DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 957 JC 700 114

AUTHOR Kinker, H. Robert

TITLE Public Junior College Recruitment, Retention and

Tenure Practices, With Fmphasis on Technological

Subjects Instruction.

PUB DATE [69] NOTE 10p.

EDRS PRICE FDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.60

DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy, *Field Studies, *Junior

Colleges, Statistical Analysis, Teacher Employment,

*Teacher Recruitment, Teacher Selection, *Tenure

ABSTRACT

Pecruitment, retention, and tenure practices at public junior and community colleges throughout the United States are the subject of this study by the Department of Education, Indiana University. Out of 592 colleges contacted in November 1968, 507 responded; 426 of the responses to this 37-question survey were considered useable sources of data. Emphasis was placed on securing data relevant to instructors of technical subjects, although data on instructors of general subjects were also included. (JO)



PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE RECRUITMENT, RETENTION AND TENURE PRACTICES, WITH EMPHASIS ON TECHNOLOGICAL SUBJECTS INSTRUCTION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. EDUCATION

& WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DGCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This study was undertaken by H. Robert Kinker, an associate professor in the Department of Higher Education at Indiana University. It was made possible through a research grant from the University and through the generous cooperation of 507 chief executive officers — or their surrogates — of public junior or community colleges located in the United States.

Procedures

On 15 November 1968, a previously validated data-collection instrument, accompanied by an appropriate covering letter, was mailed to the chief executive officers of 592 public junior or community colleges. Four weeks later a follow-up letter and another copy of the instrument were sent to those individuals who had not responded. After another four-week interval a second follow-up communication was mailed.

As a result, 507 administrators ultimately replied to the inquiry, or a return of 85.5 percent. Of the 507 responses, 426 were usable and provided the findings which are herein presented.

Findings

Question One: Agencies of Administrative Control

Only one out of each twenty five junior or community colleges was administered exclusively by officials of the city in which the institution was located. One junior college in eight, 52 or 12.2 percent, was exclusively controlled administrative ly by county officials and over one in four by district officials only. One reply in seven indicated regional administrative control only; fewer than one in five was solely administered by state officials; and roughly one in twelve was under the administrative control of the state university. Another one in eight reported some kind of combined control.

Question Two: Sources of Financial Support

Twenty seven junior or community colleges were financed solely by the cities in which they were located and another 93, or approximately one in five, by their



respective counties. All of the others had some combination of state, regional and federal financial support.

Question Three: Highest Full Time Enrollment for Any Single Quarter, or Semester, During the 1967-1968 Academic Year

In just over one out of every one hundred junior colleges the full time enrollment was 10,000 or over, while in just under one out of two schools it was under 1,000. In two out of five cases the enrollment was between 1,000 and 2,499 and in one out of twelve it ranged from 5,000 to 9,999.

Question Four: Highest Part Time Enrollment for Any Single Quarter, or Semester, During the 1967-1968 Academic Year

One out of four schools reported part time enrollments of under 250 students; one in eight from 250 to 399; one in ten from 400 to 599; roughly one in sixteen from 600 to 799; almost one in twenty from 800 to 999; just over one in twenty from 1,000 to 2,499; and just under one in seven of over 3,000.

Question Five: Enrollment Figures of 426 Junior or Community Colleges During the 1968 Summer Session

One out of nine had no 1968 summer session; one out of eleven had fewer than 100 students; over one out of five had from 100 to 249; slightly better than one out of six had between 250 and 499; and almost two out of five reported over 500.

Question Six: Accreditation Status During the 1968-1969 Academic Year

Almost sixty per cent held accreditation either from their respective states or their regional evaluative agencies, or from both. Only 34 institutions, however, offered courses accredited by the Engineers' Council for Professional Development. In one out of four junior colleges accreditation was pending; and in one out of five the students were accepted by at least three institutions already accredited, even though the "sending" school was not.

Only four schools reported that they neither held accreditation status nor were able to gain acceptance for their students elsewhere.

Since the respondents were asked to indicate all of the accreditation categories which were applicable to them, neither the numbers nor the percentages will total 426 or 100, respectively.



Question Seven: Distribution of Teaching Personnel by Instructional Categories

Three out of every one hundred junior colleges had no instructors who taught general subjects only. At the other extreme, one institution reported over 400 such instructors. Between these extremes, better than one in five had from one to twenty five instructors teaching only the general subjects; fewer than one out of two reported from 26 to 100; one in twelve between 101 and 200; and almost four out of a hundred had over 201, but under 400.

Just under one in twenty junior colleges had no instructors who taught technological subjects only. Conversely, almost seven out of ten reported from one to twenty five such instructors; one in five from 26 to 100; and five institutions had between 201 and 400.

Slightly over two out of five junior colleges employed <u>no</u> instructors who taught <u>both</u> general and technological subjects. But better than 46 out of 100 reported from one to twenty five dual capacity instructors; and well over one out of twenty had from 26 to 100.

Question Eight: Hourly Teaching Load of Instructional and Staff Personnel

Five junior colleges had no full time faculty members teaching twelve or more
hours per week, but one in five had from one to twenty five full time instructors who
did. One in seven had from 101 to 200 faculty members teaching twelve or more hours
per week; one in twenty had from 201 to 300; and four colleges had over 300.

One out of five had no full time instructors teaching fewer than twelve hours, but more than six hours per week. Another 210 claimed from one to twenty five; and four had from 26 to 100.

Although almost half of the colleges reported no full time faculty teaching fewer than six hours per week; two out of five had from one to twenty five such individuals; and three out of a hundred had from 26 to 100 full time faculty members in this category.

Over half of the colleges had no part time instructors who taught more than six hours per week, but six institutions used from 26 to 100 part time instructors



more than six hours weekly. One in three employed from one to twenty five part time instructors more than six hours per week.

In 30 per cent of the cases no part time instructors taught <u>fewer</u> than six hours per week, but in two cases out of five anywhere from one to twenty five were so engaged. One school in six employed from 26 to 100 part time instructors fewer than six hours per week; one in four from 101 to 200; and eight schools claimed between 201 and 300.

Question Nine: Existence of Academic Rank

Just under two colleges out of five had the traditional academic ranks commonly found in four-year colleges and universities; just over three out of five did not.

Question Ten: Distribution of Junior College Faculty Members According to Faculty Rank

At the time the study was made, among those junior colleges that answered Question Nine affirmatively, one individual in fourteen was a full professor; one in six an associate professor; under one in three an assistant; and more than one in three, but fewer than two out of five, held the rank of instructor.

Question Eleven: Average Annual Turnover of Instructional Personnel Over a Five-Year Period

Since three out of every seven institutions had been in existence less than five years, the question was not applicable to them. Among the others, better than a third reported a turnover of under five; one in five schools lost from five to nine; eight out of a hundred from ten to fourteen; and three out of a hundred lost over fourteen.

Question Twelve: Estimated Number of Additional Part Time and Full Time

Technological and General Subjects Instructors Required for

1969-1970 Academic Year

Almost 80 per cent of the administrators give individual estimates which indicated that an aggregate of 1,500 additional full time technological subjects would be required. Simultaneously, a third of these administrators supplied estimates for additional part time technological instructors that totalled 700.



Over three out of four administrators anticipated they would require additional full time general subjects instructors. Their estimates amounted to a total of 2,300 individuals. In addition, it was evident that another 700 part time general subjects instructors would be needed.

Question Thirteen: Methods Utilized by Employing Officials in Recruiting
Replacement, or Supplementary, Instructional Personnel

In terms of frequency, eighty six times out of a hundred junior college officials in need of replacement or supplementary instructional personnel informed the appropriate teacher preparatory institutions about their requirements. Seventy eight times out of a hundred they likewise asked members of their current faculties to submit the names of qualified individuals. In seventy cases out of a hundred administrators utilized the placement services of professional organizations and their publications. In 61 cases out of a hundred they turned to their associates at professional meetings for the names of prospective instructors. Proprietary agencies were relied upon in only one case out of five.

Question Fourteen: Features Emphasized by Employing Officials in Recruiting Instructional Personnel

The attractiveness of the local community is emphasized in 77 cases out of 100; the fringe benefits such as medical, health and life insurance and retirement plans in 61 cases out of 100; and the excellence of the salary schedule in 58 cases out of 100. Frequency of advancement in faculty rank received the least amount of emphasis — one instance in ten — and was only slightly exceeded in frequency by the ease in attaining tenure, one instance in eleven.

Question Fifteen: Number of Years of Service Required Prior to Attaining Tenure

Eighty junior colleges granted no tenure; another twenty granted it, but had no specific stipulations for its attainment. In one out of twelve schools, fewer than three years of prior service were required; in another two out of three the "waiting" period ranged from three to seven years. Two schools required more than seven years of prior service and thirty others had requirements which fitted none of the categories.



Question Sixteen: Tenure Requirements Other Than the Completion of a Stipulated Number of Years of Service

Forty nine schools out of every one hundred required the tenure candidate to demonstrate exceptional teaching ability. Six required engagement in research and eight the publication of articles - not necessarily derived from research -- in scholarly journals; seventy nine demanded a master's degree and seven an earned doctorate.

Question Seventeen: Customary Length of Initial Appointment of Instructional Personnel

The prevailing practice in seventy two cases out of every one hundred was to make the initial appointment -- and all subsequent ones prior to attaining tenure - for one academic year only. Twenty six junior colleges made the appointments for two successive semesters - or three successive quarters - and a summer session. In one out of ten cases there was no specific length.

Question Eighteen: Alternatives Utilized to Fill Existing or Impending Vacancies When No Qualified Replacements Were Available

Since administrators frequently utilized more than one alternative, neither the numbers nor the percentages totalled 426 or 100, respectively. Four out of five administrators employed several part time instructors, when available, to replace a full time faculty member. In one out of three cases the load was distributed among other instructors. Once in each five instances a full time instructor was employed on a temporary basis, even though he was not fully qualified. When a retirement was impending, approval was not approved until a qualified replacement could be found.

Question Nineteen: Query Concerning Competition With a School, Group of Schools, or Industry for Instructors

Four out of five junior college administrators found themselves in constant competition with another school, group of schools, or industry for instructors.

Question Twenty: Question Pertaining to Reluctance to Employ a Faculty member from an Institution Endeavoring to Retain Him

Approximately one administrator in three had no reluctance in employing such an instructor, but this was offset by the 35 administrators out of every hundred who were reluctant. One in five was reluctant only when an "understanding existed



between the two institutions and one out of twelve only when the other school was nearby or "friendly."

Question Twenty One: Query Relative to Administrator's Success in Retaining an Instructor Who Had Planned to Leave

Well over half of the administrators - 55.6 percent - had not, during the previous two years, successfully retained an instructor who had indicated his intention of leaving. Thirty five out of every hundred, however, had succeeded in dissuading such an individual. One in eleven administrators failed to respond to the question.

Question Twenty Two: Methods Used to Retain Instructors Who Contemplated Leaving

In over one case in five the administrator had "made nonmonetary promises about the instructor's future; in 30 cases out of a hundred he had increased the instructor's salary "by more than the usual increment." In eleven cases out of a hundred the instructor's work load was decreased and in 10 out of 100 he was appointed to a department chairmanship.

Question Twenty Three: Sources from Which Administrators Most Frequently
Obtained Technological Instructors

Employed craftsmen and tradesmen in industry provided by far the most frequent source upon which administrators relied. This source was the first choice of 134 administrators, the second shoice of 66 and the third choice of 105. The second most frequent source was engineering school graduates. It was the first choice of 71 administrators, the second choice of 58 and the third choice of 102. Third in frequency were the teacher-education institutions graduates with 57, 44 and 114 for first, second, and third choices, respectively.

Question Twenty Four: Amount of Formal Academic Preparation Considered Absolutely Essential for Technological Subjects Instructors

Approximately 47 out of 100 administrators regarded a bachelor's degree in the technological subject to be taught as absolutely essential. Twenty per cent were willing to accept less than a bachelor's degree, but required at least three years of preparation in the technological specialty. Roughly one in fourteen would insist



upon graduation from a public junior college offering preparation in the technological subject. One in twenty five considered graduation from a proprietary school specializing in the technological subject to be sufficient.

Question Twenty Five: Amount of Specialized Work Experience Required of Applicants for Technological Subjects Positions

In 317 junior colleges the applicants for technological subjects teaching positions were required to have not less than two years of specialized work experience. In 15 out of 100 institutions at least one year was required, but in one school in eleven there was no requirement whatsoever.

Question Twenty Six: Amount of Previous Teaching Experience Required of Applicants for Technological Subjects Teaching Positions

In 64 cases out of 100, no prior teaching experience was necessary. Conversely, roughly one school in twenty required at least one year and another one in sixteen stipulated not less than two years.

Question Twenty Seven: Administrators' Responses to Query About Maximum and Minimum Salaries for Each Academic Rank

In seven out of every ten junior colleges, according to their administrators, the minimum and maximum salaries were fixed. In just over one school in sixteen, however, there was neither a minimum nor a maximum limit. Another one in sixteen had a minimum, but no maximum limit. Just under two out of a hundred - 1.8 per cent had a maximum, but no minimum limit.

Question Twenty Eight: Responses to Question of Whether the Fixed Maximum Starting Salary Was Ever Exceeded in Employing an Instructor

One in four administrators admitted exceeding the maximum starting salary; another one in seven said he had done it occasionally, but 36 out of 100 denied ever having done so. Roughly one in six said the question was not applicable and another one in sixteen did not reply.

Question Twenty Nine: Administrators' Responses to Question of Their Conscientious Efforts to Keep Salary Schedules Comparable to That of Similar Institutions

The response to this question was overwhelmingly affirmative. Only four administrators reported that they made no such attempt and another three failed to



Question Thirty: Kinds of Institutions Administrators Used as Standards of Comparison in Keeping Salary Schedules Equitable.

Three out of four administrators used comparable institutions within their respective states as standards of comparison. Simultaneously, some of them - 23.7 per cent - used schools in adjacent states and 28 out of 100 utilized institutions that were comparable in size and in curricular offerings, regardless of their location.

Question Thirty One: Responses to Question of Equitability of Salaries as
Between Technological and General Subjects Instructors

While 83 out of every 100 administrators reported that the salaries of his general and his technological subjects instructors were equitable, one in six reported that they were not. Three gave no answer.

Question Thirty Two: Responses to Question of Whether Technological Subjects
Instructors, as a Group, Were Paid Higher Salaries Than
General Subjects Instructors

Twenty four out of every 100 administrators replied affirmatively and 10 out of 100 negatively, but 66 per cent ignored the query altogether.

Question Thirty Three: Reasons Given by Administrators for Paying Higher
Salaries to Technological Than to General Subjects
Instructors

Two hundred and forty two chief executive officers responded to this question and the following percentages are based on that number. Well over one out of three -36 per cent -- gave as a reason the fact that technological specialists are in short supply. Almost another third -- 32.2 per cent -- said that such potential instructors are reluctant to leave industry where salaries generally are substantially higher than in education. Almost one out of every seven thought that even when salaries were roughly comparable, a reluctance still prevailed. The remainder gave a variety of reasons, none of which had any uniformity.

Question Thirty Four: Opinions of Administrators Regarding Whether an Increase in Their Salary Scales Would Simplify Recruitment and Retention

Roughly three out of four administrators thought such an increase would simplify recruitment of technological subjects instructors, but fewer than two out of three



believed it would aid in their retention. Conversely, almost one in four said recruitment would not be made any easier and an even higher percentage -- 30.8 -- thought it would not make retention any easier either.

Question Thirty Five: Reasons Given by Administrators for Their Recurring
Losses of Technological Subjects Instructors

The data from this question represent frequencies based on an order of importance. Thus, 182 administrators attributed their losses to the fact that their technological subjects instructors left to accept higher paying jobs in industry. One hundred said their losses occurred because of the higher salaries paid by other two-year institutions. Ninety eight reported their instructors left to accept jobs in four-year colleges and universities. Significantly, forty three indicated that their instructors left involuntarily and 79 said retirement was the cause.

Question Thirty Six: Amount of Notice Ordinarily Given to Instructors Whom Administrators no Longer Desire to Retain

In better than one institution in five, an instructor who was not to be retained was so informed one quarter in advance of his impending departure. In over one out of three instances the amount of advance notice was one semester and in one out of eleven it was one academic year. Twenty nine institutions reported giving advance notice ranging from three to five months, although three months was the most common. Another 27 schools reported notification policies ranging from three to twelve months.

Question Thirty Seven: Responses of Administrators to Question About the Most Critical Problems Confronting Them

Only 350 chief executive officers answered this question. Of that number, one out of two considered his most critical problem to be finances. The next most critical, in terms of frequency of response, was that of faculty recruitment and development. Two out of five checked this one. Only one administrator in ten thought that student unrest was his most critical problem and another one in ten UNIVERSITY OF CALIF. that public understanding and acceptance was his.

