DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 664 JC 710 052

TITLE	A Program for Leadership Development of Junior College Staff. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Auburn Univ., Ala.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-69-0745
PUB DATE	Aug 70
NOTE	100p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Junior Colleges, *Leadership Training, *Management Development, Personnel Management, Supervisory Methods, *Supervisory Training, *Team Administration
IDENTIFIERS	Alabama

ABSTRACT

This program was designed to meet the immediate needs of leadership and personnel of new and developing junior colleges in Alabama. The project was divided into two inter-related programs which emphasized use of a leadership team. The resident program required 20 persons, who represented five specialities in junior college education, to participate in a concentrated program from June, 1969 to May, 1970 at Auburn University, as well as participate in the in-service program. The in-service program consisted of 99 persons, administrative teams of several junior colleges, who met in a series of seven conferences of two days duration each throughout the year. The following conclusions were reached: (1) development of programs which maximize use of a team-approach in solving simulated problems adds realism and leads to elimination of barriers caused by specialization; (2) the consortium approach to development, program planning and execution is successful; (3) use of a common experience core provides the basis for teamwork and leads to a greater understanding of the application of specialization to common problems; (4) participants were pleased with the operation of the program; (5) there is evidence that participants plan to implement change at their colleges as a result of this program; (6) the internship experience must be carefully developed and supervised. Recommendations are offered based upon the experiences and evaluation of this program. (CA)

A PROGRAM FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF JUNIOR COLLEGE STAFF

Final Report

Project No. 69-0745
Grant No. 1, NIH # 41-0915

E. B. Moore, Jr.
Project Director

Charles A. Atwell
Assistant Project Director

August 1970

This Project was conducted pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and in cooperation with that agency, the Alabama State Department of Education, and Alabama Junior Colleges.

AUBURN UNIVERSITY
Auburn, Alabama

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Project was a cooperative endeavor and credit for its success must be given to all who participated. Special recognition is given to the Advisory Committee, the Presidents of the Alabama Junior Colleges, and the staff of the Division of Research and Higher Education, Alabama State Department of Education for their guidance in establishing and operating the Program.

Dr. H. Hanley Funderburk, Jr., Vice President of Auburn University - Montgomery was largely responsible for the coordination necessary to implement a Project of this magnitude and is thus due major credit. Dean W. V. Parker and the staff of the Graduate School and Dean Truman M. Pierce and the staff of the School of Education provided significant advice and support without which the Program would have been ineffective.

Special recognition is given to the late Dr. James L. Jordan who functioned energetically and effectively as advisor to one of the resident groups. Recognition is also given to Mrs. Kathy Otwell who served as Project Secretary and to Mrs. Elouise McGuire and Mr. Harold Underwood who assisted in the completion of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE: All Appendices except E, F, G, and I have been deleted from this report.

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Need for the Project

The public junior college is new on the educational scene in Alabama. The first public junior college opened in 1963 and since that time there have been 17 institutions placed under state control. The administrative staff of these institutions were in the main as new to higher education as their new colleges. Each of them has extensively engaged in the development of their respective institutions with particular attention devoted to establishment of sound programs of transfer education and campus development.

Students are attending Alabama junior colleges at a rate exceeding initial projection. This increased enrollment has created greater demand for an expanded curriculum, added community services, additional student personnel services, and has overtaxed facilities. These conditions have created a number of leadership problems. Planning must be developed for the future direction of junior colleges while at the same time solutions to current problems demand immediate attention.

The problems enumerated above require well-prepared personnel in all administrative positions to provide the requisite leadership. As institutions grow they become more complex. This growth and complexity has required an extensive division of labor which demands specialization of staff and faculty. This specialization has created problems in communication between the several specialists who teach in and operate the educational institution. The major communication problem finds its basis in the inability to fully appreciate the role of each specialty

in relation to each other specialty and how each is related in the major enterprise--that of assisting the student to fully develop.

This project sought to meet the immediate needs of leadership personnel of new and developing junior colleges in Alabama. There had been no previous efforts to accomplish this. Traditional programs had been directed primarily toward preparation of individuals in a particular specialty with, at best, incidental attention to the relationship of the particular specialty to other specialties and to the enterprise as a whole.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the project was to bring together persons practicing or aspiring to practice a particular specialty in junior college education into specific situations which demanded full consideration of the part played by each specialty in a concerted leadership effort. There was also an attempt to overcome the dysfunctional aspect of leadership programs which usually develops when a person is disassociated from his institution and its problems for extended periods.

Two specific groups were served. The resident phase brought together twenty persons who represented the several specialties necessary for the effective education of junior college students for a concentrated program of activity extending over one calendar year.

The in-service portion of the project was designed to bring together approximately 100 persons who comprised the administrative teams of the several junior colleges to consider common problems and to develop solutions to those problems through cooperative action. Administrative teams were formed from the participants in the resident phase to perform

in the same manner. Emphasis was placed upon the definition of problems and the application of specialized leadership skills to solve those problems.

Objectives

The specific objectives of the resident phase of the project were as follows:

A. Improve the competency of each participant in his own specialty.

B. Increase the awareness of each specialist of the role of his specialty in the scheme of the junior college and the relationship of this specialty to the other specialties and the total enterprise.

C. Create an appreciation for the expanding role of the junior college and its potential for providing a wide range of educational experiences.

D. Provide persons of expanded vision and understanding of junior colleges and junior college students to return to institutions and provide positive leadership for development and growth of students, faculty, and institutions.

E. Prepare persons to assume leadership in the development and operation of educational programs for disadvantaged persons.

The specific objectives for the in-service phase included the above and the following additional objectives:

A. Development of a procedure to provide educational leadership for solution of problems common to all junior colleges in Alabama.

B. Development of a procedure to maximize educational leadership in each junior college based upon a broad perspective of the varied functions of leadership.

Project Organization

The Program For Leadership Development of Junior College Staff was a consortium of the Alabama State Department of Education, Alabama Junior Colleges, and Auburn University. Auburn University conducted the program and handled all administrative and instructional matters.

Each of the participating junior colleges was represented in all aspects of planning the project and each was encouraged to designate persons to attend both the resident and non-resident phase of the program. All participating agencies were represented on the Advisory Committee.

The project staff was carefully selected to insure that competent persons who had both training and experience were available to conduct the program. Consultants were also selected from a panel of outstanding practitioners and theorists in the field of junior college education. See Appendix A for a list of project staff. See Appendix B for a listing of consultants utilized in planning and conducting the activities of the project. (Appendices Deleted)

The project program was divided into two separate but closely related phases. The resident phase involved twenty persons who engaged in one calendar year of study on the Auburn University campus. The in-service phase involved approximately 100 persons who participated in a series of seven conferences of two days duration each. The resident phase participants also participated in these conferences. Throughout all activities an attempt was made to relate program activities to currently existing problems and to minimize the dysfunctional aspects frequently associated with leadership development programs.

METHOD

The Method section of this report presents a description of activities which initiated the project. It then presents other project activities in a chronological order, ending with conclusions and recommendations which are the result of the evaluation process.

Development of the Proposal

On May 27, 1968 the chief administrators of all Alabama Junior Colleges, the Director of Research and Higher Education, Alabama State Department of Education, and representatives of Auburn University met in conference at Auburn University to discuss the leadership development needs of Alabama Junior Colleges and to outline a program to meet those needs.

This meeting was successful in structuring guidelines for the development of a leadership program. The conferees emphasized the need not only for a resident program but also for a concentrated program of in-service activities to assist those persons who were in leadership positions and who, because of the press of on-going activities could not be spared to participate on a full-time basis.

As a result of this conference Auburn University agreed to develop a program and a proposal for financial support under the provisions of the Educational Professions Development Act. A cooperative proposal was developed and approved by the consortium on August 26, 1968. In January 1969, the United States Office of Education awarded the consortium a grant of $250,000 to conduct a leadership development program for one year.

An Advisory Committee was selected during the months of February and March 1969. The membership of this committee included representation from all member institutions of the consortium and each of the leadership specialties the project sought to serve. The committee held its first meeting on May 15, 1969 at Auburn University to establish the schedule, agenda, method of operation, and methods of evaluation for the seven state-wide leadership conferences which constituted the in-service phase of the Program for Leadership Development of Junior College Staff. The minutes of this meeting are attached as Appendix C. (APPENDIX DELETED)

It was this committee's efforts, together with the cooperation of the State Department of Education and the administrative teams of the participating junior colleges that provided the basis for development of the program and the instructional materials which supported this project.

The Advisory Committee met for the second time on January 8, 1970 at Huntsville, Alabama to conduct a mid-program evaluation and recommend changes. No changes in program content and format were indicated. However, a modification in the schedule was adopted. The minutes of this meeting are attached as Appendix D. (APPENDIX DELETED)

Recruitment of Participants

The recruitment effort consisted primarily of the announcement of the program through selected media and mailing of brochures to the participating institutions. Brochures were also mailed to universities, junior colleges, and State Departments of Education in surrounding states in order that a modest number of participants for the resident program could be obtained from other systems. Recruitment for the in-service

program was handled through the chief administrators of the cooperating institutions. Each institution was responsible for selecting the leadership team to represent their respective staffs. A total of ninety-nine participants were involved in the in-service phase. This number included all who were nominated by the institutions.

Enrollment data for the resident phase is reflected in Table 1.

TABLE 1

ENROLLMENT DATA FOR RESIDENT PHASE

Inquiries Received	175
Applications Mailed	175
Completed Applications Received	51
Well Qualified Applicants	48
Applicants Offered Admission	24
Applicants Enrolled	20

Participant Selection

The Admissions Committee, consisting of members of the Project Staff and a member of the Advisory Committee, met on April 14, 1969 and made final selection of the participants. Four who were among those originally selected declined and were replaced by alternates. No attempt was made to compile biographical data on the in-service participants. However, detailed information concerning the resident participants is presented in the project evaluation part of this report under Description of Participants.

Development of Evaluation Procedures and Instruments

The process of developing evaluation procedures and instruments was guided primarily by the first two objectives as stated in the original proposal:

1. Improve the competency of each participant in his own specialty.
2. Increase the awareness of each specialist of the role of his specialty in the scheme of the junior college and the relationship of this specialty to the other specialties and the total enterprise.

Instruments and procedures for evaluation were developed and/or selected by the Project staff. These were combined with the use of the U. S. Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form. The principal evaluation effort was directed toward the resident group because there was more control over this group and the experiences were more extensive and varied than those of the in-service group. Evaluation of the in-service group was limited to the responses to the Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form. Detailed analysis of the resident phase is the subject of a doctoral thesis which will be completed by early 1971.

Description of the Evaluation Instruments

Instruments were utilized to determine the participant's;

1. Gain in knowledge acquired from the program.
2. Modification of attitudes and beliefs.
3. Ability to critically analyze the performance of himself and members of his team.
4. Satisfaction with the content, presentation and operation of the program.

In addition, certain personal data were obtained from the applications and other records associated with enrollment in graduate studies. Each

resident participant engaged in quarterly conferences with the Project Director during which time individual progress was reviewed and suggestions received as to program modification.

The instruments used are described below:

Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form

This form was developed by the U. S. Office of Education and furnished each participant. Copies of the completed evaluations were provided the Project Director and the U. S. Office of Education. The instrument is designed to provide demographic data, career goals, assessment of program activities, and a narrative summary evaluation.

Inventory of Junior College Information

This was a locally developed instrument which was intended to inventory general knowledge of the comprehensive community junior college. It consisted of 137 items drawn from the literature but was of limited value because of the lack of adequate measures of its validity. The instrument was given at the beginning and end of the resident year.

Competency Profile

This instrument was developed to assist participants in evaluating themselves and their teammates in the performance of duties as members of the leadership team of a simulated junior college. The instrument consisted of 46 items which sought to evaluate personal qualities, leadership competencies, knowledge of the task, and attitudes. Each student was required to evaluate himself and each of his teammates twice during the year. The results of these evaluations were held confidential and are not a part of this report. Only the project director was privy to all evaluations. The results as applicable to each participant were

discussed by the Project Director and the participant involved. A copy of the instrument, rating scale, and instructions for its use are attached as Appendix E.

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values

This instrument was used to measure the "relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality: the theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious." This instrument was administered to each of the resident participants at the beginning and end of the project year to determine any shifts in values which may have occurred as a result of project experiences.

Group Cohesiveness: A Study of Group Morale

This instrument was used in an attempt to determine the effect of introducing change into the group, the extent of dissensions in the group, and the cohesiveness of the group. This instrument was also administered at the start and close of the resident year.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

This instrument is designed to measure the extent to which a person's belief system is open or closed. Since the project sought to open the belief system of the participants, this instrument was administered to each resident participant at the beginning and end of the program.

GNC Educational Views Inventory

This instrument was used to measure attitudes toward instruction and was administered on a pre-test/post-test basis.

Data produced by the above instruments are discussed in the section on Evaluation.

Operation of the Program

The project was designed to operate in two separate but interrelated phases. The resident phase was conducted on the Auburn University campus

during the period June 10, 1969 and May 31, 1970. The in-service phase was conducted at various locations in Alabama during the period October 1969 and May 1970.

The Resident Phase

The residence phase of the Project was designed to accomplish two major objectives. First, each of the participants was expected to increase his competencies in his own field of specialization. Second, in order to combat the dysfunctional aspects of over-specialization which often result in problems of communication and, in some cases, even a lack of mutual respect, program activities were designed to give each participant a better awareness and understanding of and appreciation for the role of other administrative specialists in the total operation of the institution. (See Appendix F for typical four-quarter program for each specialist.)

The residence phase provided stipend assistance to twenty students representing the five major specialities necessary for the effective operation of a community junior college. The specialties were general administration, academic administration, technical or career education, business management, and student personnel services. Participants were selected so that each of the five specialities were represented by persons who either had work experience in that particular area of specialization or who aspired to a leadership position in that specialty and were recommended by their president or supervisor. In addition to each participant's being recommended by the chief administrator of his institution, each applicant was personally interviewed by a member of the Project staff and was approved by the Project admissions committee. See Description of Participants for detailed information.

Program Content and Activities:

The residence phase of the Project extended over a twelve-month period beginning on June 10, 1969, and ending on May 31, 1970. Project activities included special, between-quarter experiences in addition to the scheduled activities which generally coincided with the regular academic calendar of the University.

In addition to formalized courses in the various specialities and in supporting areas (e.g., curriculum, foundations of education, the behavioral sciences, etc.), special experiences and courses were arranged for Project participants so that specific objectives could be achieved. Each quarter's activities are described below.

Summer Quarter, 1969: Prior to the beginning of classes, the participants underwent three testing sessions utilizing different instruments. The results of these pre-test data were used as a part of the evaluative criteria for the Project. (See the section of this report on Development of Evaluation Procedures and Instruments for a detailed description.)

Other pre-class activities included extensive counseling and orientation sessions, both group and individual, regarding the University itself, the purposes of the Project, and the career goals and appropriate curricular programs for each Project participant.

During the quarter each participant enrolled as a full-time student with a course load of from 16 to 17 quarter hours. All participants registered for a special section of the regularly offered course IED 665, The Community College. This course dealt specifically with the history, philosophy, and development of the junior college and the problems and issues confronting the junior college educator today. (See Appendix G for course descriptions of the higher education sequence.) As an added

dimension to this special section, one day per week was devoted to change and how the change process might be facilitated in the community college setting.

Early in the quarter the Project participants were divided into four administrative teams representing hypothetical junior colleges. Each team consisted of a President, a Dean of Instruction, a Dean of Career Education, a Dean of Student Personnel Services, and a Business Manager or Director of Business Affairs. (Each team was permitted to alter the titles of the various roles if they felt other titles more appropriate.)

A large room was made available to the Project on a year-round basis and was furnished with desks, bookcases, filing cabinets, etc. The participants, then, arranged the room so that each team was provided desk/work space as a team so that they could work together on team projects and problem-solving activities.

During the period between the close of Summer quarter and the start of the Fall quarter, five participants were assigned duties in the Division of Research and Higher Education, Alabama State Department of Education in order that they could become familiar with the procedures followed by that office in operating the state system of junior colleges. This three week period was invaluable to each team representative as the teams began their practicum experiences as a simulated institution in the Alabama system.

Fall Quarter, 1969:

During the pre-class period of the fall quarter, Project participants were introduced to the use of simulation, role playing, in-basket techniques, and case studies. All of these techniques were new to most of the

participants and a familiarity with these procedures was deemed necessary if maximum benefit was to be received from the extensive simulation problems which were to follow.

Each participant took a full course load of 15 quarter hours which included one common-experience course, AED 659, Practicum in Area of Specialization. This course consisted of a simulated junior college problem. Participants were provided with educational, demographic, and business and industrial data for a small city and its surrounding area. They were given enabling legislation, minimum planning funds, and their own administrative team as a staff. Each team was provided with a "consultant" who was a member of the Project staff. In addition to weekly meetings with the total group, the separate teams met frequently both with their "consultant" and by themselves.

Beginning with the basic data provided, each team was required to plan surveys, select a site, plan campus development, and develop a curriculum. Planning began, of course, with the establishment of a college philosophy and set of objectives. Staffing patterns were developed as were criteria for the selection of faculty. The organizational structure of the college was developed, and so was a mechanism for faculty participation in the governance of the college. An operating budget for the first year was developed and facilities planning was carried to the schematic diagram stage. All of these activities were geared to a hypothetical opening for the college of September, 1970.

While the above activities -- and the myriad auxiliary tasks that preceded and parallelled each major activity -- were conducted separately by team, progress reports were made during weekly group meetings so that each team received practically continuous feedback from the other teams, its "consultant", and the other members of the Project staff.

Original plans called for each team to submit a "Development Plan" for the simulated college at the end of the fall quarter. Because of the detail and in-depth planning which evolved from the simulation, the staff extended the deadline until January 30, 1970, so that the typical Plan could be more fully developed. (See Appendix H for a typical development plan.) (APPENDIX DELETED)

In addition to the common-experience course described above and the other, regularly offered courses in which the participants were enrolled, several other activities were provided. Each Project participant attended the two "drive-in" workshops which were conducted as the fall portion of the in-service phase of the Project. (See the section of this report entitled "In-Service Phase" for a complete description of these activities.)

Four participants and one of the Project staff also attended a workshop on Audio-Tutorial Instruction sponsored by Purdue University and featuring such well-known authorities in the field as Posthelwaite and others.

One of the high points of the fall quarter was a week-long field trip during which the 20 participants and the staff visited five junior colleges in Florida. The colleges which were visited were selected because of some "lighthouse" or innovative program or practice which they offered. An additional selection criterion was that each program visited should have some direct applicability to the Alabama system of junior colleges. Table 2 lists each institution visited and the particular aspect of that institution's program which was felt to be most meaningful to the Project participants.

TABLE 2

Field Trip Activities

Institution	Location	Program/Topic
North Fla. J. C.	Madison, Florida	Learning Resources Center (Extensive utilization of audio-tutorial aids and materials in instruction)
Florida J. C.	Jacksonville, Florida	1. Multi-Campus Organization (Large "central" staff but strong campus autonomy) 2. Emphasis on Career Education
Daytona Beach J. C.	Daytona Beach, Fla.	Vocational and Continuing Education Programs
Santa Fe J. C.	Gainesville, Fla.	1. General Education Core built around a required course in Human Behavior. 2. The Planning Process (Extensive faculty involvement over a 3-year period in total campus planning)
Lake City J. C.	Lake City, Florida	Compensatory Education Program

Winter Quarter, 1970: Each participant took a full course load of 15 quarter hours which included one common-experience course, AED 659. This course was designed as an extension to the simulated junior college development problem and included introduction of new variables and problem situations to the exercise.

As explained in the narrative describing the fall quarter, this simulated problem actually telescoped a full year of developmental planning -- from September, 1969, to the beginning of classes in September, 1970 -- into a little more than one academic quarter. When the development plans were submitted on January 30, each team was then directed to assume acceptance

of its general plan and the time frame for the problem was moved forward to September, 1970.

During the remainder of the quarter, the simulation dealt with problem situations introduced on a weekly basis. For example, the simulated community college faced problems such as faculty discontent, student dissent induced by off-campus radicals, very low enrollment in planned occupational curricula and overcrowded transfer classes, rejection of some innovative approaches by a tradition-oriented governing agency, problems associated with the racial composition of the student body, etc. The problems associated with accreditation and the accreditation process were also introduced.

Project participants also attended three drive-in workshops conducted as in-service experiences for practicing administrators and faculty of Alabama junior colleges. They also participated in the annual meeting of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges.

Student personnel administrators from each team attended the national conference of the American College Personnel Association in St. Louis.

Spring Quarter 1970: Each participant registered for a full course load which included a common-experience course, AED 651, Internship in Area of Specialization. Requirements for this course involved three discrete activities. The first was a weekly group meeting devoted to internship coordination and other group activities. (For example, one requirement was that each participant prepare and present a scholarly paper or speech to the other Project participants. The speech topics and the identity of the simulated audience were selected by the Project staff with a twofold purpose. One of the objectives was to improve participants' skills in public speaking, and the other was the broadening effort of having to

gather data and support arguments for a topic area in which the staff felt the participant needed additional work. (See Appendix I for samples of the speeches.)

The second activity involved each team spending 1-2 days per week for a two-week period observing and working in the Division of Research and Higher Education, Alabama State Department of Education. That office has immediate responsibility for the administration of the state system of public junior colleges. Project participants experienced a wide variety of activities and worked directly with the professional staff of the State Department of Education. It is a tribute to the caliber of work which the participants performed that some recommendations which the administrative teams made as a result of their experiences have been adopted by the State Department of Education and others have been recommended to the State Board of Education for adoption.

The third phase of the Internship required that each team engage in an actual problem-solving activity or project with an operating junior college. Each team spent a minimum of one day per week for five weeks on the campus of an Alabama junior college. The tasks assigned to the teams and the institutions with which they worked are outlined in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Internship Experiences

Institution	Location	Activity/Project
Mobile State J. C.	Mobile, Alabama	Planned a community services survey including development of draft instrument. Conducted pilot business and industrial survey aimed at identifying job opportunities for graduates of occupational programs.

TABLE 3 (Cont'd)

Internship Experiences

Institution	Location	Activity/Project
Lurleen B. Wallace State J. C.	Andalusia, Alabama	Worked with President and faculty in planning a new learning resources/general purpose classroom building.
Patrick Henry State J. C.	Monroeville, Alabama	Conducted a community survey aimed at collecting data to support added services in a community service and continuing education program.
Northwest State J. C.	Phil Campbell, Alabama	Assisted in gathering data for and preparing a grant proposal for a general cooperative community development project.

In addition to the activities listed above, Project participants attended the statewide in-service workshops which were conducted during the spring quarter. Representatives of each team and a staff member attended a conference on community services sponsored by the American Association of Junior Colleges and held at Clearwater, Florida.

At the end of the year's activities, extensive post-testing and evaluative sessions were held. These results are found in another section of this report.

The In-Service Phase

The in-service phase of the Project was designed to bring together administrative teams from the Alabama junior colleges so that leadership skills could be improved and brought to bear on the problems common to all the colleges within the state. No other organization exists whereby junior college leaders routinely meet periodically to share ideas and concentrate their leadership skills on existing problems.

Seven workshops were held at various locations within the state. The workshops, two days in length, attracted practitioners from throughout the state. Sixty-six educators - representing seventeen public and two private two-year colleges, registered for extension credit for the workshop experiences, but total attendance at the conferences averaged over one-hundred. Table 4 indicates the various specialities represented in the group which registered for graduate credit. Several of the college presidents and deans who regularly attended possessed terminal degrees and did not register for credit. Therefore, they are not shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Specialities of In-Service Participants --

Extension Credit Participants Only

Position Held	Number Registered
President	8
Dean of Instruction	9
Dean of Students	10
Business Manager	9
Other Administrators	8
Div./Department Heads	10
Student Personnel Worker	4
Faculty Member	8

The general topics for the seven conferences were selected by the Advisory Committee, and the workshop format was largely designed by the Project staff. Evaluation of the conferences was continuous and minor changes were frequently made at the suggestion of the workshop participants. While nationally known consultants were used extensively in the workshops, program formats were such so that a minimum amount of time was devoted to lectures and large-group activities and maximum opportunities were provided for small-group interaction with both resource personnel and Project staff.

A complete program listing all activities and sub-topics is attached (APPENDIX DELETED) as Appendix J. However, Table 5 reveals the major theme of each conference and the primary resource persons utilized.

TABLE 5

In-Service Workshop Topics and Consultants

Dates	General Theme	Consultants	Location
Oct. 9-11	"The Program and Scope of the Junior College"	Dr. C. C. Colvert Prof. of Higher Ed., University of Texas	Auburn University
Nov. 13-15	"The Junior College Environment: The Student and His Social Setting"	Dr. Jane Matson, Prof. of Ed., Calif. State College at Los Angeles	Mobile, Alabama
Jan. 8-10	"General Education and Education for the Marginally Prepared Student"	Dr. Robert Wiegman Dean, College of Ed. Florida Atlantic University Dr. Johnnie R. Clarke, Asst. Dean of Academic affairs, St. Petersburg (Fla.) Jr. College	Huntsville, Ala.

TABLE 5 (Cont'd)

In-Service Workshop Topics and Consultants

Dates	General Theme	Consultants	Location
Feb. 12-13	"Occupational Education in the Community Junior College"	Mr. Kenneth Skaggs Amer. Assoc. of J. C. Dr. Dewey Adams Assoc. Prof. of Ed. N. C. State Univ.	Decatur, Ala.
Mar. 26-27	"Improving Instruction in the Junior College"	Mr. Roger Garrison Chairman, Lang. & Lit. Department Westbrook (Me.) J.C. Dr. John Roueche Dir., Reg. Ed. Lab. for the Carolinas & Virginia	Montgomery, Ala.
Apr. 16-17	"Administration and Decision-Making in The Junior College"	Dr. Harold Hopper, President, Virginia C. C. Mr. Bennet Hudson Past Pres., Fla. Assoc. of Public Jr. Colleges & Instructor, Manatee (Fla.) Jr. College	Enterprise, Ala.
May 14-15	Research and Planning	Project Staff	Montgomery, Ala.

Project staff members took an active part in all the conferences; e.g., served as discussion leaders, on panels, and presented papers on selected topics. In addition, the twenty participants in the residence phase of the Project attended all of the workshops.

The February Conference was scheduled to immediately precede the annual meeting of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges. The Project staff and participants were actively involved in the interest groups and other programs of the Alabama Association.

PROJECT EVALUATION

The project evaluation was both objective and subjective in nature and was designed to determine the participant's:

1. Gain in knowledge acquired from the program.
2. Modification of attitudes and beliefs.
3. Ability to critically analyze the performance of himself and members of his team.
4. Satisfaction with the content, presentation and operation of the program.

Data used in evaluating the program were collected by use of the instruments described earlier and are summarized on the following pages. None of the data have been subjected to statistical analysis at this time. A complete evaluation of the resident phase of the project is the subject of a doctoral thesis and it was felt to discuss findings would be premature and possibly prejudice the research. A copy of pertinent portions of the completed thesis will be forwarded later to the United States Office of Education and made available to interested persons or agencies. Presentation of the data concerned with evaluation of the project will be in the following order: (a: data concerned with the resident phase; and (b) data dealing with the in-service phase.)

Description of Participants

The following data provide a brief tabular description of the participants. The data reflect primarily the status of the resident phase participants. There was no attempt to extract information as to degrees, areas of study, etc. for the in-service participants. A list of resident and in-service participants are found in Appendix K and L respectively. (APPENDICES DELETED)

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION BY COLLEGE OF IN-SERVICE

RESIDENT AND IN-SERVICE PARTICIPANTS

COLLEGE	RESIDENT	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN-SERVICE
Alabama Christian	-	3
Albert P. Brewer	-	2
Alexander City	1	9
Cullman	-	2
Enterprise	1	6
Gadsden	1	5
George C. Wallace	1	2
James H. Faulkner	1	6
Jefferson Davis	-	3
Jefferson State	1	14
John C. Calhoun	2	6
Lurleen B. Wallace	-	3
Marion Institute	-	2
Mobile	1	7
Northeast	2	5
Northwest	-	4
Patrick Henry	1	5
Snead	-	5
Southern Union	1	6
Wenonah (Now Lawson)	1	1
Other Including		
Out of State	2	-
Outside Education	3	-
State Department of Education	1	1
Total	20	97

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY

POSITION HELD AT TIME OF ENTRY

POSITION	NUMBER RESIDENT	IN-SERVICE
President	-	16
Dean of Instruction	2	16
Dean of Students	1	13
Business Manager	3	9
Other Administrative	1	11
Div./Dept. Chairman	5	15
Student Personnel	2	2
Faculty Member	3	14
Other	3	1
Total	20	97

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT

PARTICIPANTS BY AGE

AGE GROUP	NUMBER	PERCENT
50 and over	2	10
40 - 49	2	10
30 - 39	11	55
20 - 29	5	25

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY SEX

SEX	RESIDENT		IN-SERVICE	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Male	19	95	89	92
Female	1	5	8	8

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS

ACCORDING TO HIGHEST LEVEL OF STUDY

AT TIME OF ENTRY

LEVEL OF STUDY	NUMBER
Master's Plus	9
Master's	10
Bachelor's	1

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS

ACCORDING TO MASTER'S DEGREE

AREA OF STUDY

AREA OF STUDY	NUMBER
Administration	3
Student Personnel Services	5
Vocational-Technical Education	2
Business	1
Mathematics	4
Science	3
English	1
No Masters Degree	1

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS

ACCORDING TO ADMISSION TO DEGREE PROGRAM

AT END OF PROGRAM

LEVEL	NUMBER
Doctorate	13
Educational Specialist	2
Not Pursuing Degree	5

Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form.

This instrument was completed by 19 of the resident participants. All respondents were in agreement that the program was integrated with their previous background and experience and that the program was about the right length. In general they reported the use of their time as being primarily devoted to participatory activities with a minimum being spent in listening to lectures. The next highest use of time was devoted to individual and group independent study.

Data concerning program activities are summarized in Tables 13 and 14. It will be noted that the participants felt that the most important aspects

TABLE 13

RESIDENT GROUP RANKING OF ITEMS IN

SECTION C OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

		RANKING					
ITEM	N/A	1	2	3	4	4	N
CONTENT	4	6	2	2	2	3	19
ATTITUDE CHANGE	1	10	8	-	-	-	19
METHODOLOGY	3	2	2	7	3	2	19
CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNING	6	1	2	2	5	3	19
COMMUNICATION	1	10	5	1	1	1	19

of the program involved attitude change and development of communications skills followed closely by content. The strongest elements of the program were group rapport, followed by quality of full-time staff and staff-participant rapport. In fourth place was the learning atmosphere which was established. It is disappointing to note that one of the weakest elements was the internship experience.

TABLE 14

RESIDENT GROUP RANKING OF ITEMS IN

SECTION D OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

	RANKING					
ITEM	N/A	A	B	C	D	N
LEARNING ATMOSPHERE	-	9	10	-	-	19
ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	4	4	8	3	-	19
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	-	5	14	-	-	19
INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCES	-	2	9	7	1	19
FULL-TIME STAFF	-	11	8	-	-	19
PART-TIME STAFF	9	6	3	1	-	19
CONSULTANTS	2	7	10	-	-	19
FACILITIES	-	8	9	2	-	19
GROUP RAPPORT	-	12	6	1	-	19
STAFF-PARTICIPANT RAPPORT	-	11	8	-	-	19
ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS	-	1	17	1	-	19

KEY:

A - Exceeded Expectations

B - Met Expectations

C - Did Not Satisfy Expectations

D - Major Area of Weakness

Typical comments contained in the summary evaluation of the Participant Evaluation Form were as follows:

Perceptions of Major Strengths and Weaknesses

Major strengths of the program:
The excellent staff.
The similation experiences.
The observation trips.
The excellent visiting consultants.

Major weaknesses:
Too much supporting course work was designed for public school and not for junior colleges.
A lack of social activities, but this is probably the fault of the participants rather than the faculty.

The principal strength of the Leadership Program was the members of the staff. Their knowledge, educational experiences, flexibility and teaching ability were deciding factors. Principal changes in the participants' educational philosophy are directly attributable to them.

The core educational experiences provided for the participants was another major strength of the program. This common knowledge base will have an impact upon the administration of junior colleges for years to come.

One of the weaknesses of the program was the lack of sufficient emphasis being given to the junior college in courses other than the core courses. Because many of the students were secondary majors the emphasis tended to be in this area. The Florida tour was the most useful experience.

The major strength of the program lies in the organization of the participants into teams of junior college administrations. This organization provided the student with opportunity to growth in realistic and practical terms.

Total group meetings and report sessions were too lengthy and comprehensive to be as beneficial as possible.

The group activities were the most useful experiences. I was able to learn as much from the group as I was from the books. There was nothing that was a complete waste of time. A little more planning on the part of the State Department of Education could have made that particular part of the internship activities more beneficial.

I think that one of the major strengths has been through the team approach to administrative problem solving. A second strength has been the degree of realism inherent in the problems that the team was assigned. A third strength has been the interaction of the 20 participants in sharing experiences and ideas.

The major weakness to me was the lack of evaluation of the practicum exercises through conferences and feedback from the group and the staff to define strength and weaknesses of each solution. Subsequent problems might have been more effectively dealt with if they had related more closely to the original solution.

Strenths:
Group cooperation and rapport.
Enhanced knowledge and understanding of junior college program and philosophy through simulated exercise.
Field trip experience.
Teaching staff and consultants.

Weakness:
Lack of coordination in internship activity.

Most Useful Experience:
Simulated college exercise and field trip.

Least Useful Experience:
Activity concerning accreditation.

The major strength was in the group interaction. Here formal and informal discussion helped to emphasize and strengthen the concepts of the junior college. Most of this was carried on during the simulated exercise of developing a junior college.

The major weakness in the program was the last quarter in-service training program. (Internship)

Specific Changes Recommended

Changes I would like to see are:
More junior college courses to support the Junior College Leadership Program.
I think everyone should be required to live on campus. This would increase work efficiency, plus foster more socialization among the group members and families.

Change the internship to a block of time with a minimum of formal classroom instruction so that more time could be spent on working actual problems at certain institutions.
Shorten the simulation problem instead of dragging out over two quarters.
Provide for more courses in which all of the participants are together and the content oriented toward junior colleges rather than elementary and secondary education.

More courses should be limited to junior college participants. Or more emphasis should be given to the junior college in courses outside the core program.

Provisions of adequate clerical staff for the group participants. More career and educational counseling should be provided for the participants. Greater co-ordination with various state agencies and universities for participant placement and employment.

I would like to see more group visits to individual schools. I think that I would prefer to visit as an administrative team most time.

More emphasis on the evaluation of the practicum simulation project.
Internship activities more closely related to individual areas of specialization.
Addition of curriculum courses more closely related to needs of junior college students.
Greater emphasis on federal programs, areas of eligibility, preparation of projects, etc.
Provide space for individual teams to work privately.

Grouping by common job interest for a portion of the institute experience.
Better planning for internship phase.
Additional visitations and/or field trips.

More emphasis given small group discussion of people with similar interest - strengthing the internship phase - a change in roles of various teams so as to better understand the "problems" related to each area.

Was Program Justified?

Yes. Without the experiences I have received in this program my chances of moving from the instructor ranks into a leadership position in a junior college would have been small. I am sure I am now better prepared to assume a leadership role due to the excellent instruction, similation experience, and intern experience I have received through this program. Also, I have made some lifelong friends which I will be contacting from time to time throughout my career.

Yes, I feel that through the experiences provided that the total scope of the junior college is more clearly understood. I also feel that through these broadening experiences, I will be a much improved administrator.

Without a doubt, this program was crucial to my career development. Prior to the program, my philosophical orientation was in secondary education. Early in the program, I came to understand the role and function of the junior college in higher education; this alone has opened new vistas for me. For the first time I have come to a full understanding of some problems and issues in junior college administration.

Yes. Organizational and managerial skills were enhanced. Personnel area was strengthened by further exposure to various policies and procedure. In general my knowledge was broadened and increased sufficiently to justify the time spent in the program.

I may never earn an extra penny for attending the program; however, the personal satisfaction is worth more than money.

Yes. I feel that this program has adequately utilized my prior training and experience and has provided a realistic program based upon these factors that has greatly expanded my knowledge and qualifications. I think that I have learned much about administration and especially how to deal effectively with other members of an administrative team.

My experience as a participant in the Junior College Leadership Development Institute has served as a milestone in my career. I have increased not only in knowledge and understanding of the junior college movement and philosophy, but also in knowledge of needed changes in Alabama's junior colleges toward which I may be able and will attempt to contribute. While it was not a major emphasis of the institute, I have now fulfilled the requirement of residency for the degree of Doctor of Education and feel that once I achieve the degree, I can function more effectively in my position in an Alabama junior college.

Yes. This program has caused me to take a more comprehensive view of the junior college. Also the in-service phase which brought in administrators from various junior colleges in the state helped me to gain greater understanding of the objectives and purposes of the Alabama junior colleges.

Inventory of Junior College Information. This instrument was completed by each resident participant. An item analysis of both pre and post test responses was conducted which resulted in the elimination of 40 items. There is considerable doubt as to the value of this instrument but the results hold some interest if the reader takes into account that the instrument has not been normalized. Table 15 presents a comparison of the mean scores for the resident group on a pre-test and post-test basis. There was a mean gain of 6.25 points with a reduction in variation among scores.

TABLE 15

RESIDENT GROUP SCORES ON

INVENTORY OF JUNIOR COLLEGE INFORMATION

N	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST		CHANGE
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
20	70.55	5.76	76.80	3.74	+6.25

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values. Each of the resident participants completed this scale at the beginning and end of the year. The results shown in Table 16 are interesting in that they indicate some considerable change in three areas. Apparently the participants became more pragmatic, developed greater appreciation for aesthetics, and improved their level of social awareness.

TABLE 16

RESIDENT GROUP SCORES ON

ALLPORT-VERNON-LINDZEY SCALE OF VALUES

VALUE	PRE-TEST MEAN	PRE-TEST SD	POST-TEST MEAN	POST-TEST SD	CHANGE
THEORETICAL	43.30	6.53	39.60	5.93	-2.70
ECONOMIC	42.40	6.12	41.05	6.69	-1.35
AESTHETIC	29.50	4.71	32.25	7.45	+2.75
SOCIAL	41.85	4.97	45.15	7.86	+3.30
POLITICAL	45.15	6.33	44.45	6.17	- .70
RELIGIOUS	37.80	8.38	37.50	7.91	- .30

N = 20

Group Cohesiveness. Goldman's instrument was used as both a pre-test and a post-test for all 20 resident participants. The mean scores for the group are reflected in Table 17. The "Hawthorne effect" was apparently operating since the mean pre-test score exceeded the national norm at the 99th percentile by more than four points. This effect was apparently constant because the group cohesiveness had improved at the end of the program with variability remaining nearly constant.

TABLE 17

RESIDENT GROUP SCORES ON GROUP COHESIVENESS

(GOLDMAN GROUP MORALE SCALE)

N	PRE-TEST MEAN	PRE-TEST SD	POST-TEST MEAN	POST-TEST SD	CHANGE
20	66.8	4.93	71.2	4.89	+4.4

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. This instrument was used in an attempt to determine if the experiences of the resident group would cause the group

to become more open. Table 18 reveals the mean results. Apparently the experiences did affect the openness of the group but with wide variability among the scores.

TABLE 18

RESIDENT GROUP SCORES ON ROKEACH

DOGMATISM SCALE

N	PRE-TEST MEAN	SD	POST-TEST MEAN	SD	CHANGE
20	-25.90	23.08	-39.35	22.96	-13.45

GNC Educational Views Inventory. The mean results of resident participant responses to this instrument is shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19

RESIDENT GROUP SCORES ON GNC

EDUCATIONAL VIEWS INVENTORY

N	PRE-TEST MEAN	SD	POST-TEST MEAN	SD	CHANGE
20	91.00	10.89	86.35	6.29	-4.65

Evaluation of In-Service Phase

As explained earlier, the formal evaluation of the in-service phase consisted of the Participant Evaluation Form. Informal evaluation was almost constant as a result of the excellent rapport which was developed between the participants and the Project staff.

Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form.

This instrument was completed in a usable fashion by 89 of the in-service participants. There was general agreement that the program was integrated with their previous background and experience and that, on balance, the program was of the proper length. There was not as much agreement among this group as to the amount of time spent in various

program activities but this was to be expected due to the size and varied interests of the group. Informal "feedback" during the year assured the Project staff and advisory committee that the format and content of the conference series were appropriate to the needs and interests of the group as a whole. There were, of course, some expressions of dissatisfaction during the year but these were quickly resolved as best as could be with group desires taking precedence.

Data summarizing evaluations of program activities are found in Tables 20 and 21. The in-service group confirmed the evaluation of the resident group in the view that attitude change and improved communications were the most important aspects of the program. The principal strengths of the program as seen by this group were: staff-participant rapport, group rapport, quality of full-time staff, the learning atmosphere, and program effectiveness in that order. There appear to be no significant number of participants who felt that their expectations were not satisfied.

TABLE 20

NON-RESIDENT GROUP RANKING OF ITEMS IN

SECTION C OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

ITEM	RANK N/A	1	2	NOT USABLE OR NOT REPORTING	N.
CONTENT	26	17	18	28	89
ATTITUDE CHANGE	-	39	26	24	89
METHODOLOGY	7	7	10	65	89
CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNING	9	5	13	62	89
COMMUNICATIONS	2	40	22	25	89

TABLE 21

NON-RESIDENT GROUP RANKINGS OF ITEMS IN

SECTION D OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

ITEM	RANK N/A	A	B	C	D	N/R	N
LEARNING ATMOSPHERE	-	35	52	2	-	-	89
ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	1	17	69	2	-	-	89
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	-	29	52	1	-	7	89
INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCES	53	6	14	4	-	12	89
FULL-TIME STAFF	15	40	34	-	-	-	89
PART-TIME STAFF	27	17	41	3	-	1	89
CONSULTANTS	_	27	57	5	-	-	89
FACILITIES	1	22	60	4	1	1	89
GROUP RAPPORT	-	48	37	1	-	3	89
STAFF-PARTICIPANT RAPPORT	-	53	34	2	-	-	89
ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS	10	9	62	3	1	4	89

KEY:

A - Exceeded Expectations

B - Met Expectations

C - Did Not Satisfy Expectations

D - Major Area of Weakness

A random selection of comments contained in the summary evaluation of the Participant Evaluation Form were as follows:

Perception of Major Strengths and Weaknesses

The program was varied enough so that it was of interest to those who attended. Practically every phase of Junior College work was discussed. Program was moved from one part of the State to another so that we could become better acquainted with out potentials. Consultants were well qualified to work with groups assigned. Too many people had to be away from school at one time. The program was of such depth that it had much to offer participants.

The format of each conference gave participants the opportunity to hear outstanding consultants, participate in small group discussions, and react to various questions or comments raised during the conference. The quality of consultants and the outstanding contribution they made to the program was a major strength. Participants gained valuable knowledge by hearing these outstanding "keynote speakers" from various sections of our country and were helped immensely by being given the opportunity to discuss problems with all consultants in the small group meetings and individually. Another major strength of the program was the association with other junior college personnel over the state of Alabama. The most useful experience was participating in the March Conference concerning "Improving Instruction in the Junior College." The information presented on individualized instruction, instructional objectives, and learning resources proved very helpful. Dr. Roger Garrison's presentation on Improving Instruction in the Junior College contained many helpful ideas that I will put into practice in the college I am associated with. I considered the summary reaction as the least useful experience.

Strengths:
Presentation of post-secondary education problem areas and subsequent discussion of these areas as they relate to the actual state-wide Junior College system. Enhanced to a great degree communications among all Junior Colleges in the Alabama system.

No major weakness noted.

The major strength of the program was: (1) the appropriateness of teaching techniques; (2) administrative arrangements for high quality updating in the subjects for two-year colleges; and (3) high quality consultants.

The weakest points were three ill-prepared consultants.

These conferences have been the most stimulating and informative educational experiences in my career. The program was outstanding in its entirety. Consultants were established authorities in community college work.

The only weakness I see is the fact that the whole administrative team was away from our institution attending the conferences.

Communication.
Rapport.
Quality of instructors.

No major weakness except travel involved.

Specific Changes Recommended

So arranged that not too many from each school would be away at any one time. Some method to take care of travel expense of participants. Perhaps could be arranged for fewer meetings for longer periods of time. Seems now that more faculty and staff members should be brought into the program.

If the program were to continue I would suggest the following changes:
Eliminate summary reactions and use a planned evaluation session.
Opportunity be given for participants to meet in their own special areas of interest at least once during the conference.
Reduce the number of small group discussions.
Utilize better the talents and experiences of the participants.

Only major change recommended would be a constant centrally located site for the conference.

The training program was well planned and expedited. Perhaps a more specialized approach to a particular field for various administrators would be more helpful.

I would like to see some provision whereby a part of the administrative team of the participating institution could attend at a time.

Meet in a central location.

Was Program Justified?

I feel that it is an excellent program. It has done a great deal to develop attitudes which will enable us to move forward in setting up a program that will serve all those who wish to attend our schools. I have a greater in-depth knowledge of the philosophy and purposes of the Community College. All members of administration seem to be better prepared for their jobs.

The opportunity of participating in the junior college leadership program was an excellent experience and certainly justified the time I devoted to it. The professional knowledge and experience gained enabled me to be a more effective administrator. Too, ideas gained have been shared with our total faculty.

Definite enhancement in that outside consultants provided one source of possible problem solutions and this, coupled with the entire state system being represented, considerably expanded my base of knowledge and experience in the solution of problems of Junior College administration.

Definitely. Although each participant was hard-pressed for sufficient time for study and preparation, the levels of administration in the two-year colleges have been enhanced and improved as a result of this type training.

Yes. The experiences were very relevant to the dynamic junior college programs now and of the future. All of the conferences were very rewarding.

Yes, brought the junior college programs in other states to Alabama, and should help us to avoid any errors in programming.

SUMMARY

This project was designed to meet the immediate needs of leadership personnel of new and developing junior colleges in Alabama. The need was addressed through two separate but interrelated programs which emphasized the use of the leadership team. The team approach sought to reduce the barriers created by specialization and to develop procedures which could apply specialties in concert to formulate and implement policies leading to the optimum development of Alabama junior colleges.

The dysfunctional aspect of leadership training programs was recognized. In an attempt to eliminate problems arising from the separation of the resident participants from daily routine, special sequences involving simulation, field trips, and internships were designed and placed into operation. Moreover, the resident group were made an integral part of the in-service phase and participated in the in-service programs on an equal basis.

The common experiences sequence of the resident program was well received and placed high in the evaluations. Group rapport and a sense of common purpose apparently developed to a significant degree among both the resident and in-service groups. While the "Hawthorne effect" may have been operable in the resident group, it is not believed to have been significant in its effect on the in-service group since this was a more disparate group which met infrequently.

Many of the resident group felt that some of their courses were unrelated to the junior college. While this may have been true, it is felt that exposure to experiences dealing with education in general and to specific areas other than the junior college was necessary in order

to fully understand the role of the junior college in the educational system. Among the in-service group, there was a feeling that the entire leadership team should not be required to be absent from the campuses at one time. While this may have created some anxiety, it is felt that removing the entire team as a unit to examine problems and possible solutions on a subjective basis may be one of the more significant aspects of the project.

Conclusions

The conclusions are as follows:

1. The consortium approach to planning, proposal development, program planning, and program execution was successful.
2. The development of programs which maximize the employment of the team-approach in solving simulated problems adds realism and interest and leads to elimination of barriers caused by specialization.
3. The use of a common experience core provides the basis for teamwork and leads to greater understanding of the application of specialization to common problems.
4. The participants of both phases of the project generally were well pleased with the over-all operation of the project.
5. There is evidence that the participants plan to implement change as a result of their participation.
6. The internship experiences must be carefully developed and supervised if they are to be fully effective.

Recommendations

Based upon the experiences of this project and the evaluation, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Proposals and programs for junior college staff and faculty development should be developed jointly by the junior colleges and the institution conducting the program.
2. Where feasible, resident programs should be an integral part of in-service program and vice versa.
3. The use of a common experience program involving the several specialties necessary in junior colleges should be central to any leadership development program.
4. Maximum use should be made of simulations and field experiences to add realism and stimulate interest.
5. The team concept should be expanded to include faculty and other instructional and support personnel.

APPENDIX E

AED 659

PERIODIC EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL

Periodic evaluation, an integral part of practicum, has several purposes.

1. It gives each student an opportunity and an occasion for self-evaluation.

2. Concurrently, each student will have the benefit of a parallel evaluation by his instructor.

3. When working with a team or group, each student has an opportunity to evaluate the team members. (Evaluation of other personnel in the junior college organization is considered an important function of any administrator.)

4. It provides self and colleague evaluation which is considered essential to the professional growth of an administrator.

Since it is considered an opportunity for learning and growth, it is intended that this evaluation be conducted in a threat-free atmosphere. All evaluation records will be handled personally by the project director. He will schedule a conference with each member of the project group for the purpose of discussing the results of the evaluation. There will be no other dissemination of the information.

COMPETENCY PROFILE RESPONSE SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS

Each student is provided five response forms. He will rate himself and the other four members of his team. Be sure to identify both the evaluator and the subject of the evaluation.

The forms are to be given to Dr. Moore

COMPETENCY PROFILE

1. Skill in delegating authority and responsibility to others.
2. Ability to inspire confidence of subordinates.
3. Listens attentively to ideas of fellow workers.
4. Actively seeks the opinion of fellow workers.
5. Accepts the suggestions of key co-workers.
6. Keeps abreast of new concepts in education.
7. Maintains open communications with superordinates.
8. Understands and accepts the functions of complementary community agencies.
9. Open to new innovations in education and willing to apply new ideas.
10. Actively engaged in professional organizations.
11. Emphathetic to the problems of teachers and students.
12. Actively seeks the most qualified personnel for tasks.
13. Verbal and written communication is easily understood.
14. Genuinely cares for other people.
15. Actively engages in community activities.
16. Respects the right of student dissent.
17. Places the rights of the individual above the institution.
18. Maintains a sense of humor and has the ability to laugh at self.
19. Accepting of changing social habits of young people.
20. Refrains from publicly making value judgments about fellow personnel.
21. Has abiding respect for scholarship and erudition.
22. Maintains a scholarly interest in the "disciplines".
23. Understands the impact of technology on education.
24. Keeps abreast of international affairs and realizes their impact on human behavior.

25. Desists from forcing own values on others.

26. Emphathetic to the problems of minority groups.

27. Treats all persons alike regardless of ethnic or religious affiliation.

28. Treats non-professional school personnel with dignity and respect.

29. Subscribes to the doctrine of academic freedom in the classroom.

30. Gives dimension and direction to group meetings when serving as leader.

31. Skill in participating in group endeavors when official status is not exercised.

32. Social graces and personal grooming requisite in our society.

33. Clear-cut understanding of the total scope of the modern college program.

34. A commitment to continuous growth in service.

35. Insight into objectives of the junior college curriculums.

36. Understanding of objectives, curriculum, organizational procedures, methods, materials, and major issues confronting junior college education.

37. Understanding the philosophy of the junior college and its history.

38. Knowledge of effective procedures for assuring constructive participation by citizens in shaping the college programs.

39. Knowledge of specific practices and procedures in organizing the total program of junior college (e.g., knowledge of the units of the various types of organization of public and private junior colleges, as 6-3-3, -2, etc.).

40. Knowledge of the basic provisions for financing public and private junior colleges.

41. Knowledge of continuous flow of the literature in education, particularly in the junior college.

42. Abilities in the location, interpretation, evaluation and application of pertinent research evidence on educational problems.

43. Knowledge of personal attributes and qualifications of a junior college administrator.

44. Content knowledge in major fields involved in educational administration; e.g., finance, curriculum, etc.

45. Ability to gather and interpret pertinent information about the community.

46. Technical-level skill in performing managerial duties of a president, dean, etc., in a junior college.

COMPETENCY PROFILE

Subject _____ Evaluator _____

1. Least characteristic of him (me).
2. Somewhat characteristic of him (me).
3. Characteristic of him (me) on occasion.
4. Characteristic of him (me) often.

	1	2	3	4
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				
21.				
22.				
23.				
24.				
25.				
26.				
27.				
28.				
29.				
30.				
31.				
32.				
33.				
34.				
35.				
36.				
37.				
38.				
39.				
40.				
41.				
42.				
43.				
44.				
45.				
46.				

APPENDIX F

Typical Four-Quarter Course of Study for Each Administrative Specialty

Presidents or Academic Deans

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AED 697 Student Personnel Work in Higher Education
AED 670 Supervision of the Instructional Program
SY 608 Organizational Analysis

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
SP 673 Seminar in Discussion
VED 608 Administration of Vocational and Practical Arts Education
AED 692 Constitutional, Statutory and Judicial Foundations of Education

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
AED 683 The Leadership Role in Educational Administration
AED 618 Organization and Administration of Higher Education
VED 413 Nature of Adult Education

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
IED 666 Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education
AED 686 Administration and Policy Formulation
AED 688 School Finance and Business Administration

Student Personnel Administrators
(All participants in this specialty possessed at least a Master's Degree in Counseling or Guidance prior to admission to the Project.)

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AED 697 Student Personnel Work in Higher Education
SY 608 Organizational Analysis
AED 670 Supervision of the Instructional Program

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
VED 608 Administration of Vocational & Practical Arts Education
CED 631 Group Procedures in Counseling

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
CED 653 Counseling Programs in Higher Education
AED 618 Organization & Administration of Higher Education
VED 413 Nature of Adult Education

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
AED 692 Constitutional, Statutory and Judicial Foundations of Education
FED 617 Advanced Educational Psychology
AED 685 Administrative Organization and Behavior

Heads of Academic Division

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AED 670 Supervision of the Instructional Program
2 courses in their academic discipline

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
VED 608 Administration of Vocational & Practical Arts Education
AED 683 The Leadership Role in Educational Administration
1 course in their academic discipline

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
FED 617 Advanced Educational Psychology
IED 648 Advanced Study of Curriculum & Teaching
1 course in their academic discipline

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
IED 666 Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education
VED 413 Nature of Adult Education
1 course in their academic discipline

Heads of Technical Divisions

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AS 662 Social Systems and Communities
VED 608 Administration of Vocational & Practical Arts Education
AED 697 Student Personnel Work in Higher Education

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
AED 670 Supervision of the Instructional Program
VED 413 Nature of Adult Education
VED 652 Curriculum and Teaching in Vocational, Technical, and Practical Arts Education

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
FED 617 Advanced Educational Psychology
IED 648 Advanced Study of Curriculum and Teaching
AED 618 Organization and Administration of Higher Education

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
IED 666 Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education
VED 602 Teacher Education in Vocational and Practical Arts
AED 683 The Leadership Role in Educational Administration

Business Managers

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AED 688 School Finance and Business Administration
PO 635 Seminar in Public Administration
AED 689 Educational Plant Maintenance

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
AED 683 The Leadership Role in Educational Administration
EC 650 Economic Seminar
VED 608 Administration of Vocational and Practical Arts Education

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
AED 618 Organization and Administration of Higher Education
AED 692 Constitutional, Statutory and Judicial Foundations of Education
AED 693 Personnel Administration

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
AED 690 Educational Business Management
AED 685 Administrative Organization and Behavior
AED 686 Administration and Policy Formulation

APPENDIX G

Course Descriptions - Higher Education Sequence

IED 665 - The Community College

The rise and development of the community or junior college in American education, its philosophy and functions; specific attention to the transfer, terminal, and community-service functions. Includes problems of organization, curriculum construction, staffing and instructional procedures.

IED 663 - The American College and University

(Also an introductory course. Not normally required of junior college majors.)

Philosophy and function, the university and social change, the community college, academic freedom, student-faculty-community relationships; international flow of educational ideas, government cultural programs, higher education and the state.

IED 645 - Problems of Teaching the Marginally Prepared College Student

Socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds as they affect learning styles of the marginally prepared student. Develop methods of appropriate teaching strategies as a means of improving the self-concept of these students.

IED 666 - Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education (Course title presently being changed to The Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction)

The development and selection of appropriate curricular materials and effective teaching strategies. Evaluation of instruction and learning effectiveness in undergraduate programs of higher education.

AED 618 - Organization and Administration of Higher Education

A course designed for educational leaders in higher education to provide a study of the organization, administration, and evaluation of institutions in higher education in terms of the academic program, student personnel services, business affairs, and related programs. Includes the relationship between higher education and the state and federal government.

AED 651 - Internship in Area of Specialization - (This course was used for the field experience component of the Project described in detail in the Residence Phase, Spring Quarter section of this report.)

Provides advanced graduate students with full-time, supervised, on-the-job experiences in a school, college, or other appropriate setting. These experiences will be accompanied by regularly scheduled, on-campus discussion periods, designed to provide positive evaluation and analysis of the field experience.

AED 659 - Practicum in Area of Specialization (The extensive team problem-solving and simulation activities were conducted in this course. See the section of this report entitled Residence Phase, Fall and Winter Quarter, for a complete description of these activities.)

The practicum provides advanced graduate students with supervised experiences with emphasis on the application of concepts, principles, and skills acquired in previous course work.

AED 697 - Student Personnel Work in Higher Education

A study of theories, principles, practices, organization, administration, and evaluation of student personnel services in higher education.

APPENDIX I

Samples of Selected Speeches/Papers Presented as a Requirement in AED 651

Topic	Simulated Audience	Presenter
"New Approaches to Faculty Evaluation"	Workshop for New Junior College Presidents and Deans	Charles Pendley
"Cooperative Occupational Program: A Boom to Industry and Education"	Alabama Association of Chamber of Commerce	Ronald Griffith
"Repair, Renew, and Rehabilitate: New Vistas for the Community Junior College"	Alabama Commission on Higher Education	Harold Underwood
"A Comprehensive Program of Faculty Development: The Key to Effective Instruction:	Workshop for New Junior College Presidents and Deans	William Blow

Presented by Charles M. Pendley (AED 651)

NEW APPROACHES TO FACULTY EVALUATION

The Credit Department of the Hudson's Bay Company received this letter from a Canadian farmer: "I got your letter about what I owe. Now be pachant. I ain't forgot you. When I have the money I will pay you. If this was the Judgement Day and you was no more prepared to meet your maker than I am to meet your account you sure would go to Hell. Trusting you will do this."

I feel just about as unprepared as the farmer, but let me extend congratulations to all of you for your recent appointments as deans and presidents of Alabama junior colleges. I am glad to see that political affiliations are no longer the prime determinants in being chosen for such positions. Alabama has come a long way in the Junior College movement but there are new horizons to face and new tasks to explore and conquer. My topic represents one of these: New Approaches to Faculty Evaluation.

Evaluation naturally connotes a "rating" or a "grading" process. All of us are familiar with the stigmas and anxieties prevalent here. How often have we heard some instructor say, "I don't like giving tests any more than you like taking them"? But we must face it; faculty and administration are cast in the same roles. This problem is as unique in the Junior Colleges as the Junior Colleges themselves are unique. These colleges enroll a variety of students. Most of them, to borrow a term from the biologists, are still in the pupa stage awaiting metamorphosis. They are still in the process of identifying their personal, educational, andvocational goals. A few of them are self-propelled with definite direction and purpose. Others require persuasion and skillful cultivation of tentative interests. For this process to occur there must be teachers who are capable and willing to identify these

tentative interests and cultivate them. We must have junior college teachers who can do this and we must be able to measure them.

Teacher evaluation itself is no new concept but a number of factors have been responsible for its recent renewal. Some of these more important reasons are the improved economic and working conditions of the teaching profession as a result of professional negotiations. Some may prefer to call it collective bargaining. Call it what you wish, but the majority of you here today can recall a time when the paychecks were considerably leaner and proration was not an unheard of exotic beast. As we gain status and reach out to mature as a full-fledged profession we must police our ranks much as doctors and lawyers do to get rid of the incompetents, the frauds, and malpractitioners. Our improved conditions also reflect a feeling that the taxpayers are wanting to be reassured that the increased expenditures for salaries and relief from nonteaching duties have produced a better quality of instruction. We claim to do more and better teaching than any other institution. Let's be sure we are, by keeping our ranks filled with the best.

Let us speak candidly about this business of teacher evaluation. The primary purpose should be to improve instruction but the ingredients of this process are rewards and punishments. I do not mean monetary values alone. There are others. To look at it in a different perspective nullifies our whole efforts.

I see this evaluation process involving three groups; the administrators, the faculty, and the students. The interactions among these groups must be lively and sincere with all problems being mutually solved. Neither group, not even two, can do an effective evaluation alone. It takes the three. Even with all three working harmoniously

no one has yet found a completely satisfactory answer to the question, "Who is a good junior college teacher"?

Today it is estimated that more than ten thousand new junior college teachers are needed annually. Several universities and colleges have proposed models for turning out qualified graduates. But somehow we still don't have them. Cohen and Brayer assert that the junior colleges themselves must take a larger responsibility for preparing their own instructors. Edmund J. Gleazer says: "There can be no question about the need for junior colleges to marshall their own expertise and to devise rational and logical ways to measure faculty performance in order that instruction can be improved.

An agglomerate of measurement devices, samples, and statistical techniques have been used to study teachers. The so-called subjective ratings find themselves in competition with the objective scales. Over a long span of years hundreds of investigations have been conducted to determine a way of looking at teachers and teaching situations that could be standardized and subject to duplication. So far the efforts have not produced such a standardization that is representative of the wishes of the profession, or acceptable to more than one group. I think that this is good, because you still have the freedom to devise one of your own and tailor it to your needs without fear of chastisement by foreign groups.

PURPOSES

Let us move more fully into evaluation and expand its purposes. I think that we can incorporate all of our purposes into ten stated objectives. They are:

1. To stimulate improvement of individual performance.

2. To establish evidence where dismissal from service is an issue.
3. To decide on reappointment of probationary teachers.
4. To recommend probationary teachers for permanent status.
5. To select teachers for promotion.
6. To decide on reappointment of permanent teachers.
7. To qualify teachers for longevity pay.
8. To qualify teachers for regular salary increments.
9. To qualify teachers for acceleration on the salary schedule.
10. To establish the qualifications for merit pay.

These really represent the rewards and punishment facets, but hopefully the overall purpose is to improve instruction.

CRITERIA

There are two ways that we may look at measuring this faculty performance. One is the output method. Here we determine how many of our students we retain and graduate, how many of these transfer to four-year colleges and succeed, and how many of the others are successful in their jobs. It seems to me that this is the most difficult to evaluate. It's true that we can collect the data involved here but even when we do this it is difficult (and often too late) to correlate this information with an individual faculty member's performance. Here we would be evaluating the college or faculty as an entire unit.

The other method is one that I have alluded to previously: that of measuring individual faculty performance. I would like to review some of the standard criteria that have been used and then mention some new ones for your consideration.

Supervisor rating. Perhaps the most practical approach to teacher eval-

uation is through supervisor ratings. Evidence tends to suggest that in spite of the many predictive efforts based on ratings made by colleagues, students, or independent researchers, that evaluation by campus supervisors consistently prove to be the best available yardstick for predicting the success or failure of the neophyte teacher. However, this only evaluates the instructors and practically excludes them and the students from participating and without this there is little initiation on their part in improving instruction which we claim as our goal.

Ratings by Degrees. Much attention is given to the question of academic degrees when the evaluation technique is being formulated. Some colleges now are beginning to consider types of attained degrees (e.g., were the degree requirements oriented toward preparation of the junior college faculty member?) as well as the size and kinds of degree-granting institutions. Since you require the Master's as a minimum degree I suggest that you begin to give serious consideration to the aforementioned thoughts whether you adopt or do not adopt proposals that I will make later.

Ratings by Colleagues. Such procedures as these are often informal and their value has yet to be documented. However, on the surface they appear to have some merit, if nothing more than they meet little resistance from faculty members. Perhaps this portion of evaluation should best be kept as informal as possible because I really believe that it works best in such a setting.

Self-Evaluation. This is perhaps the most difficult of all the processes. Yet, it can be the most rewarding if the evaluator assumes a degree of maturity and objectivity. This is difficult to attain fully and there

are some who find it altogether impossible. One must be careful to avoid a circular route here. Brown and Thornton tell us that college teachers can best evaluate themselves by such procedures as: studying their products; introspection; consulting with their colleagues, recording class sessions, and the extent and quality of student participation.

Student Evaluation. Evaluation of instructors by their students has been a practice for several years now. But only recently has it come into vogue on a large scale. This has happened in spite of somewhat cynical opinions among some teachers toward student judgment of them. Questionaires, checklists, and rating forms have been used extensively by students at different colleges for some time. Stecklein reported that for 800 colleges that he surveyed, that 40 per cent regularly used student ratings and that an additional 32 per cent were considering their adoption at that time.

Such ratings, of course, are subject to many of the criticisms leveled at other measures based on nebulous criteria. For example, how does the student know when he has been "well-taught" or what the "image" of his instructor should be? But, I submit that these students have better conceptions of these nebulous terms than we are willing to admit and that student evaluation is essential.

Community Participation. This is a somewhat new concept but for the community college teacher I think that it is highly applicable. For the teacher to relate to his community he must participate in its activities. I am not suggesting that a high or disproportionate rating should be given for participating in church and civic activities but I am suggesting that such participation correlates well enough with his

teacher effectiveness in your junior college to warrant recognition.

Keeping Abreast of Current Philosophies. I would like to encourage the following as a part of your overall evaluation. Each teacher should do three critiques of recent articles to be submitted to the evaluation committee. Two of these should come from the American Association of Junior Colleges' Journal and one from the field that they represent on the faculty. You may counter that this is punitive and irrelevant and closely akin to some courses you've had at Auburn University. However, I believe the positive results will offset the negative criticisms.

When you get ready to formulate an evaluation system or to revise your present one, there are several instruments that will be helpful. If you are measuring teacher attitudes, the most widely used instrument is the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. This was developed by Cook, Leeds, and Collis, and is designed to measure those teacher attitudes which will predict how well he will interact with his students and his colleagues, and indirectly tell how satisfied he is or will be with the teaching vocation.

Other techniques or instruments used for this purpose include the Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory, the Minnesota Personality Scale, and the Rorschach.

You will be able to find many different techniques and styles of teacher evaluation as you attack the problem. But, I believe that my assignment was to introduce new approaches to faculty evaluation. I believe that just about anything you new presidents and deans do could be considered new in Alabama. I know that most of your colleges have an evaluation form of some kind but the results of these evaluations in

the past have been sterile and without significance.

I would further suggest that in establishing or revamping your evaluation processes that you and your people should work for a system that would have criteria applicable statewide for, let us arbitrarily say, 60 per cent of the measurement and 40 per cent of it at the local level. I do not see this as being in conflict with my previous statement in reference to each institution being allowed to establish its own criteria. The reason that I propose a statewide portion is that you are all part of a system that determines objectives and goals on a somewhat universal basis. There would be plenty of room in the 40 per cent balance for you to individualize. I believe that this technique would meet hierarchical expectations as well as the rank-and-file. Having the major portion of your performance based on statewide criteria would keep some institutions from going "too far out" and should induce the others to at least do something. Please keep in mind that I am not advocating that you do this alone. Involve your faculty and selected students in establishing a system in co-ordination with the State Department of Education. Your individual college's evaluation team would remain totally responsible for the administration of this system.

After you accomplish this I would like to ask you presidents and deans to consider three proposals that are connected with faculty evaluation. The first is pertaining to tenure. I am familiar with your present tenure policy that allows you as presidents and deans to recommend faculty members for tenure after the third year at your college. Presently one can gain tenure whether he is a dud or a master teacher. The status that tenure presently carries in your colleges is second to none, that is, "next-to-nothing". And I submit to you that you have inherited duds who should never have been considered for tenure. Heaven

forbid it being granted to them.

Secondly, I would urge you to push for merit pay, making use of your evaluation and in turn making your evaluation more meaningful. I say to you that you could have merit pay with your present austere budget. First of all, merit incentives do not increase the budget as much as you conceptualize. For a faculty of 50 members who averaged $10,000.00 yearly, a merit increase of 5% for everybody would only cost $25,000.00. I will hazard an assumption that if you really audited your expenditures for the past year that you could come up with a waste or non-essential expenditure of 10 to 15 per cent of the last fiscal year's budget, a total that is well over the amount required for merit pay.

Finally, I propose that you make use of your evaluation to introduce academic rank in your junior colleges.

Now, in conclusion, let me urge you and your evaluation teams to constantly revise and upgrade your evaluating system. Annual revision adds virility to it but if this appears impossible then make every effort for at least a biennial revision.

Thank you.

REFERENCES

1. Alabama Junior College Policy Manual.

2. Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. Measuring Faculty Performance. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1969.

3. Evaluating Teacher Performanee. ERS Circular No. 3, 1969.

4. Nunnery, Michael Y. Faculty Evaluation--Some Poorly Considered Musings. A transcript of a presentation made at the Florida Community Junior College Inter-institutional Seminar on Institutional Research, May 20, 1969.

COOPERATIVE OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS:
A BOOM TO INDUSTRY AND EDUCATION

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to take part in your 1970 annual state-wide conference. During the years, the businessman and educator have steadily increased their living and working relationships. This has proved good for us and the country as well. I plan to deal more directly with this growing relationship today. My sincere hope is that my remarks will boost all of our earlier efforts and provide a spring board for additional action in this regard.

My topic today, cooperative occupational education, which permits a student to combine his classroom course work with practical on-the-job experience, is a good example of the growing cooperation between the education world and the world of business and industry. Indeed, industry and the education institutions no longer can be said to occupy different worlds at all -- they are simply complementary aspects of our fast-changing society. It is obvious that in this highly technical era American industry and business could not exist without the highly educated labor force provided by the many education systems. Industry and business on the other hand provides much of the economic support base for education.

It seems to me that this drawing together of the leaders of business and education is one of the most significant developments in this country. Not so long ago, a college professor and businessman were considered as directly opposite to each other as human beings can be. During the day when your dad and my dad were being educated, it was fairly obvious that the school and college campuses were remote from the world of business and industry. College professors often knew almost nothing about the problems of industry and were as intolerant of businessmen as businessmen were of them.

On the other hand, the average businessman would have regarded as ridiculous any suggestion that industry should concern itself with the operation of our colleges and other institutions.

Back in those dark ages, a division existed between the basic outlooks of the educator and businessman. A couple of generations ago, the concern of the businessman for human values was considerably different from what it is today. Few businesses had retirement plans; none had the type of comprehensive employee benefit plans that characterize our companies today. In a nation which for centuries had been expanding geographically and every other way, businessmen were too busy building industries where there had been forests or prairies to look very far beyond the job immediately at hand. The sense of social responsibility which today is such an accepted part of the modern businessman was found only in exceptional cases.

Today's businessman in most instances views his role quite differently. He is growing more conscious of the responsibilities which go far beyond the immediate problems of running his organization successfully. He is recognizing his company's responsibility to help maintain the economic stability of the country; to be concerned in many ways for the welfare of the people his company employs; he knows he must give of his time to help strengthen such basic elements in our society as health and education; and he recognizes the responsibility which he has to promote the welfare of the communities in which he does business. My efforts here today will be to direct your attention to one specific responsibility area which appears to be interwoven throughout all the others. At the moment, the exciting area of cooperative occupational education is rapidly becoming what we may accurately term a "BOOM" in both the education and business communities.

Let us now look more fully at this so-called "BOOM" in business and education. During the remaining time, I think it would be worthwhile to direct our attention to several fundamental aspects. For communications sake we shall look briefly at some pertinent definitions. Proceeding from there I would like to mention briefly some early history, some reported advantages of co-op education, and then glance at some research findings on the subject.

In order that we may more accurately understand this cooperative process, we need a clear working definition of certain selected terms such as: occupational education, industry, co-operate, work experience, and finally the cooperative education plan itself.

Occupational education can be defined as that education which has been organized and provided to students for the purpose of qualifying them for certain jobs or job clusters. Occupational education as we know it today is founded in the Dewey theory of experience, as it recognizes that active participation in normal life activities is necessary to the building of meaningful concepts as a basis for present and future actions.[3]

Industry, on the other hand, means stadiness in toil; the whole establishment of productive enterprise. Again, the key word or words might be "steadiness in toil," for it is with this steadiness that we work toward attaining determined goals for the good of the society in which we live.[8]

By definition, cooperate means to work or act together, as for a common purpose. Cooperation means the act of working jointly. Key words here are "together" and "jointly."[8]

Work experience has been defined by J. Paul Leonard[4] as a practical activity in the production or distribution of goods or services carried on under normal working conditions in business in industry, in professional or

institutional fields, or in the community, to further civic or occupational competence of youth.[4]

Henry H. Armsby has defined the cooperative education plan or program. He has stated that the cooperative education plan is an integration of classroom work and practical experience in an organized program under which students alternate periods (these may vary in length) of attendance at school with periods of employment in industry, business, or government. The employment constitutes a regular continuing and essential element in the educational process, and minimum amount of employment and minimum standards of performance are included in the requirements for a degree or diploma.[10]

The cooperative plan requires that the student's employment be related to some phase of the branch or field of study in which he is engaged, and that it be diversified in order to afford a spread of experience. It requires further that his individual work shall increase in difficulty, and in general shall parallel as closely as possible his progress through the academic phases of his education.[10]

Historically speaking, we know that the cooperative or work-experience concept of education is not really new. Traces of this type of activity where practical work-experience under "normal" conditions occurred as a part of an educational scheme can be found in some of man's earliest attempts to educate the young. In these early days it was known as an apprenticeship education. One of the earliest references to apprenticeship education appeared in the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi 2500 B.C.[4]

Apprenticeship education in America blossomed between 1600 and 1800 and was almost the only means of education for children of the lower classes.[4]

However, cooperative occupation education as we know it today was introduced in America by Herman Schneider, a civil engineer. In 1906, while

at the University of Cincinnati, Schneider introduced one of the first cooperative programs into their engineering department. His pioneering efforts there forced others to follow.[12]

Contrary to some beliefs, cooperative education programs spread modestly at first throughout the United States with a sudden developmental explosion during the last twenty years. In 1960, we had grown to only 60 identifiably cooperative schools. Since 1960, however, this number has more than doubled to about 130. We can find now 75,000 students registered in these cooperative programs who annually earn in excess of $100 million dollars. Junior colleges can presently account for only 20 of these 130 co-op programs, however, almost all of their growth has occurred during the past eight years.[6] Their future looks very bright indeed.

Private schools have made a contribution also. There are several such schools now actively engaged in co-op education. An excellent example of this can be found at the General Motors Institute which was established in 1922.[4]

As if natural growth was not enough, and now a part of current history, the federal government has given cooperative education another shot in the arm. The relatively recent 1968 Vocational Act which was passed by Contgress now sets forth the authority to appropriate money to be used specifically to operate cooperative occupational education programs. It is estimated that federal funds for this part of the Act alone may total $75 million dollars by fiscal year 1972. These are in addition to any state matching commitments.[7] This action alone is truly indicative of the faith in, and commitment for, cooperative education of the future.

In passing, we have noted that cooperative education programs really amount to an attempt to combine learning experiences, theoretical and

practical, into one harmonious pattern. But we have done this hurriedly with only a broad glance as to why. Just what are the rewards for those most concerned -- the student, businessman, and educator? Unless we can benefit or improve our present state of affairs, why even change from our old self-contained classrooms?

Moving from the general to the specific in answering our WHY question, let us first consider briefly some of the more obvious weaknesses that have been detected in our traditional structures.

John L. Fierer[2] has posed the following question. How do you provide students with more "realistic" work experiences (a major recommendation for improving occupational education) when the very nature of American society denies the average youth an opportunity to do any real work? He goes further and claims that the change from an agricultural society to a highly industrialized civilization has all but eliminated the opportunities for a young man or woman under 18 to earn wages. This does not contribute to the understanding of or the successful transition into the world of work. This runs contrary to what we as educators and businessmen have grown to expect from our educational institutions.

This responsibility for work-experience, according to Fierer, has fallen to the schools. In trying to provide these experiences, schools across the country are rapidly accepting the concept of cooperative education.[2] We must, it seems, tie the student's present learning experiences with his future working experiences.

Robert L. Craig, editor of "Training and Business Development Journal," points out that many employees find the product of both present day vocational and general education programs woefully inadequate. Business and

industry, which already pour an estimated $20 billion dollars annually into employee education and development, find that work-entry training must often be remedial to compensate for the lack of relevant skills and knowledge. Such waste of our resources - manpower, time, and money - must be completely eliminated.[11]

In still another attack on our traditional system of education, Grant Venn, formerly of the United States Office of Education, claims that our public schools have been guilty of "selecting out" rather than "selecting in." Many still believe this and argue that we should continue to maintain our efforts directed only at those eager to learn through traditional modes. Venn then asks what is the future for the almost one million youngsters who drop out of traditional high school programs each year?...Today's world has no place for them in his opinion. All in all, we have isolated our adolescents and other groups from the total economic and cultural pattern of society - a major problem. In the last twenty five years, our schools have closed their doors on approximately 40 percent of the Nation's young people.[11]

In a recent publication, "Review of Educational Research," Kaufman and Brown argue for innovation in education by stating that cooperation between the education institutions and the local industries could drastically contribute to a situation of equilibrium in the local labor market.[5] At a time when business and industry are in constant states of change, this balance is long overdue and welcomed.

Specific benefits or rewards that cooperative education programs bring to the three major participants - businessmen, students, and educators, are numerous.

Eilson and Lyons[12] in their book titled Work-Study College Programs, pointed out about four major benefits business and industry reaped from cooperative education:

1. Cooperative programs provide a means of maintaining a flow of trained personnel.
2. Serves as a means to attract promising young youth into their company.
3. Serves to provide a testing ground so employers may identify persons with needed abilities and talents.
4. Improves over-all quality of employees and aids transition from school to the job.

For the student many advantages have been noted. Lupton[6] reports that many students finance their education costs in this manner. The T. A. Edison Foundation[10] reveals that cooperative students are in a better position to determine their aptitude earlier in their career training, thus saving wasted time and money in some cases.

A more complete list of student advantages in cooperative education has been organized by Wilson and Lyons[12] in one of their study reports. They have listed certain distinct advantages for students enrolled in such programs. These include:

1. It furnishes students contacts for later placement.
2. Provides students a head start in salary and position.
3. Provides greater meaning for the total educational experience.
4. Increases student motivation.
5. Provides a student with greater sense of responsibility.
6. Greatly orients students to the world of work.
7. Contributes to greater skills in human relations.

Keith Lupton[6], in a recent article indicates that education benefits tremendously from cooperative education involvement. Lupton stated that the evidence is extensive that cooperative education:

1. Is a favorable influence in cutting attrition.
2. Motivates the students toward higher grades.
3. Has a maturing effect on academic performance.
4. Helps in lessening failure rates.
5. Influences over-all classroom performance.
6. Assists in producing a better quality graduate.
7. Permits better utilization of the educational plant.
8. Courses can be planned throughout the year.
9. Limited financial aid resources are available for greater numbers of students.
10. And costly programs need not always wait the availability of money as community resources (ie. laboratories and equipment) are used instead.

Research in the area of cooperative education has been noticeably limited. This should change drastically during the next few years as these new concepts are put into practice on a much larger scale.

However, while the research findings have admittedly been scarce, there is enough to give us a general indication of success for those that have been in operation. For example, Lupton[6] reported that 50 percent of all cooperative students are now staying with their employers and cooperative students wanted each other. This is a selling point for any program, I would say.

Some earlier studies have also contributed substantially to the arguments for expanded cooperative education in America. A 1927 study made by the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education found that although cooperative students spent 20 percent less time on the college campus than

did regular students there was no marked differences between the two groups of graduates with regard to their progressional achievement.[10]

In another scarce study on the subject, Leo F. Smith[10] of the Rochester Institute of Technology reported in 1944 on their cooperative graduates, the seventh largest program at that time. His findings were detailed as follows:

1. More than 90 percent of the graduates were placed in jobs allied to their major field.
2. Four-fifths of the students reported that cooperative education was more meaningful to them.
3. 75 percent were motivated by job experience.
4. Up to 88 percent stated that they were able to apply their school work to their job.
5. 83 percent reported cooperative education as being of considerable value while only 1 percent reported no value.
6. 87 percent of the graduates stated that they would again elect a cooperative program if they were repeating their education.

Adele F. Schrag's[9] investigation into high school cooperative programs reports that an excellent rapport exists between the business community and the high schools in Philadelphia. About 100 firms in the city employ varying numbers of pupils from 12 senior high schools. During 1968-69, approximately 300 senior high students participated in the cooperative experience.

The most recent follow-up of graduates occurred when the 1967 class was canvassed by questionnaire. Two hundred and twenty seven responded, and 95 percent of these indicated they had been given the opportunity to remain with the companies to which they were assigned during their cooperative experience.

In summary, I only hope you have gained not only some bits of information but more importantly some new insights into the educative process as well. We have seen how all the business community, educators, and students can profit from this cooperative procedure. I hope we leave these conference proceedings determined to be a part of this big "BOOM" involving education and the business world. More specifically, I hope you will return and look once again at your own firm's operation needs in the light of the new cooperative process discussed here. I hope too, that we all will return and share any new understanding and insights with others in our communities so that cooperative education can explode and truly "BOOM" during the seventies.

Finally, we should leave here understanding that a sound comprehensive program of education in our complex society must be designed and organized to reach deep into the very fibers of the community. We must not rest until we make the seventies truly the age of the "cooperative community classroom: and in a complete and total way as Fantini[1] has stated.

> ... the classroom must be expanded to include the community, its problems and resources. Social workers, assembly men, merchants, and industrialists will lend their talents, not as speakers in the school, but as clinical teachers in the real setting of the community."

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Fantini, Mario D., "Schools for the Seventies: Institutional Reform," Today's Education, April, 1970, pp. 43-44.

2. Fierer, J. L., "Needed: Work Experiences for Vocational Students," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education Magazine, February, 1969, p. 23.

3. Gold, Milton J., Work to Learn. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

4. Irvins, Wilson H. and Runge, William B., Work Experience in High School. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951.

5. Kaufman, J. J. and Bowen A. F., "Manpower Supply and Demand," Review of Educational Research, October, 1968, pp. 326-345.

6. Lupton, Keith D., "Campus Stretching Through Cooperative Education," Junior College Journal, February, 1970, pp. 37-39.

7. Minear, Leon P., "A Piece of the Action," American Education, March, 1970, pp. 5-6.

8. Norris, C., "How Education and Industry can Work Cooperatively," National Business Education Quarterly, May, 1969, pp. 36-44.

9. Schrag, Adele F., "Meeting Individual Needs of Office Clerical Students... Through The Cooperative Office Education Program," Business Education Forum, February, 1969, pp. 4-7.

10. Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, Highlights of the Conference on Cooperative Education and the Impending Educational Crisis, New York, 1957.

11. Venn, Grant, "Eye on Tomorrow's Jobs," American Education, March, 1969, pp. 13-15.

12. Wilson, James W. and Lyons, Edward H., Work-Study College Program. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1961.

OTHER SOURCES

Albert, F. D., "Industry's Role in Education," Music Journal, September, 1968 pp. 32.

Bowen, C. R., "Educators Plus Employers: A Team to Meet The Critical Need for Technicians," School Shop, March, 1969, pp. 41-43.

"Businessmen and Educators Talk About Working Together: AMA Education Conference," Nation's Schools, September, 1968, pp. 12-15.

Darcy, R. L. and Powell, P. E., "What Should Students Know About Their Worker Role," The Balance Sheet, October, 1968, pp. 60-61.

OTHER SOURCES (cont'd)

Fellows, D. M., "How Industry Sees Technical Education," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education Magazine, September, 1969, pp. supplement TE-11.

Hayes, P. C., "Values of a Semi-Sheltered Work Experience," American Vocational Journal, November, 1967, pp. 42-43.

Holmes, B., "Industrial and Vocational Training: National and Historical Studies," World Book of Education, 1968, pp. 88-91.

Johnson, F. R. and Brinkman, F. J., "Quality Programs through College-Industry Cooperation," American Vocational Journal, April, 1968, pp. 26-28.

Kelly, R. K., "Experimental Work-Study Program for Disadvantaged Youth," Educational Record, Spring, 1968, pp. 214-220.

McMillion, M. B., "Supervision and Co-op Education," Agriculture Education Magazine, June, 1967, pp. 276-277.

Nennick, F., "Meeting Individual Needs of Office Clerical Students Through Cooperative Office Education Programs," Business Education Forum, February, 1969, pp. 5-7.

Osti, G. L., "Industry and the Public Education System," World Year Book of Education, 1968, pp. 52-57.

Patton, C. D. and Hillen, L. F., "Cooperative Vocational Education," Agriculture Education Magazine, July, 1968, pp. 16-17.

Pearse, B. H. "Business, Industry, and Education, Inc.," American Education, November, 1968, pp. 12-15.

Roser, T. F., "How Education Can Aid Inner City Education," Catholic School Journal, June, 1969, pp. 21-22.

Scheetz, R. B., "Industry's Role in Cooperative Education Programs," Educational Leadership, December, 1967, pp. 216-219.

Shores, J. H., "Federal Government, Industry and Education," Educational Leadership, December, 1967, pp. 211-213.

Sigel, E. "Education Industry: Business and Schools Take a Second Look," School Management, October, 1968, pp. 89-90.

Starrick, J. E., "Supermarket Mid-Management Co-op: A Three-Way Partnership," Business Education World, June, 1968, pp. 14.

Tunley, R., "Work-Study Route to A College Degree," P.T.A. Magazine, November, 1968, pp. 14-16.

Venn, Grant, "Learning Beyond the Classroom," American Vocational Journal, September, 1967, pp. 14-21.

Weier, R. F., "Cooperative Education," Journal of Business Education, November-December, 1968, pp. 71-72, 118-119.

Renew, Repair, and Rehabilitate
An Address by Harold Underwood
Junior College Leadership, April 20, 1970

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to speak to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education. Never before have I had the honor to address such a distinguished group. Dr. Atwell has asked me to speak on the topic, "Renew, Repair, and Rehabilitate." Of the many functions of the junior college, these are three of the most important ones. Although we still put most of our emphasis on the transfer program, as I will point out later, many of our students fall in one of the three areas just mentioned.

Although these three functions of the community college overlap, I will try to divide my talk into the three parts of the title. Even though I will start with "Renew" I do not mean to place more emphasis on one than than the other two.

RENEW:

In a speech made here at Auburn University in 1964, Dean Truman Pierce said, "We have yet to determine whether or not the Alabama system of junior colleges will offer the comprehensive type program or primarily the academic program." I contend that we still haven't decided what our true functions are. Some institutions are becoming more interested in meeting the true needs of the community, but many seem to have a one track mind: transfer education.

As Victor Lanter says in the December 1969, Junior College Journal, the ever changing technology and the acceleration of the applications of

automation are forcing man, lest he become obsolete, to retrain, maybe several times during his life. Also, as science and automation continue to push upward the minimum education requirements in all areas of the labor market, society finds itself faced with a proportionally larger group of adults who must be classified as miseducated, undereducated or uneducated. The same adults, who at one time could, and some did, function successfully as semi-skilled or unskilled labor, have now been forced into a mere subsistence level, both economically and socially.

In many respects, Alabama is like the underdeveloped countries in the world. We have a wealth of natural resources but our education level is low. Alabama has approximately 10 percent of the nation's natural resources, a favorable climate, an abundant water supply, and an outstanding river system connecting to a seaport, all of which could lead to great industrial growth and wealth. Shocking though it may be, one out of five adults in Alabama is sufficiently handicapped in reading and writing capabilities to the extent that his earning skill is seriously retarded.

The 1960 census points up the fact that out of a total of just under two million adults over 18 years of age, better than 43% (856,836) have less than the equivalent of an eighth grade education; 58,570 have had no formal schooling at all. Is it any wonder that Alabama is near the bottom of the list of states economically? These figures alone are reason enough for a strong continuing education program for most of our junior colleges. But, there is more.

As the work day and work week becomes shorter, people have more leisure time. Many people do not know what to do with this tiem. This, plus our growing retired population, gives us a large potential clientele

for such continuing education courses as those in recreation, appreciation of arts, and appreciation of music. There are other areas in junior college programs which could be classified as "Renewing", but I must move to my next point.

REPAIR:

The community junior college is the first institution to offer higher education to the masses. In accepting the open-door policy, the community college commits itself to provide an education for all high school graduates and others who can profit from instruction.

In declaring that we are open-door institutions and have something for everyone we have brought many problems upon ourselves. One such problem is the student who, for various reasons, is assigned to a "remedial" course. He may lack the communication skills or the mathematic skills necessary to be successful in either transfer or career programs. We must somehow place him in the right courses, motivate him, and offer him a program he needs and wants.

My father motivated me by putting me behind a top harrow. I wasn't long in deciding that studying wasn't so bad after all. Unfortunately many of our students today don't have this type of motivation so we must find other ways. To accent our motivation problem is the fact that many of our students come from homes where the parents have very little formal education and see little value in encouraging their children.

How do we determine which students must take remedial courses? It seems most institutions have cut-off scores for standardized tests. John Roueche says students in remedial work suffer from one or more of the following characteristics:

(1) Graduate from high school with a low C average or below.

(2) Are severely deficient in basic skills, ie. language and mathematics.

(3) Have poor study habits.

(4) Are weakly motivated, lacking home encouragement.

(5) Have unrealistic goals.

(6) Represent homes with minimal cultural advantages and low standard of living.

(7) Are the first member of the family to attend college.

A student with one or two of these characteristics has trouble academically, but many of these students have all of them.

The problem of the remedial student becomes acute when reports of actual numbers of students are examined. A state survey reported (according to the California Bureau of Junior Colleges) that of the 270,000 freshmen who entered California's public junior colleges in 1965, almost 70% (180,000) failed the qualifying examination for the college transfer English course. Of the 60,500 enrolled in Mathematics courses in California junior colleges in the fall of 1964, three out of four were taking courses offered in the high schools. Bob Drennen tells me that two-thirds of the students at Jefferson State Junior College take remedial Mathematics.

Who teaches these courses? In many of our institutions the "peck order" technique is followed. The teacher with the most seniority gets first choice. Unfortunately most prefer upper-level courses and leave remedial courses for new, inexperienced teachers.

A special workshop on programs for low achievers, held at the 1967 AAJC annual convention, listed the following qualifications needed by instructors in remedial programs:

(1) The instructor must seek change in the present curriculum or ignore it.

(2) The instructor must understand his teaching field, but more important, he must be able to present the material at the level of the student.

(3) The instructor must be willing to live with the knowledge that many people believe such students have no place in college.

(4) The instructor must give up the belief that to be non-verbal is to be a nonlearner.

(5) The instructor must believe in the educational worth of remedial student.

(6) The instructor must be willing to give up his subject-centered orientation.

Teachers do not acquire these characteristics naturally, they must be trained. We must develop in-service programs and summer institutes as well as make such orientation a part of our junior college instructor training programs.

I must admit that what research we have proves we are doing a poor job remediating students. However, the need for remediation is so great that we can not discontinue our efforts. We must improve our showing in this important function through better planned programs and better qualified faculties.

REHABILITATE:

What do we mean by rehabilitate? As I use the term here, I mean the salvaging of students who are on academic suspension at four-year colleges and universities. Dr. Mark Meadows says, "Perhaps no segment of the

college student population is faced with more perplexities and frustrations than those students who are ineligible to return to their previous institutions and who desire to transfer to other colleges." The doors to another college are usually closed to these students who do not possess that typical criterion for admission of the transfer student---a "C" average at the institution previously attended. For many of these students, academic suspension means the end of their formal education. While waiting their probationary period many will be drafted or take jobs, never to return to school. E. F. McKibbon says, "Human talent is probably our greatest resource; yet our system of recording academic failure and insisting on penance for that failure has severely limited the use of that talent." He suggests a rather drastic remedy; erasure of the grades earned in the original college experience.

Although there are logical reasons to admit the junior college students who are ineligible to return to their former institution, it is difficult to find instances where this has been tried. Mark Meadows makes the following report in "Reverse Articulation", College and University, Fall 1968.

> Administrators of Kennesaw Junior College responsible for the development of admissions criteria had observed the difficulty faced by students ineligible to return to their former colleges. They believed that categorically denying admission to a student declared ineligible by another college in effect allowed the other college to make the admission decision for Kennesaw College. With those factors in mind an experiment was planned in this area.
>
> A policy was established which did not categorically deny admission to the student with a poor record of academic achievement at a former college. In addition to their college transcripts, these students were required to submit the same data (high school transcripts and Scholastic Aptitude Test scores) as if they were applying as entering

freshmen. Through the use of regression equations (based on the equation of sister junior colleges of the University System of Georgia whose graduates had good success upon transfer to senior colleges), a predicted freshman grade point average was computedfor each transfer applicant. If the formula indicated that the student could have been admissible as a beginning freshman, he was considered for admission even though he was ineligible to return to his former institution.

The findings suggest that the "Rehabilitation" or "salvage function" is one that the junior college can perform well. Two-thirds of these students experiences success in the junior college. S. J. Muck found in a study at a California Junior college that 70% of the university and college transfers who were unsuccessful in their initial college enrollment were successful in the junior college.

Now let's look at some statistics closer home. In the summer and fall of 1968, 1,789 students transferred from senior institutions in Alabama to the public junior college. True, many of these students were not on suspension, but I wonder how many were on suspension who were not permitted to register at junior colleges.

Of the 1590 students entering Auburn during the fall of 1963, 322 or 20.3% were not registered during the fall of 1964. These students are not marginally prepared. They have high American College test scores (usually above 23) and have achieved well in high school. With proper counseling and a planned program they can succeed in the junior college. The doors of the junior college should be opened wide to the student who has failed his first attempt at a senior institution. To deny admission to such a student, in all likelihood, results in a waste of human talent.

In summary, I would like to say that I have tried to point out the importance of the functions "repair, renew, and rehabilitate" in our junior colleges. I have discussed our attempts to perform these functions

along with our successes and failures. In conclusion I would like to request that you make recommendations concerning the follwoing to the state school authorities, the governor, and the legislature in your next report.

(1) That each junior college offer a program comprehensive enough in nature so that they will have something to offer every student they admit.

(2) Encourage the establishment of a junior college instructor training program, especially for those involved in remedial and continuing education.

(3) Encourage research and innovation to facilitate the improvement of our instructional programs.

(4) Urge the approval of Dr. Frank Speed's proposal that any applicant who is on academic suspension from another post-secondary institution may be considered for admission to a junior college upon appeal to the college admission committee.

(5) Finally, recommend adequate financing for these and other programs carried on by the junior colleges.

Bibliography

Harlacher, Ervin L. The Community Dimension of the Community College, Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Lanter, Victor, "The Gown Goes to Town," Junior College Journal, Nov. 1969.

Meadows, Mark E., and Ingle, Ronald R., "Reverse Articulation: A Unique Function of the Junior College," College and University, Vol. 44, 1968.

McKibben, E. F., "Round Two For College Dropouts," Junior College Journal, 1967.

Pierce, Truman M., Address, "Problems Confronting Ala. in Meeting the Educational Needs of Post-High School Age Youth and Adults," 1964.

Roueche, John E., "Remedial Education in the Community Junior College," American Association of Junior Colleges, (ERIC) 1968.

Thornton, James W., The Community Junior College, John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

American Association of Junior Colleges, "Selected Papers from the 47th Annual Convention, Feb. 27, 1967, San Francisco.

This is Auburn, Feb., 1970.

Select Data on Students, Alabama Institution of Higher Learning, Alabama State Department of Education, June, 1969.

Presented by William O. Blow (AED 651)

A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: THE KEY TO EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION

When I was asked to speak on this subject, I followed the natural tendency to comb the literature for suitable material. After reading several articles on faculty development and reviewing programs now in effect in several institutions, I was frankly disappointed in what I found. Perhaps my search for information was too limited, or perhaps there are many good unpublished programs of faculty development. Based on my findings, however, I reached the conclusion that faculty development is a relatively neglected area and that there are few, if any, real experts on the subject. I hasten to add that I am not an expert on the subject. What I have to say will be reflection on apparent needs in the area of faculty development, and hopefully a challenge to each of us to give more attention to this crucial aspect of our community colleges.

In considering an approach to this presentation, I recalled the following formula for speech-making: say what you are going to say, say it, and say what you have said. In this presentation, then, I will deal with the following three areas: (1) the importance of faculty development; (2) the major areas of faculty development; and (3) Procedures in faculty development.

The Importance of Faculty Development--The importance of faculty development can hardly be exaggerated. Blocker, Richardson, and Plummer speak to this point in their recent text on the community college:

> The faculty constitutes the professional core of the community college. It translates the philosophy, purposes, objectives, and functions of the institution into meaningful action through teaching, educational

guidance, and quasi-administrative work on committees. Instructors determine the effectiveness of the institution through their contact with students. (1)

Most instructors are not ready for the task of teaching in a community college. Many people say, "select the right people, and your problems will be solved." This is not true. Regardless of how good the people may be who are chosen to be faculty members in your college, they must be developed into a smooth working team. Rarely can a competent junior college faculty be merely "brought together". Most of our instructors come with little or no preparation to cope with the particular teaching problems to be found in junior colleges. Most come from high schools, four-year colleges, or directly from graduate schools. We must conclude that there are no experts on teaching at any level, particularly in junior colleges.

The community college is a distinctive institution and must, therefore, require a different kind of instructor. The community college is not a traditional institution; therefore, its mission cannot be understood, accepted, or implemented by traditionalists. We must assume that the majority of our instructors will come to us with vague or misconceived ideas as to the nature of the junior college and its philosophy.

Major Areas of Development--Next, I shall present some areas of importance in any faculty development program. The list of suggestions which I will present is not intended to be exhaustive, but each area on the list is germane to the successful operation of the community college. I believe we can group this information under three major headings: development in understandings; development in skills; and development in attitudes.

First of all, we should be concerned with the development of appropriate understandings. Much of the problem has not been a lack of courage on the part of faculty members but the lack of clarity in the definition of roles that would make it possible to challenge new faculty people with new areas of responsibility.

Some important understandings would be the following, which I shall present with some elaboration:

(1) The nature of the society in which we live.

(2) The nature of the students who typically attend community colleges.

(3) The junior college philosophy, purposes, objectives, and functions.

(4) The use of various instructional methods and materials.

(5) Basic counseling theory and technique.

(6) The formulation of appropriate course objectives and evaluation processes.

(7) Basic curriculum theory.

(8) Understanding of the major concepts of the subject field to be taught and its interrelationship to other disciplines.

Secondly, we should be concerned with the development of appropriate skills. To a great extent this involves the application of the understandings we have just listed. The skills necessary for successful junior college teaching can be listed under five major headings:

(1) Instructional skills -- techniques of teaching; capability of using a variety of approaches in order to reach the great variety of students; the use of appropriate learning resources; skill in setting objectives; skill in evaluation processes.

(2) Relationship to students -- academic advisement; counseling; supervision of student activities.

(3) Institutional research -- skill in the use of research methods in such areas as student achievement, teaching materials, course structure, follow-up studies, etc.

(4) Relationship to the community -- identification of community needs and interests: effective participation in community activities; interpretation of the college program to the community.

Thirdly, and perhaps most important, we must give attention to the development of appropriate attitudes. Blocker and Richardson have pointed out that most beginning junior college teachers have been conditioned to a great extent by the perception of community colleges by four-year college faculties, by the graduate schools, and by the obvious lack of trappings so important to status in our society. (1) Studies involving community college faculties indicate that many instructors overemphasize the importance of the transfer programs; do not accept the importance of guidance programs; criticize the low admissions standards; fail to see the importance of the college's relationship to the community; feel that there is not enough emphasis on the traditional liberal arts; and feel that the college should become a four-year institution. The community college cannot realize its purpose until such faculty attitudes are eliminated.

What is needed is a faculty that is able to adapt to the student and to the needs of the community; a faculty that is able to think in terms of cooperation with the community; a faculty that believes in student success at all levels of ability and that will constantly search for new methods to achieve success. We must develop instructors who will be challenged by the average or below average student and whose thinking is not restricted to a curriculum handed down by a four-year college. We must develop a faculty that is willing to innovate and to do the additional research to find those programs that will challenge a much larger group of students than the four-year college has ever

attempted to educate. Specifically, I submit the following as desirable attitudes for community college instructors:

(1) Openness to and awareness of the needs of society.

(2) A willingness to accept the challenge of the education of the masses.

(3) Acceptance of the dignity of all people and of all fields of endeavor.

(4) An ardent faith in the ability of man to improve the society in which he lives.

(5) A willingness to abandon tradition in favor of change whenever necessary.

(6) A willingness to experiment and innovate in seeking new and better ways of fulfilling the mission of education.

(7) The ability to accept each individual for what he is and proceed to aid him in the process of becoming open to what he may become.

Techniques of Faculty Development -- I now come to the final point of this presentation. What are some of the things we can do in developing the understandings, skills, and attitudes appropriate for the community college instructor? In a general sense, we should capitalize on the normal desire for personal achievement. Make every faculty member feel important. To do this, you must first be convinced that each faculty member is important. Give every faculty member your complete loyalty. When you can't give a man your loyalty, get rid of him. Good morale is very important to the success of a development program. The person who is happy with his work will be much more productive than one who is not happy. Do everything possible to make the quality of human relations in your college and the working conditions such that high morale will be an outcome.

In all techniques, involve the faculty. Allow them to have a strong voice in determining the kind of developmental program they need.

The program is not merely to produce conformity to the will of the establishment.

Some specific recommendations for a faculty development program are the following:

(1) The recruitment and selection process must bring people together who have the potential for development.

(2) Require a probationary period for new instructors; place them under the care of an experienced faculty sponsor and allow them to spend much time in observation and course development; gradually increase their teaching load as they develop competency.

(3) New teachers should have an orientation period well in advance of the opening of school.

(4) Everyone should be on a twelve month contract with normal holidays and vacation periods. Teach three quarters and use one each year for personal development projects.

(5) Provide educational leaves with pay for advanced study after an appropriate period of service.

(6) Provide for intercampus visitations by faculty.

(7) Workshops throughout the year on carefully chosen projects.

(8) Provide for attendance at conferences, workshops, etc., at other locations.

(9) Provide for a good professional library, developed by and for the faculty.

(10) Institute a program of evaluation of instruction. This is necessary to measure development. Emphasize the measurement of output rather than input. Utilize a variety of evaluation techniques.

I have told you what I was going to say; I have said it; I will now tell you what I have said. I have attempted to emphasize the importance of faculty development; I have presented three major areas of faculty development; and I have enumerated some methods of faculty development. In conclusion, I will simply say that things will not automatically get better. We must work to improve our situations.

REFERENCES

1. Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H. and Richardson, Richard C. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965.

2. Leahy, Howard J. The Improvement of College Instruction Through InService Techniques. Seton Hall College. South Orange, New Jersey, 1948.

3. New England Board of Higher Education. Faculty Utilization and Retention. Boston, 1960.

4. Pullias, Earl V., et. al., Toward Excellence in College Teaching. Dubuque: W. C. Brown, 1963.

5. Siehr, Hugo, et. al., Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1963.