

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 445

JC 700 207

TITLE Selected Papers from Northern Illinois University Community College Conferences, 1969-1970.

INSTITUTION Northern Illinois Univ., De Kalb. Community Coll. Services.

PUB DATE Sep 70

NOTE 87p.

AVAILABLE FROM Community College Services, Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois (\$1.50)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.45

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role, *College Deans, Computer Science Education, *Conference Reports, Core Curriculum, Curriculum Development, *Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Methods, *Faculty Evaluation, General Education, *Junior Colleges, Personnel Management, Public Relations

ABSTRACT

This collection of selected papers covers a variety of community-junior college topics. Evaluating the instructional staff is the first one examined. Aspects such as evaluation criteria, purposes, and obstacles; the role of effective recruitment; the need for in-service training; and student and administrative participation are covered. Included are sample forms used in several junior colleges to evaluate faculty members, division chairmen, deans of instruction, and deans of students. Faculty employment guidelines for one junior college are also provided. Next, the role of the academic dean is considered, particularly as it affects faculty growth and excellence, curriculum development, and personnel administration. The roles of various members of the community-junior college staff in curriculum development are then considered, in conjunction with a discussion of the place of objectives, evaluation, curriculum meetings, and resource agencies outside the specific institution. Next, the historical development and methods of incorporating the general education requirement into a school's curriculum are surveyed, followed by a suggestion for more economical operation of student data processing laboratories through use of a full-time lab supervisor. The concluding papers deal with the increasingly diverse demands confronting schools, staff, and students, and with current trends in community-junior college public relations. (J0)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT 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.

SELECTED PAPERS

from

Northern Illinois University Community College Conferences 1969-1970

ED0 42445



COMMUNITY COLLEGE SERVICES
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

September 1970

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 28 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 700 207

Each year Northern Illinois University sponsors a series of conferences on various topics of interest to community college personnel. The topics and speakers involved in these conferences are suggested by an advisory committee to the office of Community College Services and various articulation committees. The papers reproduced in this publication are those made available in written form by the speakers at various conferences.

William K. Ogilvie, Director
Community College Services
Northern Illinois University

Additional copies \$1.50 each.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction: Conference on Academic Deans (Charles G. Jenkins)	1
Instructional Staff Evaluation (Alfred Wisgoski)	3
Impressions of Evaluation of Instructional Staff (Frank Rausa)	7
Evaluation of Instruction (Wayne E. Willard)	11
The Role of the Academic Dean (Raymond E. Schultz)	16
 Sample Evaluation Forms	
a. Thornton Community College (Faculty Employment Guidelines)	25
b. Thornton Community College (Instructor Evaluation: Students)	27
c. Highland Community College (Instructor Evaluation: Students)	29
d. Highland Community College (Division Chairman Evaluation)	30
e. Highland Community College (Dean of Instruction Evaluation)	33
f. Highland Community College (Dean of Students Evaluation)	37
g. Illinois Valley Community College (Instructor Evaluation: Division Head)	39
h. Moraine Valley Community College (Faculty Evaluation)	42
i. Moraine Valley Community College (Self-Evaluation)	45
j. Moraine Valley Community College (Student Evaluation)	47
 The Community College Staff and Curriculum Development (William K. Ogilvie)	 56
The Transfer Student and General Education Requirement (Forest D. Etheredge)	61
An Innovative Approach to Instructional Data Processing Student Laboratories (Roy A. Sedrel)	68
The Amoeba and the University (John R. Cortelyou)	74
Current Trends in Community College Public Relations (Kathryn P. Marsh)	79

INTRODUCTION; CONFERENCE ON ACADEMIC DEANS

Charles G. Jenkins
Dean of Instruction
Highland Community College

The topic for this morning's session concerns probably the most difficult and controversial duty of the Dean of Instruction. I do not think it an incorrect generalization to say that little causes more animated discussion among faculty and administration alike than the process of evaluating instructional staff whether it be for purposes of improving instruction, purposes of retention, promotion or tenure, or - and I must speak softly - purposes of merit pay determinations.

The methods, criteria, and instruments used for evaluation are legion, each evaluator ready with ample evidence as to why his particular technique is so very excellent and each evaluatee equally ready with evidence as to why the evaluation neither measures what it is supposed to measure nor adequately points out the extreme competence of the instructor - unless of course the results are extremely positive.

This morning we are privileged to have with us a number of persons who, speaking from both the giving and receiving end, may help us to understand the problems a little more completely and, perhaps, even suggest a few answers.

EVALUATION AT HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Prior to this year, Highland Community College had no formal procedure for evaluating instruction and, I suppose, one can say that as far as administrative evaluation of staff is concerned we still have no formal method. We have developed during the past year, however, a device for student rating of instruction, which was used for the first time this last semester, and which will be used this coming year on a trial basis.

Naturally, a prime concern of any educational institution is the quality of its instruction. The maintenance and improvement of instructional quality should be, therefore, a continuous process. Recognizing this, the President of Highland sought the assistance of the College Administrative Council to develop some means of evaluating the instructional process. The Council, in turn, appointed an ad hoc committee to research the question and report back to the Council with recommendations. The report, which has been distributed to Illinois community college deans of instruction, emerged after more than a year of discussion. My dubious role as Chairman of the committee, composed of administration and faculty with some student advisement, was to bring to the committee the necessary information so that some decisions could be made and, when necessary, suggest

compromises to move any stalemate off center.

I have distributed copies of what was ultimately developed, and I shall later in this program or individually be happy to answer any questions you might have. For these next few minutes, however, I should like to share some reflections which grew out of the experience with the ad hoc committee and which might serve as guidelines if you choose to develop or change your procedures for instructional staff evaluation. These, incidentally, tend as well to serve as a summary of this morning's presentations.

1. The purpose is paramount. The style, contents and method of any evaluative procedure can only be developed after the purpose for such an evaluation is determined.
2. The faculty and, if possible, student body must be involved in its creation. No evaluative process can succeed without full support of the faculty, for they are the ones who will be evaluated.
3. Any device developed must allow for flexibility. It must examine the total instructional process without being so specific that it stifles innovation or ignores disciplinary approaches. One teaches a basic math course differently than a group discussion course, for example, and so may be evaluated with different criteria.
4. Any instrument so general, must allow the instructor through discussion or sub-testing to draw out specific problems in a general area of weakness.
5. The procedures should be constructive, should emphasize those elements generally agreed upon as being critical to quality instruction, and simple enough to be used effectively.
6. No one, single method has or probably ever will be developed which will meet the needs of all institutions. It is essential that each institution develop its own procedures which reflect the personality, the philosophy, and the character of the individual institution.
7. Any administrator who requires his instructional staff to be evaluated and who himself evaluates them, must be willing to develop the procedures for his own evaluation by those who work under him. The quality of instruction in any institution can depend as much or more upon the environment for good teaching created for the instructor by the administrator as is created by the instructor alone. Quality instruction is a complex and very personal process which involves close interaction between all elements involved in its creation - the administrator, the instructor, the student.

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF EVALUATION

Alfred Wisgoski
Administrative Dean
Illinois Valley Community College

There is almost universal agreement that the single most important ingredient determining the success or failure of any educational institution is the quality of its instructional staff. In higher education this is especially true of the community junior college where emphasis is on teaching rather than research. But how is instruction to be evaluated? While debate on techniques for evaluation have filled educational journals, there is still no agreement on the validity of various methods, and not much information on the degree to which they are utilized. In fact, the evaluation of instruction remains one of the crucial problems facing educational institutions.

The invitation to participate in this morning's program included the suggestion that my remarks focus primarily on Illinois Valley Community College's attempt to resolve the problem, i.e., to describe the college's efforts to evaluate its instructional staff.

Obstacles to Evaluation Must Be Overcome

Before describing Illinois Valley's efforts to evaluate instruction, it seems appropriate to consider several major obstacles that must be overcome before any college can develop an effective system of evaluation.

First, the growing communications gulf between faculty members and administrators must be bridged. Such a gulf obviously fosters misunderstanding, suspicion and distrust of evaluation. Junior college administrators and faculty members are not of necessity natural enemies. They have many common interests and, hopefully, a common goal--the provision of quality instruction for the students. If indeed, evaluating instruction is a common concern, the first step seems to be to seek means of improving communication and establishing the rapport that is a prerequisite to any fruitful effort toward effective evaluation.

Secondly, administrators must provide leadership in developing viable policies and procedures for evaluating the faculty. In too many instances administrators really fumble around in this area. Much of the faculty's historical distrust of evaluation must be attributed to inept administrative leadership. Any system of evaluation involves good faith. Sound decisions are impossible unless honesty prevails. It seems equally inappropriate for administrators to misuse evaluation to release teachers to

keep the tax rate down or to lack the strength of conviction necessary to prevent incompetent instructional staff members from gaining tenure. There is no place for cronyism in education. Personal relationships must not be permitted to interfere with evaluation of instruction. The instructor must know that the evaluation system does not violate his academic freedom. He expects that it should be instructive.

Closely related is a third major obstacle, namely, the widespread belief that teaching cannot be adequately evaluated because it does not lend itself to any specific, neat, tangible method of evaluation. Because teaching does involve many intangibles, there is a general tendency to ignore the problem. Admittedly there are no definitive answers to the question, "What is effective teaching?" Absolute precision and objectivity in faculty evaluation are almost certainly unattainable but the need to evaluate is undeniable. For the large majority of teachers, evaluation offers a means of improving instruction.

All of the obstacles that impede the evaluation of the instructional staff can be overcome if there is an institutional climate of trust between faculty and administrators, and it is mutually understood that evaluation should be for the improvement of instruction. Now permit me to describe some of the evaluative procedures that Illinois Valley has found effective.

Effective Recruitment - A Prerequisite to Instructional Staff Evaluation

Illinois Valley's commitment to quality instruction is initially expressed in its recruitment of faculty. All too frequently the process of hiring instructional staff in community colleges is an administrative effort to "get someone aboard" with the view that unwanted staff members can always be released. Staff recruitment at Illinois Valley is preceded by a careful assessment of staff needs. The analysis of staff needs is a joint responsibility of the Administrative Dean and the chairmen of the respective divisions of the college. Division chairmen in turn discuss staff having qualifications that complement the returning instructional personnel.

After the assessment of professional staff needs is completed, the following procedures are employed:

A written notice of staff needs, including a brief job description, desired qualifications, and the salary range, is sent to approximately 100 colleges, universities and placement agencies. All applications received by the college are reviewed independently by the Division Chairmen and the Administrative Dean. Division Chairmen invite senior members of their division to participate in the selection process. The three most promising candidates for each vacancy are invited to the campus for personal interviews. Every candidate is interviewed by the respective Division Chairman, a senior staff member whose field of specialization is most closely related to the vacancy to be filled, the Administrative Dean, and the President of

the college, if he is available. Should all candidates interviewed for a given vacancy be unacceptable to the interviewers, the selection process is repeated.

The assumption is that Illinois Valley employs only qualified faculty. Therefore, the primary purpose of evaluation is not to prove who is qualified or not, but to improve instruction. All evaluation is directed to that purpose.

Illinois Valley's System of Evaluation

Evaluation, in the view of some, is a matter of politics or the unquestioned judgment of the administration. Others believe it is impossible to precisely define good teaching. They go on the assumption that there should be no evaluation. In most institutions, evaluations do go on--but often haphazardly.

To avoid whimsical and capricious administrative evaluation and to overcome the obstacles to evaluation previously discussed, Illinois Valley has developed systematic evaluative procedures predicated on an analysis of the faculty member's role. Paramount among these is teaching. Other contributions--such as committee work, the sponsorship of clubs, the guidance of students, and participation in community affairs, are considered secondary.

Faculty members are advised, at the time of recruitment, of the institutional policies that have been developed cooperatively by the faculty and administration to promote the improvement of teaching. They are clearly advised that teaching is of primary importance at Illinois Valley and that evaluation is regarded as an essential element of improved teaching.

Faculty members have always recognized the importance of evaluation, but many have feared it. Reasons for these fears have been previously discussed. Illinois Valley has attempted to minimize faculty anxiety in a variety of ways. First, evaluative techniques have been cooperatively developed to provide a means of upgrading instruction and improving the skills of faculty members. Secondly, the system is based on a foundation of mutual trust. Faculty can expect maximum freedom in teaching and external interference. Thirdly, evaluation is institution wide, i.e., it is not limited to the instructional staff. Finally, the system is flexible and subject to annual review and subsequent modifications.

The evaluative process includes self-evaluation, voluntary participation in student evaluation of instruction, classroom visitation, and a candid, private discussion of the instructor's progress and prospects. The follow-up conference is considered essential to the effectiveness of the system.

Several self-evaluative instruments, including video tapes, are available to the faculty. Recognizing that students have a right to opinions about instruction -- and they do have them -- all instructors are encouraged

to offer students an opportunity to evaluate their instruction. It seems especially desirable to require new staff members to use student opinion rating forms. A variety of student opinion rating forms are available. During the past academic year, more than 75% of the faculty voluntarily solicited students' evaluation.

The principle evaluative technique used at Illinois Valley is classroom visitation by an evaluative team involving a responsible administrator and a teaching colleague. There are, of course, the questions of stage fright which may afflict the visited instructor and the matter of sampling---how many and which times to visit--that had to be resolved. These were not found to be insoluble problems. In fact, visitation based on mutual trust and confidence have proven particularly beneficial to the inexperienced teachers. Typically, new instructors are visited at least five times annually. Exchange of classroom visits involving senior and junior staff members has been a concomitant result. The faculty have been especially receptive to visitation--frequently inviting more visitation than originally planned. It should be noted that visitation takes considerable time, but if colleges are serious about teacher evaluation, it is time well spent.

Some educators may protest that administrative and faculty judgments are subjective, but at least they are the judgments of qualified, experienced personnel who, in the final analysis, must make the decision to retain instructional staff members. Only when repeated evaluations reveal continued teaching ineffectiveness, is a non-tenure faculty member denied continued employment with the college. In reality, the evaluative system functions as a safeguard against capricious dismissal for non-tenure faculty members.

Conclusion

It has not been the aim of this discussion to prescribe specific recommendations for faculty evaluation. This is something which must be worked out by each institution in terms of its own situation and its own goals. Programs of faculty evaluation should reflect quite directly each institution's philosophy of education. That is, the factors considered in evaluation are to a great extent a description of the kinds of faculty members the college wishes to have.

Hopefully, this presentation will stimulate some of the participants of the program to critically review the system of instructional evaluation they employ.

IMPRESSIONS OF EVALUATION
OF
INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

Frank Rausa
Social Studies Instructor
Sauk Valley College

In a day and age when most Americans are aware of dissent, it is ironic that in the name of "law and order," "Stability," "Tranquillity," or even "peace," many individuals are perilously close to being denied due process. It is even more unfortunate that within the walls of institutions of higher learning, the intellectual community -- traditionally the vanguard of any significant political, economic, or social movement -- is similarly faced with situations whereby the rights of individuals are seriously infringed upon, and in some instances violated, whenever it comes to the process of evaluation of professional staff. To me, the heart of any evaluation program is the implementation and adherence to a definite evaluation policy and a grievance procedure where the rights of the administration, faculty, and students are closely safeguarded.

The prime concern of any educational institution is the quality of its instruction. Since education is a continuous process, the maintenance and improvement of instruction must be likewise continuous. To be sure, the problem of evaluating professional staff is controversial. This writer is not, has never been, nor ever will be an authority on the evaluation of college instructors. In fact, I am rather a neophyte in the teaching profession. Yet, in the three years of teaching on the junior college level, some of the idealism and enthusiasm that I possessed has been stunted when I became aware of some of the unpleasant realities that exist in our profession. Permit me to share with you people, the conclusions I have reached concerning evaluation of teaching on the community college level.

It is assumed that college administrators only employ those individuals who are qualified to be instructors. Accordingly, the purpose of evaluation procedures should be the following:

1. To provide the means of assessing instructional techniques.
2. To identify specific weaknesses of faculty members in the overall intent to provide classroom instruction.
3. To provide the opportunities to upgrade instruction and improve the teaching skills of faculty members.

With this in mind, it is imperative that the qualities and abilities that make good teachers, should be the only criteria used in a truly meaningful evaluation procedure. Especially on the community college level where

the emphasis is upon teaching and the dilemma of "publish or perish" is not yet firmly established.

An excellent study on evaluation was compiled under the auspices of Highland Community College at Freeport, Illinois, and contains several statements which are quite succinct and profound. Noteworthy are the comments relating to criteria that students and administrators looked for in an instructor. For instance, on student rating forms, the following items were considered:

1. Knowledge of subject matter.
2. Interest and enthusiasm in subject matter.
3. Organization and clarity of presentation.
4. Suitability and variety of approach in the presentation of subject matter.
5. Appropriateness of assignments.
6. Degree of student interaction and student interest.
7. Helpfulness and sympathy towards the student.
8. Tolerance and respect for student ideas.
9. Quality of examinations and evaluative techniques.
10. Fairness.

Obviously, these are ten characteristics and qualities that administrators could wholeheartedly endorse as being desirable. Yet, administrators place a great deal of emphasis on one's abilities to work well with others and professional growth.

You will note, the ten areas of interests to students pertain to teaching performance. Quite understandably, students are only interested in what they can derive from a course. This is rightfully so, for when they spend time and money for their education they should expect a return for their efforts. The relationship that evolves in the classroom is a personal one between the instructor and his students. For the duration of the class period, students must know that they are the focal point of attention in an instructor's words, thoughts and deeds. Students are not overly concerned if their instructor teaches twelve, fifteen or eighteen credit hours; is taking additional graduate study at a nearby university; is a member of the college's convocations and special events committee; promptly submits departmental and college reports; is a member of numerous professional societies; or ever publishes an article or book. Regrettably, some college instructors have been dismissed from their positions because of unsatisfactory personal appearance, annoying mannerisms, or lacking manifestations of the institution's official college philosophy. These latter items are secondary in an evaluation procedure. The paramount criterion in the process of evaluation must be instructional performance.

One can raise the question of the validity of classroom visitation by a college administrator -- be he the Dean of Instruction or the Departmental Chairman. A method incidentally used in many colleges in the State of Illinois. No professional person could possibly object to classroom visita-

tion if such observation is for the purpose of assessing or improving instructional techniques. However, considerable opposition does occur if the visitation is used exclusively for either the retention or dismissal; promotional purposes or advancement on the salary schedule; the placement or non-placement of a faculty member on tenure.

At this point, it is interesting to note some of the methods of evaluating college instructors. Evaluation has been conducted by administrative and/or collegial visitations; impromptu and informal conversations; complaints of students, parents, and community residents; grade distribution or enrollment records; student evaluations; and, of course, the old "reliable grapevine."

In order to effectively carry out any valid evaluation procedure, one cannot emphasize too heavily, the purposes and criteria of the evaluation process. To these ends, it is advocated that whatever policy is in force, the college instructor be afforded due process from the initial date of appointment -- and not when the individual obtains tenure! The right for a person to be aware of one's alleged deficiencies can only be meaningful if he also enjoys the privilege to either concur or dispute them. This right of due process is not only ethical and professional, but is guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Too often, institutional policies transcend the Constitution. This tendency is slowly changing because of various court decisions involving civil rights. The concept of due process is the very essence of our society and we in the intellectual world should not have to be reminded of this by mandates delivered down from the court bench.

Evaluation procedures should be made clear from the first day an instructor steps foot inside the classroom. Evaluation should meet the individual needs of the institution and the instructor. Certainly, the following is not meant to be definitive, merely suggestive:

1. The faculty member should decide in advance with his immediate supervisor the means that will be used to evaluate him.
 - a. Visitations by Departmental Chairman, Dean of Instruction, or colleagues.
 - b. Self-evaluation.
 - (1) Statement of objectives, goals, and techniques to be used in teaching.
 - (2) What areas an individual feels he needs improvements.
 - c. Student evaluations.
 - (1) To be used for instructor's benefit only as a means to improve teaching skills.
 - (2) Or, at the option of the instructor, to be used with other supporting data for promotional purposes.

2. Whatever procedures are decided upon, there must be continuous communication between the instructor and his immediate supervisor -- both on the informal and formal levels of communication.
3. Whenever a deficiency is noted, the instructor should be advised of means to bring about corrective action.
 - a. Observation of instructional techniques of colleagues.
 - b. University course work.
 - c. Conferences with colleagues.
 - d. In-service workshops or seminars.

4. In any event, once an instructor has been formally notified of deficiencies, all attempts must be taken to bring about improvement in difficult areas of instruction.

If there is understanding between the administration and the instructional staff of the purposes and criteria of an evaluation policy, there will be a minimum amount of problems. But it is usually the "one" instance when an individual feels he has not received fair treatment that can be the source of much embarrassment and frustration as well as unwanted publicity. This is the significance of a grievance, in that a person has the opportunity to redress any alleged wrongs and be confident that he is entitled to and can receive fair treatment. The grievance procedure becomes the vehicle whereby misunderstandings can be mutually resolved.

It is the responsibility of boards of trustees, administrators, and faculty to maintain the quality of instruction as well as preserve the rights of all individuals. In order to accomplish this endeavor, continuous and interactive communication is an absolute necessity. A good evaluation policy and a grievance procedure can help make this a reality.

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Wayne E. Willard
Dean of Instruction
Thornton Community College

The AAJC has had a commission studying the evaluation of instruction for several years. Unfortunately, as of this date, the commission has not completed their work. I wish I had the answers for all of us, but if I did, no format would fit all of our needs. Consequently, I hope to share with you some personal experiences as well as some comments of others concerning evaluation.

We might raise the question "Why should we evaluate instruction?" I would like to propose at least four reasons, and I am certain you could add others. First, to determine if the instructor or administrator should receive tenure status or continued employment. Second, to reward outstanding or exceptional performance. Third, to obtain improvement of instruction and all that it implies. Fourth, to satisfy our constituency and ourselves that higher education meets the tests of accountability.

Dr. James Holderman, Executive Secretary of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, referred to the last item in this manner. I quote:

There are some who are just now discovering that the unparalleled attention and support given to education carries with it a stipulation: it must produce. In the minds of most, it has produced. But in the minds of sufficiently large numbers, education has not necessarily produced the "right" things or in the "right" way or with the "right" priorities. Some commentators have noted "the honeymoon is over." There are many who feel we should be glad of it! For now, higher education is subject to the intense scrutiny that befits an institution upon which rests much of the national destiny.

School boards, lay boards, legislatures and public bodies of all kinds are asking -- indeed, demanding -- to see the results of the huge outlays for education. These results require justification before the critics, who argue that it is time that American higher education examine and justify itself before the American people . . .

The current literature is virtually filled with conclusions about the steps higher education is compelled to take if it is to survive. Several which recur frequently are worthy of note.

First, the concept of accountability needs to be an integral part of the decision-making processes of the college at every level.

Underlying all decisions in an institution of higher learning should be a clear, first commitment to that accountability: to its constituents, to its sponsors, to its personnel, to society. The direction of faculty talent, and the channeling of student energies must be justified as to ends sought and ends achieved. The structures of higher education should be modified, wherever necessary, to permit the operation of this principle.

Second, the university in recent years has developed effective mechanisms for the creation of knowledge but has not fulfilled its community needs to afford more attention and a greater share of its resources to relating newly-gained knowledge to society and its problems. The power of learning needs more intimate connection to the stage of action in society. Someone once said "the goodness of knowing is in the doing."

Third, the search for new knowledge needs greater relevance to human and social needs than to the career interests of those instructing and the demands of the discipline. Similarly, in too many instances, what is taught in the classroom has become dominated more by scholarly tradition and discipline than by the peculiar needs of the student. (1:1075)

The next question we might logically ask would be: "When do we evaluate and who does the evaluating?" First, evaluation should begin with the interviewing process. The material used at this stage should have been developed cooperatively by administration, division chairman and faculty -- prior to the interview with the applicant. I hope we can assume there has been some agreement on the amount of formal preparation, the recency of preparation, and informal types of preparation that the group desires and considers in filling the position.

Second, during the non-tenure period the college has an obligation to provide inservice training, to promote professional growth, and to provide opportunities for involvement with other staff members. Indeed, this is particularly essential for the novice teacher. Much of the responsibility for developing strong and effective faculty members depends upon the leadership abilities of the division or department chairman. My personal opinion is that we have neglected the leadership role and administrative characteristics of division and department chairmen too long in the development of the comprehensive community college.

Many of these individuals have not had the opportunities of receiving professional training in the areas that they have been assigned in recent years. True, most have met the stiff criteria of obtaining a master's Degree in a subject area. Most of them were or are good classroom teachers. This does not necessarily mean that they are effective leaders. All of us are aware of the tremendous differences in our own colleges or departments. I suspect most of you have observed that wherever innovation has occurred, the department chairman had a dominant leadership role. I am convinced that determining objectives, implementing an instructional program on a team

basis, and then evaluating the progress at the department level is a most effective way of improving instruction. And I hope you would agree that of the four items I mentioned earlier, the third one -- namely, improving instruction -- should be our most dominant goal.

Third, any evaluation of an education system should include a role for the recipients of that educational system -- namely, the students. Dr. Raymond Schultz, Florida State University, has stated, "there is pronounced disagreement as to whether and how students should be involved in evaluation of instruction. The real issue is whether the students can make valued judgment on the quality of instruction. Some who object base their disapproval on cases where the students have been used inappropriately as evaluators". (2:30). I am personally convinced that from third grade on, most of the students are able to select the outstanding instructors in their particular grade or classroom. In addition, they are able to determine which are the most effective. Furthermore, it has been my experience that their evaluations were not too different from my own. True, for that big middle group of instructors, students probably cannot evaluate quite so accurately, but then, neither can we as professional people.

Following the presentation, I would like to share with you the student evaluation form that was developed by a group of staff members at our college. It is used in a fraction of their classes for all first year teachers, part of the non-tenure teachers, and, occasionally, by the tenure teachers. There are several reasons for this.

We believe that students would tire of evaluating every course and every instructor so that they might not treat the evaluation form as carefully as they should. Secondly, tenure teachers should not require continuous evaluation, but they should not be omitted either. I hope that many of you have documents that you are willing to share with us. I know that Moraine Valley makes use of students in determining part of the teacher's pay. I hope you would want to inquire what they do in this process of using students as evaluators. Many other junior colleges in the state make use of students in one form or another. In addition, some of the other junior colleges rely heavily upon peer group evaluation -- which I hope they will be willing to comment upon and share with you.

Finally, I would like to quote from President Nixon's address to Congress this spring. It was entitled "Education for the 1970's," and he discusses new measurements of achievement. I will try to paraphrase by using the word college in place of school. I quote:

What makes a "good" college? The old answer was a college that maintained high standards of plant and equipment; that had a reasonable number of students per classroom; whose teachers had good college and often graduate training; a school that kept up to date with new curriculum developments, and was alert to new techniques in instruction. This was a fair enough definition so long as it was assumed that there was a direct connection between these "school characteristics" and the actual amount of learning that takes place in college.

Years of educational research, culminating in the Equal Opportunity Survey of 1966 have, however, demonstrated that this direct, uncomplicated relationship does not exist.

Apart from the general public interest in providing teachers an honorable and well paid professional career, there is only one important question to be asked about education: what do the students learn?

Unfortunately, it is simply not possible to make any confident deduction from college characteristics as to what will be happening to the students in any particular college. Fine new buildings alone do not predict high achievement. Pupil-teacher ratios may not make as much difference as we used to think. Expensive equipment may not make as much difference as its salesmen would have us believe.

And yet we know that something does make a difference.

The need in the colleges of the nation is to begin the responsible, open measurement of how well the educational process is working. It matters very little how much a college building costs; it matters a great deal how much a student in that building learns.

To achieve this fundamental reform it will be necessary to develop broader and more sensitive measurements of learning than we now have.

The President has proposed that a National Institute of Education take the lead in developing these new measurements of educational output. He continues by saying:

"In doing so it should pay as much heed to what are called the "immeasurables" of schooling (largely because no one has yet learned to measure them) such as responsibility, wit and humanity as it does to verbal and mathematical achievement.

In developing these new measurements . . . we will want to be alert to the fact that in our present educational system we will often find our most devoted, most talented, hardest working teachers in those very colleges where the general level of achievement is lowest. They are often there because their commitment to their profession sends them where the demands upon their profession are the greatest.

From these considerations we derive another new concept: accountability. College administrators and college teachers alike are responsible for their performance, and it is in their interest as well as in the interests of their students that they be held accountable. Success should be measured not

by some fixed national norm, but rather by the results achieved in relation to the actual situation of the particular college and the particular set of students.

For years the fear of "national standards" has been one of the bugaboos of education. There has never been any serious effort to impose national standards on educational programs, and if we act wisely in this generation we can be reasonably confident that no such effort will arise in future generations. The problem is that in opposing some mythical threat of "national standards" what we have too often been doing is avoiding accountability for our own local performance. We have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of schools.

This is a mistake because it undermines the principle of local control of education." (3:3-5)

I hope that we have succeeded in establishing in your minds that there is a need and a concern for the evaluation of instruction. I hope that today we will be able to come up with some solutions and to share some of the ideas that have worked for each of us.

REFERENCES

1. Holderman, James B., Executive Directors Report #84, Illinois Board of Higher Education, Springfield, 1970.
2. Schultz, Raymond, Leadership Opportunities and the Beginning Junior College President, Southeastern Regional Leadership Institute, 1970.
3. Nixon, Richard, Education for the 1970's, Renewal and Reform, 1970.

THE ROLE OF THE ACADEMIC DEAN*

Raymond E. Schultz
Florida State University

It involves a measure of risk to claim that the academic dean (whatever his title may be) occupies the most important role in a community college. A good case can be made for the importance of the faculty, departmental chairmen, and even the president! Few will disagree, however, that the academic dean occupies a very key leadership role.

Viewed from the standpoint of institutional structure, the academic dean can be described as the educational middle-man. Above is the president who has certain role expectations and perceptions of him. Below him, within the structure, are division and/or department heads, faculty, and students. Each of these groups has role perceptions and expectations that differ from those of the president and from one another.

To illustrate, I will review briefly the findings of research conducted several years ago at Florida State University by one of my doctoral students and me.¹ To place that study in context, it is necessary to realize that early research and theory formulation in this area was directed toward a unitary trait theory of leadership. Principal postulates of this theory were: (1) that there exists a "leadership trait" which is innate or inherent; (2) that leaders alone possess this trait to a high degree; and (3) the trait, when possessed, functions with equal force in a variety of situations. It was assumed that this trait could be identified and measured. To date, however, no such trait has been identified.

More recently the research has focused on "leadership behavior" as differentiated from "leadership traits". The emphasis is placed on behavior rather than presumed traits. This approach involves describing and measuring behavior of the leader and emphasizes the interpersonal relationships between a leader -- in our study the dean -- and those with whom he is involved in his administrative role -- in our case the president, department heads, and student leaders.

The basic instrument employed for the study was Halpin's Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. That instrument yields scores on two dimensions of leadership behavior; one an Initiating Structure dimension score, the other a Consideration dimension score. Among the findings were the following:

-- Student leaders disagreed with presidents in their perceptions and expectations on both dimensions.

* Address given at a conference for community college instructional and administrative personnel held at Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois, July 16, 1970.

1. J. O. Carson, Jr., and Raymond E. Schultz, "A Comparative Analysis of the Junior College Dean's Leadership Behavior." The Journal of Experimental Education. 32: Summer, 1964.

-- Deans agreed with student leaders in both perceptions and expectations of the dean's behavior on the Consideration dimension.

-- Student leaders expected significantly more Consideration than Initiating Structure in the dean's behavior.

-- Presidents and department heads expected both dimensions to be about equally present in the dean's behavior.

-- Both department heads and students expected more Consideration in the dean's behavior than they perceived.

This brief summary underscores the fact that conflicts exist among various groups in perceptions and expectations of the dean's role. However, he is not confronted with as serious a dilemma as may seem. The dean who is effective in his role is sensitive to these differences and, within limits, varies his behavior depending upon the group to which he relates at a given time. Doing this does not constitute inconsistency nor is it so interpreted by individuals comprising the various groups. Even so, the most perceptive dean does not please "all of the people all of the time." In fact, there are times when it seems to him that he is pleasing no one.

I have selected a number of areas in which an academic dean needs to provide leadership. For each one I identify what seems to me some expectations that others might reasonably hold for an academic dean in a community junior college.

1. What provisions are made for faculty professional growth?

Responsibility for a faculty in-service improvement program resides with the academic dean. One time-honored method that too often results in limited success is the faculty meeting. However, to dispense with faculty meetings because they seem ineffective is to reach the wrong conclusion. In such cases, it is likely that they lack focus, direction, and a sense of purpose. Faculty involvement in planning and conducting such meetings can do much to help them serve as a significant vehicle for professional development. These meetings, whether of the total faculty or segments thereof, should make use of the expertise within the faculty as well as outside consultants--both general and special. In my opinion, the deans frequently overlook a good bet in not making more use of special consultants to work with departments or other selected segments of the faculty.

Visitation programs encompassing other junior colleges, senior institutions, and in the case of occupational instructors, the field where the work of their specialty is performed, constitutes another potentially effective means of faculty improvement and professional growth.

If a dean permitted faculty to attend all of the professional and scholarly meetings in which they express interest, he would bankrupt the institution and have no one on campus to teach classes. At the same time, it is important that community college faculty members not be cut off from their

professional roots. Their affiliation with professional and scholarly associations helps to prevent this from happening. Obviously, providing the faculty with inducements in the form of professional leaves and expenses to attend such meetings encourages their maintaining such affiliations. Since funds for this purpose are always limited, in the interest of morale, an equitable method of distribution needs to be devised. At the same time, sufficient leeway should be maintained so that special assistance can be provided to individual faculty members when the institution would be well served as a result.

Long-term leaves for professional study are an accepted part of our profession and not without good reason. Yet, they are a mixed blessing. Not infrequently they are the avenue through which a faculty member matriculates to another position. While this is a fact of academic life, the dean has responsibility for seeing that the institution's interests are protected when a leave is granted with salary.

2. Is the faculty committed to the institution's purposes?

Probably the best single measure of whether an institution is realizing its avowed purposes is the degree to which the faculty is committed to them. This is a consideration of major importance for a comprehensive community junior college. Yet, deans frequently find it necessary to employ faculty who, while qualified for their specific duties, have little commitment to or understanding of the institution's purposes.

The faculty in-service program should give attention to this matter. One way of doing this has been mentioned, namely, through faculty meetings using both institutional staff and outside consultants as resource people. It may be possible to occasionally have a university extension course offered on campus for this purpose. A less formal procedure is to provide the faculty with professional literature. A group subscription to the Junior College Journal is excellent for this purpose. The annual group rate for the Journal is now only \$1.50 per person. This represents a real bargain!

3. Is balance and variety represented in the backgrounds of faculty?

This involves the colleges and universities which the faculty have attended -- both as graduate and undergraduate students --, parts of the country where they have lived, their age distribution, and types of experiences which they have had. Ideally, faculty should reflect diversity and balance in all of these respects. As any dean knows, these are not always easy balances to maintain.

4. How is the faculty organized for instructional purposes?

To avoid having numerous two- or three-member departments, and too many persons reporting to the dean, many institutions are organizing into broad instructional divisions.

Important as is an academic dean's leadership role in this area, he

certainly cannot provide all of the leadership needed to develop a strong and effective educational program. He must depend upon his division and/or department chairmen to carry major responsibility for curriculum development, instructional improvement, faculty selection and the numerous details that must be attended to. It needs to be made clear to these chairmen when they are appointed what is expected of them. If they are subsequently found to be incapable of or disinterested in performing these duties, they should be replaced. This may not be easy but it is part of what a dean is paid to do.

5. What means are employed to promote instructional improvement?

While this question is closely related to some already discussed, it is of such importance that I single it out for special attention. Certainly a dean must obtain evaluations in order to make decisions on whether to retain and promote faculty. More important, in my opinion, is how such evidence is used to promote instructional improvement.

Deans are usually dissatisfied with the results of their efforts in this area. I have reached the conclusion that a program of instructional improvement to even approach its potential must involve the faculty and students in a more significant way than is now normally the case. This involvement should begin with the formulation of a faculty committee chosen partly by the faculty and partly by the dean who serves as an ex officio member. That committee is charged with the responsibility both for developing and implementing the "Instructional Improvement Program" for the college. If classroom visitations are involved, members of this committee normally should make them. Portable video-recorders have reached the stage of development and accessibility where they can largely eliminate the need for direct classroom observation.

I hope that this committee would also utilize student evaluations. There are aspects of instruction that students can judge better than anyone else. These include how well the instructor organizes and presents his course, the interest which he generates on the part of students, whether significant learning is occurring, and the extent to which students already know what is being taught. By contrast, students are not qualified to make valid judgments as to the importance of a given course in the curriculum, the knowledge possessed by an instructor, or the appropriateness of the content in a course. These are matters on which an instructor's departmental colleagues are best able to pass judgment. Further, student evaluations of instructors can be overdone as is the case when students formally evaluate each faculty member in each course, each term. In my view, students' evaluations should be obtained systematically on relatively inexperienced faculty members -- by that I mean from one or two classes a term over the first year or two. Beyond that, periodic evaluations once every year or two involving the entire faculty should suffice. This does not rule out their more frequent voluntary use by individual faculty members.

There is every reason to expect that the loss of patience which is

being demonstrated by students in senior colleges over the inferior instruction they are receiving will not bypass community colleges unless serious efforts are made to maintain quality teaching. Undergraduate students at Florida State University have initiated and gained administrative approval of their own program of faculty evaluation. They publish and sell the results. This has and is occurring in other senior colleges. At FSU it is also required that student evaluations be included in the evidence used when making decisions on faculty tenure and promotions. For an excellent treatment of this topic I recommend the section of the recent book edited by Calvin B. T. Lee, Improving College and University Teaching, entitled "The Evaluation of Teaching Performance", pp. 259-343.

Questions Relating to the Curriculum

1. Does the curriculum reflect the admissions policy of the institution?

An educational institution has an obligation to offer programs that are realistic in terms of who it admits. It is nothing short of professional dishonesty to admit large numbers of students to courses and programs which we know in advance few will successfully complete.

A community junior college with an open-door policy must offer a range of courses and programs -- some awarding college credit and others not. Major efforts are now being made to develop offerings and programs intended to better serve marginal students. Many of these programs are, in my opinion, poorly conceived. A provocative report has been published on this topic jointly by the American Association of Junior Colleges and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. It is entitled Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College and is authored by John Roueche. Every community junior college academic dean should read and reflect on this document.

Providing appropriate opportunities for the advanced students who enter an open-door college is at least as important as making adequate provisions for those with deficiencies. Many community junior colleges are giving inadequate attention to this group of students. Such measure as honors courses, advanced placement, credit by examinations, and special recognition are, if anything, more important for these institutions than they are for selective senior colleges.

One good source of ideas for meeting the educational needs of advanced students is the series of newsletters published by the Inter-University Committee for the Superior Student entitled "The Superior Student." The entire series is available in microfilm from Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan. Joseph Cohen's book The Superior Student in American Higher Education: An Analysis of Honors Programs is another good reference on this topic. Participation of advanced students in the annual summer Honors Institutes sponsored by Phi Theta Kappa, the national scholastic honorary for two-year colleges, offers them an exciting opportunity.

2. Is there a clearly defined program of general-liberal studies?

The terms "general education" and "liberal arts education" have lost their original distinct meanings. That is why I choose to use the hybrid term. Here I look for two things: (a) a clear and realistic statement of objectives, and (b) delineation of required courses and other learning experiences prescribed for attaining them. It is not uncommon to find a major discrepancy between the stated objectives of a general-liberal studies program and the educational experiences prescribed for attaining them. When this happens it reflects unfavorably upon the academic dean's leadership, I feel compelled to say that, in my opinion, the general-liberal studies programs of many community colleges reflect lack of imagination and serious thought in their development. This is especially true for this component of occupational curriculums.

3. Is the curriculum tight? How well an academic dean carries out his leadership responsibility in this area can be determined by (a) the appropriateness of the courses for each program, (b) the frequency with which courses listed in the catalog are offered, (c) enrollments of individual courses over a period of time, (d) evidence of duplication of courses, and (e) courses which have been added and dropped over the past year.

It is not uncommon to find two departments or divisions within an institution offering essentially the same course. A course should be offered in the department which is its most logical home in terms of the content. For example, all mathematics courses should be listed and offered by the same department or division. This does not preclude staffing a given course with an instructor whose primary assignment is in another area. Further, it does not rule out the joint development of special courses for occupational programs.

Procedures for adding and dropping courses and programs provide a good clue as to whether an institution is maintaining a tight curriculum. While the department in which a new course or program is to be offered and the curriculum committee and/or faculty senate should pass on such requests, the dean must assume responsibility for recommending approval or disapproval by the president and, in the case of new programs, the board.

One finds procedures for adding courses and programs much more frequently than for dropping them. The latter is necessary, however, if a tight curriculum is to be maintained. We owe it to students to specify in the college bulletin the frequency with which courses are offered and that commitment should be honored. At the same time, few colleges can afford the luxury of numerous classes with small enrollments. This gives a clue as to where pruning should be undertaken. In the cases of specialized courses required for transfer and for occupational curriculums, exceptions to minimum enrollment policies may be justified.

4. Is innovation encouraged in teaching and curriculum development?

Relatively little will occur by way of innovation without a strong

commitment by an institution's academic dean. He needs to continually challenge the faculty to formulate and test ideas that offer promise as ways to better educate students. When employing faculty he needs to seek those who are committed to innovation. Finally, he needs to give recognition to those who make contributions by this means. An admonition is in order here, however. Too frequently those who promote as well as those who undertake an innovation assume at the onset that it must prove successful. This misses the entire point of innovation which is to formulate and test ideas. The result of each effort needs to be evaluated honestly and without defensiveness. When this is done, and an innovation does not warrant being adopted, it should be discontinued. A .300 batting average is as good in educational innovations as it is in baseball.

Personnel Administration

1. What provisions are there for faculty involvement in policy formulation?

As this group well knows, a good deal of the growing faculty unrest is focused on faculty involvement in policy formulation. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the ground rules in this area are being rewritten. The concept of an administrator as one who possesses "power over" others is fast disappearing. The days of the despot -- even the benevolent one -- are all but gone. A new set of relationships is emerging between faculty and administration. What their final form will be is still too early to say with certainty. While the administrator is not going to be displaced, his role is undergoing a transformation. He will make less unilateral decisions on basic policy decisions and be involved in more group decisions. This requires more, not less, leadership ability than in the past.

Among the numerous recent treatments of this topic three warrant mention here. First is a set of proposed guidelines for faculty involvement in policy formulation growing out of a study committee of the AAJC Commission of Administration. Those guidelines were published in the September, 1966 issue of the Junior College Journal as part of an article by Robert Lahti entitled, "A Faculty Role in Policy Formulation." Second is the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" appearing in the Winter 1966 issue of the AAUP Bulletin. That statement was jointly formulated by AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Third is the report of the American Association for Higher Education Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations and entitled Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. This last report contains a policy statement by a Task Force of professors on their role, as seen by them, in the governance of institutions of higher education. That Task Force conducted extensive field investigations on college and university campuses -- including junior colleges.

To be more specific, when I examine the committee structure of the institution I look at two things. First, the number of committees and the ratio of "standing" to "ad hoc" committees. My hope is to find relatively few standing committees -- not over five or six -- with use made of ad hoc committees as needed. Second, I try to determine the extent to which committees are involved in policy formulation as contrasted to policy execution. Too often committees are used to carry out distasteful tasks rather than recommend policy. Policy execution is an administrative function and should be carried out by those in administrative roles.

2. Is there a written statement on academic freedom?

There are currently strong pressures for freedom of speech on the one hand and pressures for thought control on the other. In this situation a well-formulated policy on academic freedoms affords protection both to faculty and the institution. It is most important that the statement be formulated in the absence of a crisis relating to academic freedom. The chances are against formulating a sound policy when threat and duress are present.

3. Is there good faculty morale?

I weigh this matter heavily in evaluating a dean's leadership. Many of the points already discussed bear on morale. Evidence of good morale is reflected by mutual trust and respect among the faculty and between them and the administration along with a willingness to express dissenting ideas without fear of reprisal.

There is no precise prescription for obtaining and maintaining good morale. There are, however, conditions which contribute to that end. An administrator will have faculty respect and loyalty when he uses his position to gain improvements for the faculty and supports them; when he takes advantage of the many opportunities to recognize accomplishments of the faculty; when he operates in the open and above board; and when he shows sympathy and offers assistance in their times of need. Faculty will identify with a dean who exhibits intellectual vitality; and by contrast, have little respect for one who is an intellectual "clod."

Another way that a dean promotes good morale is by setting a high level of expectation as opposed to imposing on faculty a long list of rules and regulations. A faculty considers itself professionals and expects to be treated as such. They resent such things as being told when they must arrive on campus and when they can leave. This is not to say that they should not be held responsible to meet their classes and fulfill other obligations such as holding office hours when students are on campus and taking seriously committee assignments. They expect this and will support a dean who does not retain the few who fail to fulfill such responsibilities.

Effective communications are basic to good morale. There are numerous devices for maintaining effective communications. The basic consideration is that whenever possible the faculty be informed on matters of fundamental

importance to them and the college before they hear them by the "grapevine", on the evening news, or read them in the paper.

The impact of "non-verbal" communication on morale is more important than generally realized. There are no rules for managing non-verbal communication. It almost seems that attempts to employ rules in this area are self-defeating. The following excerpt from an article entitled The Unvoiced Message illustrates the subtleties of non-verbal communications.

You meet John Anderson...in his office by appointment. You arrive on time; his secretary says that he is busy but will see you in a few minutes. He is alone in his office, you note that no lights are glowing on the receptionist's switchboard. Anderson is not on the phone. Yet you wait 15 minutes until he buzzes his secretary to have her usher you into his office...He reaches across the desk to shake hands with you, declares that he is happy to meet you, and asks, "What can I do for you, Mr. X?"...You begin to realize more fully the significance of the 15-minute wait in the outer office. You recall that, instead of coming to the door himself, he buzzed his secretary to bring you in. The omission of any apology for keeping you waiting fits the rest of the picture. When your conversation is finished, Anderson stands -- but still behind his barricade -- smiles at you, perhaps a bit too suave, and tells you, "Feel free to drop in any time at all. I'm always glad to help the cause of education." You notice his stealthy glance at his watch and the slight tightening of the corners of his mouth. These barely detectable movements betray his impatience and fear lest you commit the blunder of prolonging the interview after he has decided to terminate it.

Conclusions

In closing, let me repeat that I make no claim to have touched upon all of the points that are important in an academic dean's leadership role. Hopefully my remarks underscore the fact that as the chief academic officer he, more than any other single individual on the institution's professional staff, is the key to the type of educational institution it will be. If the dean's role ever lacked excitement and challenge, it certainly is not in 1970 in the midst of the great social revolution in over a century.

THORNTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Harvey, Illinois

FACULTY EMPLOYMENT GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

The Board of Trustees is committed to the recruitment of a faculty whose members believe strongly in the philosophy, objectives and purposes of the community college and who will give complete support to the total educational program of Thornton Community College. The President of the college will recommend to the board for approval teaching staff members who:

1. Will contribute in every way possible to cause the philosophy, objectives and purposes of the college to be realized.
2. Will be fully qualified in their subject matter teaching fields with at least a Masters Degree in their disciplines - except in those circumstances where outside experience or avocational interests more than compensate for formalized education.
3. Will understand the heterogeneity of the junior college student enrollment, both in interests and in abilities, and who will therefore give every possible assistance in helping orient students toward realistic educational achievement.
4. Will be alert to the changing nature of our society as a whole and in particular, to the rapidity with which their particular subject areas are undergoing change. Vision, creativity, scholarship, warmth, loyalty, open-mindedness, integrity, reliability, are among many others, words which are descriptive of the members of the teaching staff who will be recommended for employment by the District.
5. Will have demonstrated ability to teach through experience or preparation and show a potential for continued professional growth.

Procedures:

1. Each candidate shall be interviewed by the following professional staff members:
 - a. The department chairman or his designate.
 - b. Not less than two members of the administrative staff.
 - c. A member of the faculty where appropriate and subject to the availability of faculty members.
2. The Professional Interview Record shall be completed by each interviewer and forwarded to the Office of the President, Thornton Community College.
3. The president shall recommend to the Board of Trustees the candidate chosen for appointment.

PROFESSIONAL INTERVIEW RECORD
(For Office Use Only)

Date Location of Interview Name of Applicant

Position interviewed for: _____ Full Time Part Time

(Rate according to all candidates ever interviewed.)

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
APPEARANCE (Clothes, looks)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
PERSONALITY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
COMMUNICATION (speech, understanding)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
EMOTIONAL STABILITY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ALERTNESS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
PREPARATION FOR POSITION	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
PROBABLE EFFECT ON STUDENTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
CONFIDENTIAL FILE (if read)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL RATING AS CANDIDATE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

ACTION RECOMMENDED: ___ Offer contract ___ Offer if position is available
 ___ Do not offer

COMMENTS:

Signature of Interviewer

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

This questionnaire is administered to help us determine your attitudes, interests, and opinions related to this course and the way the course material was presented. It is hoped that through procedures such as these, improvements in instruction, course material, and methods of teaching may occur. It is essential, therefore, that you respond to each questionnaire item carefully but frankly.

PLEASE CHECK ONE IN EACH CATEGORY. DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME. DATE _____
SUBJECT _____ SELECTION OF COURSE; _____ REQUIRED OR _____ ELECTIVE

THE LEARNING PROCESS

A. STIMULUS TO THINKING

- _____ I was frequently stimulated to THINK
_____ I was occasionally stimulated to THINK
_____ Little or no thought was required of me

B. RESPECT FOR STUDENT THINKING

- _____ Ideas of students not welcomed
_____ Ideas of students accepted but not encouraged
_____ Free expression of ideas encouraged

C. INSTRUCTOR'S PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS (voice, dress, mannerisms, etc.)

- _____ Highly conducive to learning
_____ Somewhat distracting
_____ Highly distracting

D. EVALUATION (tests, quizzes, exams)

- _____ excellent _____ satisfactory _____ unsatisfactory

E. GRADING SYSTEM

- _____ very satisfactory _____ satisfactory _____ unsatisfactory

F. ORGANIZATION (of material and activities)

- _____ excellent _____ satisfactory _____ unsatisfactory

G. INSTRUCTOR'S COMMAND OF SUBJECT MATTER

- _____ thorough acquaintance _____ fair acquaintance _____ inadequate acquaintance

H. HOW OFTEN WERE OPPORTUNITIES PROVIDED TO WORK WITH FELLOW STUDENTS IN THIS COURSE? (either in or out of class)

- _____ frequently _____ occasionally _____ very rarely

J. DO YOU FEEL THE PERFORMANCE REQUIRED OF YOU IN THIS COURSE WAS APPROPRIATE FOR COLLEGE LEVEL WORK?

- _____ usually _____ occasionally _____ very rarely

***If you have answered any of the above as unsatisfactory, would you please state your reasons for the rating.

CLASS MANAGEMENT

- A. IS THE INSTRUCTOR APPROACHABLE?
_____ usually _____ occasionally _____ seldom
- B. HAVE YOU BEEN ABLE TO SECURE ASSISTANCE WITH YOUR PROBLEMSIF YOU
NEEDED HELP? _____ Yes _____ No
- C. STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP: _____ strong feeling of good will
_____ reasonably friendly atmosphere _____ feeling of hostility
- D. HOW DOES THIS INSTRUCTOR COMPARE WITH YOUR OTHER INSTRUCTORS?
_____ above average _____ average _____ below average
- E. HOW MANY DIFFERENT INSTRUCTORS DO YOU HAVE THIS SEMESTER? _____

Please use the back side of this sheet to comment on any aspects of the teaching process that you have found most helpful in this course.

FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

Give your instructor the feedback necessary to improve this course.

Indicate your attitude toward each statement by filling in the appropriate box on the answer sheet.

SA	A	N	D	SD
Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. My instructor treated me with respect.
2. My instructor communicated ideas to me in ways that I could understand.
3. My instructor acknowledged my questions to the best of his ability.
4. My instructor patiently assisted me with my problems.
5. My instructor was well prepared for class.
6. My instructor used evaluation procedures which were fair.
7. My instructor was sincerely interested in his subject.
8. My instructor attempted to develop my interest in the course.
9. My instructor motivated me to do my best.
10. My instructor was readily available for consultation with me.
11. My instructor encouraged me to think independently and intelligently.
12. My instructor organized the course well.
13. My instructor organized the lectures and class sessions well.
14. My instructor made the course content relevant.
15. My instructor exhibited a sense of humor.
16. My instructor demonstrated comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter.
17. My instructor made an effort to know the class members as individuals.
18. My instructor was generally tolerant of ideas which differed from his.
19. My instructor differentiated fact, theory, and opinion in his comments.
20. The text was useful to the course.
21. In general, I feel the course was worthwhile.
- 22.
- 23.
- 24.

HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
"Serving Northwestern Illinois"

TO: Full-Time Teaching Faculty
FROM: Charles Jenkins, Dean of Instruction
SUBJECT: Divisional Chairmen Evaluation

It is important that there be evaluation at all levels of endeavor. To this end, therefore, I would appreciate your response to the attached Divisional Chairman Evaluation form, to be returned to me by March 4.

No name is required on the blank, and no Chairman will see an individual blank. A summation will be prepared by me, and discussed with your Divisional Chairman. I hope you will be honest and direct in your response, for only then can we obtain the quality of information necessary to truly improve overall instruction within Highland Community College.

Feel free to discuss any item on this blank with me if you have a question regarding its intent or a definition of terms.

DIVISIONAL CHAIRMAN EVALUATION

Division _____

Please read the following statements and designate the level which best describes your Divisional Chairman within a five point rating scale as follows:

1. Always
2. Usually
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

Ample space is provided for written comments and any qualifying statements, constructive criticism, or praiseworthy notations are urged.

I. Communication

1. The Divisional Chairman effectively reflects individual faculty member's and divisional needs, positions, and wishes to the administration. _____
2. The Divisional Chairman attempts to interpret objectively administrative policies and decisions to his staff. _____
3. Divisional meetings are held often enough to adequately discuss items of general concern within the Division. _____
4. The Divisional Chairman is receptive to individual faculty member's concerns and problems. _____

II. Freedom, Autonomy, and Equality

5. The Divisional Chairman does not favor one subject area within the division to the exclusion of another. _____

Divisional Chairman Evaluation
Page -2-

6. An individual faculty member is given relative freedom to approach his subject matter in his own way. _____

7. The Divisional Chairman consults the individual faculty member in determining course assignments, schedules, and curriculum changes. _____

8. The Divisional Chairman investigates situations thoroughly before making decisions. _____

9. The Divisional Chairman is definite in his decisions, but is still willing to change if adequate evidence is presented. _____

III. Leadership

10. The Divisional Chairman encourages innovation and creativity in instructional methods when necessary. _____

11. The Divisional Chairman creates a good working atmosphere. _____

12. Given the opportunity, I would recommend the reappointment of my present Divisional Chairman. (check one)

____ Yes

____ Yes, with qualifications (indicate)

____ No, with qualifications (indicate)

____ No

HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
"Serving Northwestern Illinois"

TO: Full-Time Staff

FROM: Charles Jenkins, Dean of Instruction

SUBJECT: Dean of Instruction Evaluation

Attached is an evaluation blank. I would appreciate your candid and honest evaluation of my activities as Dean of Instruction as you see them. Written comments on any item will be welcomed. Would you return your responses to me by March 4.

The only identification I want is an indication of whether you are a member of the instructional or administrative (including divisional chairmen) staff.

If for any reason you do not feel qualified to respond to a particular statement, leave it blank. Any comments on the evaluative instrument itself will also be appreciated.

Thank you.

HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Dean of Instruction Evaluation

Please Check

_____ Administrative (including Divisional Chairmen)
_____ Instructional (including S. P. S. personnel)

Please indicate your attitude toward each statement by circling the appropriate response.

- SA Strongly Agree
- A Agree
- N Not Sure
- D Disagree
- SD Strongly Disagree

Written comments are welcomed.

The Dean of Instruction

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. | Considers and acts upon instructional problems promptly. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 2. | Aids in making needed instructional services and materials available. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 3. | Keeps faculty informed on instructional policies and issues. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 4. | Recognizes and acknowledges competence and diligence. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 5. | Conducts meetings effectively. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 6. | Is fair and constructive in evaluation of instruction and instructional personnel. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 7. | Encourages the implementation of new and innovative ideas. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 8. | Is available and willing to discuss concerns of the instructional staff. | SA | A | N | D | SD |

Dean of Instruction Evaluation
Page -2-

9. Is consistent in implementation of established College policies.	SA	A	N	D	SD
10. Does not favor one instructional area within the College at the expense of another.	SA	A	N	D	SD
11. Supports and interprets the instructional program adequately to the Board of Trustees and the public.	SA	A	N	D	SD
12. Is student oriented.	SA	A	N	D	SD
13. Encourages individual and/or group involvement in decision making and policy recommendation when applicable.	SA	A	N	D	SD
14. Supports and encourages proper use of chain-of-command.	SA	A	N	D	SD
15. Effectively orients new faculty members.	SA	A	N	D	SD
16. Is diplomatic in working with others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
17. Accepts criticism graciously.	SA	A	N	D	SD
18. Supports and protects the principles of academic freedom.	SA	A	N	D	SD
19. Demonstrates a stable, level-headed personality.	SA	A	N	D	SD
20. Respects and accepts ideas other than his own.	SA	A	N	D	SD

Dean of Instruction Evaluation
Page -3-

- | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 21. Is free from annoying personal mannerisms. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 22. Earns the respect of the faculty and staff. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 23. Displays broad intellectual interests. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 24. Is neatly dressed and well groomed. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 25. Is well organized. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 26. (optional) The area(s) I would like to see most improved in the Dean of Instruction Office are as follows: | | | | | |

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION - DEAN OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

1. A relationship of mutual trust and openness exists between the Dean of Student Personnel Services and his professional staff. _____
 2. Members of his professional staff feel free, in a professional manner, to take exceptions to decisions reached by the Dean of Student Personnel Services. _____
 3. The Dean of Student Personnel Services is receptive to the concerns and problems of individual members of his professional staff. _____
 4. Decisions of the Dean of Student Personnel Services do not favor one area within the division to the exclusion of another. _____
 5. The Dean of Student Personnel Services encourages innovation within the Student Personnel Services Division. _____
 6. The Dean of Student Personnel Services creates a good working atmosphere. _____
 7. The Dean of Student Personnel Services considers and acts upon divisional problems promptly. _____
 8. The Dean of Student Personnel Services recognizes and acknowledges competence and diligence. _____
 9. Once a job is delegated, the Dean of Student Personnel Services refrains from "looking over the shoulder" of his professional staff members. _____
 10. When the Dean of Student Personnel Services disagrees with a decision of a member of his professional staff, he does not comment upon or change this decision without prior discussion with that staff member. _____
 11. The Dean of Student Personnel Services communicates adequately both up and down the organizational chart. _____
 12. The Dean of Student Personnel Services is definite in his decisions, but is still willing to change if adequate evidence is presented.

 13. The Dean of Student Personnel Services encourages the individual or group involvement of his professional staff in decision-making and policy recommendation when applicable. _____
- The Dean of Student Personnel Services is student oriented. _____

15. The Dean of Student Personnel Services is diplomatic in working with others. _____
16. The Dean of Student Personnel Services accepts criticism graciously. _____
17. The Dean of Student Personnel Services demonstrates a stable, level-headed personality. _____
18. The Dean of Student Personnel Services is free from annoying personal mannerisms. _____
19. The Dean of Student Personnel Services is neatly dressed and well-groomed. _____
20. The Dean of Student Personnel Services is well-organized. _____
21. The Dean of Student Personnel Services presents to the College administration and the Board of Trustees the needs, positions and wishes of the Student Personnel Services Division adequately. _____
22. The Dean of Student Personnel Services exhibits competence in his knowledge of each of the student personnel services. _____
23. The Dean of Student Personnel Services exhibits competence in the administration of the Student Personnel Services Division. _____
24. The Dean of Student Personnel Services is effective (has adequate "clout") in dealing with his administrative colleagues and the Board. _____
25. The Dean of Student Personnel Services earns the respect of the faculty and staff. _____
26. The Dean of Student Personnel Services provides adequate leadership for the Student Personnel Services Division. _____
27. The Dean of Student Personnel Services does not make arbitrary decisions within his division, but investigates the situation thoroughly. _____
28. The Dean of Student Personnel Services conducts meetings effectively. _____
29. Given the opportunity, I would recommend the reappointment of the Dean of Student Personnel Services. _____ Yes _____ No
30. The area(s) I would like to see most improved in the Dean of Student Personnel Services are as follows:

ILLINOIS VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

TEACHER EVALUATION

Name of Teacher _____ Date _____

Class Observed _____

1. Is the teacher well prepared for the day's work or activity?

Comments: _____

Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor
(Encircle one)

2. Does the teacher have an adequate knowledge of his subject?

Comments: _____

Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor
(Encircle one)

3. Is the discussion or activity germane to the course?

Comments: _____

Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor
(Encircle one)

4. Does the discussion or activity seem to be leading to a discernible and desirable goal?

Comments: _____

Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor
(Encircle one)

Teacher Evaluation
Page Two

5. Is there evidence of good teacher-student relationships?

Comments: _____

Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor
(Encircle one)

6. Has the teacher aroused the students' interest in the material or activity being carried on?

Comments: _____

Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor
(Encircle one)

7. Does the teacher show skillful use of a variety of teaching techniques?

Comments: _____

Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor
(Encircle one)

8. Is an attempt made to check results and to ascertain student progress?

Comments: _____

Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor
(Encircle one)

Teacher Evaluation
Page Three

9. Overall Evaluation: Outstanding Above-average Average Below-average Poor

10. Recommendations and general comments: _____

Division Chairman

MORaine VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INSTRUCTIONAL DIVISION

ASSOCIATE DEAN'S EVALUATION OF FACULTY

The Associate Dean or his assistant will rate the instructors on the following items: administrator observation, student open-ended questions, staff self-evaluation, and peer evaluation.

The Associate Deans will complete three copies of a two-section evaluation for each faculty member under their supervision. One copy will be forwarded to the Dean of Instruction; one copy will be forwarded to the instructor; and one copy will be retained for Personnel files.

When pages one and two have been completed, the Associate or Assistant Deans sign and date the evaluation. They will then confer with the instructor being evaluated and will explain, if necessary, both pages of the evaluation form -- and their reasons for the particular evaluation -- to the instructor.

If the instructor agrees with the evaluation, he will sign and date the document which will be forwarded to the Dean of Instruction.

If the instructor disagrees with any part of the evaluation, he will be permitted one week to reply on page three of the form. Upon completion of the reply, the form will be forwarded as outlined above.

I. ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

- 5 = Superior
4 = Above average
3 = Average
2 = Below average
1 = Poor
NA = Not applicable

Classroom Activities and Attitudes

1. Classroom observations indicate that each class session has a definite teaching goal.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2. Provides for differences in student abilities and interests.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3. Has effective rapport with students in the classroom.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4. Appears to effectively communicate content of day's lesson.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
5. Provides opportunities for understanding of skills and concepts.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
6. Provides opportunities for implementation of skills and concepts.	5	4	3	2	1	NA

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 7. Methods of evaluating students demonstrate that he knows how to measure student progress toward course objectives. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 8. Communicates an enthusiasm for his subject matter. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

Course-Related Activities and Attitudes

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 9. Contributes ideas for course or curriculum revision or development or for improved teaching strategies. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 10. Has grown professionally through continued studies, attendance at professional meetings, professional readings, research, or publication. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 11. Reacts positively to constructive criticism. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 12. Cooperates with peers in course-related activities. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 13. Is an effective member of a horizontal or vertical teaching team. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 14. Keeps office hours adequate to provide individual help for students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

College Activities and Attitudes

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 15. According to schedule, completed grade reports, equipment orders, evaluation reports, etc. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 16. Contributes to the college by serving on committees, participating in community activities, sponsoring student clubs, or acting as a college representative at professional meetings. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 17. Functions in unusual or difficult situations with understanding and cooperation. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

COMPOSITE RATING FOR _____ ITEMS: _____.
Number

II. CLARIFICATION AND/OR OTHER COMMENTS

III. FACULTY MEMBER'S REACTION TO EVALUATION

Name _____

Date _____

FACULTY SELF-EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

1. How do you provide for differences of student ability and interest?

2. Cite a specific example of dissemination, understanding, and implementation in your teaching activities.
 - a. Dissemination:

 - b. Understanding:

 - c. Implementation:

3. Describe or give examples of how you measure student progress toward course objectives.

January 1970

Self-evaluation Instrument

-2-

4. What ideas have you contributed for course or curriculum development or revision or for improved teaching strategies?

5. Describe professional growth: continued studies, attendance at professional meetings, professional readings, research, or publications.

6. Describe contributions to the college: serving on committees, participating in community activities, sponsoring student clubs, or acting as a college representative at professional meetings.

OTHER COMMENTS:

PROCEDURE FOR ADMINISTERING STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

(Approximate time: 20 minutes or less)

PROCEDURE:

The instructor may wish to ask a responsible student in each class to conduct the evaluation procedure. The instructor or the designated student should:

1. Read the instruction page (Your Evaluation of Your Instructor) aloud to the students.
2. Distribute materials (pencils, cards, forms). Every student who is present should be entitled to complete an evaluation.
3. Answer any questions which students may have about this evaluation.
4. All completed materials should be returned by the students to the envelope provided for that section.

OPTIONS: You may also want to consider some of the following:

1. Giving students advance announcement of the day evaluation will take place in your classes.
2. Including the evaluation at a point which will minimize negative feedback from other class activities.
3. Recognizing that your presence may inhibit student responses, you may wish to take a coffee break while the students complete the form.
4. Providing absentees an opportunity to complete an evaluation without identification -- retain the materials until after the last class meeting and allow the student to put his materials into the envelope designated for that class.

ROUTING OF COMPLETED FORMS:

After last meeting of your final class

1. Forward all completed IBM cards, pencils, and remainder of the forms to your associate dean.
2. Retain Questions 13 and 14. Please do not destroy. Procedure for the use of this information is yet to be determined.

December 1969

YOUR EVALUATION OF YOUR INSTRUCTOR

The student evaluation of instructors is used by the instructor to improve instruction and by the administration to determine salary increases. Your evaluation of your instructor constitutes a major part of that instructor's over-all evaluation. Since this evaluation directly affects both your future instruction and your instructor, please consider your judgments carefully.

DO NOT GIVE ANY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION. DO NOT FILL OUT THE FRONT OF THE IBM CARD.

For Items 1 - 12, choose the one answer which you think best describes your instructor. On your IBM card, darken the space corresponding to the letter of your answer choice.

Write your answers to Questions 12 and 13 in the spaces provided on Page 3. Please give specific attention to these questions. They are very important to your instructor.

When you have completed your evaluation, please return all materials to the large envelope provided for your class.

December 1969

MORaine VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Student Evaluation of Faculty
(Revised December, 1969)

Please choose one answer and darken the appropriate letter on the IBM card.

1. INTEREST IN STUDENTS

<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
Consistently willing to work with students on an individual basis, inside or outside of class	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>

2. ABILITY TO MAKE CLASSWORK INTERESTING

<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
Consistently promotes class interest	Usually promotes class interest	Sometimes class is interesting and other times boring	Class more often boring than interesting	Class consistently boring atmosphere

3. INSTRUCTOR'S INTEREST IN SUBJECT

Instructor communicates interest in subject.

<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
<u>Consistently</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>

4. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER

Instructor demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of his subject.

<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
<u>Consistently</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>

5. ORGANIZATION

Uses an organized approach to reach course goals.

<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
<u>Consistently</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>

6. EFFECTIVE PRESENTATION OF COURSE CONTENT

<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
Consistently clear, complete, and helpful	Usually communicates effectively	Generally effective but occasionally confusing	Frequently Unclear and incomplete	Consistently vague, incomplete, and unhelpful

7. ADJUSTMENT OF PRESENTATION

Adjusts rate and method of presentation according to difficulty of material.

^a Consistently ^b Usually ^c Sometimes ^d Rarely ^e Never

8. MAKES REASONABLE ASSIGNMENTS

Assignments promote students meeting of course objectives.

^a Consistently ^b Usually ^c Sometimes ^d Rarely ^e Never

9. ENCOURAGES INDIVIDUAL THINKING BY STUDENTS

^a Consistently ^b Usually ^c Sometimes ^d Rarely ^e Never

10. VALUE OF SUBJECT

The instructor demonstrates that the student can use or enjoy this subject.

^a Consistently ^b Usually ^c Sometimes ^d Rarely ^e Never

11. RESPECT

Instructor treats students with respect.

^a Consistently ^b Usually ^c Sometimes ^d Rarely ^e Never

12. GRADING

Grading policies are clear and fair.

^a Consistently ^b Usually ^c Sometimes ^d Rarely ^e Never

Class _____ Section _____

Instructor _____

13. What do you believe makes this instructor an effective teacher?

14. What do you believe this instructor could do to increase his effectiveness?

MORaine VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION
TEACHING EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Instructor _____ Date _____

Course _____ Evaluated by _____

1. Presentation (the how; pay particular attention to the beginning and ending of the session). _____

2. Organization (the what). _____

3. Physical setting. _____
4. How is information received by the students? _____

5. Does the instructor respond to reactions of students? _____

6. Use of visual aids _____
7. Student interest _____
8. Suggestions.

STAFF PROFILE SUMMARY

Date of Employment _____

Name: _____ Rank: _____

Step: _____ Salary: _____

1968-69

Evaluations: Student _____ Administrator _____ Composite _____ Merit Monetary Promotion

Teams:

Comments:

1969-70

Evaluations: Student _____ Administrator _____ Composite _____ Merit Monetary Promotion

Teams:

Comments:

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE STAFF AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

William K. Ogilvie
Director, Community College Services
Northern Illinois University

The image of any specific community college is characterized by many things including the type of student it attracts, staff morale of the institution, the type of facilities that it has available, etc. Its image is also reflected by the type of instructional program it offers its clientele. It can be traditional, it can be rigid, or it can be innovative. It can be a stereotype of a curricular program offered by a leading senior institution of the state, or it can be a program designed to meet the needs of the community which the institution serves.

Whatever it is, or however it is characterized, it reflects the total institutional attitude of each individual community college toward curriculum development and improvement. The term total is used because it implies administrative attitudes, board attitudes, and staff attitudes. It implies the desire of the staff to work toward curricular improvement, and the degree to which the administration of that specific community college allows staff involvement in curriculum development and gives moral and monetary support to the proposals. It also implies that the senior institutions of the state and the state agencies that control and/or supervise institutions of higher education in the state will not exert undue pressures on the community college as it involves itself in curriculum development and improvement. At this early phase of the discussion, it should be acknowledged that not all "innovations" are really innovations, that not all curricular proposals made by the instructional staff are logical or even in keeping with the junior college philosophy, and that not all administrative or state controls are bad.

The key involvement in curricular development takes place at the local level. It is important that this involvement include not only the chief administrative officer of the community college, his dean of instruction, and a curriculum committee, but also the individual in charge of institutional research, a representative of the library staff (or as they prefer to be called now, the multi-media center), and a representative of student personnel services. It is also important that curricular proposals start with the individual academic department or division for they are the experts in the instructional areas even though such proposals occasionally must be suggested to a department. What is really being said here is that curricular development ideally involves a team approach.

A cursory examination of the roles played by specific individuals from local community college staffs in curriculum development should reflect the following areas of involvement:

The community college president. He, of course, is the key individual, the responsible individual. His philosophy toward the community college stamps a visible mark on the curricular offerings of the institution. He educates his board. He helps screen staff applicants to make certain they are capable of administering or contributing to the development of good curricular programs. He can stifle or encourage the development of programs designed to meet community needs. He can assign and hold responsible for the curriculum other members of the administrative staff. His careful selection of an academic dean is essential.

The academic dean. His chief responsibility is, of course, curriculum development. He can, like the president, stifle or encourage the continual process of faculty involvement in the solving of curricular problems. He is also responsible for continual evaluation of the total curriculum of the institution. He is the administrative staff member responsible for instigating a means through which curricular and instructional problems are acted upon before they reach an emergency stage.

The college research coordinator. He should be, according to Arthur Cohen, (1:23)

"Charged with aiding instruction directly. Too often his activities end when he submits evidence of students' "Success" in various programs by computing their grade-point averages to the second decimal place. Make his services available to instructors. Have him find out what an "A" student is actually and specifically able to do; how a "D" student's attitudes and abilities differ."

Student personnel services. Learning involves students, but curriculum committees tend to overlook the necessity of having a representative of student personnel services on the committee. They are a source of much information that curriculum committees should consider as essential. Meyer and Hannelly in the 1956 N.S.S.E. yearbook state that:

"Probably no member of the staff of any junior college has a better over-all picture of the student body than the student personnel workers. For this reason their membership on curriculum committees provides an excellent system by which this knowledge may be tapped. The advantages are two-way: The work of curriculum committees is facilitated by the contribution of the student personnel worker, and the student personnel worker is placed in an improved situation for understanding the many facets of the educational program." (2:210)

The institutional curriculum committee. This committee is responsible for giving an interdisciplinary and institutional appraisal of problems and proposals affecting curriculum development. They must ask,

"How does this proposal relate to the total curricular concept of this particular institution? Is it in keeping with the community college philosophy? Will it help the college meet the needs of the community? Is it logical or feasible? Is it a step forward or is it a step backward?"

Division or departmental committees. The membership of this committee theoretically knows their area or discipline better than any other one segment of the college. They should be the "instigators" of curricular change although they often are not. Once again I quote Cohen. He indicates that instructors should

"Operate in departmental teams so that the skills of each staff member may be utilized to the fullest. What if all cannot perform each task with equal facility? One may be best in specifying objectives; a second, in designing assessment devices; a third, in constructing media. Let each operate so that he contributes his own best talents to the process of curriculum." (1:23)

The individual instructor. The focal point, the aims of all curricular plans come to rest on the shoulders of the individual classroom instructor as he confronts his students. The instructor devises and manipulates learning situations. He evaluates student progress in his course. He should be a diagnostician of individual learning problems, not merely an information dispenser. When the classroom door closes, the curricular and instructional plans of the institution either become effective or they go down the drain. The circle of curricular responsibility is completed at this point. The degree to which the college president was successful in selecting an effective teaching staff now becomes obvious.

There are a few more items that should be briefly touched upon before bringing this discussion to a close. They involve objectives, standards, evaluation, curriculum meetings, and the use of resource people from other educational and community agencies in curriculum development.

Objectives. Objectives are not merely window dressing, they give direction to instructional activity. Unless the implications of objectives are thoroughly understood by the professional staff there can be no sound basis for organizing instruction or for evaluating student progress. Community college curricular development should only take place when a clear understanding is present of the community college philosophy and when this philosophy is reflected in the curricular objectives of the institution. Objectives go beyond catalog descriptions. They also involve texts, media, lab projects, field assignments, discussion topics, and standards. More academic crimes have been committed under the guise of "standards" than almost any other educational rationalization in existence.

Evaluation. Curricular plans instituted and never evaluated are of little consequence in promoting institutional excellence. A curricular offering not meeting the objectives of the community college or the needs of its clients should be either revised or eliminated. Instructional staff members not conducting their classes in a manner compatible with the objectives of the institution should either have their instructional skills upgraded or the instructor should be removed from the classroom. On the other hand, the extension of curricular development depends upon acknowledgment. Everyone knows who the best teachers of a faculty are, but no one wants to name them. The teachers who effectively carry out the objectives of the curriculum in the classroom should be recognized and they can only be recognized after evaluation. An investigation by Reynolds (3:19) of 70 junior colleges throughout the United States, indicated that in almost all institutions studied neither the dean of instruction, nor division head, nor department head ever took the time to visit classrooms while a class was in session.

Curriculum meetings. Curriculum meetings should involve themselves with genuine curricular problems and not a multitude of household chores. Teachers correctly view meetings of this type as unchallenging.

Resource people from other agencies. The use of resource people from other educational or community agencies is often overlooked in the development of the community college curriculum. If high school or university staff members are not consulted, the community college instructional program will soon be operating in a self-imposed academic vacuum. The community college was not created for this. The American educational system operated on a continuum - from K through forevermore. All aspects of it must be interrelated. They cannot be interrelated without an exchange of viewpoints. This type of resource should be thought of as advisory.

The ideas, and sometimes restrictions, of other educational agencies such as state and regional accrediting agencies, including those that are concerned with certain occupational fields must also be considered for their regulations are more binding.

The local community has many agencies whose ideas should be incorporated into curricular considerations. The reference here is not merely to the industrial and business agencies whose desires can have major impact on the curriculum. There are other agencies whose interest in the offerings of the junior college might seem remote, but who might be interested in the total curriculum rather than one specific portion of it. They exert the broad viewpoint. The reference here is to the welfare agencies, the ministerial associations, the chambers of commerce, the labor unions, or the law enforcement agencies of the community. This is not beating the drum for a "let everyone get into the act" routine. It is merely giving recognition to the fact that besides the staff of the local community college, many individuals can contribute to an effective curriculum under the framework of the junior college philosophy.

When one of the "emerging community colleges" starts to emerge, there usually exists a frenzied analysis of catalogs of established institutions (both community college and senior institution) in the office of the dean of instruction. The first curriculum is ushered forth to the local board, and with fingers crossed, passed on to the state board. This is just the start. Real curriculum development progresses from that point. And, it pays off in the classroom, for superior instruction is at the central core, or the very heart of the community college concept.

REFERENCES

1. Cohen, Arthur, "Developing Specialists in Learning" Junior College Journal 37:21-22, September 1966.
2. Meyer, A.M. and Hannelly, "The Student Personnel Program", The Public Junior College, 55th Yearbook of N.S.S.E., University of Chicago, 1956.
3. Reynolds, James W. "Improvement of Instruction in the Junior College", Improvement of Instruction, Proceedings of Fourth Annual Junior College Administrative Institute, Southeastern Junior College Leadership Program, Pensacola, Florida, July 1964.

THE TRANSFER STUDENT AND
GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT

by
Forest D. Etheredge
President, McHenry County College

General education programs in American colleges and universities are an outgrowth of the development of the elective system and of the graduate school in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. As late as the middle of the last century, all college students pursued essentially the same course of study regardless of their future vocational plans. Recently the Birmingham Publishing Company reprinted the official catalog of the University of Alabama for the year 1837. This eight-page publication is very interesting both because of the ways in which it differs from our present day catalogs and also because of the surprising number of similarities. The members of the freshman class of the University of Alabama in that year spent three hours a day in class. One hour was devoted to the study of ancient languages, one hour studying algebra and geometry and one hour studying natural history. The members of the sophomore class studied mathematics, including the calculus, as well as zoology and English rhetoric and composition and French. Members of the junior class studied Greek and Roman literature and mythology, natural philosophy, French language and literature and moral and mental philosophy. The members of the senior class studied moral and mental philosophy, physical science, French language and literature as well as an introduction to either Italian or Spanish language and literature. The entire four year curriculum consisted of approximately 15 courses. This limited curriculum was typical of the colleges and universities of that era. The University of Michigan was the leading western state university in the middle of the last century and its entire curriculum during the 1843-44 academic year consisted of 50 term courses. Of the 50, 26 were in Latin, Greek and mathematics, nine in natural sciences, five in logic, philosophy and psychology, three in morals and religion, four in political science and four in English.

The growth of the elective system beginning at approximately the middle of the nineteenth century and continuing to the present day, has changed this picture drastically. The essentially single track college program which had been the rule up to the middle of the last century, became splintered into an increasing number of different programs available to students with varied interests. Prior to the advent of the elective system, there was general understanding as to what a college education was and what it entailed. It was understood that the holder of the baccalaureate degree had spent four years studying, for the most part, natural history, philosophy, Latin, Greek and one or more foreign languages.

The elective system in American colleges was encouraged both by the demands of students to be permitted to study those things which were more

directly relevant to their future professional interests and also by the growth of the graduate professional schools which increasingly demanded study in the area of specialization as a requirement for admission.

The introduction and growth of the elective system eventually made it at least theoretically possible for students to spend four years taking course after course in a single subject matter field. The development of programs of general education represent an attempt to forestall this possibility. General education programs then represented, and still represent, an attempt to retain breadth in the educational experience in the face of growing demands for education in narrow, specialized areas at the undergraduate level.

Support for the concept of general education is to be found in virtually all philosophies of education. The realist, the pragmatist, the idealist all support in principle, this concept. However, differences between these philosophies lead to differences of opinion regarding the subjects to be taught, the emphasis to be given to them and to a certain extent, the manner in which the subjects are to be taught. These differences originate because the conception of man and of the school differ along the various philosophies. It should be pointed out that there is no such thing as a single conception of general education in the philosophy of realism, nor is there a single such conception in the philosophy of pragmatism. Different realists have varying ideas on this subject as do the pragmatists. However, the ideas of the realists and the idealists do seem to cluster about a point at one end of a continuum and the ideas of the pragmatists cluster about the other end. I shall attempt to summarize these opposing conceptions by contrasting their attitudes on certain selected subjects. The classical realists view man as a rational animal, therefore the quality that makes him distinct is his rationality. The cultivation of this rationality should be the sole aim of education. Since in their view, reason is a separate entity and is unaffected by social and physical factors, education should everywhere be the same, in slum or suburb, in Ghana or England, in city or rural area, the pattern of education would be the same. Moreover, the universal values and truths are to be found in the books of the Western tradition. Therefore, all one must do is to study these books and one will be as well educated as it is possible for a man to be. According to this view there is nothing new under the sun. All there is to be known as far as fundamental truths are concerned is already known. The good life lies in the life of the mind, that is, in contemplation. The social philosophy accompanying realism, is a very conservative one, and frequently the idea of an intellectual elite is espoused.

The pragmatists would take issue with these views. Granting man's rationality, they see this as but one of man's several characteristics. Man is not entirely mind, but is body as well. Granting man's individuality, he is still a member of a society. Pragmatists feel that all these characteristics of man must be considered and are important for the educator to keep in mind when constructing a curriculum. Since social and physical characteristics are not everywhere the same, the patterns of education cannot be everywhere the same. What is a good education for a slum child in Chicago, may be a very poor education for a child in Africa. In addition, pragmatists are unwilling to admit that there is nothing new under the sun. They believe that as more and more experience is generalized, novelities may appear. They cannot accept the

great books of the Western tradition as containing all the truths. Pragmatists and realists also differ on the idea of the good life. Experience, which leads to further growth of the individual, is considered to be the good life in view of the pragmatists. Passive contemplation has little place in this dynamic view of the individual. The social philosophy of pragmatism is not protecting and conserving, but active and growing and changing.

The realists and pragmatists present us with what are in many respects views occupying opposite ends of a spectrum; thus, we have contemplation versus action, mind versus mind-body, old truths versus new solutions, tradition versus reform, theoretical versus practical, subject-matter versus student and the past versus the present. These antithetical statements are, of course, overgeneralized summaries of these two philosophies.

As usually seems to be the case, the truth probably lies somewhere between these sets of polarities. The goal of any education should be to enable a man to acquire an understanding of himself, his society and the universe, to understand the implications of his beliefs about these things and to enable him to contribute to the progress of his society. This definition recognizes the two-fold nature of man's intellect, the speculative and the practical. Both of these divergent aspects of man's nature must be recognized. Man not only thinks, but he acts, and the aim of education should be to enable him to do both in a way consistent with his beliefs.

It seems obvious that an education which is limited to a specialized field, cannot, because of its very narrowness, meet the goal of education as just defined. A general education component is necessary in order to provide the breadth of educational experience which will enable the specialists to integrate his knowledge into the wider field of human knowledge and into the activities of society at large. Hopefully, the general education component would enable the educated man to better understand himself and his society.

The preceding summary of philosophical points of view on man and education will help to illustrate why it is, that there can be agreement on the concept of general education and yet no unanimity of agreement on the content of programs of general education. While we may readily agree that there is a need for general education in collegiate programs, decisions on the content of these programs are ultimately based upon our answers to philosophical questions regarding the nature of man. In fact, the entire curriculum is the result of the college's attempt to implement its philosophical beliefs. Realistically we can never expect to reach unanimity of agreement regarding the content of a general education program. There will probably always be as many varieties of general education programs as there are groups and individuals that concern themselves with this problem. The most that we can expect in this area is that those people who concern themselves with the problem, concern themselves deeply enough to be sure that their proposals are consistent with their philosophy of education. Moreover, we should not be discouraged by these differences of content in general education programs since each of the various philosophies undoubtedly contains a kernel of truth.

The philosophical is not the only impetus for the development of programs in general education. The regional accrediting associations require a general education core as one of the stipulations for membership. The following para-

graph is quoted from the "Guide for the Evaluation of Institutions of Higher Education", published by the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The quotation reads as follows: "Each institution will be expected to show that it requires a program of general education to enable the student to become acquainted with the major areas of knowledge, the biological sciences, humanities, physical sciences, and social sciences. The instructional programs should enable the students to become acquainted with basic ideas in these areas and gain proficiency in dealing with modes of thoughts involved in each discipline. An institution should be prepared to give the reasons in support of its particular plan of general education". Certainly, this requirement of the North Central Association and similar requirements by other regional accrediting associations has had a significant influence in the development of the programs of general education.

For the junior colleges in Illinois, for instance, additional impetus was provided by the Illinois Junior College Act of 1965. This act defined general education as one aspect of a comprehensive junior college program. The comprehensive program, of course, is one of the requirements which must be satisfied for a junior college to be identified as a Class I College under the terms of the Act.

So much for the factors which have acted to encourage the development of programs in general education in colleges and universities. How have these programs been incorporated into the college curriculum? In general, I think it can be said that this problem has been solved in two different ways. First, by the development of special courses in the natural sciences, the social sciences and other fields which have been specifically designed to integrate the subject matter of these fields with the rest of human knowledge and human activity. Secondly, the problem has been solved through the device of requiring students to select a certain number of courses from the natural sciences, social sciences, etc. Typically, the courses are those which are offered by the faculty in these fields and are not especially designed for students filling the general education requirement.

The development of special courses for students who are satisfying the general education requirement has been called a "creative feat" by Jencks and Riesmann. The development of such courses requires faculty members who are not only specialists in their own field, but also have a great interest and thorough understanding of the relationship of their area of specialization to the remainder of the human experience. While there are such people, they are all too rare. Their rarity is attributable, at least in part, to the fact that little encouragement in the form of rewards is given to those people who pursue this kind of interest. It is possible to be awarded a Nobel Prize for work done in chemistry, but you will never receive such an award for the development of a general education course in physical science. Consequently, there are few teachers who are prepared to develop and teach these courses and, consequently, there are relatively few such courses being offered. To be sure, there are individual institutions that have pioneered in the development of such programs of general education, the University of Chicago and Columbia University are two examples that come to mind. Where such programs of general education exist, they typically are comprised of courses that are

offered during the first two years of the college experience, thus permitting time for specialization during the last two years of college. Daniel Bell in his recent book, The Reforming of General Education, which was the outgrowth of a study of the general education program at Columbia College and which contained recommendations for reform of this program, has suggested that the general education experience should come, not only at the beginning, but also at the end of the college experience. This arrangement would permit some specialization during the middle of the four year college experience.

Bell proposes that the first year be spent acquiring the necessary historical and philosophical perspectives, that second and third year students receive training in a discipline and learn to apply these tools to various aspects of a field, and that the fourth year be spent in seminars and integrative work in problems that cut across disciplinary lines. One of the strengths, as well as one of the weaknesses in Bell's proposals is that it treats the college undergraduate experience as a single four year unit. The growth and increasing importance of the junior colleges in this country, as well as the increasing mobility of college students in general will result in the number of students beginning and ending their collegiate experience within the walls of the same institution being an increasingly small minority. This mobility must be recognized as a negative factor in developing highly integrated programs in general education.

The most common solution to the problem of implementing programs of general education to be found in the colleges and universities of this country today, is the so-called distribution requirement. This solution involves the establishment of a certain minimum number of hours in each of the various subject matter fields, such as the social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, etc., which must be taken by students in order to satisfy the requirement for the baccalaureate degree. For the most part, courses taken by students to satisfy this requirement are regularly organized courses offered within a department. Frequently, the courses taken are the introductory courses which are offered not only to the students satisfying the general education requirement, but also to the students who are beginning to "major" in that field of specialization. The trend in this country, at the present time, is in the direction of satisfying the general education requirement through the use of this device. Some of the reasons for the trend being in this direction, rather than in the development of special general education courses, have been outlined in the preceding paragraphs.

A study has been made of the general education requirements of the public junior colleges within the State of Illinois. The study has revealed, not surprisingly, that virtually all of these institutions use the distribution requirement technique in order to satisfy the general education requirement for their students. Typically, the general education requirement varies with the type of degree toward which the student is working. The requirements for the Associate in Arts and the Associate in Science Degrees usually are the same. These are the degrees that students who are planning to continue their college work beyond the junior college level would receive. Typically, the number of hours of general education required of those students who are planning to obtain employment after two years of college work are less than those planning to work toward the baccalaureate degree. The general education component for the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science degree ranges

from a low of approximately twenty percent to a high of approximately sixty-six percent of the total hours required to receive the degree. The mean number of hours is twenty-four or approximately forty percent of the total hours required. This tabulation includes only hours in mathematics and science, humanities and social science. Required hours in English composition and physical education have not been included. The inclusion of hours in these subjects as general education, would substantially increase the percentages cited above.

While the junior colleges of the state in general seem to have strong programs in general education, it is interesting to note that many of the catalogs of the institutions on which this study is based make little or no reference to general education at all, much less do they comment on the rationale behind their programs.

There are one or two junior colleges which do not have general education programs of their own, but which permit this requirement to be satisfied by selecting courses which will satisfy the general education requirement at one of the senior colleges or universities. This appears to be an eminently practical solution to the problem of the loss of class standing experienced by some junior college transfer students. There are, however, two serious drawbacks to this resolution. First, it is not very realistic to expect a freshman junior college student to identify the university he will attend two years later when he has completed his junior college experience. There are all too many changes in plan that occur during that interval to resolve the problem in this way. Second, this solution precludes the possibility of the development of a strong general education program in the junior college. This is particularly unfortunate because there is great potential for the development of innovative interdisciplinary general education program in these institutions if they are encouraged to move in this direction.

As mentioned previously, most of the junior colleges of the state implement their programs of general education through a distribution requirement. There are exceptions to this rule. The most notable exception, the City Colleges of Chicago, which have a general education core which is composed of courses in biological science, physical science, social science and humanities. These are courses which are specially designed for the non-major and a sincere attempt is made to integrate the subject matter of these various fields into all phases of human activity. These courses were originally introduced into the City Colleges of Chicago more than three decades ago and were patterned after the general education program developed at the University of Chicago under the aegis of President Hutchins.

In reviewing the problem of general education, we must admit, if we are honest with ourselves, that there is no single magic formula for conferring breadth on the collegiate experience of our students. There are many ways in which this might be done; through the development and introduction of special courses or through a "distribution" requirement. There are many different emphases that might be given to the various fields of human knowledge in the development of such a program. The solutions that are developed are dependent on many factors, including the prevailing educational philosophy of the institution, the training, talents, and interests of the faculty and, let us

hope, the needs of the students. I believe that the rules and regulations which are established for the transfer of individual students from one institution to another should reflect the fact that there is no magic formula and that there are several different ways in which general education can be incorporated into the educational experience of college students. I, therefore, propose that the Associate in Arts or Associate in Science Degrees which are awarded by the junior colleges upon the completion of one of their transfer programs and which incorporates a general education requirement be accepted by the senior colleges and universities of this state as satisfying their general education requirement. This proposal, if it should be implemented, would help to insure that students completing two years of work in local junior colleges would be able to transfer as juniors to the senior colleges and universities upon the completion of their junior college experience.

At the present time, we are faced with a situation where many junior college transfer students cannot be classified as juniors because they have not satisfied their special general education requirements. This is true in spite of the fact the students have satisfied the general education requirements of the junior college awarding the Associate Degree. The situation seems most unfortunate because of the strong implication that one general education program is more "correct" than another. It seems to me to be impossible to defend this implication on any objective ground.

I would like to challenge the universities and the junior colleges to cooperatively develop an articulation program which would incorporate as one of its basic principles, the statement that the general education requirement of the university is satisfied by the completion of the general education requirement of the junior colleges awarding the Associate Degree. I believe that this is a principle which is in keeping with the best interests of the students, as well as the best interests of the junior colleges and universities of the State of Illinois.

AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH TO INSTRUCTIONAL
DATA PROCESSING STUDENT LABORATORIES

Roy A. Sedrel
William Rainey Harper College

"The most serious problem confronting the data processing industry today is the shortage of experienced practitioners. It includes everyone from the keypunch operator to the customer engineer, programmer, systems analyst and data processing manager." (2:34)

This statement by Alan Drattel in an article in Business Automation contains the essence of the need which has been the stimulus to the rapid expansion of data processing education in American junior colleges. At the same time, however, it contains the essence of a serious problem facing the college administrator as he attempts to establish and maintain a quality program. This paper will focus on some of the ramifications of the data processing teacher shortage and a new approach to the organization and operation of student laboratories employed at Harper College as a partial solution to the problem.

STAFFING PROBLEMS

The data processing instructor, unlike most instructors in the academic disciplines, possesses a high degree of job mobility. A recent publication by the American Association of Junior Colleges made reference to this point in the following statement:

"Another condition precipitated by the rapid growth of computer technology is the demand for trained personnel by industry. Many instructors who gained a measure of technical competence were lured away from education by more attractive salaries and administrative positions." (4:14)

In order to overcome the mobility problem, community colleges must build in "retention" factors of one form or another. A primary retention factor is a competitive salary schedule. This point is emphasized in the AAJC publication, The Computer and the Junior College in the following:

"Salaries for trained instructors should be equivalent to what a computer professional in industry would command, dependent on geographic area and complexity of equipment. These salaries are in the upper limits of most community college salary schedules and often place the administration in a defensive position with other disciplines." (4:15)

The rapid change in computer technology has made it imperative for data processing instructors to have release time for both in-service and "outside" technical training. Hill and Sedrel alluded to this need in the following:

"Another implication to consider is the fact that instructional personnel in computer technology have very few senior institutions in which to pursue additional training in certain required skills. Although systems training and other skills in computing science are offered, these areas are not geared to the level of instruction in community college programs. Consideration must be given to released time for instructors to obtain training in vendor schools, technical seminars, or independent study." (4:15)

The generally higher level of salaries and reduced teaching loads has resulted in a high per student instruction cost for data processing education programs in today's community colleges. At the same time, constant pressure to hold the line on educational costs is being applied by our taxpayers. The administrator, at this point, has no alternative but to seek new methods of instruction which will enable him to maintain the quality program demanded by the community within the financial constraints, also imposed by the community.

WHERE CAN EFFICIENCIES BE EFFECTED

A quality data processing education program must have provision for both theory and practice. This is generally achieved by requiring a large number of laboratory hours in the curriculum. The U.S. Office of Education technical bulletin entitled Electronic Data Processing-I, contains a recommended curriculum outline requiring six lab hours per week during the first semester, five hours per week the second semester, six hours the third semester, and nine hours the fourth semester of a two-year program. (3:2)

A publication by the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation for Illinois does not specifically state the number of recommended laboratory hours. However, Illinois does recommend from 800-1000 contact hours as required for a two-year program.(1:4) Current practice generally follows a ratio of one third-two thirds. That is, one third of total contact hours is in the form of laboratory practice with the remaining two thirds in the form of classroom lecture.

The typical organizational structure for a data processing laboratory course is to have the students and instructor meet in a lecture situation the required number of hours, with alternate meetings in a laboratory situation for the remaining contact hours. This means that approximately one third of the instructor's time is devoted to laboratory instruction. Or, to state it another way, one third of the instructor cost is allocated to laboratory instruction. It is in this area of laboratory instruction that significant efficiencies can be introduced into the data processing educational program.

HOW CAN EFFICIENCIES BE EFFECTED

The following is an analysis of instructor costs for a semester in a typical situation based on a program enrollment of 160 students in the second semester of a two-year program, with a teaching load of 15 contact hours and an average instructor salary of \$12,000 for a two semester contract.

$$\frac{160}{20} = 8 \text{ sections for laboratory instruction}$$

$$8 \times 5 = 40 \text{ contact hours of laboratory instruction}$$

$$\frac{40}{15} = 2.3 \text{ full-time equivalent instructors}$$

$$2.3 \times 6,000 = \$13,800 \text{ instructor costs for laboratory time}$$

$$\frac{\$13,800}{160} = \$86 \text{ per student for one semester}$$

The above does not take into consideration release time for professional education as suggested earlier. Allowing three hours release time for this function further increases the cost to approximately \$124 per student.

If one analyzes the activities involved in laboratory instruction, it will be found that the instructor typically spends the greatest percentage of his time simply supervising students, getting materials to students, and checking the results of their practice. This is particularly true for a programming laboratory. The question can then be raised, "Is it necessary to have a highly technically competent and costly instructor conduct laboratory sessions?"

The instructional and administrative staff at Harper College, after an analysis and investigation of alternative methods of laboratory instruction, concluded that program objectives could be met at a significantly reduced cost by employing a full-time laboratory supervisor. The laboratory supervisor would be responsible for the same functions performed by the

classroom instructor in the laboratory and would be available to the student during the entire day. In order to employ this concept, students would not be scheduled into laboratory classes on a set time basis, but rather, would be free to conduct their laboratory work at their convenience. As the laboratory supervisor is a para-professional individual, the costs of laboratory instruction would be approximately \$25.50 per student. (\$4,100 salary for one semester divided by 160 student load).

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Harper College has employed the use of a full-time laboratory supervisor for one semester. To date several results are evident:

- 1) Instructional cost savings of \$97.50 per student.
- 2) More professional utilization of highly technical instructional staff resulting in increased morale and status.
- 3) Individual needs of students met to a higher degree. Students may spend as much or as little time as they individually require or desire, for their laboratory assignments.
- 4) Technical expertise more readily available to all students as supervisor is available at all times without prior appointment.

CONCLUSIONS

Continued use of the concept of a full-time laboratory supervisor and further analysis of student achievement is needed before any substantiated conclusions can be reached. However, empirical evidence indicates that the concept has several major advantages for both the student and the college and should be continued.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Business Data Processing Technology, A Report of Committee on Curriculum Evaluation and Development, (Springfield, Illinois, Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation), 1964.
2. Drattell, Alan, "The People Problem", Business Automation, Volume 15, No. 11, November 1968.
3. Electronic Data Processing-I, Technical Education Program Series No. 4, (Washington, U.S. Office of Education) ,1963.
4. Hill, James and Roy Sedrel, The Computer and the Junior College, (Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges), 1969.

THE AMOEBIA AND THE UNIVERSITY

John R. Cortelyou
President, De Paul University

The amoeba is an interesting little critter, and as an aside, so is the university. The amoeba is a very small animal which lives in fresh water. It is so small you have to look through a microscope to see it. It doesn't really look like much when you do see it. You will never guess it is a living thing at first view or on second view, for that matter. It is just a little blob of living stuff called "protoplasm" -- it doesn't have any particular shape at any given moment in time -- its shape happens to be whatever it is the first moment you look at it -- and two moments later it has a different shape -- it constantly changes -- and so we say it is shapeless. This means that the little thing is constantly moving its fluid mass -- one portion going in one direction -- another portion going its own way -- and yet another part going in another way. Now that kind of motion doesn't sound like a very good technique for getting anywhere -- assuming it is going somewhere in the first place -- and when it gets to where it is going -- it gets there more by accident than by design. This sounds like a nutty little thing -- but from its own point of view it isn't no nutty -- it is a living thing, it does all the things any living thing does -- it is interested in staying alive -- just because it doesn't do everything the same way human beings do things doesn't make it nutty. As a matter of speculation I'll bet the little amoeba thinks we're the ones who are nutty! We do things the hard way -- and we're much more complex in our structure. Well, so much for the amoeba.

Now for the university -- and we all know what a university is, or at least we thought we did up until a few years ago. I like to think about a university as a living system -- a kind of a person in its own right that lives in society together with a lot of other living systems of various sizes, shapes and kinds. As a matter of fact, universities themselves are various sizes, shapes and kinds. The thing that makes me think of universities as a living system is the fact that there is so much life in them as manifested in the millions of living things called persons that are hustling and bustling about within its walls. It reminds me of my little amoeba; it has millions of little particles of different sizes and shapes and kinds all moving about and around, kind of hustling and bustling around, seemingly not going any place in particular and not in very much of a hurry to get there.

We customarily think about the university in the traditional expression that it is a community of scholars living and working together. In another sense, it is a mixture of people of all ages, sizes and shapes, some of whom are maintenance personnel, others secretaries, without whom the place would fall apart, cashiers, registrars, admissions officers, student recruiting personnel, public relations persons, development officers, business office personnel, administrators and so on down the line. By the way, there are also students in the university, and faculty. So to call the university a community of scholars is stretching the point of community and

scholarship a little too far. As a matter of fact, to emphasize community and scholarship, or community of scholars, is to place an emphasis on a point that could be debatable, namely, that the only persons of real importance in a university are the students and the faculty. This is very remote from the real truth because all of these other persons are necessary and important to the integrity and health of the institution. As a matter of fact, if it were not for all of these people there would be no community and no scholarship. I bring this matter to attention because as we tend toward equalitarianism in the university complex wherein students, faculty and administration are being leveled to the same plane, at the same time, we retain an aristocracy with respect to these very important people. There seems to be the attitude -- they are to be seen, get their work done but certainly they should have no voice within the university unless it is within the sphere of their own peers. If secretaries or business office personnel too often become disturbed with unreasonable demands upon them or if maintenance personnel of one kind or another complain of the messiness of students and faculty which doubles their work -- these people are expendable. You can always find replacements. In this sense a university is far from a community of scholars.

I will by-pass the anatomy of a university because it is far too well known that it is composed of a variety of colleges, within each college various and sundry departments, special institutes, schools, centers for this and that -- these are specialized appendages for implementing specialized functions.

As a dynamic system the university does have functions. The usual functional description of a university is that it preserves, transmits, and advances knowledge. If we focus in on knowledge we must admit that the university is not in short supply. It not only has knowledge but it has a broad spectra of knowledge as well as depth within any spectrum. As a matter of fact, it has a large deep-freeze of knowledge known as the library. It has a large number of men and women called faculty who represent vast storages of knowledge in their heads, in their notes, in their learned writings, and in their libraries in their offices. There are also many young men and women called students who have a vast amount of knowledge in their heads, in their notes, and in their libraries. If expertise, or, as they say, "know-how" is a form of knowledge, and I believe it is, the diversity and depth of that kind of knowledge in a university is in short supply. The vast majority of that kind of knowledge is in the library of the college of hard knocks which is composed not of books, but in the minds, in the hearts, and the hands of men and women outside the pale of the university.

If we think of the university in terms of its function of transmitting and advancing knowledge, our attention is focused on the faculty to whom is given the function of transmitting through teaching and contributing to the increase of new knowledge through research. Thus, if we see, bouncing off the walls of the university, this reflection that the university is to conserve, transmit and advance knowledge, the dominant image of the university is the faculty and the library.

However, when we view the university from the point of view of the kind and the number of persons in it, we find that the greatest number are young men and women who are there neither to conserve knowledge, transmit it, or advance it. The function of the university must be identified with the purposes of why these persons have come to it. They have come to the university to learn. It is true that for the young men and women, the students of the university, learning is not a new experience. They have been through learning experiences since their early childhood in unstructured and informal situations within the home, the Church, the society at large. They have been within institutionalized learning experiences in their elementary and secondary school years. As a matter of fact, anyone who enters a university, no matter what age or sex, has gone through a variety of learning experiences of a formal or informal type.

But when entering the university the person who identifies himself as a student has made a voluntary decision to spend his or her time, energy, and a certain amount of finances to learn more. Whatever the motives may be, or whatever the merit or value of the motive, this much is true -- that the student has placed a value of importance on further learning. For some, many, or all young men and women, a learning experience within a university setting may be a first, very sharp, come-uppance to a conscious realization that learning is not a simple process, that memorizing facts must not be confused with understanding the interrelationship of facts, that there are different modes of learning, differences in methodology of learning, and that what they thought they had learned before, they have come to realize that they have never learned at all. Within a university setting the student may come to know that of the variety of modes of learning there are certain ones which are really their strong suit in the learning process itself and other modes are not their cups of tea. The same is true for methodologies of learning. Within this context we can see that the action of the student or the function of a student is that of a learner and that learning is the most important tool whereby knowledge can be acquired, understood, and fruitfully used.

Without putting our heads too hard to work, I am certain that we could extend the concept of a student as a learner to the members of the faculty and the administration as learners. Within this purview we can see the university in a different perspective other than as a conserver, transmitter, and advancer of knowledge. Rather, in our context can we see it as a center of learning wherein faculty, students, and administration are all learning together. In this sense the university is a community of learners, each one carrying out this function in the on-going process of human development. In this process the student must be paramount, because faculty and administration with their advantage of a head-start in the totality of the enterprise of learning have made a commitment of their lives and their talents to the service of enhancing the human development of other persons who will be able to act decisively, effectively and wisely.

For over a hundred and fifty-seven years the university has been a handy little gadget in society. With the rise of science and in response to the demands of agricultural and industrial expansion, the centers of

political and economic power in America have made their intrusions into the university. They saw in the university unique institutional strengths which could contribute to resolving the problems particular to their own goals. They saw in the university a substantial accumulation of a particular kind of human talent that was prepared for dealing with the problems involved in their own enterprises. They tantalized the innate curiosity of many faculty members with challenging opportunities to seek new knowledge.

There was always, and continues to be, a quid pro quo between the university and those institutions which seek to utilize the expertise of the university or a quid pro quo between the faculty in the university and those with whom they join in the search for new knowledge or in their service as consultants both at home and abroad. The sum total of all of these intrusions has been a constant drain on the time, the energies, and the talents of those members of the university community who participated in this rewarding venture with the various agencies of government and business.

Society itself began to put new demands upon the university for specialized training to fit specialized societal needs. New curricula had to be developed. New short-term institutes, and sometimes long-term institutes, workshops, seminars, etc., were the response to these specialized needs of a society. Society saw in the universities the same qualities earlier seen by the political and business powers when they reached into the university to seek its help in the resolution of their problems. The university is requested to collaborate with regional and municipal authorities in efforts to combat juvenile delinquency, to reduce racial conflict, to renovate obsolete forms of local government, to participate in urban planning. If a university has a medical school, it is inescapable that it would develop programs that would apply to the knowledge and the care of those in the community surrounding the university. The university is asked to take the responsibility for building the educational, governmental, agricultural, and health institutions of under-developed countries. Society is desperately seeking the talent that will better our cities, improve our schools, lengthen our lives, overcome racial tensions, and find solutions to international ills. There is a call for the university to be involved in direct social action whereby it brings not only its knowledge but also its skills to bear upon the problem within the community itself. It is not enough that agronomists discuss the corn-hog price ratio; the university should enter into the fields and pluck the corn and feed the hogs. It is not enough to give advice on how to do something; there must be assistance in doing it. And it is here that my university really looks like a little amoeba. It has its substance flowing out in a vast multitude of direction so that there is not only extreme diversity in its shape, but also a diversification of its energies from the central mass into the finger-like protrusions of its body.

While all of this was going on, this ever-increasing number of calls upon the university to serve the functions of business, government and various social agencies, the clarion call was cut loud and clear that if you want to be somebody and get some place in this life, you better have a college education.

It is no longer a question of who should go to college, but rather where I should go to college. Because a college or university degree has gained extraordinary prestige, we are tempted to assume that the only useful learning and growth comes from attending such an institution. It almost seems that the dignity and the worth of a human being is equated with whether or not he has a college degree instead of the qualities of mind and spirit that are within the reach of every man. Added to the Pied Piper's call of onward to college we go, the number of college-bound men and women have increased, the rate of college-going youth has increased so the substance of my little amoeba has increased en masse without decreasing one iota the little finger-like projection of my amoeba as they express the response of the university to the society's needs.

And so there is a great tug-of-war that is going on, outside parties pulling at the expertise, the talent, the energy, the imagination of the university personnel. They are not asking, they are demanding, "come out and help us." Inside parties, at the same time, are tugging for the identical expertise, energy and imagination that society is calling for, that is, the students of the university who have chosen to learn along with those faculty members who have made a commitment of their lives to assist in the learning processes of students. But, they find that the experts not only have no time for them, they are not even available on campus most of the time. It is no news to anyone that this tug-of-war has bent the university out of shape, nor is it news that this tug-of-war has generated a bubbling cauldron of angry people. This anger, both from within and without the university, is tending to politicize the university by some with a religious fervor, favoring coercion over persuasion, intimidation over reason, threat over thought, and duress over dialogue. This description is limited to whatever extent confrontation politics increasingly dictates the resolution of differences within the university.

It thus becomes clear that new compacts and more encompassing principles and values must be part of the enterprise of learning within the university community. While much is negotiable in constructing new treaties, intellectual freedom is not. There can be no accommodation with those whose political commitments are more important than the intellectual freedom of others, a principle increasingly compromised by the more aggressive elements of the student and faculty community who seemingly little regard either academic freedoms or those freedoms protected by civil law. The prospect of losing these freedoms is not to be dismissed lightly, considering the militancy of that element and the timidity with which recent violations of other's rights have been condemned by the academic community.

It is equally clear, however, that all the expertise in American higher education must work to develop new ways of retaining the American university as a center of learning while coming to grips with the larger social values as an integral part of the educational experience, either within existing centers of learning or new ones developed apart from the university and equipped to address themselves to the diverse social action programs required to meet diversity in societal needs. Unless American higher education addresses itself to this problem, it runs the risk of the diminution of its function as a center of learning at the expense of being an educational institution for social action and politicization. As someone else has said, I forget who, "if higher education does not resolve this problem it will continue to lecture on navigation while the ship is going down."

CURRENT TRENDS IN
COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC RELATIONS

Kathryn P. Marsh
Graduate Student, Northern Illinois University

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC RELATIONS TODAY

The community college is now a reality for all these fifty United States, representing almost half of all institutions and involving almost one-third of all students in higher education.(1) By 1975, it is predicted that there will be 3.5 million students enrolled in more than 1,000 public two-year colleges in the U.S.(2) As enrollments soar, as districts become larger and multi-unit, and as coordination problems become more complex, it is certain that public relations will become increasingly important to the future growth of the community college.

The School Public Relations Association defines educational public relations as a planned and systematic two-way process of communication between an educational organization and its publics. A primary function is to win public favor in a systematic manner. Authorities seem to agree that:

1. All educational institutions, with or without their consent, will have public relations (3)
2. A public relations program requires direction and that the community college president is the true director, in that he is the only one who can change policies and practices. (4) and
3. There is a public relations job and responsibility for every member of the community college staff, including such non-academic personnel as custodians and switchboard operators.

There is evidence that the public relations program is maturing at every level of education, including the community college. Of 444 junior colleges in existence in 1948, not one listed a PR official on its staff. (5) Twenty years later, William S. Graybeal found that 27.5% of the responding institutions reported the employment of a dean or director of public relations. (6) In a 1970 article on a survey of 143 public community colleges in Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Washington, Mitchell Tandler found that 39 of the 73 respondents reported that they had a full-time PR director. Of these, 31 reported directly to the president, a requirement that PR specialists consider essential for an effective program.(7)

However, in many community colleges today, some journalism instructors handle these PR duties on a part-time basis. In a 1969 junior college survey by the American Society of Journalism School Administrators, 94 of 227 journalism teachers reported that they had PR assignments too. (8) While journalism and public relations will probably continue to be closely associated, the trend is toward more professional, full-time public relations programs.

In summary, then, GROWTH, in quantity and quality, is the key word to the future of community college public relations. In fact, the community college information program has been called a "sleeping giant" because of its untapped potential for both the community and the college. (9) The following section will discuss briefly some of the new directions that growth is most likely to take.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC RELATIONS

A. Objective Centered. The PR program of the future will focus on specific goals rather than on generalized image-building. The trend is toward the formulation of a complete, coordinated, long-range program, with emphasis on the program's effects on the attitudes and actions of people. (10)

B. The Interpretative Function. Because in many areas of the country the community college is relatively new and unknown, and because it offers millions of Americans the best possible chance to close the opportunity gap, it has a special obligation to interpret its rationale, history and Philosophy. This requires a comprehensive PR program that not only defines objectives but also allocates time and resources to achieve them.

C. More Comprehensive Role. Surveys show that the public equates public relations with publicity. While the PR program must continue to disseminate and interpret factual information, it must also stimulate public interest, service the mass media, encourage financial support, and win the favor of the college's many publics.

D. A More Sophisticated Delineation of Publics. While most community colleges consider the whole district as their public, PR men recognize that "the public" is made up of many different publics. Thus colleges organize specific programs to counsel high school students, or to serve foreign students and other special groups. The PR program, too, must seek to reach and involve many different publics, using widely the tools of persuasion, information and cooperation.

E. Innovation. Though innovation has long been the hallmark of all education, at least one authority says that the most radical change in an entire field of education has taken place in the nation's community colleges. (11) As a case in point, long before the status of women became a national issue, the community college was doing a tremendous job in helping the mature woman who sought financial security or simply a richer life through the medium of higher education. (12) The community college has a

unique opportunity to "make" public relations in the only legitimate way; that is, by having something to offer its different publics. (13)

F. **Advisory and Counseling Services.** While establishing special programs is primarily a curricular function, the PR specialist, with his acute internal-external sensitivity to public opinion and his knowledge of the behavioral sciences, can make a vital contribution in helping the community college meet the needs of its many publics, particularly in the area of community services. Alert to current happenings, he can anticipate trends to counsel and advise, not only curricular committees, but also the president, board and faculty.

G. **Greater Attention To Internal Communications.** As colleges grow larger, districts bigger and professional groups more militant, the PR program must provide effective two-way communications with both academic and non-academic personnel. The staff is one of the most important publics the community college must consider.

H. **Greater Attention To The Student.** While community colleges have had relatively few incidents of student rebellion, the PR director must foster the concepts of a teaching-oriented faculty and concern for student success, encouraging student participation in college affairs and striving to keep the "communication gap" small.

I. **More Emphasis On The Electronic Media.** While some writers call for a re-defining of the place of mass communications in the total PR program, it is clear that the electronic media will become increasingly important in the years ahead. (14)

J. **Stronger Reliance On Controlled Media.** Although the community college will continue to seek mass media exposure, studies show that mass media tend to reinforce rather than convert public opinion. Behavioral scientists say, too, that ideas, information and opinions filter downward from "top influentials." For these reasons, and because much news does not warrant general coverage, community colleges will rely increasingly on controlled media, depending on the "relay reinforcement" theory or Roper's "concentric circles" theory to reach more influentials. The most successful controlled media are news letters, internal and external. Special bulletins addressed to specific publics are also popular, as is the external magazine.

K. **Increasingly Sophisticated Technology.** Public relations journals are full of Brave New World predictions for such wonders as computerized personalized college catalogs, videotaped annual reports, and laser-printed institutional magazines. (15) Moreover, PR specialists say that the computer will not only help to analyze and interpret PR results, but also that its vast capacity for data retrieval will make it invaluable for planning.

L. **Greater Emphasis On Feedback.** Because communication must be a two-way process to be effective, the PR program strives to set up a partnership between professionals and citizens. For this purpose, administrators

can make greater use of present personnel as reporting agents. The PR program will obviously encourage open houses, visits, conferences, speakers' bureaus and other person-to-person opportunities that build good will and produce valuable feedback. The community college can also use more advisory boards in public relations.

M. More Attention To Evaluation. As in other areas of community college operations, it is essential that the college public relations program provide for constant evaluation, both to determine cost effectiveness and to measure response. Some national professional organizations are setting up standards and providing advisory and evaluating services, both in the senior institutions and in the public schools. (16) One writer believes that three forms of evaluation should be undertaken regularly: Output, exposure and impact. (17)

N. Greater Professionalization. As PR programs receive more emphasis, there is clearly evident a trend toward stronger professional organization and more in-service training. The Public Relations Society of America has embarked upon an accreditation program for its members. The National School Public Relations Association is a major service organization in the public school sector. The American College Public Relations Association, begun in 1917 as a meeting of College News Bureaus, now has about 3,000 members. (18) At the community college level, the AAJC publishes materials on public relations and news bulletins to provide for an exchange of ideas, under the direction of William A. Harper, director of public relations. As yet, Michigan is the only state to list in the 1969 AAJC Directory its own association of junior college public information officers. It seems safe to say that others will follow.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS SPECIALIST OF THE FUTURE

The PR man of tomorrow will have more education, more status, more pay - and more responsibility. Hopefully, his education will benefit from an inter-disciplinary effort by schools of journalism and schools of education. He will hold a top-level administrative position, reporting directly to the president. He will recommend research, suggest curricular programs, and sometimes initiate action. He will head a team involving such diverse specialists as psychologists and social workers. (19) He, or someone on his staff, will know how to use a wide variety of electronic equipment, and have some knowledge of computers.

He will need a formidable array of specialized talents. First, he must have communications skills and writing ability. As the ACPRA News Letter said in August, 1965, "Despite electronic advances and the sophistication of communication techniques, the printed word remains at the core of education." Whether tomorrow's schoolmen in McLuhan's global village communicate via tomtom or Telstar, someone will have to write the message first. The PR man must, then, have the ability to write well and to understand the communications system as it works in the world of today. (20)

He will also need a sensitivity to public opinion, a good "ear," a sense of anticipation, a sense of timing, a depth of concern and a willingness to accept controversy as an opportunity to probe for root causes of problems. (21)

Above all, the public relations man will need an absoluteness of commitment, a total dedication to the general philosophy and rationale of the whole community college movement. Without such a commitment, his talents and skills will avail him little. With such a commitment, he can look forward to an interesting and rewarding career, as well as the satisfaction of knowing that he and his colleagues are helping to solve some of society's problems through this exciting new development in the field of higher education.

Clearly, the future of the "new" comprehensive community college and its impact on our world has already begun. There is a challenging and rewarding role for the public relations specialist to play in that future.

REFERENCES

1. Williams, Harrison A. "To Close the Opportunity Gap." Junior College Journal. September, 1969, page 8.
2. ..."MUD - an Increasing Dilemma for Community Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal. March, 1970, page 23.
3. Hanson, Abel A. (Director of ACPRA Summer Academy.) "A Professional Approach." College and University Journal. Summer 1967, page 3.
4. Leffingwell, Roy J. (President of the Pan Pacific Public Relations Association.) "No Single Body of Knowledge." College and University Journal. Summer 1967, p. 16.
5. Loschen, Roger T. (Director of PR at Everett Junior College, Everett, Washington.) "Public Relations Problems Unique to the Junior College." Junior College Journal, December 1961, n. 207.
6. Graybeal, William S. (NEA Research Division.) "Faculty and Administrative Salaries." Junior College Journal, September 1968, p. 27.
7. Tendler, Mitchell (Director of Community Relations, Oakland Community College, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan.) "Case for the Public Information Officer." Junior College Journal, February 1970, p. 44.
8. Bell, W. J. (East Texas State University.) "The Journalism Educator." Quarterly published by the American Society of Journalism School Administrators. No. 3 of 1969, p. 29. "Junior Colleges Complain."

9. Bradley, Vince (Director of Publications, Cerritos College, California.) "Surveys and Opinion." College and University Journal, Fall, 1967, p. 37.
10. Ashmore, Frank I. (Executive Director, American College Public Relations Association.) "New Goals, New Trends, New Tools." PRide, June 1961, p. 5.
11. Smith, Patrick D. "Changing the Nurse's Image." College and University Journal, Winter 1968, p. 42.
12. ...Continuing Education Programs and Services for Women. Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, 1968. Pages 30 and 31.
13. Alvarez, Eli A. (University of Puerto Rico.) "Adult Education's Role in Public Relations." PRide, January 1959, p. 16.
14. Ferrer, Terry. "The 58% Investment." College and University Journal, Winter 1967, page 31.
15. Arden, Kelvin J. (Director of University Publications, Cornell University.) "Graphic Communications in 1989." College and University Journal, Fall 1969, p. 9.
16. Beyers, Robert W. "Evaluating Your Information Services." PRide, February 1960, p. 17.
17. Hiebert, Ray Eldon (Head of Journalism Department, University of Maryland.) "Ending the Monologue." College and University Journal, Fall 1969, p. 4.
18. ...50th Anniversary Supplement, American College Public Relations Association. College and University Journal, Spring 1967.
19. Goldberg, Emanuel (Director of Public Relations, Brandeis University.) "PR and the Non-Specialist." College and University Journal, Summer 1965, p. 43.
20. MacMillan, Thomas G. "A New Deal for the Public Relations Graduate." Public Relations Journal, May 1969, p. 30.
21. Cook, James W. (President, Illinois Bell Telephone.) "The New Public Relations." Public Relations Journal, January 1969, p. 52.