determine the current needs of small businesses in Oregon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SBA Budget</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Determine “needs” of small businesses throughout Oregon | Work with NFIB, OEDD  
* Conduct statewide “needs assessment” of small business needs  
* Survey small business owners  
* Survey SBDC Directors  
* Survey SBDC Advisory committee members  
* Analyze results  
* Distribute results to SBDC’s  
* Implement | ✓ | ✓ | Jan. 1986  
Feb. 1986 | “” | State Director |
| | | | Mar. 1986 | Mar. 1986 | June 1086 | “” | “” |
GOAL: To upgrade existing OSBDCN resources and to develop new resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Upgrade the network speakers/seminar list</td>
<td>* Solicit additional resources individual for inclusion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Total number of seminar speakers, used how often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop new small business curriculum</td>
<td>* Research existing curriculum * Identify new curriculum needs * Compile * Distribute</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Number of new curriculums developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Produce and distribute NFIB/LCC “Small Business Legal issues Video tapes</td>
<td>* Produce tapes * Duplicate * Distribute</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sept. 1985</td>
<td>Project completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Obtain private sector funding for specified OSBDCN projects</td>
<td>* Identify projects for funding * Compile list of potential private sector funding sources * Solicit private sector funding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Amount of private sector support received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Seek additional grant funding for OSBDCN</td>
<td>* Identify potential funding sources * Sears * EDA * Prepare and submit grant proposal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Amount of grants awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assist Oregon Department of Education with administration Distribution of lottery funds allocated for OSBDCN</td>
<td>* Review lottery funds proposal * Seek input from Directors, Presidents, college administrators regarding needs * Assist with administration &amp; distribution of lottery funds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mar. 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GOAL:** To upgrade existing OSBDCN services and to develop new services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>Activities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>Timeline</strong></th>
<th><strong>Evaluation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responsibility Agent</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Conduct on-site visits to all SBDC's | • Schedule 2 visits per year  
• Conduct on-site visit                                                           | ✓          | ✓ by-yearly  | number of visits        | State Director           |
| 2. Develop statewide computer network | • Research possible computer network configurations  
• Solicit input from all SBDC's & college administrators  
• Secure funding  
• Implement network                                         | ✓          | June 1987    | Network operational     | State Director           |
| 3. Increase assistance available to inventors | • Secure funding to increase contract with Innovation Institute                  | ✓          | June 1986    |                          |                          |
| 4. Conduct Quarterly Directors meetings | • Schedule meeting  
• Provide funds for meetings  
• Provide staff training                                                     | ✓          | Quarterly    | Directors evaluation of meeting | State Director           |
| 5. Develop Venture Capital Network   | • Research existing VCN in New Hampshire  
• Secure statewide approval for VCN  
• Secure funding  
• Implement VCN                                              | ✓          | ✓ June 1986  | VCN operational         | State Director           |
GOAL: To maintain public awareness activities and to develop new public awareness activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Responsibility Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Continue “Small Business of the Month” feature in Oregon Business Magazine | * Solicit articles from SBDC’s  
* Submit to Oregon Business                                                   | ✓      | ✓        | monthly          | Article published    | OSBDCN staff         |
| 2. Prepare and distribute news releases about OSBDCN activities            | * Prepare newsletter  
* Print newsletter  
* Distribute newsletter                                                      | ✓      | ✓        | ongoing          | News releases published | OSBDCN staff         |
| 3. Publish Quarterly OSBDCN Newsletter                                     | * Prepare articles  
* Submit                                                                      | ✓      | ✓        | quarterly         | Newsletter published  | OSBDCN staff         |
| 4. Publish articles in small business publications                         | * Prepare articles  
* Submit                                                                      | ✓      | ✓        | ongoing          | Articles published    | OSBDCN staff         |
| a. Inc. Magazine                                                          |                                                                           |        |           |                   |                      |                      |
| b. Venture Magazine                                                        |                                                                           |        |           |                   |                      |                      |
| c. U.S. Bancorp newsletter                                                 |                                                                           |        |           |                   |                      |                      |
| d. 1st interstate newsletter                                               |                                                                           |        |           |                   |                      |                      |
| 5. Make presentations to business & professional organizations about OSBDCN |                                                                           | ✓      | ✓        | ongoing          | Presentations made    | OSBDCN staff         |
**GOAL:** To serve as a liaison between the business community, the Oregon Department of Education, and the Small Business Administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Assist with 1986 house Conference on Small Business | * Contact OEDD  
* Assist with Oregon State Conference on Small business | ✓ | ✓ | Mar. 1986 | Project completion | State Director |
| 2. Assist Oregon Department of Education with State Advisory meeting | | | ongoing | " | OSBDCN staff |
| 3. Work with SBA to develop new small business program | | | | New programs developed | " |
| 5. Assist Oregon Department of Education with Oregon Entrepreneur Task Force | | | ongoing | ODE evaluation | State Director |
APPENDIX D

TPC DIAGNOSTIC PLAN
## Diagnostic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Focus</th>
<th>Specific Information Sought</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. History of organization</td>
<td>(1) What were the critical events in the organization's history, are there identifiable phases of development?</td>
<td>Documents, interviews, and surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) What is the service/product mix history of the organization (sequence of development, relative success and performance)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Environment of organization</td>
<td>(3) With whom or what is the organization interdependent for services, goods, information, influence? (Identify external network.)</td>
<td>Documents, interviews, and surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) How fluid are elements in the environment (economy, markets, competition, labor market, etc.)?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents, and surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) When there is environmental change how predictable is it?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Organizational resources</td>
<td>(6) What capital does the organization control?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) What is the state of the organization's technical capability?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) What are the overall people resources (numbers, skills, etc.)?</td>
<td>Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Mission/Strategy Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Mission</td>
<td>(1) What is the formal view of the mission?</td>
<td>Documents, interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Diagnostic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Focus</th>
<th>Specific Information Sought</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Strategy</strong></td>
<td>(2) How do members describe the mission?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) How is the mission formulated (who is involved, doing what, when)?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. What are the perceived goals?</strong></td>
<td>(1) Is there a formal strategy? If so what is it?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) What do members perceive to be the strategy?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) How is strategy arrived at (who does what, when)?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Organizational processes surrounding mission/strategy formation</strong></td>
<td>(1) What are the goals as perceived by key staff?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Who are the key people with regard to strategy formation, how do they work together to influence mission/strategy?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Task Analysis

| **A. What are the basic tasks?** | (1) What are the core tasks? | Interviews, documents (job descriptions, management by objectives, documents, etc.) |
|                                | (2) Who performs what tasks? | Interviews, observations, documents |
|                                | (3) What is the nature of the core tasks? Expertise required. | Interviews, documents |
|                                | Standardization of tasks. Discretion of task performers. | |

---

*Note: The content appears to be fragmented and may require further context or clarification.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Focus</th>
<th>Specific Information Sought</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. How do the tasks interrelate?</td>
<td>Task variability.</td>
<td>Interviews, observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Integration of core tasks—Who is interdependent with whom for what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Prescribed Organization Analysis**

**A. Differentiation—What is the overall configuration of the organization?**

(1) How is the organization differentiated: vertically, horizontally, spatially,

(2) What is the distribution of authority over budgets, personnel, tasks?

(3) What are the characteristics of individual units?
  - Number of job titles.
  - Number of tasks.
  - Heterogeneity of people skills.
  - Interchangability of roles.

**B. Integration—What is the overall configuration of the organization?**

(1) Which simple integrating mechanisms are in use and how effective are they?
  - Rules/programs.
  - Hierarchy.
  - Planning.

(2) Which mid-level integrating mechanisms are in use and how effective are they?
  - Slack resources.
  - Buffering.
  - Self-contained units.

(3) Which complex integrating mechanisms are in use:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Focus</th>
<th>Specific Information Sought</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vertical information systems, liaison personnel, task forces, teams, matrix structure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. People Analysis

A. What are the demographic characteristics of the staff?

   (1) Education and skill levels of staff? - Documents, questionnaires
   (2) Personal characteristics—sex, age, etc. - Documents

B. What are the managerial styles of key staff?

   (1) Risk taking?
   (2) How much use of professional management technology?
   (3) How participative?
   (4) How open and flexible?

C. What are the motivational forces driving various staff?

   (1) How do staff perceive their own ability to control their effectiveness?
   (2) What outcomes do staff members value (money, security, challenge, career mobility, etc.)?
   (3) What is the perceived match between what employees value and what they feel they get?

VI. Organizational Processes Analysis

A. What are the characteristics of communication?

   (1) How open is communication and for what issues?
   (2) Is there much distortion?

   Interviews, observation, questionnaires
### Diagnostic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Focus</th>
<th>Specific Information Sought</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) What is the quantity and quality of communication relevant to task accomplishment?</td>
<td>Interviews, observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. What are the characteristics of</td>
<td>(1) Are there different modes of decision making for different issues? What are they?</td>
<td>Interviews, observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision making?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Emergent Organization Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. What is the overall emergent</td>
<td>(1) Who shares information with whom (types of information specified)?</td>
<td>Interviews, observation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td>questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Who influences whom regarding what issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Who is friendly with whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which coalitions form?</td>
<td>(1) Are there identifiable clusters of people who cooperate in order to exert influence? If so, around what issues?</td>
<td>Interviews, observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. What are the cliques which exist?</td>
<td>(1) Are there relatively durable small clusters of friends within the departments?</td>
<td>Interviews, observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Output Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. What is the degree of goal</td>
<td>(1) Are they applying their limited resources toward the attainment of goals or are there</td>
<td>Interviews, documents (analysis of budgets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimization in ER?</td>
<td>&quot;unfunded&quot; goals and &quot;funded&quot; nongoals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Is there a clear relationship between the amount of resources spent on the various goals and the importance of the goal?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Focus</td>
<td>Specific Information Sought</td>
<td>Method of Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) What kind of return on investment are they getting on resources (return on staff time etc.)?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Are all parts working toward at least one of the goals?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Are goals adjusted with environmental changes?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. What are the behavioral impacts of the organization?</td>
<td>(1) How satisfied are members with their work, each other, their careers, etc.?</td>
<td>Interviews, questionnaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

OAI MATERIALS & QUESTIONNAIRES
The attached materials are designed to gather information that will be used to provide an in-depth diagnosis of your center's environment, history, and performance. This data will be used to provide an informational base concerning the events that triggered change within your organization.

This research effort is being done as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Post-Secondary Education, Oregon State University.

A code number has been placed on the first page of this packet. This number coincides with your name. Access to names and numbers will be restricted to myself only. No member of your center and/or community college will be able to relate your name to the packet being submitted.

Please help this research effort by answering ALL questions to the best of your ability. Most questions required only circling a number or letter. If the questions do not say things the way you would like to say them, please select the response that comes closest to your own opinion. Feel free to add your comments in the spaces provided for them.

The results will be made available to all SBDC and community college personnel in such a way that individuals will not be identifiable. Your responses will be totally confidential.
General Instructions

1. Please answer ALL questions in order.

2. Most questions can be answered by circling one of the numbers provided or by filling in an answer space.

3. If you do not find the exact answer to fit your case, use the one that comes closest to it.

4. The spaces to the right of the questions are for statistical purposes. PLEASE do not write in them.
### Time Spent in Coordination

1. We realize that your activities may vary a great deal from day to day. However, during your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation on the average, how many hours per day did you normally spend in each of the following activities? (Your answers do not need to add up to eight hours.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1984 HRS./DAY</th>
<th>1985 HRS./DAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Keeping track of your work activities and recording them on Time Distribution Reports and on performance records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Talking informally to people, taking care of personal matters (excluding lunch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Coordinating work with other units in this college, discussing and solving work problems encountered with other units, performing office-wide projects and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Coordinating work activities with people from the OSBDCN office, issuing requests, responding to directives, and working out issues with the OSBDCN office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Coordinating activities with other organizations outside the OSBDCN, developing and maintaining service and programs with other agencies, obtaining resources (e.g., grants), and doing community service projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Providing direct services to current or potential small business owners or employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task Difficulty

1. During your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation, to what extent was there a clearly known way to do the major types of work you normally encounter? (Circle one number for 1984 and one for 1985.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO NO EXTENT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO A LITTLE EXTENT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO SOME EXTENT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO A GREAT EXTENT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO A VERY GREAT EXTENT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. During your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation, how easy was it for you to know whether you did your work correctly? (Circle one number for 1984 and one for 1985.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL EASY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT TOO EASY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT EASY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUITE EASY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY EASY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. During your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation, what percent of time were you generally sure of what the outcome of your work efforts would be? (Circle one number for 1984 and one for 1985.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40% OR LESS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-90%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91% OR MORE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. During your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation, how often did difficult problems arise in your work for which there were no immediate or apparent solutions? (Circle one number for 1984 and one for 1985.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONCE A WEEK OR LESS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 2-4 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT ONCE/DAY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 2-4 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 OR MORE TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on following page)
5. During your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation, to what extent was there a clearly known way to do the major types of work you normally encounter? (Circle one number for 1984 and one for 1985.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 1 HOUR/WEEK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-4 HOURS/WEEK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1 HOUR/DAY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 2-3 HOURS/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 HOURS OR MORE/DAY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direction and Frequency of Information Flows

1. During your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation, how often did you receive or send written reports or memos from or to each of the following to coordinate the work of your unit: (Circle one number for each year.)

a. People in other units of your college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ONCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT EVERY HOUR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. People in the OSBDCN office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ONCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT EVERY HOUR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. People in other organizations or agencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ONCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT EVERY HOUR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. During your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation, how often did you have work-related discussions (face-to-face or by telephone) with each of the following on a one-to-one basis: (Circle one number for each year.)

a. Individuals in other units of this office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ONCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT EVERY HOUR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Individuals in the OSBDCN office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ONCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT EVERY HOUR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. During your SBDC's first year (1984)/second year (1985) of operation, how often were you involved in work-related problem-solving meetings with the following: (Circle one number for each year.)

a. Two or more people in other units of your college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ONCE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT EVERY HOUR</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Two or more people in the OSBDCN office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ONCE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT EVERY HOUR</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Two or more people in other organizations or agencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ONCE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/WEEK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT 1-3 TIMES/DAY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT EVERY HOUR</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domain Uncertainty Questionnaire

Instructions

The following questions will help us determine the degree to which organizational decision makers clearly understand the mission and goals of the organization and the means for achieving them.

I. Consensus on Operating Goals

1. Listed below are the goals of the SBDCs. Please indicate whether each is a very important, somewhat important, or a little importance goal to your organization. (Circle one number for each year.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Description</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. To coordinate SBDC services with other public and/or private agencies in order to meet the needs of the Small Business community</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. To reduce the failure rate of small businesses in the community</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. To advise potential small business owners regarding the feasibility of their intended ventures</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. To develop those businesses being served by the SBDC in improving, to a significant degree, their ability to generate profits</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. To develop and promote the small business community's awareness of SBDC services and programs</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. To provide short-term guidance, training, and counseling to current and/or potential small business owners</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. To develop, maintain, and update meaningful resources for center staff and/or its clients</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. To provide long-term counseling, training, and guidance to current and/or potential small business owners</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. To select and train center staff members capable of providing a consistently high level of service</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Looking back now at those goals you indicated were important goals for your organization, please indicate which one was most important, which was second most important, which was third most important and which was fourth in importance for 1984 and also for 1985. (Place the letter of the goals from question 1 above in the appropriate box.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOST IMPORTANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND MOST IMPORTANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD MOST IMPORTANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH IN IMPORTANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Clarity of Operating Strategies

Below is a list of major events that may or may not affect the operation of a Small Business Development Center. Please indicate whether or not each was an event experienced by your organization in 1984 and if YES, briefly describe the nature of the event and circle the number best describing any strategy developed.

1. Events in the economic condition of the local and/or regional economy of your SBDC's service area (e.g., unemployment rate going up or down.) (Circle one number.)

   1  NO, event did not occur
   -2  YES, event occurred in 1984

   --> 1a. Briefly describe the event:

   1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

   1  HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS
   2  A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR
   3  HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK
   4  HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT
   5  HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT

2. Events in the OSBDCN administrative office in Eugene (e.g., change in personnel, new rules and regulations, etc.).

   1  NO, event did not occur
   -2  YES, event occurred in 1984

   --> 1a. Briefly describe the event:
1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

1. HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS
2. A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR
3. HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK
4. HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT
5. HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT

3. Events in other Small Business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within your SBDC's service area (e.g., introduction of new agencies and/or services, etc.).

1. NO, event did not occur
2. YES, event occurred in 1984

--> 1a. Briefly describe the event:

1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

1. HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS
2. A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR
3. HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK
4. HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT
5. HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT

4. Events that happened within the community college sponsoring and supporting your SBDC (e.g., change in upper level management, changes in the reporting of structure, etc.).

1. NO, event did not occur
2. YES, event occurred in 1984

--> 1a. Briefly describe the event:

1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

1. HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS
2. A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR
3. HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK
4. HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT
5. HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT
5. Events that happened within your own SBDC (e.g., change in personnel, goals, funding, etc.).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO, event did not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>YES, event occurred in 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1a. Briefly describe the event:

1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KID OF EVENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a list of major events that may or may not affect the operation of a Small Business Development Center. Please indicate whether or not each was an event experienced by your organization in 1985 and if Yes, briefly describe the nature of the event and circle the number best describing any strategy developed.

1. Events in the economic condition of the local and/or regional economy of your SBDC's service area (e.g., unemployment rate going up or down.) (Circle one number.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO, event did not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>YES, event occurred in 1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1a. Briefly describe the event:

1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KID OF EVENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Events in the OSBDCN administrative office in Eugene (e.g., change in personnel, new rules and regulations, etc.).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO, event did not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>YES, event occurred in 1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1a. Briefly describe the event:
1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

1 HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS
2 A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR
3 HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK
4 HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT
5 HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KID OF EVENT

3. Events in other Small business Assistance and/or Economic Development Programs within your SBDC’s service area (e.g., introduction of new agencies and/or services, etc.).

1 NO, event did not occur
2 YES, event occurred in 1985

4. Events that happened within the community college sponsoring and supporting your SBDC (e.g., change in upper level management, changes in the reporting of structure, etc.).

1 NO, event did not occur
2 YES, event occurred in 1985

1a. Briefly describe the event:

1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

1 HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS
2 A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR
3 HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK
4 HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT
5 HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KID OF EVENT
5. Events that happened within your won SBDC (e.g., change in personnel, goals, funding, etc.).

1   NO, event did not occur
2   YES, event occurred in 1985

→ 1a. Briefly describe the event:

________________________________________________________________________

1b. Which of the following best describes any action taken to deal with the event. (Circle one number.)

1   HAD NO IDEA HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS
2   A TENTATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPED BUT STILL REMAINED UNCLEAR
3   HAD A STRATEGY BUT DIDN'T KNOW IF IT WOULD WORK
4   HAD A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT
5   HAD A VERY CLEAR TRIED AND TESTED STRATEGY TO DEAL WITH THIS KIND OF EVENT

Comments:__________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

This questionnaire is now completed.
Thank you for your effort.