DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 346 JC 860 507

AUTHOR Southerland, Arthur R.
TITLE Access versus Selectivity in the Community College. Horizons Issues Monograph Series.
INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. Council of Universities and Colleges.; ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-87117-163-5
PUB DATE Aug 86
CONTRACT 400-83-0030
NOTE 95p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Publication Sales, 80 South Early St., Alexandria, VA 22304 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Access to Education; Admission Criteria; *College Admission; *Community Colleges; Educational Change; Educational Quality; Equal Education; Open Enrollment; *Selective Admission; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Stressing the importance of proper management and careful integration of instructional and support programs, this monograph argues that access and selectivity in the community college can complement and temper each other. Chapter I offers a brief historical overview of the relationship between access and selectivity in American higher education, focusing upon the community college. Definitions of access, selectivity, assessment, evaluation, success, standards, excellence, student potential, and self-concept are presented in chapter II. Chapter III explores indicators of access and selectivity, focusing on institutional statements of philosophy, mission, and objectives; geography and delivery systems; curricula; student services; faculty; costs; and students. The prognosis for the changing dominance of access and selectivity is discussed in chapter IV, along with views concerning action needed for revitalizing the community college. Finally, chapter V provides a summary. A 10-page list of references concludes the document. (LAL)

ACCESS VERSUS SELECTIVITY IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Arthur R. Southerland is associate professor of educational leadership and research at the University of Southern Mississippi in Hattiesburg. Since coming to USM in 1978, he has taught classes in higher education administration and has served widely as a consultant and speaker for community colleges. His research interests include trustee responsibilities and relationships, instructional management, and college-community relations. From 1966 to 1978, he was with the Dallas County Community College District. He assisted in the opening of three of the seven colleges in that district and worked in those colleges as well as in the central office. His roles in the community college included having been a faculty member, faculty association president, a division chairman, an evening dean, a dean of instruction, and an assistant to the vice chancellor for academic affairs. He is a member of the Council of Universities and Colleges, an affiliate of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Southerland holds the B.M.Ed., M.Ed., and Ph.D. degrees from East Texas State University.

ACCESS VERSUS SELECTIVITY IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By Arthur R. Southerland

A Publication of
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Council of Universities and Colleges
ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

The material in this publication was prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges pursuant to its contract with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and to the Council of Universities and Colleges for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the Council of Universities and Colleges, or the Office of Educational Research and Practice.

OERI
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
OR·CS·LP·PIP·IS

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract No. 400-83-0030. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department.

American Association of
Community and Junior Colleges
National Center for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle
Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7050

Printed in U.S.A.
ISBN 0-87117-163-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Max Johnson (not his real name) was a twenty-five year old, part-time student at the community college where I was evening dean. His mother called me one night, frantic for help. Hurriedly she reviewed Max's background. A shy, withdrawn person, Max was a college dropout/push-out several times over. He had just been paroled from the state prison, having served a sentence for a drug-related offense. On the afternoon of Mrs. Johnson's call Max had been in a violent argument with his parole officer. Shortly thereafter, he left home deeply depressed, threatening suicide. After this overview, Mrs. Johnson said, "There is one possible hope. If Max has not harmed himself, he may have gone to English class. His instructor has ignited a spark of interest in writing which I have never seen before." Max was in class that evening, and I walked with him to a counselor's office. In time, he responded to counseling and performed very well in classes. Max was later able to earn a comfortable living and more importantly became comfortable, living.

While not every troubled student's story turns out as happily as his, I am grateful to all of the Maxes I have known. Likewise, I am indebted to the talented community college faculty and student personnel professionals who have demonstrated to me again and again the near magical chemistry which can take place when a student's potential is unlocked and developed.

Our nation has recently been swept over by a new wave of concern over excellence in education, including a high tide of attention to the role and practices of the community college. Some proponents of change would have the two-year college attain a higher level of excellence by tightening admissions requirements. Such an approach would deny most of the Max Johnsons entry

into a two-year college. In this monograph I want to explore some points of view relative to the thesis that access and selectivity can and must coexist.

Several people deserve special acknowledgement concerning their contributions to this work. To Teddy Bouchillon, Becky Causey, Nancy Johnson, Sally Maxwell, Larry Roberts, and Beverly van Aller, I express my thanks for their help in organizing the material contained herein. My colleague John Rachal provided invaluable aid through stimulating discussions and by proofreading the text. Commendation is due Sylvia Hall who deciphered handwriting, which began at a poor level and deteriorated as the manuscript progressed, and converted it to a beautifully typed copy. To the Council on Universities and Colleges of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges I offer my deepest appreciation for affording me the opportunity to do this project.

Arthur R. Southerland
Hattiesburg, Mississippi
August, 1986

CHAPTER I

ACCESS AND SELECTIVITY-- WHERE DID THEY COME FROM, AND HOW DID THEY CORRELATE?

Access and selectivity regularly interact, creating a state of tension in community colleges. While access is often thought of an uninterrupted freeway running into and through the two-year college, selectivity periodically intersects it. These junctures form checkpoints at which determinations are made as to whether or not students are allowed to proceed and, if so, which route(s) they may take.

This monograph begins with a brief overview of the historical origins of the relationship between access and selectivity in American higher education, focusing upon the community college. Definitions of access, selectivity, and other related concepts are examined. Finally, the prognosis for the changing dominance of access and selectivity is discussed along with some views concerning action needed for revitalizing the community college.

Over the past four decades, the availability of formal learning beyond high school has been widely extended. Recently a resurgence of attention to selectivity has developed. Widespread concern over quality in education has of late focused renewed attention on the community college. Among the possible approaches to achieving higher levels of excellence is the elevation of admissions standards. Although the pursuit of excellence through exclusion is an obvious pathway to the goal, this alternative places the principles associated with access and selectivity in an adversarial relationship. In the pages to follow, the argument will be developed that while access and selectivity may not necessarily coincide, they can at least peacefully

coexist. Indeed, if the community college is to remain a viable institution, access and selectivity must continue to complement and temper each other.

Brief Historical Overview

For more than 2 1/2 centuries after the establishment of Harvard in 1636, American colleges and universities were largely elitist institutions modeled after their older European counterparts. Selectivity was decidedly dominant over access. Convinced of the superiority of German universities, many of the leaders of our nation's institutions of higher learning promoted a philosophy of meritocracy and aristocracy (Brick, 1964). In the 1800s higher education entered a period of philosophical tension. Some educators sought to perpetuate the elitist point of view and to limit access to colleges and universities even further than had been the practice in the past. Others advanced the call for wider access to higher education as a means of promoting the protection and progress of democracy through the masses.

In the mid-nineteenth century a movement, similar to today's renewed quest for excellence in higher education, developed in which several university presidents sought to improve the quality of the collegiate experience. With the common belief that students in the freshman and sophomore years were not sufficiently mature, a number of universities devised plans during the last half of the nineteenth century for separating freshmen and sophomore students from upperclassmen. As outgrowths of these attempts, freestanding private and public junior colleges began to appear in 1896 (Brick, 1964).

It should be noted that the emerging junior college was more a by-product of the goals of the university elitists than the accomplishment of a goal. Theirs was a mission designed to focus the resources of already selective universities upon an even narrower range of students. Thus, the junior colleges,

contrived out of elitism, became a new symbol of opportunity.

With the emergence of a four-pronged instructional program of transfer, occupational, community services, and remedial courses along with student personnel services, a prototype had evolved for the nation's newest colleges. Not only did community colleges broaden access by increasing their functions, but the creation of counseling and remedial programs indicated a recognition of the need for intervention to aid students in getting maximum benefit from the access that they had gained. In this type of intervention, selectivity began to fulfill important roles beyond that of blocking admission to the institution.

By the 1960s the comprehensive community college was promoted by the American Association of Junior Colleges as the most effective means for meeting twentieth century needs (Brick, 1964). Its contribution to society's needs and to individual needs have been far-reaching, "making access easier for people who in an earlier era would not have considered going to college: minority-group and low-ability students, students from low-income families, and older students who for whatever reasons had missed their chance to attend college previously" (Cohen, 1985, p. 152). As the community college evolved, access assumed dominance over selectivity, a position which is currently being challenged through such barriers as elevated admissions criteria and increased costs.

Enrollments

There were almost as many students enrolled (50,138) in the Dallas County Community College District in Texas during Fall 1983 (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1984) as were attending all of the colleges and universities in the United States as undergraduates (52,000) in 1870 (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975). Between 1870 and 1970 college and university

enrollments grew more rapidly than the population did in every decade except for the period from 1880 to 1890 (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975). For that hundred year span, "the percent growth in enrollments outstripped the percent of population growth by 34 times" (p. 24). Enrollments have faltered for short periods of time, but on the whole they have been characterized by phenomenal expansion.

By 1982 two-year college students numbered 4,964,379, an all-time high, constituting almost 40 percent of total higher education enrollments. The number of two-year college students dropped slightly in 1983. About 12.2 million students were enrolled in American colleges and universities in 1984, and about 37 percent of them were attending community, technical, and junior colleges (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1984; "College and University Enrollments", 1985; "Fall 1983 Enrollment," 1985; "Fall 1984 Enrollment," 1986; Grant & Snyder, 1983-84).

Since 1974 there have also been substantial numbers of persons involved in non-credit offerings. Figures vary from about 2.9 million in 1975-76 to a high of almost 4.4 million students in 1981-82. In 1982-83 the numbers dropped to about 3.5 million (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1984).

Accessibility has indeed made a dramatic difference in the percentage of citizens who go to college; furthermore, it has changed our definition of what it means to be of "college age." By removing barriers, promoting openness, establishing more institutions, expanding offerings, providing support services, and permeating campuses with concern for the student, the two-year college has been exemplary in expanding opportunity for study beyond the high school.

CHAPTER II

CAN WE AGREE ON THE TERMS?

In different ways for various students and at different times in students' lives, community colleges serve as an intermediator, an invigorator, a culminator, or a perpetuator. For some students these institutions are an intermediate stage in preparation for study at a higher level. In any of the emphases of the community college--transfer studies, technical-occupational programs, general education, student development services, or community services--the student may be invigorated to learn for the first time. To some students the two-year college experience is the culmination of their formal education prior to entering the job market. For an increasing number of persons, the comprehensive community college is a center for perpetual, life-long development. In each of these associations with the learner, several concepts come to bear, and in this chapter we will attempt to clarify the emphasis which should be applied to each of them. Specifically, our attention will be focused upon access, selectivity, assessment and evaluation, success, standards, excellence, and student potential and self-concept.

Access

Most discussions of access focus upon admission, because this one act is fundamental to a fuller realization of the term. Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines access as "permission, liberty, or ability to enter." The permission to attend college is at the heart of the open-door philosophy. Brick (1964) quotes certain musts for junior colleges which were adopted at the 1961 meeting of what was then the American Association of Junior Colleges. Among these tenets was the statement that two-year colleges "must hold open the closing door of

opportunity for college education" (p. 69). But permission is an empty provision unless the student has the ability to enter; thus the elimination of barriers has been of primary concern. Thornton (1972) speaks of these as "barriers based on class, poverty, race, or cultural deprivation" (p. 33). In addition, the Truman Commission (cited in Levine, 1978) lists the barrier of religion. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1985) states as its primary goal the intent to "reaffirm and promote the concept of access as fundamental to the mission of community, technical, and junior colleges" (p. 48). A central cause of this high priority rating is concern over two barriers which are developing and which present a threat to the openness of higher education. The first issue is that of a decline in federal and state financial assistance for students. Second, there is an emerging barrier related to the use of tests as the "sole criteria for admission, placement, degree completion, and entry into upper-division programs" (p. 48).

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1975) describes universal access "as a condition where (1) all college-age persons are financially able to attend college if they otherwise wish to do so and (2) there are places for them" (p. 118). A slightly more conservative, though supportive stance, is seen in the 1973 report of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, referring to each individual's ability "to enroll in some form of postsecondary education appropriate to that person's needs, capabilities, and motivation" (cited in Hyde, 1982, p. 1).

Access is a more comprehensive issue than admission. Another portion of Webster's definition cited above refers to "the ability to participate in, work in, or gain insight into." The ability to participate in a college is influenced by qualities possessed by the learner and by qualities of the institution. Concerning the latter, the Truman Commission report (cited in Levine, 1978) also lists the barrier of a restricted curriculum. Hyde (1982)

amplifies this further in referring to informational and geographical obstacles. He also alludes to the need for an institutionally supportive climate. The magnitude of access is governed by the college's mission, geography, delivery systems, curricula, student services, faculty, and costs. These dimensions of involvement with the student suggest that access is all of the policies, procedures, programs, and practices of an institution which promote admission and continued progress toward the student's objectives.

Initially, access has to do with the student's freedom to try college-level work. Access, therefore, is a condition in which almost any person may choose to enter an institution. Its importance is based on the premise that in a democratic society the opportunity to pursue higher learning is a right rather than a privilege. This means that to the extent possible an individual is allowed into a college with a clean slate, as it were, with the chance to prove his or her ability to benefit from the experience, free from arbitrary and inappropriate hurdles, impediments, or restrictions. Cohen and Brawer (1982a) pose the question, "access to what?" (p. 23). Because the several curricular tracks do not purport to take the student to the same destination, the price of the ticket varies. Due to the different purposes of the program options--developmental or remedial, transfer, one-year occupation, two-year technical, general education, and personal enrichment--access is multi-dimensional. To the critic, the community college is trying to be all things to all people and ends up not doing a good job at anything. To the college educator with a missionary zeal, the two-year college provides a wide array of options, taking the learners as they are and lifting them to new heights.

The very name community college implies accessibility. While the size of the service area varies from one college to another, there is a strong identity with the community whether in the form of a city or a multi-county area. No accurate figures exist to reveal how many people would have remained unserved by other types

of institutions if local community colleges were not available. It is safe to say that the numbers would be staggering. It is not just the availability of a college which is important. The collective attitude of the institution toward the learner is vital, and the community college has the reputation for being a place where the student is respected, helped, and developed. In such a place access is more than a single act at the front door. It is a systemic quality rather than an appendage. Access in the community college reveals itself as a pervasive spirit in virtually every dimension of the institution.

With the freedom to enter comes the student's responsibility to adequately perform. Attaining admission is the initial step, followed by a continuous series of checkpoints at which the student must earn continuing access. These checkpoints mark those occasions in which selectivity interacts with access.

Selectivity

Any act of denying or restricting entry or of limiting, redirecting, or discontinuing access is selectivity. When applied for the right reasons, selectivity is an appropriate counterbalance to access. In our efforts to promote the openness of community colleges, access to some became synonymous with a free ride. Fear of litigation and an obsession with headcounts have caused some administrators to lend credence to this misconception. Addressing this problem, Parnell (1984) says, "The open-door label has never meant that high school students can do anything they choose and still succeed in community college programs" (p. 47).

Selectivity must occur if an institution is to be accountable and perform responsibly, but it is crucial that selectivity be applied without bias. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1980) states, "The public has a clear interest in access to higher education. . . . Society also has a special

interest in assuring that selective places be filled on the basis of fair and reasonable institutional policies and procedures and that no one is subject to discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, or ethnic origin" (p. 115). In legal matters this principle is discussed in terms of actions being free of arbitrary and capricious decisions and behavior.

For an institution to be selective and at the same time fair there needs to be a carefully thought out rationale for its screening and sorting measures. In the spirit of the community college, selectivity should be viewed as more than something done to students; it should be something done with them and for them as well. Four reasons can be identified for exercising selectivity in the two-year college: (1) to increase the student's chances of later academic, employment, and/or social success, (2) to uphold the qualitative standards of the institution, (3) to protect the rights and safety of other members of the college environment, and (4) to use the institution's resources to serve as many as possible in a prudent manner while achieving maximum results.

The stringency of selectivity, of course, depends upon the criteria and standards applied to each situation, and it is further determined by those interpreting policies and doing the selecting. The act may range from non-directive counseling to mandating action. Our discussions will be largely restricted to those matters in which the institution dictates the consequences, thereby exercising selectivity. In our definition we referred to denying and restricting entry as two forms of selectivity, and in a community college such actions may seem out of place. Depending on the institution, however, a good deal of selectivity may have taken place before the student fills out an application. Colleges which are at too great a distance from the student, which have limited or inflexible schedules, which fail to provide a full complement of curricula and support services, which have faculty who are not dedicated to helping students of all ability levels, and which have prohibitive fees,

are practicing selectivity in its most undemocratic forms. Colleges can set reasonable standards of admission and still provide access to a wide segment of the community. The institution may determine that in order to benefit from college-level work the applicant should meet such prerequisites as being at least of a particular age, holding a high school diploma or its equivalency, attaining some minimum score on an entry examination indicative of basic literacy, and providing evidence of the potential to benefit from instruction as a student in higher education.

Beyond general admission, selectivity may be found in the form of entry-level assessment and subsequent placement in developmental or remedial courses to protect the student from almost certain failure in the regular college curriculum. No one advocates that the two-year college should be an open pharmacy where the students fill their own prescriptions without professional intervention. And yet, some colleges choose to operate almost that way. For example, the older student, who has been out of school for several years, is often in a hurry to make up for lost time. To be held back by being required to take courses in reading, writing, or mathematics meets with strong resistance from many. When institutional records are accurate enough, however, to show that in similar cases academic achievement has been upgraded through developmental courses, the student's impatience should yield to the institution's experience.

Colleges may have few preconditions for institutional admission but may apply higher standards for certain major fields or programs, thus practicing selectivity. Cohen and Brawer (1982a) advocate this approach, suggesting that "using the program itself to screen out the unworthy should be discounted . . . because one cannot at the same time teach and judge" (p. 244). Secondly, they point out that it is more humane to withhold admission to programs than to allow students in, fully expecting large numbers not to complete the course of study. In those institutions with comprehensive curricular offerings the sting of

the denial of entry into particular fields may be alleviated by counseling students into another field in which success is more likely. By providing lateral mobility to other options, continuing access can be provided concurrently with screening.

Degree requirements are forms of selectivity above and beyond performance expectations associated with them. Most institutions have a prescribed configuration for the associate degree. Although the student may meet or exceed the total number of semester hours expected, the degree will not be granted unless the required pattern of courses has been taken. This limiting of student choice is selectivity.

A number of other institutional policies involve the possibility of the student's access being limited, redirected, or discontinued. Several are dealt with in Chapter III, so we will simply list them. Let us consider the implications for selectivity in the following:

1. Grading policies.

2. Attendance policies and related course drop and withdrawal requirements.

3. Prerequisites for individual courses or programs.

4. Performance standards and specific required competencies as measured by formative and summative evaluations.

5. Restrictions on the number of times a student may take a course.

6. Time limits for completing required work in a class.

7. Time limits for completing degree requirements.

8. Limits on the number of transfer credits accepted.

9. Requirements for grade point average.

10. Schedule change policies.

11. Refund policies.

12. Provisions, standards, and limits on credit by examination.

13. Disciplinary measures including probation and supervision.

14. Limits on course loads.

Selectivity need not be a bad word. The determinant of its badness or goodness is whether the institution has taken every reasonable action to contribute to the person's persistence before altering or severing its relationship with the student. Thus, access and selectivity operate together, maintaining openness within a setting of high expectations. Part of this balance is achieved through student assessment and evaluation.

Assessment and Evaluation

Implicit in the act of admission is the role of the college in helping the student to succeed. In order to adequately perform that function, the institution needs to answer several questions. Among them are the following:

1. What is the student's academic and psychological readiness for the overall college experience as well as for specific courses and programs?

2. What are the student's personal and career goals?

3. How will it be known that competencies have been achieved?

The wider the door to admission, the greater the need for diagnosis. Proper placement minimizes the risk of failure and the resultant human misery (Roueche & Archer, 1979). Entry-level assessment is crucial to proper placement.

Some precautions should be taken in carrying out assessment. Care must be exercised in the selection of both procedures and instruments to assure that they really gauge what they are intended to measure. In too many instances a mismatch occurs, somewhat analogous to taking an individual's temperature with a yardstick. Second, in light of the multiple functions of the community college, additional specialized assessments may be needed for certain areas of study beyond the common core of instruments administered to all entering students. Although Roueche and Archer (1979) review a number of published instruments, they point out that locally designed tests are preferred by a majority of community colleges with assessment centers. Further, they recommend the use of locally prepared instruments because of their adaptability to the needs and capabilities of the institution. Third, we must not lose sight of the fact that the field of tests and measurements is still an imprecise science. There is no accurate predictor for the effects of motivation on student potential, nor is there a way to foresee the mysterious chemistry which takes place when a faculty member somehow induces a level of accomplishment not observed in a student's previous work. Yet, thousands of transcripts point to a time of awakening experienced by students after which they have performed extremely well in spite of all indications to the contrary. Consequently, those who give tests and interpret their results should avoid the temptation to become smug about their sufficiency; they should also use as wide an array of performance predictors as possible. As previously mentioned, the American Association of Community and Junior College (1985) warns against the

overuse of tests as the sole criteria for placement and other purposes.

In implementing assessment programs consideration must be given to the student for whom test anxiety interferes with the ability to perform well on formally administered instruments. It should also be remembered that for many learners, particularly older students, high school grades and traditional tests are often poor predictors of college grades. Students in the traditional college age group are apt to be more test-wise than older learners, and norms for standardized tests are more likely to be determined using traditional students.

Many community colleges seem to be inhibited in developing full-scale assessment programs due to costs and/or philosophy. To be sure, instruments are costly in terms of materials and personnel. If the improvement of human resources produced by success through proper placement is not sufficient to justify the costs, then the extension of the person's association with the college should be. Potential revenue produced for the institution by students will be lost if they enroll and are immediately cycled out due to failure. Of course, assessment and placement do not automatically ensure success, but together they can improve the odds. As a matter of philosophy some colleges appear to take the position that mandatory assessment is undemocratic and therefore contradictory to the open-door approach to admissions. Rounds and Anderson (1984) attribute some of the institutional aversion to mandatory assessment to the influences of the civil rights movement and student activism of the 1960's. Both reinforced the concept of the student's right to fail, advocating few prerequisites or restrictions on registering for most courses.

The evidence is clear that students generally do not have the necessary information or attitude to make choices entirely on their own. On the other hand, "an increasing number of studies show significant gains in retention and GPA data for those students who were

tested and placed in courses meeting their skills needs" (Rounds and Anderson, p. 11). Still other community colleges have assessment programs but make placement voluntary, leaving the choice for probable failure up to the student whose assessment results indicate the need for remediation. Some colleges assess only those entering students whose previous academic records indicate likely problem areas. But as O'Keefe (1984) suggests, "By itself a high school diploma is little guarantee of mastery of any specific body of knowledge" (p. 62). He points out that high school grades are accurate predictors for about one student in four. Using the Scholastic Aptitude Test score along with high school records increases the accuracy of prediction to one in three.

If used properly, assessment improves the possibilities for continuing access; therefore, it is egalitarian in its orientation despite arguments to the contrary. Evaluation, by comparison, is meritocratic. As we are using the term, the purposes of assessment are diagnosis and prescription. Evaluation's purpose is to measure the extent to which prescribed competencies have been mastered. The truth of the matter is that many instructors do not test what they have taught. Given two or more faculty members who teach the same course, the chances are great that their tests will be highly dissimilar. Other problems with evaluation include the following:

1. Faculty tend to evaluate too infrequently.

2. Faculty often use a limited range of evaluation instruments, leaning toward the same type of examination throughout the course.

3. Too few faculty require students to write as part of the evaluative process.

4. Specific, measurable competencies are too seldom found. As a result, there is often an unreliable re .ationship between student

grades and student learning.

Community colleges must aspire to excellence. In order to validate the level of excellence attained by individual students, evaluation processes and instruments must be tightly coordinated with expectations for each course and program of study. Cries of invasion of academic freedom should be overridden, and faculty should be required to cooperatively develop banks of valid and reliable test items for courses taught by more than one instructor. Colleges should halt the use of evaluations as arbitrary means of creating grading curves.

It is true that the field of tests and measurements is an inexact science, but we know more than we are utilizing. Community colleges owe it to their students to assess their academic and psychological status upon entry, place them in courses for which they are prepared, and evaluate them frequently, thoroughly, and fairly in a variety of ways consistent with stated, measurable expectations.

Success

Having gained access to college via the open door, students' goals and aspirations lead in many directions. To determine who among them has succeeded and who has failed is a complex issue. Success may be viewed quite differently by the student, the institution, and society. Even the most obvious indicator of success--academic achievement--may produce contrasting opinions. Students who are progressing academically but who are attending college to satisfy someone else's wishes may not be succeeding in their own estimation. At the other end of the spectrum, all who show up among the dropout figures or among the names of students not graduating are not to be summarily classified as failures. A Southern Regional Education Board (1977) report on student mobility states, "If a student identifies his goal, which may be acquiring a degree or certificate, the community

college has provided the service and the programs necessary to meet the student's goals" (p. 15). It is even possible that some students succeed, at least to some extent, without knowing it; that is, they benefit from their collegiate experience but their low self-concept prevents their recognizing the benefits gained. This is not to suggest that community colleges should cease to be concerned about high attrition rates and just explain all of the pushouts, dropouts, and stopouts as successes in disguise. To the contrary, community colleges need better record keeping and more thorough student follow-up systems in order to properly identify and respond to student failure and success.

Webster's definition of success is "the degree or measure of attaining the desired end." For students, that means achieving their objective(s). For the two-year college, success usually means that transfer students have a smooth transition to the senior institution, that general education students demonstrate at least minimum mastery of the required content of the courses they take, and that community services students gain specified skills and knowledge. When one of these four situations coincides with the students' objectives, this is perhaps success at its best. But what about students with other aims in mind? Community colleges simply must do a better job in ascertaining students' objectives and, as long as these fall within the mission and available resources of the institution, contribute to their attainment. After validating goal attainment through appropriate evaluation, the institution can for the first time point with accuracy to the success of those to whom it has granted access.

In discussing assessment, reference was made to an implied college responsibility to help students succeed after having admitted them. That is not to suggest, however, that the institution must guarantee success. The proper role of the institution in relation to students' achievement is to assure the availability of expertise, effort, concern, and every reasonable resource to promote their successful navigation of the

system. Depending on the perspective of the observer or evaluator, success will be indicated in the form of intellectual, social, psychological, emotional, and economic gains. From the institutional point of view the degree of success is most frequently measured in terms of the extent to which the student has met the standards associated with the course that the student has elected to navigate.

Standards

According to Webster, a standard is a criterion "set up . . . for the measure of quantity, weight, extent, value, or quality." Today's community college finds itself caught on the horns of an old dilemma, the points of which have been recently resharpened. On the one hand, community colleges have no choice but to respond positively to the movement toward greater levels of excellence in higher education. Having labored from its inception to refute the label of inferiority, the community college must produce new evidence of excellence or lose much of the credibility it has gained. On the other hand, the two-year colleges have staunchly defended the principle of open access. As a result, the stage is set for one of the most intense self-examinations ever faced by the community college.

While there have been other educational reform efforts, none has more threatened or challenged the belief shared by community college educators that equity and excellence can coexist than the present focus on quality. In defense of open access, Thompson (1985) holds that standards of achievement must be set by the open-door institution, " . . . but it must not use low indicators of success as an excuse for excluding nontraditional and disadvantaged students" (p. 13). Among the numerous reports on educational reform, Cross (1984) observes that most advise colleges to raise admissions standards. She says, "Community colleges are frequently considered lower in quality than research universities, not on the basis of

comparing the 'value added' to their graduates but on the basis of comparing the selectivity they exercise in admitting their students" (p. 170). Additionally, Cross points out that the reform movement in education almost totally ignores one of the main clues to corporate excellence identified by Peters and Waterman (1982): extraordinary effort on the part of ordinary people. If the community college is to remain true to its mission, it must set standards regarding the manner in which students are to perform while in the institution and not in terms of excellence they attained before matriculation. "The hard part," says Cross (1984), "is not identifying winners but making winners out of ordinary people" (p. 170).

Community colleges could lower their attrition rates by admitting only excellent scholars. Likewise, hospitals could lower their mortality rates by admitting only patients with low-risk health problems. Attrition is a serious problem, but colleges exist to help students, not to compile impressive statistics. It is a sad irony that attrition will probably increase at two-year colleges that revise their standards to reasonably practical levels. Richardson (1983) notes that colleges have often shifted their emphasis when faced with large numbers of underprepared students, modifying objectives so that all may succeed. Without substance, success is meaningless. Thus, Richardson concludes, "Some may have to fail or even be excluded if higher education is to remain an avenue for social mobility for the academically underprepared" (p. 50).

The task then is for community colleges to set admission standards geared to those capable of learning at the college level; colleges should also set completion standards that clearly demonstrate that adequate learning has taken place. Moving the student from the first point to the second is what the job is all about. Cross (1981) contends that the purpose of access "was not merely to permit students to enter colleges but to enable them to learn" (pp. 5-6).

Higher education should provide students with a sharper view of reality. In setting standards we must be careful that the curriculum does not become a maze of arbitrary and disparate hurdles. Neither should the curriculum be so designed that those who complete it are less in touch with reality than when they began. Standards ought to be incremental rather than detrimental.

In reviewing catalogs it will be seen that the standards for admission to certain programs are often different than the standards for general admission to the institution itself. Likewise, it seems logical that in keeping with the diverse functions of the community college that formative and summative standards should vary according to the purposes of a course or program. That standards are different may or may not mean that they are higher or lower. It would be far easier for the institution to have a fixed set of expectations for all students, but it is more important for standards to be meaningful and equitable than it is for them to be unrelated but equal. With a plurality of standards for different functions, however, the institution must prevent these from eroding one another. For example, while the expectations for a remedial mathematics course will appropriately be less than the expectations for college algebra course, remedial students entering college algebra should have been brought to the appropriate level. Likewise, it is a contradiction in terms for a college to count precollege courses as part of a diploma or degree.

Community colleges, therefore, must maintain a perpetual inventory of their expectations for students. Standards should be allowed to exist only when they have a proven relationship to (1) what the student must be or do in order to continue to succeed within the institution, and/or (2) what the student must be or do upon departing the institution to pursue subsequent objectives.

Excellence

"Opportunity with Excellence" is the motto of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1985), "indicating a commitment to maximum accessibility for students and to educational excellence" (p. 48). The AACJC proposes several measures of excellence including (1) the "value added" approach as indicated in the progress made by the student while attending college; (2) the extent to which students achieve their goals; (3) the extent to which colleges interact with and meet the needs of their communities; (4) the extent to which each college achieves its stated missions and goals; (5) the services provided by a college to ensure student success; and (6) the consistency of high quality in all college programs. Items one and two relate to indicators pertaining to the student; items three through six relate to the institution. This list implies that excellence is the high mark of achievement and that it must ultimately be measurable in student performance and behavior. Excellence must likewise be measurable in the institution's purposes, policies, processes (methods), curriculum content, standards, evaluation techniques, and support services.

Parnell (1985) contends that "Excellence in education cannot be caught. It can only be cultivated, challenged, and celebrated" (p. 171). In The Neglected Majority he focuses upon the 75 percent of our high-school graduates who do not complete a baccalaureate degree, proposing a two-plus-two, tech-prep associate degree. He concludes that what matters most in the cultivation of excellence "is how faithfully schools and colleges are seeking the best in all of their students rather than in just some of them" (p. 172). Thus, excellence should be fostered not for the sake of institutional reputation but for the sake of the stewardship with which individuals and society entrust community colleges. College excellence should be recognized in terms of the degree to which students are transformed into more productive and more self-actualized human beings, scholars, and workers.

Excellence Versus Difficulty

One of the greatest limiters to excellence is the mistake made by many academicians who think that excellence is synonymous with difficulty. They judge the quality of their efforts in terms of the length of their assignments and the number of students who drop courses or fail. There is no question about the need for serious work in the attainment of excellence; however, in the hands of a master teacher, a capable learner can progress through levels of mastery to unprecedented achievement with a minimum of pain. By the same token, difficulty in and of itself is not necessarily tied to excellence. If difficulty is a result of poor teaching, disjointed course sequencing, inadequate facilities, or testing that is not matched to instructional objectives, then excellence will be achieved in spite of, rather than because of, the "hardness" of a course.

If we are not careful, we educators will spend the next several years battling over excellence without having determined what it is. Thompson (1985) recommends that the term must be defined first as an abstract notion. After that it should then be expressed in specific terms relative to community values, institutional constraints, resources, and commitments to standards of excellence. Institutional rhetoric will not of itself produce excellence. "The support, participation, and involvement of the trustees, administration, staff and students," says Thompson, "are necessary to achieve quality" (p. 12).

Student Potential and Self-Concept

In broadening access to higher education, community colleges have been confronted not only with large numbers of academically underprepared students but with the reality that many learners arrive with poor self-concepts. The educational system works jointly with their experiences in the home and in the community to reinforce their feelings of unworthiness.

Along with the remediation of students' academic deficiencies, educators must realize that "a prior need of these students is a rebirth of self-concept, a renaissance of individuality" (Thornton, 1972, p. 38). The seriousness of the problem reveals itself in the fact that two-year college freshmen rate themselves as less self-confident than their counterparts at four-year colleges and universities in the areas of academic ability, drive to achieve, leadership ability, mathematical ability, intellectual self-confidence, and writing ability (Cross, 1968).

Reporting on the results of a study of selected community college and technical institute students, Griffin (1980) observes that low achievers feel that they are not as smart as their peers and that they are less able to succeed than their peers. He concludes, "These feelings often become a sort of self-fulfilling prophecy" (p. 17). In her classic book Beyond the Open Door, Cross (1974) describes one of the characteristics of the weaker student as being "fear-threatened" while the strong student is "achievement-motivated." The slow learner responds to the threat of failure by not trying and by avoiding risks. These persons have a tendency toward passive approaches to life and its demands.

Several important principles in relation to self-concept and academic achievement have been demonstrated by successful developmental programs in community colleges. Instructional approaches which involve the learner rather than creating a spectator role have produced positive results. Learning which is competency-based instead of time-based has proven to be decidedly superior. The division of course requirements into smaller digestible components, especially in relation to a systems approach to learning, has helped break old cycles. When achievement is real, and the student is rewarded, the self-concept tends to increase. A caring environment with high expectations creates an upward spiral in which success enhances self-worth; this in turn helps move the student away from a "fear-threatened" orienta-

tion toward an "achievement-motivated" orientation.

Cross (1974) notes the tendency of slow learners to hold unrealistic aspirations as a way of reacting to threats of failure. Thus, the institution faces the delicate task of helping students to develop healthy, realistic expectations. Presently, much emphasis is being placed upon the importance of the relationship of expectations to achievement. Concerning this, The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) states, ". . . student performance clearly rises to these expectations . . . . When educators expect too much . . . student learning and persistence suffer. When we expect too little, we will seldom be disappointed" (p. 20).

The improvement of students' self-concept must be accompanied by substantive academic progress. To make students feel better about themselves in the absence of achievement is to tear down whatever progress has been made, setting the student up for another downward plunge. It should also be remembered that educators have a greater responsibility to students than to just make them feel better about themselves. Richardson (1983) contends that community colleges have reinterpreted the original definition of access, i.e., increasing the percentage of the population completing an appropriate educational sequence leading to advanced study or new employment. Instead many colleges promote access in terms of how many people participate in some form of organized learning experience. Clearly, the enhancement of self-worth falls within the community college's role of developing the whole person. That end, however, becomes a means to another end, that of preparing the individual to be a productive member of society.

CHAPTER III

INDICATORS OF ACCESS AND SELECTIVITY

Having discussed pertinent terms, we now examine indicators of access and selectivity including institutional statements of philosophy, mission, and objectives; geography and delivery systems; curricula; student services; faculty; and costs. Individually each of these indices can either enhance or impede accessibility. Each may be used by the institution as a device for selectivity. In combination, these components form a complex system of interactive influences upon the possibilities which higher education holds for its participants. Furthermore, all college components are affected by its students; so, this chapter concludes with a brief profile of today's community college learner. Because private two-year colleges exercise more selective admissions criteria while restricting their curricular offerings to an emphasis upon the transfer function, the discussions presented in the remainder of this monograph are more applicable to public community colleges.

Institutional Statements of Philosophy, Mission, and Objectives

Community college catalogs contain descriptions of varying length and precision concerning institutional beliefs, purposes, and aims; however, there are frequently many similarities in the messages they contain.

Open-Door Admissions

Though no effort was made to quantify the number of times any given point was made, twenty-five bulletins from selected large and small, rural and

urban two-year colleges throughout the United States were reviewed in an attempt to capture the prevailing tone. Reference was found to an open-door philosophy of admissions at an early point in most mission statements; however, the door is wider at some colleges than at others. One community college may have a rather general statement approximating an invitation for everybody to come. The catalog for Joliet Junior College (Illinois) affirms an open-door admissions policy based on the belief "that all who can benefit from its services and programs should be free to do so" (1977, p. 2). Another institution may cite some preconditions, requiring that the student: (1) be at least 18 years of age, (2) be a high school graduate or have a high school equivalency degree, (3) attain a certain minimum score on a standardized admission test, or (4) show evidence of the ability to do college-level work. By enforcing these regulations in varying combinations and with different degrees of stringency, the open-door policy can be a tool for exercising considerable selectivity. Public two-year colleges tend to be less selective in admissions practices than private ones. One survey ("Undergraduate Admissions," 1981) showed that fewer than 10 percent of public two-year colleges require some specific level of academic achievement beyond high-school graduation. Among private two-year colleges, 60 percent were found to be more selective than the open-door approach, while another five percent applied still stricter competitive measures.

Meeting Individual and Societal Needs

In the democratic tradition, community/junior colleges typically describe for themselves a dual role of meeting the educational needs of the individual and of society as a whole. Those needs are referred to in terms of skills necessary for informed, active citizenship. The meeting of personal and social needs is also looked upon in light of broader institutional responsibilities for preparing students for a vocation or for further study. Beyond these purposes, literature

published by comprehensive two-year colleges ordinarily expresses, in spirit or in words, a commitment to the development of the students as a whole person, often referring to the building of leadership ability and social skills. The importance of guidance and counseling is stressed among the goals of numerous community colleges.

Various approaches are used by two-year colleges in referring to their philosophy concerning remediation. In some instances developmental programs are referred to in a general statement about helping students attain skills to live in a complex society. Other colleges, such as Florida Junior College at Jacksonville (1984-85), refer more specifically to "fostering the reliazation of human potential by providing . . . educational experiences leading to the acquisition of functional literacy skills" as well as to providing "a developmental education program for college credit students who need further preparation for advance courses" (p. 10).

Assisting individuals attain richer, fuller lives through the worthy use of leisure time is a purpose sometimes articulated by community colleges, while others have more inclusive statements specifying the provision of personal growth experiences and the development of skills related to recreational, avocational, and vocational pursuits.

Numerous community colleges refer to their dedication to local civic and cultural enrichments, a stance which embraces much more than the traditional instructional and student services functions. It involves the community in the life of the college and vice versa. Besides enriching the culture of the community, educators have a fundamental responsibility to preserve the culture. Community colleges articulate their role in different manners on this point, too. Perhaps thinking of culture in the global sense of "all of those things in man's environment which have been created by man," some institutions apparently feel that perpetuating the culture is the responsibility of the

general education and liberal arts segments of the curriculum, thus not requiring a separate commentary. Identification with the local cultural heritage as well as with the broader context of man's culture, however, is a trait which dramatizes the community college's unique position in higher education as a connecting link between the local community and the rest of the world. Two statements from the philosophy section of the Northwest Community College Bulletin in Nome, Alaska (1982) illustrate this point. Among the listing of basic educational beliefs is the statement that, "Educational needs and goals are imbedded in family, village, and regional settings as well as national and international perspectives." At the same time, the bulletin points out that, "Native cultures must be maintained and strengthened" (p. 7).

College bulletins often support the idea of lifelong learning, the provision of appropriate educational experiences for a wide range of persons. The Richland College (Texas) bulletin (1984) notes that it is the Dallas Community College District's primary goal "to help students of all ages achieve effective living and responsible citizenship" (p. 5). By way of contrast, the catalog for North Carolina's Cape Fear Technical Institute (1984) describes a comprehensive program "to meet the needs of the adult population within the community it serves" (p. 13).

The College Atmosphere

College publications and handbooks often point to the atmosphere within the institution as well as to the college's components. One college notes the importance of an atmosphere in which "the student will find encouragement for serious study and investigation, culminating in more effective powers of understanding, reasoning, and articulation" (Southwest Mississippi Junior College, 1976-77, p. 11). Another articulates a responsibility to ensure that the environment is

"conducive to the development of programs which respond to the needs of students in a changing society" (Los Angeles City College, 1976-77, p. A-2). And the unpublished staff handbook developed at Eastfield College (Texas) describes institutional atmosphere as one of acceptance of persons with widely diverse backgrounds and talents, as one in which individuals may discover and improve their abilities, and as one in which persons are mutually supportive within a framework of high expectations. These references to an institutional climate characterized by caring and concern suggest that access is not fully realized by the act of being admitted to a college. Access in the fullest sense means that students are accepted as they are and that they are assimilated into the life of the institution.

Community college statements of philosophy and mission are often appropriately quite global, encompassing multiple college functions in respect to the development of analytical skills, healthy interpersonal relationships, and self-fulfillment. Some philosophies are expressed primarily in the cognitive domain, while others address the affective and psychomotor domains, too. A common thread is found within all the various approaches; these statements say to people, "You are important. We have provided a wide array of pathways to make higher education accessible to you."

Geography and Delivery Systems

Through geographic proximity and flexibility of scheduling, community colleges have extended access tremendously. Two-year colleges are now found in some form in each of the fifty states; although considerable distances between campuses may exist in more sparsely populated areas, two-year colleges are located as much as possible on the basis of convenience to the public. Hyde (1982) reports that in 1972, 73 percent of the population resided within 30 miles of a community college and that of those persons attending a community college, 81 percent lived within 30 miles of one.

These numbers are particularly significant in light of the fact that 95 percent of community college students commute.

Campuses

In metropolitan areas it is common to find a community college within a 10 to 20 minute drive of any part of the institution's service area. This is sometimes made possible through the existence of multi-campus or multi-college community college districts. Experience at these districts shows that for a great many potential students the difference of a few miles can be a determining factor in deciding to attend college. This has been observed in the evolution of multi-college districts; even though a new unit added to the college district may be situated quite near a previously operating campus, the new college often opens with minimal impact on enrollment at the older campus. According to Hyde (1982), attendance patterns reveal that an increase of five miles in the average distance to the nearest community college would lower enrollments by 16 percent. While problems inevitably arise with the provision of adequate library and other support services, many two-year colleges take additional steps to deliver instruction beyond the boundaries of the campuses.

Extension Centers

Even in multi-campus districts instruction is often offered at satellite centers. Instructional offerings at these centers are typically high-demand courses which require a minimum of equipment, because the facilities for such extension programs are often used for other functions during the day. Two-year colleges regularly borrow or rent facilities for evening or weekend classes from a variety of organizations including public schools, parks and recreation departments, public libraries, churches, and banks. Classes are sometimes taught in shopping centers as

well as in an occasional warehouse. Community colleges reach out to the people in numerous ways.

Classes for the institutionalized. One special part of the salvage role of the community college is the teaching of credit and non-credit classes at institutions in which persons are confined. These sites include prisons, jails, sanitariums, and hospitals. Offerings range from one or two courses a semester to entire in-house associate degree programs. Either way, classes for institutionalized persons can be a valuable part of their rehabilitation and/or therapy.

In-house training for business and industry. Another form of extension practiced by numerous community colleges is the provision of classes upon request at local businesses and industries. These on-site extension classes are often taught during the regular work day with the employer paying all or a part of the costs. For some these two provisions are the deciding factors in their ability to pursue college-level studies.

Flexible Scheduling and Nontraditional Instruction

In addition to the extension of access through their geographical coverage, community colleges offer further opportunities to many potential students through variations in the ways in which courses are scheduled and taught. To offer classes from perhaps 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. is to make higher education available to students who must maintain a job and who might otherwise be excluded by traditional 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. offerings. A few community colleges have experimented with round-the-clock instruction to respond to the needs of shift workers. Weekend schedules open other possibilities, with classes on Friday evenings, Saturdays, and, occasionally, on Sundays.

To accomodate public employees who work rotating shifts, such as firemen and police officers, class

meeting times may be moved every three weeks or so in coordination with shift changes. Accelerated classes taught over a period of six or eight weeks may be feasible for some students when a semester-length course would not. Or, a class that meets only once a week for several hours may be the answer to other students' schedule problems. Another means of accomodating students is the provision of traditional semester-length courses through multiple class sections. Depending on the size of the college, a student may be able to choose from as many as 50 sections of certain basic courses in the areas of communications and social sciences. Finally, student access through scheduling can be effected by teaching courses out of sequence for the benefit of the learner whose college work is not synchronized with the academic year. For instance, scheduling introductory courses in the spring term instead of only in the fall opens more options for students. This is of particualr assistance to part-time students and to new students who enter college at a time other than the fall semester.

In addition, community colleges have been pacesetters in higher education through the implementation of innovative instructional strategies. Aside from their pedagogical advantages, a number of nontraditional approaches to teaching provide an enormous amount of flexibility for the student who has obligations that prevent adherence to a fixed schedule. Among the more common innovative delivery modes are (1) self-paced, open laboratory courses, sometimes made even more flexible through open-entry, open-exit arrangements, and (2) courses via television, radio, and newspapers.

Curricula

As previously noted, comprehensive community colleges provide instruction in five categories: transfer, general education, developmental education, technical-occupational education, and community

services. In spite of the fact that community/junior colleges are usually limited to teaching transfer courses at the freshman and sophomore levels, institutions with sufficient enrollments often provide a surprising array of course offerings. References to the quantity of courses taught in different areas in the ensuing discussion are based upon casual inspections of several college bulletins. The numbers are for purposes of illustration and should not be interpreted as standards for curricular content.

Credit courses taught in support of the transfer and general education functions may total to 150 or more separate entries. Developmental or remedial courses can add up to a dozen or more courses supplemented by learning laboratories with scores of mini-lessons for prescriptive purposes. Depending on the local service area, one-year and two-year technical vocational programs will vary in number from one to perhaps 60, each of which comprises a number of individual courses. For example, a college with twenty technical programs may list more than 150 separate course titles. In a multi-college district, in which students often attend classes on more than one campus, as many as 1,300 credit courses may be taught. Obviously, all of these courses are not open to all students, illustrating still another way in which access and selectivity operate jointly.

Registration patterns, however, give cause for concern, as Cohen (1985) observes: "By 1980, 90 percent of the enrollment in community college liberal arts classes was in courses for which there was no prerequisite; one-third of the enrollment in mathematics classes was in courses in which the content was less than algebra and three out of eight students taking English were in remedial sections" (p. 156). Of the credit courses offered, a number require successful completion of prerequisites. In an area such as college-level mathematics, each course in an entire sequence may be a prerequisite to the next, thus presenting a formidable obstacle course for the student to negotiate. The performance standards applied to

each course combine with the content to govern the steepness of the grade. Another related factor is the student's choice of a major, with some programs of study having admissions requirements exceeding the general admissions criteria of the institution.

The extent to which selectivity occurs, therefore, is not fixed throughout the college. In the curricula, then, access is afforded through the splendid inventory of educational options provided in many institutions. Selectivity is realized through course or major prerequisites, through performance expectations once entry has been gained, and through limitations in the breadth and depth of curricular offerings. Layers of sophistication within the curriculum also broaden access while at the same time applying selectivity. As an example, students enrolled in a transfer program may be required to take one or more general biology courses. Persons majoring in a science related major, on the other hand, would be expected to take more rigorous biology courses than those intended for the nonscience major. Technical-vocational students may opt for a one-year certificate program in a field for which there is also a two-year program. Typically the one-year occupational program concentrates upon more basic content and focuses on the manual skills. The two-year program in the same vocational area usually builds on the one-year program, involving more complex technical, theoretical competencies during the second year. These illustrations point out that a community college curriculum balances access and selectivity through depth as well as through diversity in breadth.

One of the continuing myths haunting community colleges is the widely held belief that a student does not have to be academically strong to major in a technical, or vocational field. It is assumed, therefore, that access for slower students is automatically provided through the vocational curriculum when they fail to meet the qualifications for regular academic work. As suggested above, certain one-year occupational programs may require a smaller degree of intellectual prowess, thus providing access

to some who would otherwise be excluded from college. The two-year technical programs, however, frequently involve conceptual and quantitative skills rivaling those necessary in pre-baccalaureate studies. Furthermore, Cohen (1981) points out that a number of associate degree programs in the technologies and health-related fields, which started out as so-called terminal programs, have recently been absorbed or converted into university-level programs. Through this type of metamorphosis, differences in academic standards that existed at one time have often been equalized.

Access may also be affected by the packaging of the curriculum. For instance, dividing courses into one- and two-semester hour units may, especially for the part-time student, make classes accessible, whereas lumping requirements into large megacourses may exclude students with limited time for college work.

The possibilities for noncredit instruction are limited only by community interest, morals, mores, legality, available space, and the imagination of program administrators. Few, if any, prerequisites are required for community services classes, providing virtually unlimited access to the growth opportunities available through this function. For some persons the noncredit route provides psychological access to the credit programs. That is, by having a rewarding experience in the nonthreatening environment of informal study, students may overcome the anxiety which previously prevented them from attempting college-level work.

Noncredit classes run the gamut from the basic to the exotic. In large urban community college districts title listings may exceed 1,000. The bulk of these classes are for adults, but many colleges offer community services classes for all ages, including children. Such endeavors, though not always at the college-level, complement the other curricular offerings and indeed make the two-year college a community institution. That is especially true when the broader definition is

applied, viewing the institution's curriculum as the "courses and planned experiences which a student has under the guidance of the . . . college" (Good, p. 157).

Student Services

Today's community college student lives in a far more complex world than did the student at Joliet Junior College in 1902. The problems, stresses, and choices confronting students are many. Because the contemporary two-year college serves students of virtually every demographic variable imaginable, the delights, difficulties and dilemmas faced by its students cumulatively represent the sum total of human experience. The community college cannot provide the solution to everyone's needs. The open-door philosophy, however, carries an inherent obligation for the institution to assume a share of the responsibility for providing help to those whom it has welcomed into its midst. Accordingly, the student personnel services of the college contribute singularly and in concert to assist the student in dealing with personal and educational problems. Of equal importance is the role student services play in promoting student development for life enrichment. In one sense, student personnel services help the student to capitalize on the opportunities afforded through access and to cope with the barriers encountered through selectivity.

Dassance (1984-85) suggests that student services programs should fulfill two broad purposes: "to furnish direct services to students and to promote students' development" (p. 27). Most of the responsibilities carried out by student services professionals are directed toward helping students succeed; therefore, at first glance it would appear that they are more allied with access rather than with selectivity. Without a doubt student personnel programs generally promote access; nevertheless, they carry out highly important tasks which are selective in nature.

From the recruitment of prospective students until they are admitted, the majority of the contacts that new arrivals have with the community college are with individuals who work in student services. The student's first big step toward access to higher education, then, is guided by these key representatives of the institution's philosophy. Since the open-door policy may not be literally applied in all two-year colleges and since some programs of study have higher admissions standards than the general entrance requirements of the college, members of the student personnel staff deal with access and selectivity concurrently. This is evident in entry-level assessment for course placement and in testing related to aptitude and career choices. The personalized, supportive treatment which students receive in the hands of the student personnel professional helps them deal with the sometimes unpleasant realities which such testing brings to light. Thus, by using objective data in a caring environment, the counselor can help the student accept the resulting selectivity with hope rather than defeat. The same can be said of the counselor's involvement with the students' personal and emotional problems.

Besides providing housing, medical, and financial assistance that helps students make the most of the access they have gained, student services personnel usually prepare grade reports; handle course drop, withdraw, and reinstatement requests; and take action related to student probation and/or suspension. In that these matters involve punitive measures to varying degrees, they reflect very real ways whereby a student's access to higher education may be limited or terminated after admission. The delicate interaction between access and selectivity is at work in the remedial function as well. Counselors and faculty attempt to give students a realistic view both of their needs and of their capabilities. Confronting students with their own shortcomings means dealing with the hard fact that some programs cannot currently be made available to them (selectivity). Helping students to feel of value as persons while at the same time

building academic ability means that there will be goals for continued success (access).

The developmental aspect of student services then, entails much more than basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. This aspect covers several broad areas involving knowledge, values, and emotional well-being. Dassance (1984-85) summarizes those goals as: "teaching life skills necessary for functioning in our society, helping students negotiate and benefit from the developmental tasks all human beings face, and assisting students with the career development process" (p. 28). Rippey (1981) classifies developmental needs into three categories: (1) the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes; (2) the development of self-determination; and (3) the development of an ability to control one's environment (p. 16). He holds that three strategies for change are available to professionals in facilitating student development: instruction, consultation, and milieu management. Through collaboration with faculty members and administration, student services staff interact with the students in a wide range of enrichment activities, extending access not only to higher education but to life's opportunities as well.

Faculty

The qualities sought among faculty and the workloads of faculty are two indicators of the community college's student focus. Faculty traits and the ways instructors spend their time on the job demonstrate an enormous concentration of effort on the goal of continuing the access which students gain through admission. The interaction that students have with instructors becomes the catalyst to aid the learner in transforming access into growth.

Emphasis

At the heart of the recruitment and hiring process

for community college faculty is a search for competent professionals who are committed first and foremost to teaching. Cohen (1985) points out that faculty who teach transfer courses typically hold the master's degree, while instructors in technical-occupational programs, though holding less than a master's degree, commonly have a minimum number of years of full-time work experience in a trade or craft. Instructors who hold the doctorate represent only about 15 percent of the total community college faculty. Administrators look for personal qualities and for a philosophy of education that are indicative of the instructor's ability to help students learn. On the inside of the open-door, faculty become the most vital connection in the access chain.

Because of the strong emphasis on instruction, it is widely held that the best, most humanized undergraduate instruction takes place in community colleges. While this is the case in many instances, findings of recent research point to serious instructional shortcomings. Chapter IV presents recommendations for rectifying problems which have eroded the ideal of teaching excellence.

Assisting students to achieve success is the overriding responsibility of faculty in two-year colleges. The word "assisting" is used measuredly to emphasize that while faculty have a critical contributing role, the students share the responsibility for their own achievement. This caring, nurturing role of the community college instructor has drawn criticism from some who allege that students are overprotected. But looking at community college faculty only from the viewpoint of their role in fostering student success is misleading, because instructors perform functions related to selectivity as well. After motivating, teaching, and advising, selectivity comes into play through evaluation and grading. Teaching involves accountability as well as encouragement; at community colleges, both dimensions are permeated with genuine concern for the student.

Faculty Load and Assignments

Although instructor work loads vary a great deal among teaching fields and among two-year colleges, the underlying principle remains similar: the student is the center of attention. A 30-clock-hour week is common for community college teachers, though, many faculty, of course, exceed this in actual practice. The average instructor in transfer programs spends 15 of those hours in class, about 10 office hours in prime time, and the remaining five hours in committee assignments, meetings, community service activities and the like. Thus, about 83 percent of the faculty member's time is allocated to direct contact with students. The remaining duties pertaining to the other 17 percent often involve curriculum planning and instructional development. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1985a) reports that student-related activities involve 90 percent of faculty time, with about seven percent devoted to administrative tasks and three percent to research. From either point of view, it can be readily seen that the great preponderance of the instructor's obligations are tied to the teaching-learning process. Instructors in technical-occupational programs often teach longer hours as a result of their involvement in clinics and laboratories (Cohen, 1985). These persons may spend 83 percent of their time in direct contact with students. Part-time faculty obviously do not begin to approximate this kind of interaction. (Chapter IV contains further observations on the impact of part-time instructors on instructional quality.)

Community college faculty have little or no responsibility for research and publication, quite in contrast to their university counterparts. Furthermore, the classes assigned to instructors in two-year colleges are, on the average, smaller than the freshman and sophomore classes taught by university faculty. The class size obviously permits more interaction between the student and the faculty member than is possible in the large group settings frequently found in other types of institutions. In universities the

teaching of freshmen and sophomores is often relegated to new faculty, junior faculty, and graduate students. In the community college students should encounter the best the institution has to offer throughout their educational experience.

Costs

Public community colleges have been promoted as the most economical form of higher education. Though the Truman Commission, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and others have recommended free public education through the fourteenth grade, that ideal has had only limited application. The costs borne by the student, however, have been minimal. Even with rising costs, attending a community college is still a bargain in most states. Through grants, loans, scholarships, and work-study programs, costs borne by the student have been considerably offset in many instances. The various GI bills, social security benefits, federal and state student aid programs have favorably affected millions of community college students. As Hyde (1982) points out, "The federal government annually spends $5 billion and states spend another $1 billion in direct need-based financial assistance for students to promote their educational opportunities" (p. 1). (The high priority which support for access through financial assistance has had at the federal level, especially since the 1970s, at this writing appears to be much in jeopardy, however.)

The College Board (1985) reports that tuition and fees for public two-year colleges during 1985-86 averaged $659; at public four-year institutions, the average was $1,242. The costs at public two-year colleges, therefore, are 53 percent of those at public four-year colleges and universities. When total costs of attending college are considered, the difference between attending a community college and a senior institution shrinks but is still a factor. Commuters at public two-year colleges in 1985-86 paid $3,627 in total costs. Their counterparts at public four-year

schools paid $4,240. The $613 lower cost at the community/ junior college represents a savings of over 14 percent. Since more than 95 percent of all community college students commute, this cost profile describes about 4.1 million students. Resident student costs at public community/junior colleges are not presented in the College Board estimates for 1985-86. If we figure a seven percent increase over 1984-85 costs, this would amount to $4,295. Costs for resident students at public four-year colleges were $5,394 or almost $1,100 more. Of course, college-related costs vary considerably among states; thus the amounts must not be taken as literally or universally applicable.

The American Council of Education (cited in Wilson, 1986) reports that self-supporting community college students receiving financial aid incurred average total costs of $5,679 in 1983-84, while self-supporting students at four-year colleges receiving aid paid costs averaging $6,099. For aid recipients living with their parents, costs were $3,347 for two-year college students and $4,235 for four-year students.

Since three-fourths of all students anticipate financial aid in one form or another, Hyde (1982) suggests that the net price which students pay for college attendance should be examined. The net cost is the amount paid by the student exclusive of financial aid and parental assistance. Hyde's findings show that in 1978 both low- and high-income community college students paid about one-third of the total, while middle-income students paid a slightly higher share. Because financial aid has been more widely available to students at four-year colleges than to students at community colleges, the net cost for students receiving financial aid averaged $500 less at public four-year colleges than at two-year colleges. A study by the American Council of Education (cited in Wilson, 1986) points out that the advantages of lower tuition at community colleges are more than offset by additional costs which the two-year college student must bear.

Several other variables have to be considered.

With decreasing allocations for financial aid in higher education, students at community colleges will fair better in view of a probable shift in the net costs mentioned above. Secondly, the geography of the college comes into the picture. Except where students live near a public four-year college, the community college student's ability to live at home and keep a part-time job may offset higher amounts of financial aid available through the senior colleges. On the other hand, financial aid plans have tended to favor full-time enrollees, to the detriment of the many community college students who study on a part-time basis.

The rate at which fees have recently increased is another factor to be considered. Between 1984-85 and 1985-86, tuition and fees increased by seven percent at public two-year colleges and by nine percent at public four-year colleges and universities (College Board, 1985). Total costs for commuters at two-year public colleges rose by 5 percent, while at public four-year colleges they increased by 8 percent. Rising costs negatively impact access. Hyde's analyses thus suggest that for every one percent increase in the cost of attendance an enrollment decline of 1.9 percent at two-year colleges may occur. For low-income students choosing whether or not to attend a community college, a one percent cost increase may produce a 2.3 percent enrollment decline.

Data from the National Association of College and University Business Officers ("Finances of Community Colleges . . . ," 1982) reveal student contribution toward community college costs. In 1980-81 the median institutional expenditure per full-time student equivalent (FTSE) was $2,739. The median charge for tuition and fees for credit instruction totaled $447, or 15.7 percent of the institution's expense. Parnell (1985) gives figures from the National Center for Education Statistics for the same period. The mean expenditure per FTSE among public institutions was $3,061 in two-year colleges, $7,246 in four-year colleges, and $9,725 in universities. The mean for

tuition and fees at public institutions was $510 in two-year colleges, $1,020 in four-year colleges, and $1,270 in universities. These comparisons reveal the concerted effort that states have made to keep the costs of attending community colleges as low as possible.

Low costs alone do not create access for all students, but high costs are a barrier to college for many economically disadvantaged persons. Singularly and in combination, the indicators discussed in this chapter have opened the gateway to higher education for many. Community colleges have made college-level study attainable for persons who would have otherwise been excluded, bearable for many who would have faced overwhelming odds, and gratifying in terms of growth and discovery for many who would otherwise have found it a drudgery.

Students

When the community college was still in its adolescence and seeking identity, Thornton (1972) was prompted to observe, "Although the door was open, many of the guests did not come--they did not even know they were welcome" (p. 56). That situation has changed drastically as evidenced by the explosion of enrollments mentioned earlier in this monograph. As impressive as the growth rates are, they do not provide a complete picture. For the enrollees came one at a time--a high school graduate, a high school dropout, a veteran, a mother whose children were grown, a black, a valedictorian from last year's class, a salutatorian from a class five years before, a retired person, a handicapped person, a Chicano, a person from the middle class, a 25 year-old married man with a family to support, a divorced mother, a full-time student, a person on welfare, a part-time student with a full-time job, an intermittent student, a non-credit student, an institutionalized person, a low achiever, and other typical folk who came to learn.

The full impact of the diversity of students drawn to the community college because of its access can best be gained by working in registration, teaching a class, or working in a counseling center. Since we cannot do those things in this medium, in this section we will review some prevalent characteristics of students, revealing at least in some measure how successful community colleges have been in their attempt to be our most democratic institutions.

Academic Abilities. Some contend that the two-year college has become America's garbage dump. The implication is that only the less-able attend community colleges. To the contrary, one of the things which makes these institutions such dynamic places is the mosaic nature of their student bodies. Numerous students in need of remediation attend class alongside many academically gifted students. Between the two extremes are students of widely varying abilities.

While as many as 50 percent of the entering freshmen may need remedial work (Roueche, 1984), 46 percent of them may have been in the top 40 percent of their high school graduating class (Astin, King & Richardson, 1980). The gap is widened by the fact that not all who need remediation get it. A Carnegie Foundation (1985b) report shows that of those freshmen enrolled in remedial courses in 1984, 19 percent were in reading classes, 23 percent were in writing classes, and 28 percent were in matheamtics classes. Of the students who take developmental courses, 50 percent may earn non-productive grades such as I, W, WP, and WF (Roueche, 1983). In one sense the great percentage of low achievers in two-year colleges is a positive indication of the success of the open-door; although, the wide range of student abilities in a given class makes the instructor's job a most challenging one. Teaching in a community college is perhaps the most exhausting, exhilarating assignment in higher education.

Age. Increasing numbers of students beyond the traditional college age group have enrolled in colleges

and universities in recent years. Grant (1983) reports that from 1972 to 1982 students in the 25 to 34 age range increased by nearly 70 percent. Enrollment of those 35 years of age and older grew by more than 77 percent. In 1980 the mean age of two-year college students was 27 (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1982). Data from 1978 reveal that the average age of part-time community college students is 30.4 years (Hyde, 1980).

Sex. Women students in higher education increased by nearly 61 percent from 1972 to 1982 (Grant, 1983). In two-year colleges women account for about 53 percent of the total enrollment (Hyde, 1980).

Minorities. According to Grant (1983), the enrollments of blacks and other minorities in higher education increased by over 85 percent from 1972 to 1982. Hyde (1980) observes that racial minorities constitute a larger proportion of community college populations than at four-year institutions.

Curricular Choices. During the 1970s, enrollment growth in occupational programs outstripped enrollment increases in transfer programs. Cohen (1981) states, "Now more students who complete occcupational programs transfer to universities than those who complete transfer programs" (p. 8). This is especially interesting in light of findings (Astin et al., 1980) that almost 77 percent of the entering freshmen at two-year colleges in 1980 were enrolled in college preparatory programs in high school. The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in Higher Education (1984), hereafter referred to as The Study Group, points out that "the percentage of arts and sciences . . . degrees awarded by community colleges . . . declined from 57 percent in 1970 to 37 percent in 1981, with a corresponding rise in occupational degrees" (p. 9).

Attendance Patterns. Of the 4.5 million students enrolled in two-year colleges in 1984, 62.5 percent were part-time ("Fall 1984 Enrollment," 1986). Hyde's (1980) research shows that over two-thirds of community

college students are employed. Cross (1980) calls attention to the fact that typically it takes four part-time students to produce one full-time student equivalent. Not only is the academic load of part-time students smaller, but they are far less likely to take part in the broader aspects of the institution's services and developmental activities. Further, part-time students often enroll intermittently, resulting in a less cohesive college experience.

Yes, the guests found out that they were welcome, and how they did come! Now the community college's single most perplexing dilemma is how to continue to provide access for students with such widely differing abilities, aspirations, and personal characteristics while at the same time ensuring that reasonable but high standards of performance are met. The need to establish a strong, positive relationship between access and selectivity has never been more critical.

CHAPTER IV

WHAT IS THE PROGNOSIS?

Selectivity is threatening to supplant access in the community college, arresting the progress which has been made in making higher education available to the masses. Paradoxically, community colleges must exercise more selectivity (in the proper perspective) in order to preserve access. If the two-year college is to overcome pressures to achieve excellence through exclusion, more selectivity will be required both in terms of intervention with students and in terms of quality control of the personnel, processes, and programs within the institution. Excellence of outcome will be the only defense for continued broad access. The state of the art of selectivity must be refined so that outcomes can be enhanced and verified with greater accuracy. America's community colleges have enjoyed such phenomenal popularity with students, legislators, boards of trustees, local taxpayers, and legislatures that many of their administrators, faculty, and staff never dreamed of a day of reckoning. Who would ever have thought that anyone would seriously propose that public higher education has too high a price tag or that two-year colleges should shut out so many of those whom they have prided themselves in reaching?

Those harsh realities are here, and they have been preceded by the loss of some qualitative and quantitative gains which many had thought to be permanent. This is not a time for precipitous action. Today's challenges call for serious, objective introspection. Institutions, like people, can become sedentary, and some two-year colleges have done so.

In this chapter two courses of direction, one of which the community college must choose, are reviewed. Later in the chapter we will examine some ways in which instruction, student services, and college leadership can be strengthened in order to maintain the community

college's reputation for being on the leading edge of positive developments in higher education.

The American community college has recently entered an institutional version of a stage which Sheehy (1976) calls one of life's passages. We are in a priod of crisis, of questioning, of reexaminiation. Financial constraints, rising costs, and the widespread movement for educational reform pull heavily at the community college's central purpose—to serve as the college of the people.

In providing access to higher education, the two-year college has been unequaled. Open-door admission policies, the widespread location of campuses, flexible scheduling, diverse curricula, student services, faculty who emphasize student contact, and moderate costs have allowed the community college to enrich the lives of millions. While broadening access, community colleges have exercised various forms of selectivity through performance standards, student placement, and institutional programming and policies. Access and selectivity have struggled against and tempered each other as kinesthetic forces, working to produce what the American Assocation of Community and Junior Colleges (1985) calls "Opportunity with Excellence." Now two alternatives emerge as pathways for the future direction of the community college. Associated with one is a dismal prognosis; with the other, a brighter portrait of possibilities. A choice must be quickly made between the two, for to hesitate in selecting the second is to embrace the first by default if not by deliberate intent.

Prognosis: Critical

One prognosis is that selectivity will return to a position of dominance over access, approaching the position it held earlier in American higher education. Community colleges may become primarily accessible to those of comfortable financial status and/or those among the intellectually gifted. The proponents of new

levels of excellence typically view the imposition of selective admissions as the best means of quality control. If community colleges adopt significantly higher standards for entry many able learners will be excluded and history will repeat itself. At the extreme, two-year colleges can take the position assumed by Nineteenth Century academics who advocated the separation of less able students into another unit of education, concentrating the resources of the university upon the more mature, serious upperclassmen. Imagine the results of similar action by two-year colleges. It is possible that society's expectations for broad-based educational opportunity beyond the high school could result in yet another layer of institutions of higher learning. Such an unattractive, impractical move could occur unless the nation's educational needs are met by existing institutions.

Another possibility is for the community college to totally ignore the calls for excellence, let the transfer function fall into disarray, and become what Vaughan (1985) calls "a mechnism for social stratification" (p. 34). Either way, the misappropriation of standards is a potential denial of access to many for whom the community college is the only hope for socio-economic gain and personal development.

Financial barriers were thought to have been overturned years ago, but formidable obstacles once again face students in higher education. Learners are caught in a squeeze between the curtailment of financial aid on one side and rising costs on the other. Trachtenberg (1984) points to the financial pressures confronting two-year colleges because of the need for increased investment in state-of-the-art equipment. Hyde (1982) and Jaschik (1985) describe the efforts of many officals to cause the student rather than the taxpayer to assume more of the costs of attending college. Johnson (1983) observes that "there appears to be, however, a growing trend to curtail enrollments by means of the budgetary process" (p. 8).

Breneman (1983) forecasts that predicted

enrollment decreases in higher education, due to the changing pool of traditional college-aged students, will only mildly affect the community college. If, however, enrollments at two-year colleges are affected by changes in admissions standards and by escalations in student-paid costs, college revenues will decline proportionately, setting off another spiral of inflationary adjustments to the detriment of numerous students. Budget woes at community colleges will also result in a reduction of services, curricula, and faculty. These may bring further denial of access for some and a lessening of the institution's ability to assist the students who come to make the most of the access gained.

The barriers described above constitute selectivity of the worst sort--selectivity based not on what students can be, but upon what they have done or what they can pay.

Prognosis: Excellent

Through the concerted efforts of community college leaders and faculty, the prognosis is excellent for the two-year college to enter an era of much needed qualitative improvement. In order for such growth to occur, access must remain preeminent. Simultaneously, selectivity must be used skillfully and methodologically in a series of intervening checkpoints for assessing students, remediating and redirecting them, and upholding legitimate high expectations for behavior and academic progress.

The leadership orientation for meeting the needs of the present and for anticipating the challenges of tomorrow must be that of progressive conservatism. Those personnel, programs, philosophies, practices, and policies which have been effective in promoting the social and personal betterment of each institution's community should be kept in place. Any facet of the college which is obsolete, which is out of touch with today's realities, or which fails to meet standards of

high quality must be removed, revised, or revitalized. Thus the community college, while renewing its commitment to open access for the learners it serves, should exercise an unprecedented degree of selectivity upon all of the elements of which it is comprised.

Assertive action is required to combat the reestablishment of financial and academic barriers that limit access to higher education, preclude the student's ability to try, and prejudge his or her ability to succeed. Once admitted, the learner should encounter a personalized system of assessment, advisement, placement, and orientation designed to enhance—though not to guarantee— chances of success. This requires the college to provide an able faculty, appropriate facilities, a cohesive and needs-based curriculum, and a wide range of support services.

Student success should be validated both in terms of the degree to which personal goals have been achieved and in terms of reasonable, measurable criteria and standards of excellence related to the next level to which they are to move, whether that level be academic or occupational. The community college applies selectivity as a complement to access, moving learners, vertically (up or down), laterally, or out. This is accomplished as students qualify for and/or respond to standards for program admission, voluntary and mandatory placement in courses, course prerequisites and requirements, and behavioral expectations. Institutional success should be confirmend by thorough, on-going programmatic and personnel evaluations, followed by whatever corrective measures are necessary to keep the college on the leading edge of high quality performance.

A bright future is attainable for the community college. The functions are there, except for some potential need which may be forthcoming and which may require engrafting. That should cause no concern, for in the past the addition of each new function resulted in growth and more democratic access. The programs and the talent are present, also. With the continued

availability of reasonable financial resources and the application of good judgment in their use, the community college will continue to open the gateway to the American dream for many of our nation's sons and daughters who would otherwise be pushed aside.

Revitalizing the Community College

The upper limits of excellence achieved at any institution will be determined by the efforts of those who work with students and by the students with whom they interact. Administrators can take their colleges no farther than the point to which their faculty and staff are able and willing to be led. Townsend (1985) reemphasizes this fact, concluding that neither a new direction nor an improved identity can be gained for the community college without strong faculty support. The core of the institution is instruction, and it is with instruction that revitalization must begin.

Instruction

As the community college gained national attention, it was widely acclaimed for having the best instruction in higher education. Instructors were excited about their jobs, and they displayed genuine care and concern for their students. Studies showed that students who transferred to senior institutions did as well or better during their junior and senior years as the native students who attended the senior college or university as freshmen and sophomores. In too many instances, however, these trophies have been tarnished or forfeited, and community colleges must regain a reputation for greatness by earning it on a daily basis. First, let us look at teachers and teaching.

Faculty and Teaching. An institution's reputation for excellence in teaching can be neither earned nor sustained by having only a few good teachers. "What is needed now," say Roueche and Watkins (1982), "is a

recommitment to great teaching" (p. 22). They further underscore that in addition to recognizing and rewarding excellence in all its forms, colleges must be intolerant of incompetence. Roueche (1983) holds that many earlier claims for teaching superiority were without documentation. He points to the loss of 50 percent or more of community college freshmen as a sign of deterioration in instructional quality, a trait about which we previously boasted.

The word teacher holds some clues to breathing new life into teaching. First, it contains the verb to teach. To revitalize teaching is to have faculty members incorporate the full meaning of the process into their relationships with students. Even among those faculty with superb mastery of their discipline, there is a tendency to view teaching as simply telling; but, the art and science of causing students to learn must involve much more than that. Some of the synonyms of the verb form teach are to: impart, show, direct, discipline, school, coach, tutor, involve, manage, and accustom to some action or attitude. In the noun form we see the teacher as: guide, preceptor, counselor, advisor, mentor, synthesizer, listener, orchestrator, facilitator, catalyst, and diagnostician. With the diversity of contemporary students, the master teacher must use every appropriate method, involving as many stimuli as possible in order to respond to the learning needs and styles of their changes.

Knowles (1980) speaks of a spectrum of teaching techniques with a group of assumptions about learners at each end. At one extreme is pedagogy, an approach which views the learner in a dependent role. At the other other end of the spectrum is andragogy, which views the learner in a self-directed instructional role. A more realistic assumption, Knowles suggests, is that in any given situation the best approach to teaching will focus at a point between the two ends. Adult learners have a need to be self-directing, although they may be dependent in different situations. As adults mature, their accumulated experiences become a resource for learning. Also, their readiness to

learn is prompted by the need for skills related to real life tasks and problems. In addition, the time perspective of adults changes from a postponed application of knowledge to an immediacy of application. As a result, "their orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject-centeredness to one of performance-centeredness" (p. 45).

For the learner in the community college who has a low self-concept, who is immature, and who is extrinsically motivated, a tightly structured approach to learning is indicated. Roueche and Armes (1983) differentiate structure from the rigidity associated with content-laden courses in which students are force-fed. Careful organization coupled with support form the basis for meeting the needs of today's student. Sequencing skills and stating clear-cut expectations are associated with these requisites "so that new patterns supplant old, largely passive or unproductive ways" (p. 18). As learners become more self-confident, more mature, and more intrinsically motivated, the methods selected by the faculty then need to be modified more toward the end of the spectrum which Knowles describes as andragogy, moving the student from dependency to greater independence. Note that the emphasis here is on changing strategies, not the abandonment of structure. The revitalization of instruction will surely be moved forward by helping faculty develop skills for organizing courses and for selecting instructional strategies in a manner that moves students from passive helplessness to active self-directedness.

A second clue to adding zest to instruction is found in the word teacher--tea. The analogy here is of the teacher as the stimulant or motivator for learning. The faculty member certainly cannot bear the whole responsibility, but with the right application of enthusiasm, teasers, prods, praisings, and rewards student learning can be increased. Blanchard and Johnson (1982) describe two amazingly simple motivational techniques for improving management effectiveness. In the One Minute Manager they advocate the one minute

praising and the one minute reprimand, brief one-on-one encounters in which emphasis is on supportive feedback immediately after observing a behavior in relation to stated expectations. This technique can be used by administrators to stimulate faculty toward excellence and by instructors to energize students toward achievement. At the end of each session, shake hands or touch the person as a sign of reassurance and reaffirm your support of the individual as a person. After a corrective action, Blanchard and Johnson (1982) say, "Realize that when the reprimand is over, it's over" (p. 59). This person-centered use of management by objectives is reflected in course goals and specific, measurable instructional objectives which are explained to the students prior to instruction. Instructors should not only articulate their expectations, they should explain to studnets how to fulfill the requirements as well. (Easton, Forrest, Goldman & Ludwig, 1985).

Describing the expertise involved in producing excellence, Conger (1983-84) says, "The truly good teacher has a special regard for those whom he instructs. He doesn't coddle them. He challenges and inspires them" (p. 24). Motivation also involves basic techniques such as asking questions in class, encouraging students to ask questions, helping students to work cooperatively with other students, relating the course content to students' interest, and promoting active learning through exercises and examples that demand involvement (Easton et al., 1985). This approach is supported by The Study Group (1984) which gives the following recommendations relative to instructional strategies:

1. "Faculty should make greater use of active modes of teaching and require that students take greater responsibility for their learning" (p. 27).

2. "Learning technologies should be designed to increase, and not reduce, the amount of personal contact between students and faculty on intellectual issues" (p. 29).

Another hint about instructional improvement in the word teaching is each. Effective learning requires the instructor to view a class not as a sea of faces but as a group of individuals. The skills for doing so range from knowing students' names to individualizing learning experiences. The teacher's professional repertoire may include, but should not be restricted to, self-paced instructional approaches. In a more traditionally organized class the instructor may use a variety of assignments, media, stimuli, and techniques to reach a wider range of student needs. In courses with multiple sections, the student may be provided with several alternative approaches such as audio-tutorial sessions, peer-tutoring, seminars, media-based instruction (television, radio, or newspaper), mini-courses, independent study, or lecture. Cognitive-mapping prior to registration can be used to match available teaching approaches to the learner's preferred learning style. Of course, no faculty member can be expected to master all instructional techniques; but instructors can be expected to broaden their use of different strategies.

Cross (1983) observes that 89 percent of our colleges and universities offer some form of individualized instruction. That, however, does not mean that 89 percent of the faculty are individualizing their teaching. Projections indicate that the number of adult learners at community colleges will continue to increase in the immediate future. Colleges cannot afford to invite them in without providing a learning climate within which they can flourish.

In individualized learning students are not compared with each other (Christensen, 1980); the learner's performance is measured against specific standards, not against the performance of other students. Christensen also encourages faculty to be aware of the personal circumstances of the student and to develop the habit of dealing with the learner's academic and social problems in private. Smith (1980) concludes, "If we accept the premise that information processing skills are going to be a mark of educated

persons in the future, then an integral part of their education should be focused on helping them diagnose their own situation, organize information, learn, and know what and how much they have learned" (p. 11). To develop these skills within the learner is to provide the best in individualized education.

Ache is another indicator in the term teacher. Teaching in the community college is hard work, and more faculty members should stretch themselves to the point of having some aches produced by involvement in their students' learning. Too many instructors in two-year colleges have slackened their pace as a result of being bored, frustrated, burned out, tired, or semi-retired in attitude.

Cher, another part of the word teacher, is a French word which comes from the same root words as care for or cherish. A caring environment has been strongly identified with successful community colleges. An interesting coincidence is that the word teacher, teach and cher overlap, showing their interdependence. This does not mean that instructors should hover over students, but that all teachers' actions must be motivated by concern. Conger (1983-84) maintains that "a good tacher never intentionally violates the dignity of his students" (Easton et al., 1985, p. 24). Blanchard and Johnson (1982) speak of this in terms of caring about people and results, caring enough to be tough—tough on poor performance but not on the person. Roueche and Armes (1983) call this "disciplined caring."

He and her appear in the word teacher as reminders that in this age of sexual equity the learner still has to be viewed in terms of the sexual identity of the individual. Faculty awareness concerning sexuality must include proper responses to both real and stereotypical differences, and instructors must avoid all semblances of sexual harrassment.

Another point to consider in promoting teaching excellence is the tendency to expect community college

faculty to be generalists rather than specialists. Small institutions with limited teaching staffs have done this all along, and in the face of tight budgets, larger institutions are assigning instructors widespread teaching loads that give themselves more latitude in the event of reductions in force. As a management tool this is a smart move, up to a point. But there should be a happy medium in order to prevent morale problems. An instructor who has to make four or more separate course plans every week is as apt to burn out as the instructor who teaches several sections of two or three courses. Further, we could make a case for at least some subject-matter specialization throughout the instructional offerings; however, at least three areas deserve special mention.

With the great need for remedial and developmental work in reading, writing, and mathematics, it is highly important that those who teach basic skills courses have both the personal disposition and the special expertise required for these assignments. Instead, the teaching of remedial students is often relegated to the least experienced faculty members. This is an area where seasoned faculty are needed. Second, an instructor of developmental writing may have a Ph.D. in English, but chances are the bulk of his or her expertise will be in literature rather than in techniques for teaching the fundamentals of grammar. The right kind of specialization, then, is of great import. Third, a specialist in Russian renaissance history is likely to be impatient and unfulfilled in teaching five sections of Western Civilization; therefore, matching faculty expertise to the student needs and to the curriculum should be of high priority.

Evaluation and grading of students performance. If colleges are to point with any assurance to an improved level of excellence in student achievement, faculty expertise in evaluation must be refined. Choices of evaluation devices and approaches are often poorly correlated with course expectations. And even when the best approach to evaluation has been selected, poor test construction and improper administration

frequently lead to false readings about the extent of student mastery. Further, Sadler (1983) emphasized the importance of feedback following evaluation beyond the mere reporting of what went wrong: ". . . students should be given opportunity with incentive to rework and resubmit papers, with continuous rather than single-shot access to evaluative feedback during the reworking" (p. 74). Formative evaluation involves both formal and informal progress checks, allowing the teacher not only to provide feedback, but to make adjustments in the teaching strategy as well (Easton et al., 1985). Sadler warns against treating evaluation and grading as synonymous, holding that grades are action-neutral as far as improvement is concerned.

Part-time faculty. The advantages and disadvantages of using part-time faculty have received an increased amount of attention in recent years. Bramlett and Rodriquez (1982-83) observe that, "Part timers bring current, practical, specialized knowledge to the campus. They deserve the best expertise in helping to deliver their knowledge to the students in the most effective ways possible" (pp. 40-41). Nationally, part-time faculty constitute about 57 percent of the instructors in community colleges (Boggs, 1984). Therefore, their far-reaching impact on students must be recognized, and the quality of their performance must be no less than that which is sought and expected from the full-time faculty.

Over the driveway leading from the service center for a natural gas company is a sign which all employees observe as they leave the parking lot. It reads, "From this point on, you are Lone Star Gas." Students in the classroom care little about the instructor's contract status. They react to the excellence with which the faculty member conducts the course. Therefore, after a part-time faculty member is assigned to a course, he or she becomes the community college as viewed by the student. With the high percentage of part-time faculty on college staffs today, the chances are very great that the majority, if not all, of a student's classroom work during any given semester will be carried out

under the direction of adjunct instructors. And yet when it comes to part-time faculty, few institutions use the same care in hiring, supervising, and evaluating that is applied to the full-time staff. Professional development programs, office space, and opportunities for involvement in college affairs are rarely provided for part-timers. These inconsistent practices are major barriers to attaining and maintaining great teaching.

Curriculum diversity and continuity. Providing multiple curricular options or tracks has factored greatly in increased access to higher education. Community colleges must offer the widest variety of courses and programs that can be supported at a level of excellence. Cohen (1985) observes that the transfer curriculum of most community colleges has a flat profile. Enrollments tend to cluster in introductory courses and in courses without prerequisites. The end result, Cohen contends, is that a college's curriculum takes on a grade 13 plus remedial emphasis, opening a gap at grade 14. In these instances students may have difficulty in completing two years of transfer work. Occupational programs, by contrast, are more structured, more sequential, and have fewer electives. The variety of content, of course, should be geared to the functions of the college as determined by needs assessments.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered relative to curricular improvement:

1. Regardless of the function to which courses are related, community colleges should assure that continuity exists from one instructor to the next in sections of the same course. Similarly, among related courses there should be carefullly planned sequencing of competencies from one course to the next. Cohen and Brawer (1982b) point out that transfer courses are often discrete, resulting in a curriculum that "is more

a myriad of miniature curricula than a program" (p. 37).

2. In keeping with the position of The Study Group (1984), standards and techniques relative to remedial programs ought to "enable students to perform well subsequently in college-level courses" (p. 48).

3. To protect the integrity of the college-level curricula, institutions should not give credit toward graduation for remedial courses. To do so is both contradictory and damaging.

4. Both the curriculum and the instructional strategies of the college should "match the knowledge, capacities, and skills it expects students to develop" (The Study Group, 1984, p. 45).

5. Two-year colleges should expand and reinvigorate their liberal arts offerings, seeking not only to provide content excellence but to develop student "capacities for analysis, problem solving, communication and synthesis, and . . . [to] integrate knowledge from various disciplines" (The Study Group, 1984, p. 43).

6. The associate degree should be promoted "as the minimum standard of excellence in educating students for employment or for transfer" (American Asssociation of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985, p. 49).

7. In response to expanding high tech occupations, Vaughan (1984) suggests that some colleges would do well to consider offering a general technical program involving work in a number of areas rather than specializing in a single high tech field.

8. Parnell (1985) proposes the Tech-Prep/Associate Degree program, a four-year sequence involving grades 11 through 14 combining a common core of learning with technical education. Such a program is intended to parallel the college-prep associate

degree, serving that part of the population who are unlikely to pursue a baccalaureate degree.

9. Further work is needed in programming related to the concept of life-long learning. Institutions must be prepared to fulfill the increasing need for occupational upgrading and retraining, as well as to respond to the personal growth needs of citizens in the community.

10. Community colleges should expand their honors programs for exceptional students.

With careful planning, diversification, continuity, and quality control the community college can become known, not as a dumping ground for society, but as America's best refinery of public talent.

Student Personnel Services

A modern, vital community college is a complex microcosm. The more expansive its offerings and services and the more diverse its clientele, the greater the need will be for early and continuing encounters with the student through various professional relationships. All available data point to the likelihood that two-year colleges will continue to have students with wide ranges in age, interests, aptitutdes, academic abilities, goals, socioeconomic backgrounds, and feelings of self-worth. At the same time financial constraints at the local, state, and national levels are exerting pressures on college budgets, leading to the curtailment of functions and services. Since most student personnel services do not generate income in the form of full-time student equivalencies or student contact hours, administrators naturally look to this area for possible budget reductions (Elsner & Ames, 1983).

Nelson and Murphy (1980) report the projected effects of enrollment declines and budget reductions on student personnel services in public colleges and

universities. A wide divergence of opinion exists among student personnel administrators who participated in the study concerning which programs may be terminated. But it was generally agreed that possible reductions or alterations through selected reprogramming, staffing changes, and/or curtailment of activities are expected in counseling programs, student activity centers and programs, and health care programs.

While some economies can no doubt be realized through better management, severe reductions in student personnel services may be counterproductive. Deegan (1984) states, "A major problem is that student services programs have already been integrated with the mainstream academic activities in community colleges" (p. 14). To those outside the student personnel unit, much of what is done in the area may be viewed as peripheral. According to Elsner and Ames (1983), "No genuine consensus exists about the nature of, need for, or direction of community college student services programs" (p. 139). At no time in the history of this function have challenges of its effectiveness and relative worth been greater. The continuance of student personnel services as a requisite to students' success will depend upon: (1) the movement toward resolving the issues cited by Elsner and Ames, (2) the solid documentation of the contributions made by student services, and (3) adaptation to changing characteristics and conditions as needed.

Student personnel professionals have often adapted neither their programming nor their schedules to the changing student clientele. Community colleges often enroll as many credit students (by headcount) in their evening programs as are enrolled during the daytime. And yet, in many cases few or no counselors or other service staff are on duty at night. In addition, health centers are either closed or understaffed, and deadlines for dropping classes are frequently set for 5:00 p.m. or earlier. While many institutions have no dormitories and serve predominantly part-time students who are employed, student activities are often

scheduled as if students were available for lengthy leisure time pursuits.

Counseling. Some attempts at integrating student personnel functions have met with mixed reaction among two-year colleges. Assigning counselors to one or two credit classes is one approach. This is looked upon by some as a way to bring about wider acceptance of counselors by faculty. Others contend that requiring counselors to teach puts them the untenable position of evaluating students with whom they seek to build supportive relationships. Another unresolved issue related to counselors is whether they should be housed centrally or dispersed throughout the academic divisions. Further integration may be achieved through a decentralized approach, allowing counselors to specialize in one or two instructional divisions, thus improving their effectivenss in academic advisement.

The Study Group (1984) presents the following recommendations pertaining to student personnel services:

1. "All colleges should offer a systematic program of guidance and advisement that involves students from matriculation through graduation. Student affairs personnel, peer counselors, faculty, and administrators should all participate in this system on a continuing basis" (p. 31).

2. "Academic and student service administrators should provide adequate fiscal support, space, and recognition to existing cocurricular programs and activities for purposes of maximizing student involvement. Every attempt should be made to include part-time and commuter students in those programs and activities" (p.35).

Additionally, it is recommended that student personnel administrators in community colleges give particular attention to the following areas:

1. Entry-level assessment programs should be

established at every college, involving all entering students immediately upon their admission. Both academic and psychological needs of students should be inventoried, followed by prescriptive counseling and placement.

2. Thorough orientation programs for all entering students should exist at every college, continuing through at least the first semester on a regular basis.

3. New sources of financial assistance for students should be vigorously pursued to offset probable declines in state and federal student aid programs.

4. Every possible effort should be made to enhance the articulation of students' credits from high school to the community college and from the two-year college to the senior institution (Cohen & Brawer, 1982a).

In the words of Elsner and Ames (1983), "It is imperative that the relationship of student services to the instructional program be clearly defined and enhanced . . . " (p. 158). Student personnel services professionals must infuse renewed vitality into those programs and activities for which irrefutable evidence exists that students' academic progress is augmented by their existence. In the absence of such evidence, objective research should be conducted to ascertain the extent to which measurable results are being produced. Those functions found lacking should be either corrected or discontinued, so that in the final analysis student services can be honestly recognized as indispensable to the fulfillment of the missions of the community college.

Coordination of College Functions

As institutions age and grow larger, they are subject to a phenomenon similar to the continental drift. According to this paradigm, most of the world's

terrain was at one time a part of a continuous body. Gradually, dynamic forces within the earth's core caused parts of the land mass to break apart, each of which began a slow migration away from the original mass, leading ultimately to today's continents.

Functional Drift. Community colleges are subject to a parallel of continental drift—functional drift. Because of the unique responsibilities associated with different segments of the institution and because of management's need to limit the span of control, administrative divisions are created within every college. As each unit goes about its assigned tasks, it typically begins a slow drift away from the central core. This pulling apart is largely unintentional, primarily resulting from employees looking within the unit rather than looking at the whole. Thus, the instructional division inches away from the student personnel services division, and the business affairs division moves away from both of them. The fragmentation, however, does not stop there. Individual instructional divisions become enclaves, the learning resources area becomes sacred turf, and the college becomes a collection of loosely connected or unconnected parts like islets or ice floes. While all of them exist to serve the student, these divisions sometimes pull away, sometimes collide, leaving the student bewildered instead of bettered. Cosand (1979) comments, "The colleges cannot drift, cannot make decisions based upon expediencies" (p. 2). The leaders of the contemporary community college must find better ways of coordinating the institution's functions without smothering the creativity and productivity that are associated with each.

Excellence and Efficiency. A key to administrative excellence is the ability to differentiate between effectiveness and efficiency. Lawrence (1984) says, "Effectiveness is concerned with doing the right things. Efficiency is concerned with doing them well. It is never enough to be merely efficient. Never let the tyranny of the bottom line compromise imagination" (p. 22). Clowes and Towles

(1985) suggest the rekindling of "the passion and evangelical impulses that contributed to the early formulation of the college missions" (p. 32).

In studying leadership behavior while developing their Community College Excellence Model, Roueche and Baker (1985) organized David Brown's framework of managerial action into three categories: sense of direction, structure for implemenation, and sense of personal commitment. They stress the strong relationship between student success and the provision of both a climate and a culture for excellence. Involvement in decisions and in goal setting is important to the achievement of the climate and culture of which Roueche and Baker speak. Novak (1983) observes that most community college faculty work with curricula which were set before their hiring. "Faculty attempts to modify or change the curriculum have resulted mostly in additions, not changes of substance . . . " (p. 15).

Involvement. Involvement, to be meaningful, must go beyond superficial recognition and reach to the substantive issues confronted by the institution. To exercise leadership by making pronouncements is to ignore the store of talent and experience within the institution. Today's leaders need as much information as possible to make the best decisions, and these internal reservoirs of employee knowledge and innovative thinking must be tapped. Furthermore, leadership of informed people requires an approach other than the traditional vertical structures of command and control. Cleveland (1985) contends that leadership of informed people "results in the necessary action only if it is exercised mainly through persuasion and by consulting those who are going to have to do something to make the decision a decision" (p. 17).

Some community colleges are expanding staff involvement through the use of quality circles (Ladwig, 1985; Shibata, Custer & Kleywegt, 1984). Others use college councils and regular meetings of leaders from all divisions of the institution, while some seek

college-wide participation in long-range planning. Administrators will find that involvement is more time consuming and tedious, although in the long run the products will be well worth the labor.

Missions and Objectives. The maximum value of involvement can only be gained when everyone in the institution is pulling in the same direction. Achieving unanimity of direction entails pursuit of common purposes. To avoid getting swept away by the current of reform or being dragged behind by adherence to outmoded programs and approaches, institutions should seriously reexamine their missions. Before reaffirming or refurbishing mission statements, specific institutional objectives ought to be written. Too many colleges stop with the articulation of sweeping philosophical utterances of purpose, which are subject to many interpretations. Such generality can lead to the inadvertent or deliberate drifting of functions alluded to previously. Cosand (1979) says, "The conflict between stated and unstated philosophies and staff ambitions has been and continues to be serious, even though it is probably submerged as much as possible on the surface but may seethe with frustration and cynicism under the surface" (p. 3). Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965) suggest that the administrator must exert careful leadership in finding common ground from which to proceed.

Having reexamined missions and objectives (with the appropriate involvement of employees), the next leadership challenge begins: encompassing all segments of the institution in fulfilling the purposes, aims, and objectives. This requires keeping institutional aspirations and expectations constantly in front of the faculty, staff, and administration while evaluating each in light of those targets.

Personnel and Program Evaluation. The need for regular, thorough evaluation of employee performance has never been more critical. If excellence of process is an assumed prerequisite to excellence of product, then each individual's contributions to the quality of

the learning environment must be measured and responded to through reward or corrective action. A common theme in recent literature addressing excellence in the two-year college is the positive role that faculty evaluation can play in stimulating improvement (Andrews & Marzano, 1983; Rabalais, 1983; Roueche & Watkins, 1982). Institutions will miss the mark though, if they restrict their personnel evaluation to faculty only. The performance of each person on the payroll should be carefully reviewed in light of the college's definition, criteria, and standards of excellence.

Similarly, each program component of the institution must be examined both in regard to its inherent excellence and in terms of its relation to the college's missions. Much more institutional research and evaluation is needed in order to investigate the validity of suppositions about the effectiveness and relative worth of college services, instructional strategies, course sequencing, curriculum content and design, and student placement (Roueche, 1968). Although the main purpose for such analyses is to improve program effectiveness, Ewell (1985) contends that this kind of assessment also entails asking whether the results obtained are worth the invested resources. While avoiding a witch hunt syndrome, such an examination should be made on something of a zero-based approach; that is, no person, policy, procedure, strategy, course, or program should be assumed to be contributing to excellence until there is documentation of that contribution. The response to areas needing improvement should be firm, positive, and constructive.

Professional Development Programs. Several reasons may be cited for regular, on-going professional development programs. The foregoing discussions suggest that faculty members need varying degrees of assistance in developing and refining skills related to instruction. Keeping employees current in their field is another vital dimension of professional development. Parilla (1986) refers to the need to support and encourage faculty "to conduct their own intellectual renewal through scholarly work related to their

teaching" (p. 2). Furthermore, in light of the college's commitment to using the results of evaluation for improvement, the institution has an obligation to follow individual diagnoses with prescriptions and assistance for improvement. Mass inoculations can help with epidemics but they are of little value in curing individual ills.

Bender and Kenbill (1984) observe, "More than ever before, community an technical colleges are recognized as a primary force in the nation's human resource and economic development. Yet these same institutions have not responded to their own human resource development needs" (p. 16). As with personnel evaluation, professional development programs must include all employees, addressing the growth needs of each. Institutional development is dependent upon individual development, upon the conditions which promote within competent people the urge to improve their job performance. Talented people, high quality support services, and a well planned curriculum combine to aid students in converting access to success.

Coordination with External Constituencies. Community college leaders have the responsibiltiy of coordinating the institution's efforts with a number of external constituencies. Since a community is actually a plurality of publics, the institution cannot claim to serve the needs of its area without an awareness of the different interests and expectations of the subgroups upon whom it depends for support. These groups often change membership when looked at in relation to their social, geographical, economic, and political alliances.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1985) continues to promote linkages, coalitions, and networking at the local, state, and national levels. Institutions are encouraged to "maintain positive working relationships with other institutions and agencies" (p. 53). In addition to partnerships within institutions, Powell (1984) states, "We need more partnerships with external agents, with business,

industry, labor, public employers, small businesses, and high schools" (p. 38). Parnell's (1985) advocacy of the 2+2 "Tech-Prep" associate degree fosters such collaborative involvement. Hodgkinson (1983) suggests that leaders work to estalish the community college as "an equal, rather than a 'junior,' partner responding to the whims of industry" (p.230). It is a delicate balance, but relationships with external groups must increase if the two-year college is to serve its community to the fullest. Additionally, Kintzer and Richardson (1986) underscore the importance of working with universities to ensure clarity and consistency of standards and to ease the transfer of credits.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

From 1870 to 1970 enrollments in American colleges and universities grew 34 times faster than the population; this was due in large measure to a concerted effort to extend access to higher education (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975). With the advent of the junior college as a free-standing institution around the turn of the Twentieth Century, there began a remarkable broadening of educational opportunity beyond the high school. In 1900 there were 100 junior college students enrolled in eight private junior colleges, representing one in every 2,320 students enrolled in higher education (Brick, 1964; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975). The original transfer function was combined with technical-vocational programs, student services, general education, community services, and remedial programs. Along with the access provided through the addition of functions and support services, the open-door concept of admissions was widely promoted. With more institutions available to the people and with lower costs and diversified curricula, the two-year colleges gained national recognition as a vital part of higher education's delivery system. The term community college described both this institution's orientation and its multiple functions.

Between 1965 and 1975, new two-year colleges were created at an average of almost one per week. Enrollments surged past 4 million in 1975 as economic barriers were overcome by increased state and federal financial aid programs. In 1977 there were 1,235 community, junior, and technical colleges, declining slightly to 1,219 at present. Two-year college enrollments were more than 4.9 million students in 1982, dropping to 4.5 million in 1984. Almost 4 of every 10 students in our nation's colleges and universities attend a community, junior, or technical college

(American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1984; "College and University," 1985).

Community colleges have been widely known for providing higher education at minimal costs. Tuition and fees at public two-year colleges during 1985-86 are 53% of those at public four-year institutions (College Board, 1985). Students pay less than 16% of the college's expenditure for instruction ("Finances of Community Colleges . . .," 1982). Attending a public community college is still a bargain in most states. Total costs paid by the student, however, often are greater for the two-year college than for a four-year institution. One major factor is that formulas for financial assistance tend to work to the disadvantage of community college students, offsetting the lower tuition and fees at two-year colleges. Action must be taken to eliminate the rising barrier of costs, lest access be curtailed to many financially deprived individuals.

In recent years community colleges have included higher proportions of economically disadvantaged students, older students, women, and minority students than their four-year counterparts (Hyde, 1982). Combined with the foregoing highlights, these indicators of outreach to people make it clear that two-year colleges have served the nation well.

A series of alarms was sounded by several reports in the early 1980s dealing with the state of American education. No level of our educational system has been spared criticism. In higher education deficiencies in performance standards, student achievement, curricular content, and instructional processes have been cited. If responded to in the right frame of mind, the current attention to excellence can lead to careful introspection among community college administrators, faculty, and staff.

Revitalization is needed in instruction, student services, and overall coordination of institutional functions. Community colleges should do a better job

of assessing and placing students. Curricula ought to be carefully reviewed, and sequencing of specific, measurable competencies should take place. Formative and summative evaluations should be refined and directly tied to the competencies identified for each course. Through these improvements, both the quality of the educational experience and the accuracy of performance appraisal can be improved.

This is not the time for a resurfacing of the inferiority complex long associated with being "junior" institutions. In some instances two-year colleges will need to follow the advice of the senior institutions and alter some practices. In others, community colleges can proudly become models for universities to emulate. Having for years responded like fire fighters to a huge influx of students, community colleges should take the time now to be more contemplative. There are both Jeffersonian elitists and Jacksonian egalitarians among us. With all the creative thinking that we can muster, we should refine and repair our vehicles for democratic advancement without excluding the passengers for whom they were built. Community colleges must evolve in the future, as they have evolved in the past, in response to the needs of their constituencies. In this manner they can remain vibrant as they move toward the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of the community college and beyond.

In Values, Vision, and Vitality, Gleazer (1980) identifies the following qualities found in successful community colleges:

1. they are adaptable in mission and in process;

2. they foster a continuing awareness of the community;

3. they maintain continuing relationships with the learner;

4. they extend opportunity to the unserved;

5. they serve a diversified clientele; and

6. they function as the nexus, link, or bond of a community learning system.

Community colleges, more than ever before, need to reaffirm their beliefs, rekindle a vision of great possibilities, rectify their deficiencies, reclaim their successes, and revitalize their efforts.

With proper management and careful integration of instructional and support programs, access can afford the thoroughfare of opportunity on which the student may progress. Selectivity will intersect that thoroughfare at appropriate intervals to redirect the student as needed and to affirm the substance and quality of the experience which the student gains through access.

References

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1984). Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1985). Public policy agenda. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(5), 48-53.

Andrews, H.A., & Marzano, W.A. (1983-84). Faculty evaluation stimulates expectations of excellence. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(4), 35-37.

Astin, A.W., King, M.R., & Richardson, G.T. (1980). The American freshman: National norms for fall 1980. Los Angeles: American Council on Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 274 404).

Atwell, C.A., & Sullins, W.R. (1984). Curricular comprehensiveness in small rural community colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges.

Bender, L.W., & Lukenbill, M.D. (1984). Human resources development: Let's begin with ourselves. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(2), 16-18.

Blanchard, K., & Johnson, S. (1982). The one minute manager. New York: Berkley Books.

Blocker, C.E., Plummer, R.H., & Richardson, R.C. (1965). The two-year college: A social synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Boggs, G.R. (1984). A response to uncertainty: The increased utilization of part-time instructors in

American community colleges. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 8, 5-17.

Bramlett, P., & Rodriguez, R.C. (1982-83). Part-time faculty: Full-time concern. Community and Junior College Journal, 53 (4), 40-41.

Breneman, D.W. (1983). The coming enrollment crisis: Focusing on the figures. Change, 15(2), 14-19.

Brick, M. (1964). Forum and focus for the junior college movement. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.

Cape Fear Technical Institue. (1984-85). Catalogue. Wilmington, N.C.: Cape Fear Technical Institute.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1975). More than survival. New York: Jossey-Bass.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1980). The Carnegie Council on policy studies in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1985a). The faculty: Deeply troubled. Change, 17(4), 31-34.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1985). Planning for the future. Change, 17(3), 31-35.

Christensen, F. (1980). Equipping faculty to serve lifelong learners. In B. Heerman, C.C. Enders, & E. Wine (Eds.), Serving lifelong learners (pp. 23-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cleveland, H. (1985). Educating for the information society. Change, 17(4), 13-21.

Clowes, D., & Towles, D. (1985). Lessons from fifty

years. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 56(1), 28-32.

Cohen, A.M. (1981). Maintaining perspective. Community College Review, 8(4), 5-11.

Cohen, A.M. (1985). Student access and the collegiate function in community colleges. Higher Education, 14, 149-163.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1982a). The American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1982b). The technology of instruction. Community and Junior College Journal, 53(1), 34-37.

College and university enrollments, 1970-1993. (1985, July 31). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 13.

The College Board. (1985, Fall). Total annual college costs increase by 7 percent. The College Board News, pp. 1-8.

Conger, G.R. (1983-84). Scholarship essential—What's a good teacher? Community and Junior College Journal, 54(4), 22-25.

Cosand, J.P. (1979). Perspective: Community colleges in the 1980's. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Cross, K.P. (1968). The junior college student: A research description. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Cross, K.P. (1974). Beyond the open door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K.P. (1980). Our changing students and their impact on colleges: Prospects for a true learning society. Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 627-630.

Cross, K.P. (1981, April). On old practices and new purposes in education. Paper presented at the Conference on Remedial and Developmental Mathematics in College: Issues and Innovations. New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202 497).

Cross, K.P. (1983). The impact of changing student populations on community colleges. Community College Review, 10 (4), 30-34.

Cross, K.P. (1984). The rising tide of school reform reports. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 167-172.

Dassance, C.R (1984-85). Comunity college student personnel work: Is the model still emerging? Community College Review, 12(3), 25-29.

Deegan, W.L. (1984). Revitalizing student services programs. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(8), 14-17.

Delworth, U., & Hanson, G.R. (1980). Student services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Easton, J.Q., Forrest, E.P., Goldman, R.E., & Ludwig, L.M. (1985). National study of effective community college teachers. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 9, 153-163.

Elsner, P.A., & Ames, W.C. (1983). Redirecting studet services. In G.B. Vaughan (Ed.), Issues for community college leaders in a new era (pp. 139-158). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. (1982, June). Two-year college students: A statistical profile. ERIC Fact Sheet, (5).

Ewell, P. (1985). Assessment: What's it all about? Change, 17(6), 32-36.

Fall 1983 enrollment. (1985, January 23). The

Chronicle of Higher Education, p.22.

Fall 1984 enrollment. (1986, January 22). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 26.

Finances of community colleges in 1980-81. (1982, August 4). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p.18.

Florida Junior College. (1984-85). Catalog. Jacksonville, FL: author.

Gleazer, E.J. (1980). The community college: Values, vision & vitality. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Good, C.V. (Ed.). (1973). Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grant, W.V. (1983). Trends in college enrollment: 1972 to 1982. American Education, 19(7), 37.

Grant, V.W., & Snyder, T.D. (1983-84). Digest of education statistics (21st ed.). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 402)

Griffin, J.M. (1980). Underachieving students in community colleges: Common personality and biographical characteristics. Community College Review, 8(1), 15-19.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1983). Establishing alliances with business and industry. In G.B. Vaughan (Ed.), Issues for community college leaders in a new era (pp. 222-248). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hyde, W. (1980). The age and related demographic characteristics of students attending community colleges and four-year institutions (Working paper No. 32). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. (Contract No. 400-79-0072).

Hyde, W. (1982). A new look at community college access. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 905)

Jaschik, S. (1985, October 23). State officials, public-college leaders at odds over how to set tuition rates. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1, 14-15.

Johnson, B. (1984). Valid testing model for admissions-placement. Communtiy College Review, 12(2), 8-12.

Joliet Junior College. (1977-79). General Catalog. Joliet, IL: author.

Kintzer, J.W., & Richardson, R.C. (1986). The articulation/transfer phenomenon. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 56(4), 17-21.

Knowles, M.S. (1980). Modern practice of adult education. Chicago: Associated Press.

Ladwig, D.J. (1985). All in the family: An alternative approach to applied research. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 56(1), 34-36.

Lawrence, B. (1984). Beyond the bottom line: Good managers look to results. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(5), 21-23.

Levine, A. (1978). Handbook on undergraduate curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Los Angeles City College. (1976-77). Catalog. Los Angeles, CA: author.

McGrath, E.J. (1945). The junior college of the future. Junior College Journal, 15(6), 260-268.

Monroe, C.R. (1972). Profile of the community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nelson, J., & Murphy, H. (1980). The projected effects of enrollment and budget relations on student personnel services. NASPA Journal, 17(4), 2-10.

Northwest Community College. (1982-83). Information Catalog Nome, AK: author.

Novak, C.R. (1983). Associate degree integrity at stake. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(2), 15.

O'Keefe, M. (1984). The role of tests in the transition from high school to college. NASSP Bulletin, 68(473), 59-68.

Parilla, R.E. (1986, January). Gladly would they learn and gladly teach. Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges Occational Paper, 4(1), 1-4.

Parnell, D. (1984). Associate degree preferred. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(2), 47-49.

Parnell, D. (1985). The neglected majority. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Peters, T.J., & Waterman, R.H. (1982). In search for excellence New York: Harper & Row.

Powell, P.T. (1984). What America will need from its community colleges by the year 2000. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(1), 37-38.

Rabalais, M.J. (1983). Excellence is based on eight components. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(3), 28-29.

Richardson, R.C. (1983). Open access and

institutional policy: Time for reexamination. Community College Review, 10(4), 47-51.

Richland College. (1984-85). Richland College Catalog. Dallas, TX: Dallas County Community College District.

Rippey, D. (1981). What is student development? Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 207 619)

Roueche, J.E. (1968). Superior teaching in junior colleges: Research needed. Improving College and University Teaching, 16(1), 33-35.

Roueche, J.E. (1983). WANTED: Teaching excellence in the community college. Community College Review, 10(2), 52-57.

Roueche, J.E. (1984). Between a rock and a hard place: Meeting adult literacy needs. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(7), 21-24.

Roueche, J.E., & Archer, P.F. (1979). Entry Level assessment in college. Community College Review, 6(4), 15-27.

Roueche, J.E., & Armes, N.R. (1983). Structure is the linchpin of effective teaching. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(1), 16-19.

Roueche, J.E., & Baker, G.E. (1985). The success connection: Creating a culture of excellence. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 56(1), 20-26.

Roueche, J.E., & Watkins, K. (1982). At the risk of appearing "uppity"--a commitment to great teaching. Community and Junior College Journal, 53(1), 22-24.

Rounds, J.C., & Anderson, D. (1984-85). Entrance

assessment and student success. Community College Review, 12(3), 10-15.

Rudolph, R. (1962). The American college and university. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sadler, D.R. (1983). Evaluation and the improvement of academic learning. Journal of Higher Education, 54(1), 60-79.

Sheehy, G. (1976). Passages: Predictable crises in adult life. New York: Dutton.

Shibata, K.E., Custer, H., & Kleywegt, C.J. (1984). Mission of quality. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(2), 27-29.

Smith, P.P. (1980). The new professional: Professor or facilitator? In B. Heerman, C.C. Enders, & E. Wine (Eds.), Serving lifelong learners (pp. 9-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1977). Lateral and vertical student mobility: An essential for the community college. Atlanta: author.

Southwest Mississippi Junior College. (1976-77). General Catalog. Summit, MS: author.

The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (1984). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Thompson, C.P. (1985). Maintaining quality with open access. Community College Review, 12(4), 10-14.

Thornton, J.W. (1972). The community junior college (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Townsend, B.K. (1985). Faculty preferences for institutional directions for the community

college. Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 19, 215-227.

Trachtenberg, S.J. (1984). What America will need from its community colleges by the year 2000. Community and Junior College Journal, 55(1), 39-40.

Undergraduate admissions. (1981, January 19). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 8.

Vaughan, G.B. (1983). Historical perspective: President Truman endorsed community college manifesto. Community and Junior College Journal, 53(7), 21-24.

Vaughan, G.B. (1984). Balancing open access and quality: The community college at the watershed. Change, 16(2), 38-44.

Vaughan, G.B. (1985). Maintaining open access to higher education: The continuing challenge. Phi Kappa Phi, 45, 31-34.

Wilson, R. (1986, April 23). Students at community colleges found to face high costs but receive less federal aid than those at 4-year colleges. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 13, 18.

Horizons Issues

Monograph Series

Continuing series of monographs on community, technical, and junior college education, sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Council of Universities and Colleges, and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

The Articulation/Transfer Phenomenon: Patterns and Directions.
Frederick C. Kintzer and James L. Wattenbarger, 1985. $10.

Presents a concise review of trends and future directions in the articulation and transfer of students from two-year colleges to other segments of higher education.

Curricular Comprehensiveness in Small Rural Community Colleges.
Charles A. Atwell and W. Robert Sullins, 1984. Out of stock.

Describes curricular comprehensiveness as it exists in small rural community colleges, compares programs, investigates the role of funding in program diversity, and explores instructional and managerial strategies.

At the Crossroads: General Education in Community Colleges.
Clifton F. Conrad, 1983. Out of stock.

Reviews the past and examines the current condition of general education in community colleges, focusing on trends and developments while offering options to consider for revitalizing existing programs.

The Management of Student Affairs Programs in Community Colleges: Revamping Processes and Structures.
William L. Deegan, 1982. Out of stock.

Presents a perspective on the student affairs profession, identifies the problems and issues that influence the development of student affairs programs, and proposes recommendations for future research, policy development, and management practices.

What Is Student Development?
Donald Rippey, 1981. $5.

Offers a new model for student development dependent on developmental learning theory, demands integrated learning strategies involving all available resources of the college, and prescribes educational functions for professional employees.

Perspective: Community Colleges in the 1980s.
Joseph P. Cosand, 1981. Out of stock.

Views the challenges facing community colleges in the 1980s—from planning ahead to anticipating declining resources and changing student mixes and interests—as drawn by a man who has spent 35 years as a community college teacher, dean, and president, and as a university professor with specific assignments in community college education.

To order, write AACJC Publications, 80 South Early Street, Alexandria VA 22304. AACJC members are eligible for a 25% discount on publications. Microfiche and paper reproductions of each monograph are available (at cost of reproduction and mailing) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 3900 Wheeler Avenue, Alexandria VA 22304.