DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 423 JC 740 236

AUTHOR Grede, John F.
TITLE The Untried Model of the Urban Community College.
PUB DATE 21 Jun 73
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; College Planning; *Community Colleges; Decentralization; Flexible Facilities; *Models; Specialization; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

A model for a new type of urban community college is described. It consists of a cluster of five community colleges scattered around the perimeter of a central business district of a large city. Each college concentrates on one of the following specializations: business, creative and performing arts, engineering and industry, health, and public and human service. The model is predicated on several assumptions about urban conditions, the student body, and academic matters. The career education concept is fundamental to the model, which will require a general education unit to serve the career programs. Potential problems exist in, for example, the fact that it will not be as easy to shift specializations, which will necessitate an early career decision by the student. The model's strengths include the following: (1) the separation between academic and occupational programs would be minimized; (2) remedial or developmental programs will relate directly to career programs; (3) the clearly defined basis for each unit's existence makes autonomous operation possible and encourages economical operation; (4) the specialized units promote development of curriculum cores; and (5) the location of the college promotes integration. Reactions of educators to the model are attached. (KM)

THE UNTRIED MODEL OF THE URBAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOHN F. GREDE

JUNE 21, 1973

THE INVISIBLE MODEL OF THE URBAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Statement of the Problem

The rapid growth in the 1960's of multi-unit urban community colleges occurred with little more to guide it than the "establishment" model of the single-unit, small town and suburban community college district. With the wisdom of hindsight it may be that those of us in the big city community college complexes now view with regret our inability to gaze into our crystal balls and develop a more appropriate model than that which has resulted in the polyglot patterns that currently characterize our big city multi-unit districts.

Amid all the variations in patterns there are a few significant elements of consistency. One of these is that urban areas somehow seemed to automatically require multi-unit structures. Even where this eternal verity did not develop logically from the common school concept of geographically distributed neighborhood high schools, it seemed to be accepted and instituted axiomatically as a response to greater concentrations of people. One additional common element, derived from single-unit districts, was the assumption that the effectiveness of the multi-unit system varied directly with the degree of autonomy of each component unit.[1] What the specific mission of each unit was other than simply servicing more students

---

1. Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Governing the Multi-Unit Community College System," Educational Record, Spring, 1973, p. 141.

close to their homes, and how it would fit into the total complex serving the district, was commonly an afterthought left to chance, imitation of previous units, the drive of local administrators, or the variable pressures of agencies and groups from an ill-defined service area. As a result the typical program mix in any one unit tended toward a comprehensive approach with a wide range of "something for everybody".

In retrospect, then, it would appear that the concepts on which the multi-unit urban community college systems were built included:

(1) A complex of several colleges or campuses.

(2) Maximum autonomy for individual units.

(3) Comprehensive educational offerings in each unit.

This was the multi-college concept which its defenders saw as fostering democratic and decentralized decision-making and simplified communications.[2] Viewed from a citywide or system-wide basis, however, it often encouraged duplication of effort, uneconomic small programs, confusion as to responsibility, and wasteful competition between units.

Recognition of alternative models has been slow and late - probably too late to affect much of the existing structure. Only this year the concept of autonomous colleges, with uneconomic duplications and little concern for common goals of the system, was challenged by a well known community college administrator and writer who supports a highly centralized "flagship campus" which stresses a

---

2. "Decision Making in the Multi-Unit College," Junior College Research Review, January, 1972

single institution offering services in satellite multi-campus locations. In his model all planning - fiscal, program, and facilities - is centralized along with the management information system and personnel administration. The campus units administer only the instructional program, the nature and parameters of which presumably would be left to centralized planning.[3]

Another alternative, conceivably a workable compromise between the extremes of multi-college and multi-campus, stresses clear definition of specialized but complementary missions for a limited number of units. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in 1970 made a gesture in this direction and opened the door a small crack.

> "These goals (of community college students) are best achieved in the comprehensive community college.
>
> This does not mean, however, that every community college should conform to a single pattern. In large urban centers there may be a case for some degree of specialization. One institution, for example, might develop a particularly strong curriculum in the allied health professions....[4]

Let us push the door wide open and unequivocally postulate a model composed entirely of specialized units.

---

3. Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Governing the Multi-Unit Community College System," Educational Record, Spring, 1973, pp. 144-1

4. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Open Door Colleges. New York: McGraw Hill, 1970, p. 16.

Capsule of the Model

Envision a cluster of five community colleges scattered around the periphery of a central business district of a large city in a kind of loose educational park. Each college concentrates on one of the following fields of specialization:

Business

Creative and Performing Arts

Engineering and Industrial

Health

Public and Human Service

This is the skeleton. To give it flesh requires first that assumptions implicit in the model be identified.

Assumptions

A rapid, efficient public transportation system, supplemented by expressways, connects the residential areas of the urban complex with the central business district and provides satisfactory commuter service day and evening.[5]

A large population base of young and older adults provides a potential of three thousand to ten thousand student

---

5. One obvious measure of the effectiveness of the public transportation system is the extent to which it is used by the public. According to a public statement of the late George DeLong, Board Chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority, the public transportation system in Chicago carries approximately 65% of all the individuals who come into the Chicago Loop. This figure was only slightly affected by the development and expansion of the expressway system.

headcount per unit assumed as optimal for a sizeable range of programs, economy of operation, manageable size of facility, and parking availability for those not using public transportation.

The distribution of interests within the large potential student population is such that each of the five specialized fields would attract a large enough proportion of the total to warrant its existence as a self-contained, semi-autonomous college.[6]

The adequacy of the potential student body is only one facet of the assumption that the five fields of specialization offer a feasible and logical division of labor on which to base the mission of each college and the organizational structure of the system. First it must be recognized that the labels for the five fields are frankly career-oriented and are based on fairly well accepted community college categories that have emerged from the development of community college occupational programs.[7] These

---

6. In order to document the feasibility of the population base, in the spring of 1972 the City Colleges of Chicago merged its transfer and occupational categories and classified its 16,500 full-time students into the five clusters. Preliminary results indicate that all categories, with the possible exception of Creative and Performing Arts, which tallied 867 students, would readily fall within the 3,000 to 10,000 headcount range. The feasibility of the allocation would be more certain if the 32,000 part-time students were added to the full-time students.

7. Some big city community colleges, Denver and Tulsa, for example, have organized their educational programs on each campus into divisional categories, very closely approximating four of the five specialized fields of the model. Conceivably each division could be expanded to a full campus if conditions warrant it.

labels give increased recognition to the growing national emphasis on career awareness, preparation for careers, and continuing education stressing upgrading, updating and retraining of adult workers. This is the probable emerging priority of community college vocational programs.[3]

There is the further assumption that these five specialized fields provide an easy bridge to traditional academia. In broad perspective they really represent the applied aspects of traditional academic divisions commonly found in post-secondary education. Thus the following relationships appear reasonable:

Career-Oriented Label	Academic Division Label
Business	Business
Creative and Performing Arts	Applied and Theoretical Humanities and Communications
Engineering and Industrial	Applied and Theoretical Mathematics and Natural Sciences
Health	Applied and Theoretical Life Sciences
Public and Human Services	Applied and Theoretical Behavioral Sciences.

This happy congruence is assumed to make for both educational unity and program flexibility through a potentially successful marriage of the theoretical and the applied aspects of human knowledge. In community college parlance the academic and the occupational faculty,

---

3. Analysis made by Lyman A. Glenny, Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, at the 1973 Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Anaheim, California, February 26, 1973.

students, and programs would be brought together within the parameters of a reasonably cohesive field of specialization. Flexibility would be enhanced in that all the common varieties of community college programs - full-time, part-time, credit, non-credit, remedial, day, evening - would be available at each college. Baccalaureate-oriented, occupational, continuing education, and community service programs - the full range of offerings - would be provided in each of the colleges, or related satellites, within the framework of the specialized field which identified the mission of the particular college. In theory a student, once he had opted for a specialized field, could move with minimum "red tape" from longer programs to shorter ones, from college-bound to immediate employment, from job entry preparation to upgrading or updating.

The career education concept, which is fundamental in the proposed model, assumes that general education for personal adequacy and civic competence is as integral a part of education as is specialized job skill development. Therefore, a general education unit, honestly accepting a service relationship to career oriented programs, is essential in each college to provide the breadth of exposure beyond the confines of the specialized field identifying the institutional mission.

Finally there is implicit in the proposed model the assumption that the urban community college, with its obligation of mass community post-secondary and adult education, can profit from

some of the same principles of specialization and division of labor as Adam Smith's pin factory, providing we stop short of an output of students who are standard interchangeable parts of society. The proprietary schools have, after all, expanded at a pace roughly equivalent to that of the growth of occupationally-oriented programs in community colleges. One important key to their success has been specialization.[9]

---

9. Address presented by George P. Doherty, President of Bell and Howell Schools, Inc., at the 28th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, March 14, 1973.

Concerns:

The arrangement of five specialized community colleges does not make it as easy physically to shift from one specialized field to another in comparison to having all programs within a single institution. It does involve the necessity of transfer to another facility, assuming the student wishes to change his major field of specialization.

The model requires an early decision by the student and a commitment to a field of interest, such as health or business. This is potentially a serious problem with the model since a large percentage of community college students are uncertain about career choices. Possibly the current national emphasis on encouraging career awareness as early as the elementary school years will make possible selection of at least a broad area of specialization by the time the student enters the community college.

Greater commuter time is required except probably for a large number of Blacks and Latinos who reside in the close-in older sections of the city. The centrally located institutions would obviously not be as close to home for many, even though relatively few of the students in our geographically-distributed institutions actually walk to college.

There is less opportunity for a close working relationship between a community college and a residential area surrounding it since the five perimeter colleges would clearly not be located where

most people live. Thus the model colleges would probably have more of an impersonal character than is currently true of many community colleges.

The use of the career-oriented labels in the title does involve a risk of the institutions being branded as low status trade schools even though they provide accredited education acceptable for transfer and appropriately categorized as career or co-professional education. In the long run a recognized institutional record of high quality output is the only real answer to the status question.

Strengths

One probable effect of the kind of specialization proposed in the model would be to minimize the traditional and often arbitrary separation of transfer-oriented education with its Associate in Arts degree, and occupationally-oriented education with its Associate in Applied Science degree. Perhaps all that is really needed is the Associate Degree in a specialty, or major, such as Accounting, Music, or Nursing. This eliminates the transfer or terminal connotations and places the emphasis where it should be, on the area of specialization, without defining prematurely whether the student goes on to a senior institution for a baccalaureate degree or completes a shorter program within the community college.[10] The specialized Associate Degree needs to be composed of specific levels and kinds of skill and knowledge organized into modules which have utility in their own right but which also may be assembled like

---

10. The risk for a student in selecting a program not specifically designated as transferable is decreasing. The development of upper division senior institutions, particularly in Florida and Illinois, has created the promise of an alternative system of higher education which accepts all two-year degrees at full value. In Illinois, for example, discussions with both Governors State University and Sangamon State University indicate a strong commitment to accept every two-year program graduate from the community college into an appropriate "capstone" program with full junior year status and no more additional course work required than that appropriate for a native student.
(See G. Ernst Giesecke, An Alternative System of Higher Education in Illinois, Sangamon State University, Springfield, Illinois, 1973.)

building blocks into the full Associate Degree. If such programs are available on a full-time and a part-time basis, coordinated with or at least compatible with paid work experience, then flexibility is a reality in that the student may tailor the amount, pace, and continuity of his specialized education to his own specifications.

The model insures that remedial or developmental programs relate directly to career oriented programs. Thus the utility of remedial work becomes readily apparent to students. The acquisition of basic communication skills would be more palatable to minority group students since it would have an immediate visible relationship to a goal - a marketable job skill - rather than literacy skills acquired for the sake of literacy.

General education, including communication skills, could be subordinated to the mission of the unit and be oriented in each college to the particular needs of students' career choices rather than being the primary emphasis per se as it has been in many traditional community college programs. Communications skills, for example, can be taught with a focus to improve career competency. This may help motivate the acquisition of skills which carry far beyond improved job competency into improved self-image and enhanced social skills.

The emphasis upon a cohesive group of programs within a field of specialization brings together faculty with many interests

in common. In effect the college constitutes a super-division in terms of subject matter compatability. Faculty could obviously better judge their own peers and a better and broader base for comparative evaluation and improved quality would be established.

The specialized nature of each college encourages easy identity and makes the building of a reputation potentially a simpler and more successful process. The institution is more readily recognized and the public image is improved when the mission of the institution is succinctly defined. The concept of comprehensiveness has educational appeal but doesn't readily convey to the public what the institution is all about. Witness the Jones Commercial High School in Chicago which has built its reputation on high calibre students for the secretarial and business fields, or the Fashion Institute of Technology in New York which has specialized in the apparel industry.

The clear-cut sense of mission permits the institution to know precisely what its responsibilities are and consequently to better concentrate its energies in performance of its role. This approach reduces the "something for everybody" concept of the community college to manageable proportions since it confines efforts of each component of the multi-unit system to a reasonably well-defined content area. Collectively, of course, the units do provide "something for everybody," the concept commonly known as comprehensiveness.

The clearly defined basis for each unit's existence makes autonomous operation a reality. With well-defined roles there is probably less competition among the units of the system than when the units are merely mirror images of one another. When all units are doing about the same kind of thing there is increased need for a strong central administration to act as referee, as, for example, when several units wish to develop a prestige program such as nursing while ignoring other programs with greater manpower shortages.

The concept of specialized missions with well defined program responsibilities provides a sound basis for budgeting - in fact it virtually insures a program based-budgeting approach since the very differences among the colleges are in the programs rather than in geographical locations.

Specialization of function encourages economy of operation which permits the concentration of expensive facilities such as laboratories and sophisticated equipment in one location. It maximizes the utilization of teaching personnel as well as support staff such as laboratory assistants. Furthermore, since the varieties of equipment and supplies needed are within a narrower range than would be true with a comprehensive institution, large scale purchasing is more feasible.

The specialized institution promotes easy development of curriculum cores since there are enough students, for example, specializing in health, to make the core which all students would take, academically and economically sound. This encourages common

introductory course work in general education or in foundation courses in the sciences or mathematics. Furthermore, the involvement of faculty in the entire curriculum rather than in individual courses is more practical since there is a very large concentration of faculty with common backgrounds and common objectives. Cohesiveness and cooperation among the faculty in the development of courses and instructional materials would seem to be a reasonable expectation.

The more precise definition of the mission of each unit encourages more effective career choice by concentrating guidance, counseling, and placement efforts on a limited portion of the career spectrum rather than attempting to stay abreast of the entire universe of career opportunities. It may also be that a specialized unit can relate more effectively to counterpart agencies in the market place. Hospitals, nursing homes, and other health facilities, for example, can probably get more effective articulation and better utilization of scarce clinical facilities by working with a single health-oriented unit than with several comprehensive ones.

Ethnic and racial integration is promoted by locating the institutions centrally rather than distributing them among segregated residential neighborhoods which overwhelmingly influence the kind of population mix, or lack of it, which emerges.[11]

---

11. Of seven colleges which comprise the City Colleges of Chicago, only one, the Loop College, located toward the northeastern edge of the central business district, has a relatively stable integrated enrollment. All six others are largely Black or White.

Conclusion

Much of the discussion of the model composed of specialized units is pragmatic. It has grown out of experiences with a multi-unit structure which, after many years, is still struggling to reconcile college individuality, initiative, and responsibility with system integrity and economy. The task is only slightly less difficult than reconciling freedom and order in the larger society.

There are no easy answers and even the one proposed here has real limitations. It is not even easy to generalize about the problem. Nevertheless, in summary it appears that the essence of effective multi-unit urban community college operation may lie in the relationship between unit autonomy and the specificity of mission of each unit. A pre-determined division of labor among units, which collectively offer the full spectrum of community college programs, appears to promise more unit individuality, less competition, and consequently less central office decision-making. Alternatively, without clear-cut division of labor a strong central office role is needed with a consequent loss of unit individuality, initiative, and even responsibility.

* * * * * * * *

* * * *

REACTIONS TO

THE UNTRIED MODEL OF THE URBAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

June 18, 1973

In principle, you are expanding on a campus scale the comprehensive division principle we have going here in Tulsa. I know the division idea works but it is due to very close communication among divisions. This would be more difficult in specialized, scattered colleges. Land acquisition in a properly dispersed downtown perimeter would be a problem to some plans, like Oklahoma, where sites have to be donated; but I realize this is perhaps a rather unique state situation.

I think that a strength in your plan lies in the creation and opening of the campuses simultaneously, as the simultaneous opening of the four divisions in TJC allowed interfacing and communication to begin immediately.

Your concept of controlled autonomy is a good one. A strong central organization is essential for coordination and non-duplication. Perhaps "coordinated individuality" is an appropriate term.

One area you did not emphasize was that of community service or special programs. To me these flexible, generally non-credit type of programs are important on each campus, but again centrally coordinated so that each program complements the philosophy and operation of each campus.

I enjoyed the paper very much and think it presents an idea between two extremes while, with operational refinement and adaptation to a locality, can be well worth active consideration.

Alfred M. Philips, President
Tulsa Junior College
Tulsa, Oklahoma

June 5, 1973

Many thanks for giving me the opportunity to look over your "Untried Model." The model is not untried except in that part involving the geographic location of the units. The idea of career differentiating among colleges in a system has been tried but not to the extent you mention in your article. In L.A. at one time there were Pierce Agricultural College, Trade Technical College, Metropolitan College of Business. Pierce was transformed into a comprehensive college and Metropolitan had to be combined with Trade Tech. Even at Trade Tech student and faculty pressure (not to mention accreditation teams) is strong for comprehensiveness.

In your model you do not take up the problem faced in the Pierce and Metropolitan situations. Nor do you provide for taking care of new groups of careers. For example, you include Health as one of the areas for differentiation. This is a relatively new area. What happens if a new area should emerge?

Since your model depends on assumptions that cannot be proved or disproved until some urban center adopts it, not much can be said about the claims made under "Strengths." I doubt very much if the "remedial work becomes readily apparent to students." There is as much floundering on remedial work in technically-oriented post-secondary institutions as in the comprehensive colleges.

You do mention one serious weakness but you do not elaborate on it, i.e., the rigidity the system fosters by early student commitment. In a fluid society such as ours this requires much more attention than is given in the article.

The success of Jones in Chicago and Fashion Institute in New York does not prove that your model will meet with the same success. These are special cases. An equal number of failures could be cited in the high school or postsecondary field.

The reference to the success of proprietary schools is mentioned. Since we know so little about them we cannot really evaluate the model from that experience.

I subscribed to your position on integration, but I found that neighborhood racial patterns are difficult to overcome. Of course, if you force students to go to a central area then integration will take place. However, few large cities would undertake such a project!

Despite my reservations I hope you can convince Chicago to institute your model.

John Lombardi
Research Educationist

(formerly President of Los Angeles City College, and
Assistant Superintendent of Los Angeles Community Colleges)

June 19, 1973

It looks good. It fits in well with my conceptions of effective occupational programs.

I would suggest that the complex of campuses is not sufficient but needs related off-campus centers.

It is quite important to emphasize the savings in facilities and equipment. Our experience also indicates that a program such as aviation may develop on one campus with high quality and adequate quantity of equipment. On the other hand, extension of the program to a second campus may have to be satisfied with inferior or "Mickey Mouse" equipment.

In my opinion a high quality program in one location will attract students in spite of inconveniences.

George Mehallis,
Director, Technical/Vocational Studies
Miami-Dade Junior College, North
Miami, Florida

I don't believe it is an either/or situation but rather a middle road where each college of a multi-unit district is a comprehensive center for the immediate area it services, and, in addition, may emphasize certain specializations in order to avoid unnecessary and needless duplication. This combination can work to the benefit of all and avoid many of the concerns you bring out in your paper.

The Junior College District of St. Louis attempted, with considerable success, to go down the middle, and this was made possible by having the presidents of the three colleges also serve as vice presidents of the district. This dual responsibility made for strong colleges and for a fairly efficient district.

In the years to come where attention will be given to the older students, both during the day and evening, I believe it is essential that these adults have proximity access to further education. If they have to travel far they won't participate, and society will be the loser.

I could elaborate further but I would disagree with the fully specialized concept for it would tend to categorize and prevent a student from changing his or her objective when such a change would be of benefit to all concerned. It tends to reflect the European philosophy, which, by the way, is changing rather rapidly to the U.S. philosophy of comprehensiveness.

This movement trend of Europe to the U.S. and the U.S. to Europe in terms of postsecondary education is perhaps indicative of the need to find a middle road.

Joseph P. Cosand,
Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan

Former Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education

Former President of the Junior College District of St. Louis

The model is perhaps too simplistic since multi-unit structures develop not only for the purpose of instruction but as a result of political subdivision.

The relationship between autonomy and the uniformity of mission of each unit is questionable since maximum autonomy means different things to different people.

The cluster college specialization emphasizes a large metropolitan community rather than the immediate community around the college. In this sense there is a basic conflict between the concept of community and large urban concentrations. Your model colleges are "impersonal" which is not necessarily bad.

There is also a basic conflict between the comprehensive community college and the specialized institution. Maybe it is time to review the meaning of comprehensive.

Your paper is so much career oriented that the names of these institutions really should be technical rather than community colleges.

Leslie Koltai
Chancellor
Los Angeles Community College District

Former Chancellor
Junior College District of Metropolitan Kansas City, Missouri

June 28, 1973

A cluster of five specialized vocational campuses is certainly logical and philosophically predicated to eliminate knotty administrative, competitive, and communicative problems experienced in multi-campus comprehensive community college complexes. But our concern lies with the practicality of the proposal to serve the felt educational needs of all the people within the geographical boundaries of the district, not on the elimination or ease of solving problems derived from bigness and complexity.

The proposed organization would not be functionally probable for Metro-Phoenix. The area of Maricopa County is expansive with more than a million inhabitants mostly clustered in Phoenix and in adjacent smaller cities and towns. The entire urban area is experiencing a tremendous growth rate. Then too, no mass transit system of any consequence exists. The automobile is a necessity in this sprawling metro-center. If our four comprehensive colleges and one technical college were assigned to perform the fields of specialization suggested, the daily transporting of the human beef would be astronomical and would further tax our already overtaxed streets and highways. Thus it appears that the lauded community college virtue of "proximity" should be maintained.

A great function of the community college is to give the poorly oriented and motivated high school graduate or adult the opportunity to discover himself, to remedy deficiencies,

and to change career directions by changing curriculums. The comprehensive campus facilitates this honored objective.

History says that many of our respected universities as well as the forerunner of the modern comprehensive community college began as a single purpose institution. Your proposition reverses this process in that it would move from the universal or comprehensive campus "something for everyone" to five specific career centered campuses whose functions combined would duplicate and may hopefully facilitate the organization and function of the multi-campus community college complex. If this were true, would it be logical to ask why five single-purpose campuses, why not one huge university-type comprehensive campus to serve the entire area since the average miles commuted by a student would be approximately the same?

Perhaps the greatest threat of the proposed organization is the feeling that it would, to an extent, eliminate local pride in "our college" or make redundant the meaning of "community" in community college.

In general, educational philosophy and practice has long wrestled with the challenge of educating "the whole man". When people are categorized and separated and excluded within groupings for any rationalized base or purpose, we damage the values derived from spontaneous democratic involvement and communication, and thus lessen the possibility of exploration

so essential to an individual in choosing a career compatible with his abilities, characteristics, and desires.

When we know that much of the success experienced by college graduates in every walk of life results from a large degree from friendships and experiences gained from spontaneous and heterogeneous peer associations made on campus rather than solely from knowledge gained in the laboratories and lecture halls, it would seem inconsistent to force our youth to have to determine a career choice when entering college which could only be changed by transferring to another college campus. Unless the proposed organization cluster of vocationally career oriented campuses can maintain and enhance all the societal values of the comprehensive community college campus, it should never be implemented because stimulating the growth and developmental potential of the individual to eventually serve himself, his home, his community and society better is the ultimate objective of our educational system.

John F. Prince,
President

Maricopa County Community College District,
Phoenix, Arizona

June 20, 1973

I can certainly concur with your concept of a possible new model for the urban community college development which features a "One District Concept" with only the decentralization necessary to make the "One District" function. This new model can actually simplify decision-making and communications, and certainly can be more accountable and efficient to meet the needs of the urban area.

Your model is certainly the "heart" of our master plan development for metropolitan Milwaukee for the 1970's to 1980. We expect to maintain a large downtown campus as the comprehensive center of our district offering most of the second year courses of our two-year Associate Degree programs. It will be the only campus to contain the Health and Graphic Arts Technologies.

The Central Comprehensive Campus will be supported by three day Regional Centers in the South, West, and North, and many evening centers in rented spaces. Each of the Regional Centers will serve as supportive arms to make the central campus more comprehensive. The South Campus is located in a highly industrialized area emphasizing foundries and heavy machinery. For this reason it will offer the first year of the two year technical and industrial programs as well as the one year and short-term courses needed in these program areas. The West Campus

is also in an industrial area but with a different type of industrial base. It has small engine manufacturing, machine tool, and farm equipment. It would also offer the first year of the two year technical and industrial programs plus one year and short-term courses based on the industrial specialties of the area. The North Campus will specialize in agri-business and business programs related to the economy of the area.

While the "One District" operation for metropolitan Milwaukee does not follow the capsule nor the exact model which you propose, it does have some commonalities in structure and even more so in goals and objectives.

Assuming we would be beginning an initial metropolitan urban community college system with no deterrents brought about by the present structure, your model makes sense. In our situation at Milwaukee we inherited a large downtown comprehensive center that has served the area since 1911. To it was merged some small, inadequate suburban satellite campuses. We have arrived at our plan for 1980 by taking what we have and using it as advantageously as possible, following many of the same roles and objectives which you outlined. One of the strengths of our model, and as I see it, your model, is the close cooperative relationship that is brought about through organization of the central city with the other parts of the metropolitan area. This is not only a "must" for the community college but the community college can pave the way for other vitally needed cooperative ventures if our urban centers are going to survive.

William L. Ramsey
District Director
Milwaukee Area Technical College