CRITERIA FOR EXCELLENCE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES AS PERCEIVED BY LOCAL COMMUNITY LEADERS

By

JERRILEE KAY MOSIER

Bachelor of Science in Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1976

Master of Science
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1983

CRITERIA FOR EXCELLENCE OF COMMUNITY

COLLEGES AS PERCEIVED BY LOCAL

COMMUNITY LEADERS

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Very few true gains are accomplished without the help and assistance of others. The writer would like to thank those persons whose cooperation and support made the research and writing of this study possible. Thanks to Dr. John Gardiner, committee chairman and dissertation adviser, for his excellent direction and guidance throughout the doctoral experience. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Thomas Karman, Dr. Waynne James, and Dr. Dianna Newman for their excellent contributions as members of the dissertation committee.

A special word of gratitude is offered to the writer's family and friends for their endless moral support and encouragement. Very special thanks is extended to the writer's father for his understanding advice and tireless listening ear throughout the doctoral experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The community college has been described as the educational phenomenon of the twentieth century (Carnegie Commission, 1970). As an institution of higher education whose "open door" philosophy and broad breadth of mission has been inherently tied to the American ideals of equal opportunity and democracy (Monroe, 1972; Brubacher and Rudy, 1976), the community college has provided for the massification of higher education in this country (Priest, 1980). It has been a "unique, significant, dynamic and challenging part of higher education" (Monroe, 1972, p. x). The mission of the modern community college has been designed for and by the people. The focused two-year liberal arts education of 40 years ago, has been modified to also emphasize programs in such areas as occupational-technical education, adult basic education, compensatory/developmental education, community services, and continuing education. The result has been a diverse teaching and service mission designed to help fulfill the educational needs, wants, and aspirations of the people and the community. Educational innovation and environmental adaptation have been required as integral components of each institution's policies and procedures where the comprehensive mission of the community college has been fulfilled (Solomon, 1976).

"Community colleges are a vast, valid growing force in America" (Feldman, 1982, p. 28). In 1980, community colleges were the largest

single segment of American higher education (Priest, 1980). In 1980, over one-third of the nation's higher education institutions were community colleges, with 250 new institutions opening their doors between 1968 and 1978 (Cohen and Lombardi, 1979). The numbers of students enrolled in credit bearing courses at community colleges increased from just over one-half million in 1960, to more than two million by 1970, to more than four million by 1980 (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). In 1982, 36 percent of the nation's total enrollment in higher education was enrolled at a community college (Feldman, 1982). The Carnegie Commission Reports, More than Survival (Carnegie Commission, 1975) and Three Thousand Futures (Carnegie Commission, 1980), both predicted that enrollments would continue to rise at the community colleges during the 80's, while other institutions of higher education would experience enrollment stabilization and reductions.

For several decades, there has been increased attention given to the educational quality of all levels of the educational process, from elementary schools to graduate schools. The community college has been included in this analysis. Critics have attributed the community colleges' astonishing rate of growth to low standards and the poor quality of its educational programs and practices, a logical consequence when traditional criteria are applied to an "untraditional" institution of higher education (Solomon, 1976; Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

Need for the Study

Quality promised to be the main focus of the eighties (Kuh, 1981), as societal trends of declining enrollments, changing student characteristics, changing societal expectations for higher education and the fluctuating national, state, and local economies (Kuh, 1981) forced educators

to reexamine the meaning of quality, as it related to the different institutions and the populations they served.

This was a complex task for two multifaceted reasons. First, the diverse nature of American higher education (Solomon, 1976), a diversity that permitted "flexibility and adaptability and encouraged experimentation and competing solutions to common problems" (Cartter, 1966, p. 3), and a diversity of mission that had to be recognized and addressed when forming standards of quality. Second, the variety of populations who sought to define quality and to identify its criteria from different perspectives and for different purposes:

1. Faculty--educational service to student population, security of employment in times of retrenchment, prestige of program and institutional affiliation;

2. Administrators--educational service to student population, evaluation of institutional programming, receipt of needed local, state, and national monies, prestige of institutional affiliation;

3. State higher education coordinating agencies--review of new and existing institutional programming in state program review processes, establishment of statewide institutional policies (admissions, tuition, etc.);

4. Regional and Professional accrediting agencies--accreditation of programs and institutions, as well as guidelines for improvement recommendations;

5. State legislators--allocation of state monies for higher education;

6. General public--recognition and receipt of a quality education for expenditure of time and money.

Each of these populations, as well as the individuals comprising the populations had a "preconception" that quality higher education should be based upon their values, past experiences, and aspirations (Morphet, Jesser, Ludka, 1972).

Traditionally four categories of criteria for quality have been emphasized in the research of quality in higher education: input criteria, student/institutional involvement criteria, output criteria and institutional/departmental characteristics (Kuh, 1981). Researchers have examined criteria for quality in graduate schools (Cartter, 1966; Roose and Anderson, 1970; Clark, Harnett, and Baird, 1976), professional schools (Gregg and Sims, 1972; Blau and Margulies, 1974-75; Cole and Lipton, 1977), and undergraduate education (Astin, 1965, 1971, 1977, 1979; Brown, 1967; Gourman, 1967, 1977; Rock, Centra and Linn, 1970). Few studies have been concerned with the identification of appropriate criteria for the measurement of quality in the community college.

The input category of criteria had generally included an institution's selectivity in its admissions standards, as well as to individual student characteristics (Astin, 1977), strenghts, weaknesses, major aspirations (Kuh, 1977; Willingham, 1980), educational background (Kuh, 1977; Watts, 1977), and the socio-economic status that the student brought to the college environment (Astin and Panos, 1969). The input criteria to the educational quality of the institution were closely examined by Astin (1965, 1971; Astin and Henson, 1977). In their study of 1977, Astin and Henson stated that:

> Educators have a keen interest in selectivity because the folklore of higher education suggests that the more selective institution has higher academic standards than the less selective institution and, by implication, a higher quality of educational program. Both faculty and administrators are inclined to view the average test scores of their entering

> freshmen as an index of institutional worth. Regardless of the validity of such views, ample evidence suggests that an institution's selectivity is a good measure of perceived quality (pp. 1-2).

The student/institutional involvement category of criteria as measures of institutional excellence had traditionally centered around the degree to which students were involved and were satisfied with their involvement with other students (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969; Astin, 1977; Astin and Scherrer, 1980), the instructional practices of the institution (Menges, 1981), informal faculty-student interaction (Sandford, 1967; Centra, Rock, 1970; Pascarella, 1980), and student effort in the learning process (Pace, 1979, 1980; Astin, 1980). There had been less use of the involvement category criteria than of the other indices in identifying and examining institutional quality, for quality measured by involvement became more of a "function of what students do with an institution's resources than of resources themselves" (Kuh, 1981, p. 18).

The category of output criteria had generally focused upon the institution's graduates and their accomplishments. Specific research into the quality of undergraduate education utilizing output criteria had primarily focused on the students' persistence toward degree completion (Gruson, Levine, and Lustberg, 1977; Astin, 1979), the number of students who went on for further study (Rock, Centra, and Linn, 1970; Astin, 1979), and the lifetime earnings of the institution's alumni (Solmon, 1975). Astin (1980) stated that:

> The basic argument underlying the value-added approach (output) is that true quality resides in the institution's ability to affect its students favorably, to make a positive difference in their intellectual and personal development. The highest quality institutions, in this view, are those that have the greatest impact-add the most value-to the knowledge, personality, and career development (pp. 3-4).

Institutional/departmental characteristics were the fourth traditional category of criteria ordinarily considered in the examination of quality in higher education. These criteria typically related to the size of the institution (Rock, Centra, and Linn, 1970; Meeth, 1974; Millett, 1979), the proportion of the faculty members who had a doctorate, faculty salaries (Solmon, 1972, 1975; Adams and Krislov, 1978; Meeth, 1974; Millett, 1979), the size of the library, financial resources (Troutt, 1979), and physical plant.

How could the effects of the community college be evaluated best if these categories of criteria for quality were used to establish standards for excellence? The community college with its open admissions policy would be "judged guilty" on charges of poor quality if those criteria generally were applied here (Flager, 1981). The institution fell short in the evaluation of criteria in the output category, because in a direct way, these criteria were related to the individual student characteristics. The average community college student was most likely to combine work and study (an important student characteristic if involvement criteria were used), be slightly older than the traditional college age student, and have every likelihood of being a member of a minority group, a woman, of lower academic ability, or of a lower socioeconomic status than the traditional college student (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

The institutional characteristics of the community college are at odds with the traditional focus of quality criteria. Few faculty members have obtained doctorates (a degree which has an emphasis on research) because the primary focus of the community college is on teaching. Faculty salaries are established in higher education according to folklore priorities and research has always been top priority for faculty compensation.

In 1961, Gardner stated that

> . . . as things now stand the word excellence is all too often reserved for the dozen or so institutions which stand at the zenith of our higher education in terms of faculty distinction, selectivity of students, and difficulty of curriculum. In these terms, it is simply impossible to speak of a junior college, for example, as excellent. Yet sensible men can easily conceive of excellence in a junior college.
>
> The traditionalist might say, "Of course! Let Princeton create a junior college and one would have an institution of unquestionable excellence." That may be correct, but it would lead us down precisely the wrong path. If Princeton Junior College were excellent in the sense that Princeton University is excellent, it might not be excellent in the most important way that a community college can be excellent. It would simply be a truncated version of Princeton. A comparably meaningless result would be achieved if General Motors tried to add to its line of low-priced cars by marketing the front end of a cadillac.
>
> We shall have to be more flexible than that in our concept of excellence. We must develop a point of view that permits each kind of institution to achieve excellence in terms of its own objectives (p. 84).

The purpose of this study was to investigate and identify criteria for excellence for community colleges as perceived by leaders of communities which those institutions served and to compare those criteria with the standards most commonly used to determine quality within American higher education.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What were community leaders' perceptions of the overall importance of the various community college functions in relation to instructional excellence?

2. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence in academic-transfer programs at community colleges?

3. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for occupational/technical programs at community colleges?

4. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for remedial/compensatory programs at community colleges?

5. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for student services programs at community colleges?

6. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence in community education/services programs at community colleges?

7. What were community leaders' perceptions of minimum and maximum size for a quality community college and its various functions?

8. What were community leaders' perceptions of general miscellaneous criteria for excellence for community colleges?

9. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for each community college function when compared with the criteria most commonly used to determine quality within American higher education in categories of input criteria; output criteria; student/institutional involvement criteria; and institutional/departmental criteria?

Definitions of Terms

For purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

Academic transfer was the function of the community college comparison of courses that served as the equivalent to those offered at the freshman and sophomore levels of a baccalaureate degree (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

Community College was an institution accredited to award the associate in arts or sciences as its highest degree (Cohen and Brawer, 1982) and whose function was comprised of five areas: academic-transfer, occupational/technical, remedial/compensatory, community education services and

student services. Community college was used synonymously with two-year colleges, junior colleges, and junior community colleges in the present study.

Community education/services encouraged the promotion of the concept of lifelong learning to improve the quality of life for individuals in the community (Gleazer, 1980). It included classes for credit and not for credit, varying in duration from one hour to a weekend, several days, or an entire school term (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

Remedial/compensatory programs of the community college included those courses designed to teach the basics of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and also included study skills programs and English as a second language courses (Cohen and Brawer, 1980).

Criteria were standards upon which judgments or decisions may be based.

Excellence was used synonymously with quality, both indicating the standards and characteristics of institutions which were recognized as the best of their kind.

Input criteria for excellence "reflect characteristics of entering students such as ability and aspirations" (Kuh, 1981, p. 1).

Institutional/departmental criteria for excellence represented those institutional characteristics that remained relatively stable over time such as expenditures per student, size of student body, and institutional purpose.

Student/institutional involvement criteria for excellence "characterizes the interactions between and among students and faculty such as satisfaction and frequency of contact" (Kuh, 1981, p. 1).

Occupational/technical programs prepared students for the job market upon completion of two years or less of training.

Outcome criteria for excellence "reflect intended products or unintended effects associated with college attendance such as persistence, academic achievement and alumni attainments" (Kuh, 1981, p. 1).

Student services assisted students in securing certain basic necessities (i.e., housing, food, health [mental and physical], and employment).

Traditional was a predetermined method of solving problems and making decisions. These inherited answers worked just so long as the same problems occur (Solomon, 1976).

Assumptions and Limitations

It is impossible for any research effort to evaluate all aspects of an area of study. The present research had the following assumptions and limitations:

1. The perceptions of the college presidents and the community leaders were assumed to be accurate.

2. The study involved a limited and directed sample of selected communities served by community colleges.

3. The study involved a limited sample of the population of the communities (i.e., community leaders).

4. Generalization of the study to community colleges outside of the states of Kansas and Oklahoma were unwarranted.

No claim at all was made as to the external validity of the results of this study. The results were viewed as suggestive and not conclusive.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was to present a review of literature relating to the community college, its nature and mission, functions, and locus of control, in reference to the perceived criteria for excellence in other institutions of higher education. Organizationally, the chapter was divided into the following sections:

1. The Community College,
   - Nature and Mission of the Institution,
   - Functions,
   - Locus of Control,
2. Traditional Criteria for Excellence in Higher Education, and
3. The Community College and Criteria for Excellence.

The Community College

Nature and Mission of the Institution

The community college, as with all institutions of society, developed from the basic principles and traditions of the people it was designed to serve. Monroe (1972) identified three principles of the American public school system that were to be the foundation of the subsequent development of the community college. They were as follows:

1. Universal opportunity for a free public education for all persons without distinction based on social class, family income and ethnic, racial or religious backgrounds.

2. Local control and support of free, non-tuition educational systems.

3. Relevant curriculum designed to meet both the needs of the individuals and those of the nation (Monroe, 1972, p. 1).

These principles laid a foundation for two subsequent historical events that directly impacted the nature and mission of the institution (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976). These events addressed the mission of the community college in higher education and provided the impetus for its development.

The first event was the establishment of the first public junior college at Joliet, Illinois in 1901. With the conception of Joliet, came a supporting rationale for the two-year college movement. William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago, along with other prominent educators of the day, envisioned the junior college as an institution that would be an extension of high school, providing "collegiate" lower level (junior) courses to prepare students for the upper level (senior) courses of the university (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976). Harper also foresaw the junior college as possibly enticing students who might otherwise not attend college to do so (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976).

The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education for American Democracy in 1947 was the second historical event that directly influenced the evolvement of the American community college. Vaughan (1983) had termed it the "Community College Manifesto," citing it as:

> . . . a declaration of the nation's intent to promote the American ideal through higher education. The community college, through its prominent role in the action's scheme of higher education, was to be a major vehicle for the democratization of American higher education. The Commission's report, a public statement issued by a distinguished group of Americans and accepted by President Truman, perceived the potential of the two-year college in shaping American society (p. 24).

The Commission's view of the two-year college and its expanded role in America's higher education was typified in its use of the term community college. The Commission (1947, Vol. 3, p. 5) suggested that ". . . the name 'community college' be applied to the institution designed to serve chiefly local community educational needs. . . . Its dominant feature is its intimate relations to the life of the community if serves."

Specific recommendations and proposals toward the development and expansion of the community college were made in the Commission's (1947) report. Selected excerpts are as follows:

1. Its (the community college) purpose is educational service to the community, and this purpose requires of it a variety of functions and programs. It will provide college education for the youth of the community certainly, so as to remove geographic and economic barriers to educational opportunity and discover and develop individual talents at low cost and easy access. But in addition, the community college will serve as an active center of adult education. It will attempt to meet the total post high school needs of the community.

2. . . . the commission recommends that the community college emphasize programs in terminal education. . . . However, it must not be crowded with vocational and technical courses to the exclusion of general education. It must aim at developing a combination of social understanding and competence . . . should mix a goodly amount of general education for personal and social development with technical education that is intensive, accurate, and comprehensive enough to give the student command of marketable abilities.

3. The community college seeks to become a center of learning for the entire community, with or without the restrictions that surround formal course work in traditional institutions of higher education. . . . The potential effects of the community college in keeping intellectual curiousity

> alive in out-of-school citizens, if stimulating their zest for learning, of improving the quality of their lives as individuals and as citizens are limited only by the vision, the energy and the genuity of the college staff and by the size of the college budget.
>
> 4. . . . the liberal arts college is so well established in the American educational tradition that it need not fear community colleges will weaken its own appeal. It should encourage the development of the community college, not oppose it. Experience indicates that these community institutions awaken intellectual curiousity and ambition in many youth and who would not otherwise seek college education at all, and in many cases these students will be stimulated to continue their college careers if the four-year colleges will meet them halfway with liberal admission policies (Vol. 1, pp. 47-74).

The Eisenhower Commission on higher education (President's Commission on Education Beyond High School, 1957, p. 12) reiterated and supported the Commission's report of 1947, noting that the "expansion of the two-year college has been one of the most notable developments in post-high education in twentieth century America."

Monroe, in his work Profile of a Community College (1972), outlined three necessary institutional objectives if the mission of the community college was to be fulfilled. They were as follows: (1) comprehensive curricula, (2) open door principle, and (3) community orientation.

Gleazer (1980) defined the community college mission as a process, a process that had six requisite institutional characteristics:

1. The college is adaptable. It is capable of change in response to new conditions and demands or circumstances.
2. The college operates with a continuing awareness of its community.
3. The college has a continuing relationship with the learner.
4. The college extends opportunity to the unserved.
5. The college accommodates to diversity.
6. The college has a nexus function in the community's learning system (p. 15).

The community was of primary importance to the mission of the community college. The individual institutions were closely tied to the cultural values, customs, and mores of the community which they served, seeking to attend to the unique wants, needs, and aspirations of the people, as individuals and as a collective body. Thus each institution was different, varying not only from state to state, but also one from another (Medsker and Tillery, 1971).

Several authors have suggested that to define the community college was to limit the potential and capability of the individual institutions (Monroe, 1972; Gleazer, 1980). It may be best, as suggested by Cohen and Brawer (1982), to merely characterize the community college as untraditional:

> It may be best to characterize community colleges merely as untraditional. They do not follow the tradition of higher education as it developed from the colonial colleges through the universities. They do not typically provide the students with new value structures, as residential liberal arts colleges aspire to do. Nor do they further the frontiers of knowledge through scholarship and research training, as in the finest traditions of the universities. Community colleges do not even follow their own traditions. They change frequently, seeking ever new programs and clients. Community colleges are indeed untraditional, but they are truly American because, at their best they represent the United States at its best. Never satisfied with resting on what has been done before, they try new approaches to old problems. They maintain open channels for individuals enhancing the social nobility that has so characterized America. And they accept the idea that society can be better, just as individuals can better their lot within it (p. 28).

Functions of the Institution

Boque, in his work The Community College (1950, pp. xx-xxi), stated that the book "has not been written in defense of a name; it is a thesis in behalf of functions. . . ." These functions varied inasmuch as they were derived from the all encompassing mission of the institution to

provide for educational service to their respective communities. The functions of the community college and their degree of emphasis varied from institution to institution, depending upon the student population and the community being served. A global picture, however, could be obtained through a review of the most prominent functions ascribed to the community college in American higher education.

Twelve functions of the community college were identified by Monroe (1972). A brief synopsis of each function and Monroe's related discussions follows:

1. Transfer Curricula--The transfer curriculum was the curriculum most favored by the majority of students and faculty. It was a basic part of all community colleges. Courses offered through the transfer curriculum must be sufficiently good quality so that students transferring to a senior college experienced no serious problem.

2. Citizenship and General Education--Careful consideration must be given to the need for a core of required courses designed to meet the humanistic and citizenship needs which all persons living in a given society had in common.

3. Occupational Training--Through occupational training the community college trained persons for entry into skilled jobs which had required increasingly sophisticated, technical knowledge and retrains employees for new jobs as old jobs become obsolete.

4. General Studies--This function of the community college included a body of studies similar to courses offered through transfer and general education programs, "but are geared to less rigorous standards of achievement" (p. 34). This body of studies can be considered general education courses taught at a non-transfer level.

5. Adult and Continuing Education--Adult education expanded greatly during the next ten years. This came about as jobs required more training, reduced working hours brought about more leisure time, retirement came earlier, a person's educational level was increased, and as people wished to learn more about themselves.

6. Remedial Programs--Through this function the college attempted to reach the increasing numbers of students who did not possess the minimum levels of skill in reading, writing, and languages.

7. Counseling and Guidance--This was a neglected function of the community college. Although in the past the college faculty had regarded counseling as babysitting or spoonfeeding, they were now realizing that the open-door college required an effective counseling service.

8. Salvage Function--This function was very closely related to both the remedial and counseling functions. It gave aid to the low level students and guided the nonmotivated students. This function provided a second chance for students who failed their first year in a senior college or university.

9. Screening Function--This function was once performed by the universities, but now the community college had the distasteful task of selecting between the fit and the unfit.

10. Goal-Finding or Cooling-Out Function--Through this function the community college assisted the students in choosing their future vocational goals. The time and opportunity can be provided to explore more and different educational programs than at a four-year college or university.

11. Custodial Function--This function provided the opportunity for students who had no particular motivation and who were in college simply

because it was better than loafing on the street, going to work, or joining the military, to be stimulated to become a useful student. The custodial function was legitimate.

12. Curricular or Student Activity Function--Through this function students learned to relate better to other people. It was an important function that helped allow for the development of student interests.

Whereas Monroe's list of community college functions was comprehensive, his discussion of each function became somewhat dated, as will be noted in the review of more recent literature, it was also cumbersome for discussion because of the number of functions identified, the large proprotion of overlapping and integrated responsibilities of each, and the inclusion of possible hidden functions with the more clearly delineated operational curricular functions. The functions of the community college became more manageable if they were defined in terms of curriculum.

Cohen and Brawer (1982) noted that there were basically five curricular functions attributed to the community college in each state's legislation. They were as follows: academic-transfer preparation, occupational/technical education, continuing education, remedial/compensatory, and community services. In their book, The American Community College (1982), however, they chose to combine the community service and continuing education into a function termed community education and to include student services as the fifth function of a community college. For purposes of further discussion, the curricular functions of the community college were identified in a like manner (i.e., academic-transfer preparation, occupational/technical education, compensatory/remedial education, community education, and student services).

Academic-Transfer Preparation

The primary function of Joliet in 1901 was to prepare students in their first two years of general education toward the baccalaureate degree in preparation for transfer to a four-year college or university. Lombardi (1979) indicated that from 1907 to 1940, transfer education compared 60 to 70 percent of the community college environment and maintained its preeminence through the mid 1960's. By 1973, its share of the total enrollment had dropped to 43 percent.

The academic-transfer program itself had not changed a great deal; however, the way that students made use of it had. Students no longer followed the clearly delineated pattern of two years at a community college, transferred, and then attended two years at a four-year college or university. Cohen and Brawer (1982, p. 348) suggest that while "patterns of student flow have never been linear," a great many more students had started to use the academic-transfer program for their own individual purposes as the community college matured:

> . . . dropping in and out of both community colleges and universities taking courses in both types of institutions concurrently, transferring from one to another frequently. Among the students in junior standing at a university may be included some who took their lower division work in a community college and in the university concurrently, some who dropped out to attend a community college, some who attended a community college and failed to enroll in the university until several years later, and some who transferred from the community college to the university in midyear (p. 348).

Community colleges to a large extent were evaluated upon the success of their transfer students at the four-year colleges and universities (Cosand, 1979). Miller (1976, p. 5) stated that the "transfer process must be assessed (at the community college) . . . in light of both actual numbers of transfer students and their growth rates."

Cosand (1976), a long time community college administrator and former Assistant Commissioner of Education, insisted that:

> The maintenance of a high quality strong academic program is essential for the image and status of the community college . . . (for without it, the community college program) would indeed be barren and . . . could (hardly) be called a college or an effective and integral part of higher education (p. 6).

Occupational/Technical Education

The terminology identifying the programs that led students to immediate employment in business and industry consisted of the following: vocational, technical, terminal, career, semiprofessional, apprenticeship, and occupational (Lombardi, 1978; Cohen and Brawer, 1982). The most commonly used term in community colleges to identify this particular function was occupational (Monroe, 1972; Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

Occupational programs had been a function of the community college curriculum since its inception in 1901 (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). Harper (cited in Brick, 1965, p. 18) stated in 1900 that "many students who might not have the courage to enter upon a course of four years of study would be willing to do the two years of work before entering business or professional school."

Eells (1941) was an avid proponent of occupational education and its function in the curriculum of junior colleges during the 1930's and 1940's. In his book, Why Junior College Terminal Education?, six fundamental principles are cited as prepared and adopted by the Commission on Junior College Terminal Education. The Commission stated that:

> The junior college . . . essentially a community institution . . . has a special obligation to meet fully the needs of its constituency . . . (and because) the junior college marks the completion of formal education for a large and increasing proportion

> of young people . . . it should offer curricula designed to develop economic, social, civic and personal competence (p. 1).

It was not until the 1960's, however, that community colleges began to experience a rapid increase in student enrollments in occupational/technical programs (Monroe, 1972; Lombardi, 1978; Cohen and Brawer, 1982). Monroe estimated, in 1972, that one-third of all community colleges students were enrolled in occupational courses. Parker (1974) reported that at selected community colleges more than half of the students were enrolled in basically occupational programs during 1973-74. By 1980, as predicted by Monroe in 1972, occupational/technical education had become the major curricular function of most community colleges (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

Remedial/Compensatory

Remedial/compensatory education was the community college's primary instructional response to the high risk students who entered in mass through the open door admissions policy. Medsker and Tillery (1971) estimated that 30 to 50 percent of the students entering the community college were in need of the basic skills required for college study. This function consisted of courses designed to teach basic literacy levels of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and usually included such courses/programs as English as a Second Language, study skills, and of late, courses with a focus on personal/social variables (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Remedial programs were not new to American higher education. Cross (1976) reported that Wellesley College introduced the first course in remediation for academic deficiencies in 1894. The poor study habits of students were the primary emphasis of these early courses. Remedial

reading courses were introduced in the late 1930's and early 1940's, with writing development courses evolving a short time later. It was not, however, until the late 1960's that almost every community college in the nation had developed courses/programs for the increasing number of students, who were enrolling with basic academic deficiencies (Roueche and Snow, 1977).

Cross, in her study of 1970, found that 80 percent of public community colleges had special provisions for students who had not met the traditional academic requirements for college. Of those colleges, 92 percent offered developmental courses to upgrade verbal and other academic skills. Only 61 percent of the community colleges had special counseling programs for remedial students.

In 1973, all of the public community colleges in the random sample studied by Morrison and Ferrente were providing some type of special service to students with academic deficiencies. Cross (1976) reported the results of her nationwide study of 1974 of all community colleges, which indicated some kind of special service or program for the disadvantaged in 93 percent of the schools. Roueche and Snow found similar results in their study of 1977.

Community Education/Services

Lombardi (1978) suggested that there had been three distinct eras of development for the community college, as defined in light of the emphasized function of the development period. The first era of functional emphasis, as defined by Lombardi, was the academic-transfer function which began with the inception of the community college in the early 1900's and lasted until the late 1960's, when the functional emphasis

began to move to occupational/technical education. This was the beginning of the second era, which lasted until the late 1970's, when the third era began to emerge somewhat unnoticed by many educators. The third era of functional emphasis was community education services, the broadest of all community college functions.

Community education services encompassed adult education, adult basic education, continuing education, community services, and community-based education. The activities and services of community education had been offered as degree college credit, non-degree college credit, non-college credit, and non-credit; they were college-sponsored or cosponsored by college and/or a public or private community group; length varied from one hour to several days, a weekend, or a semester (Lombardi, 1978).

The broad base approach of the community education/services had been highly successful in terms of the number of students served. The number of people reported to be enrolled in non-credit activities during 1980-81 was over four million (Yarrington, 1982). The Chronicle of Higher Education (1982) stated that according to statistics released by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), over 21 million adults had taken part in continuing education programs during 1981, one-fourth of whom took courses in two-year colleges.

According to Atwell, Vaughan and Sullins (1982, p. 21), these students were usually "older and more experienced than the typical full-time student; they viewed their role as citizen as primary and their student role as secondary." They were committed to learning rather than to a particular college: "These adults have returned to college for any number of reasons--to learn a new skill, to improve a skill, to meet new

people, to improve the quality of life, to get out of the house--the list is virtually endless."

Harlacher (1969) identified seven major trends in community education/services in his book, Community Dimension of the Community College: (1) multi-service outreach programs which extend the educational services of the community college beyond the physical campus; (2) the extension of adult education by offering a great variety of short courses, workshops, and seminars as well as the regular college courses; (3) the use of a variety of educational media to provide better educational and recreational outlets for the community; (4) the college taking the responsibility for leadership in assisting the community to solve some of its basic social, political, and economic problems; (5) the college assuming a responsibility for cooperating with other community agencies and organizations for the mutual improvement of the total community; and (7) the recognition that the college is not the only educational agency in the community and that the college seek to avoid duplicating services in a competitive manner.

Student Services

The student services function of the community college attempted to provide the student with the necessary assistance (directly or indirectly) toward the completion of their educational/occupational goals. The function included the more direct student personnel services such as guidance and counseling and financial aid, as well as the more indirect services such as the institution's articulation agreements with other institutions.

The guidance and counseling component of the student services function became particularly crucial for the student population of community colleges (Carnegie Commission, 1970). Students entered the open door college with a wide variety of educational backgrounds, abilities, interests, and life experiences. The role of guidance and counseling was to acknowledge those unique characteristics and, as Thornton (1972, p. 269) asserts, to "help each student to know, to accept and to respect his own abilities, so that he may reach them with realistic educational and occupational goals."

Koos (1970) believed that community college students were more in need of student personnel services than four-year college students:

> A larger proportion of students in community (colleges) than in four year colleges have disabilities in skills in reading, language, mathematics, and study. Larger proportions come from families of lower social status and have a high incidence of economic problems and/or lower motivation for continued attendance. The need for guidance in respect to personal qualities and attitudes is less apparent because of the relative intangibility and the limited research concerning them, although these restrictions can hardly minimize their importance. To illustrate from the findings, in comparison with students in four year colleges and universities, junior college students have been found to average significantly lower in social maturity and autonomy or independence, and are more conventional and authoritarian (p. 509).

The need for guidance and counseling for the nontraditional student population of the community college was also addressed by Collins (1970, p. 257) where he noted that "older students returning to school after many years of absence have fears, aspirations and attitudes different from those of the recent high school graduate."

A more indirect student service of the community college was program articulation with four-year colleges and universities. Cohen and Brawer (1980, pp. 184-85) believe that articulation agreements "facilitate the flow of students, coordinate programs among institutions and

minimize course duplication," and were an institutional imperative if the community college student were to have a "fair opportunity to compete in the upper division."

Locus of Control

The term "community" was seen by Monroe and Gleazer as the key identifier when discussing the two-year college, for it was from this base that the community college received its locus of control (Monroe, 1972; Gleazer, 1980). The success of the institution stemmed from its ability to identify with the values of the people and to integrate its educational services into their very lifestyle, which according to Gleazer (1980, p. 62), provided a "link that produces knowledge and the community." It was this "intimate relationship" between the community college and the community it served that was addressed and supported by the Truman Commission (1948, Vol. 3, p. 5).

Gleazer (1980) discussed the idea of a community locus in his book, Values, Vision, and Vitality:

> It is through the cooperative mode that the community college achieves its distinctiveness. It is to serve the community and it is to do more than that. It is to be creatively occupied with the community. It is the community's college. . . (p. 38).

"It is the community's college," so at its very best the community college fosters a sense of ownership among its community members. It was this community ownership that played an integral part in the rapid growth of the community colleges during the 1960's and 1970's (Monroe, 1972).

The most striking characteristic supporting the community's ownership of the community college was that control in most institutions

across the country rested in the hands of a local board of trustees, the members of which were elected or appointed from its immediate locale (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). The practice of resting control with a local board of trustees was passed on to the community college from the elementary and secondary public schools, and it was a practice that was supported by the Carnegie Commission (1970, p. 2) in The Open Door Colleges: "The community college by the nature of its purposes should relate to its local community and be governed by a local board or at least have a local advisory board."

It was the input and sense of ownership of the community that allowed the community college to respond quickly to meet the needs of the community. The community provided the college with direction and an impetus for change.

Traditional Criteria for Excellence in Higher Education

Cartter, in his landmark study, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (1966, p. 4), stated that, "In an operational sense, quality is someone's subjective assessment, for there is no way of objectively measuring what is in essence an attribute of value." Thus, qualification of the concepts of quality and excellence became elusive by both definition and characteristic. These concepts were to a high degree subject to various interpretations and perceptions (Miller, 1979).

Furniss (1978) addressed the complexity of quantifying quality:

> One way to see how difficult (quality) is to grasp is to consider what might be commonly agreed to as the ten principal 'indicators of quality. . . .' We can list 4,000 different academic courses, 30 kinds of institutional facilities, 40 student services, the background of the faculty members, the

> numbers (even kinds) of books in the library, the professional pay scale, the character of the institution's neighbors, the SAT's of its students, the size and wealth of its alumni body and its income per FTE student, and we still don't know whether the institution is a good one or not. Even if we know the courses were all taught splendidly, the facilities were in superior condition, the student serviced tailored to the students' needs and so on, we still have not established the insitution as one of superior quality in the eyes of all on whom it may depend for its well being (p. 21).

As Furniss suggested, several indicators of excellence had traditionally been used when examining institutional quality in higher education. These criteria were categorized into four areas of concentration: input, output, involvement, and institutional/departmental characteristics (Kuh, 1981).

Input criteria for excellence in higher education had been researched extensively by a number of individuals (Astin and Panos, 1969; Astin, 1977; Astin and Henson, 1977; Kuh, 1977; Watts, 1977; Willingham, 1980). They related to the institution's selectivity in its admissions standards, as well as to the characteristics that the students brought with them to the college environment. These characteristics included: SAT and ACT scores, general educational background, major aspirations, and socio-economic status.

The involvement indices for excellence in higher education included the instructional practices of the institution as they related to the students' learning styles and intended instructional outcomes (Menges, 1981), as well as student involvement and interaction with peers and faculty (Sanford, 1967; Feldman and Newcomb, 1969; Centra and Rock, 1970; Astin and Scherrei, 1980; Pascarella, 1980).

Student effort in the learning process was another factor that was included as an index of quality in the involvement area in higher education. Pace (1980), in his study of 13 colleges and universities,

reported that student effort in academics was an indicator of the effort that was likely to be invested in other areas of campus life.

Output criteria most often relate to the end product of the institution's educational process--graduates. Studies have examined alumni contributions to community and attitudes toward social issues (Pace, 1974), as well as graduates' lifetime earnings (Solmon, 1975). Factors laso included within this category of concentration focus on student persistence toward degree completion (Bruson, Levine and Lustberg, 1977; Astin, 1979), and the number of students who go on for further study (Rock, Centra and Linn, 1970; Astin, 1979).

The fourth traditional category in the examination of excellence in higher education had been institutional departmental characteristics. These criteria typically related to the size of the institution or department (Meeth, 1974; Millet, 1979), the proportion of faculty members who had a doctorate, faculty salaries (Solmon, 1972, 1975; Adams and Krislov, 1978), the size of the library, financial resources (Troutt, 1979), and physical plant.

These categories of criteria, while coming under fire by many (Priest, 1980; Levine, 1982), continued to be the primary criterion used in analysis of institutional quality. Millet (1979) noted:

> Colleges and universities, public and private, have long been inclined to assess quality, in terms of . . . qualifications of faculty, entering test scores of incoming students, average faculty compensation, the student-faculty ratio, the faculty instructional load, the number of books in the library, the net square feet of classroom space per student, the size of the endowment, and the size of the annual budget. It has been generally assumed that the larger the proportion of the faculty with PhD degrees, the larger the proportion of full time faculty members, the higher the faculty compensation, the lower the student-faculty ratio, the lower the faculty instructional load, the larger the number of books in the library, the higher the test scores of incoming students--then the higher

> the quality of the institution. And in fact there has been just enough correlation between these . . . and the general reputation of the college or university to encourage the continuing use of these measures of quality (pp. 11-12).

The Community College and Criteria for Excellence

Gardner (1961, p. 84) stated that "sensible men can easily conceive of excellence in a junior college . . . (therefore) we shall have to be more flexible . . . in our concept of excellence." He felt that the traditional criteria for excellence in higher education were not suitable to the measurement of quality at community colleges. Priest (1980, p. 3) reiterated this assumption: "Community colleges are not just a variation of the traditional in higher education. They represented a different breed of cat." If these assumptions were correct, then by what quality criteria should they be evaluated?

In 1978, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges stated:

> Our (community colleges) success can no longer be measured by our transfer record to the four year institution. Other criteria are more indicative of our goals and missions: namely, what can we do to improve low income, racial, and ethnic opportunity; our contribution to the labor force; what community colleges are doing to reduce employment, to provide needed skills and to respond to the manpower needs of a rapidly changing industrial technology; our assistance and service to community human services, and how we meet the requirements of the adult learner; how successful we are in promoting the concept of lifelong learning (as cited in Cohen and Lombardi, 1979, p. 27).

This statement indicated that there was indeed a need for the identification of new criteria for excellence in higher education for the community college and that such criteria should be based upon the mission and nature of the institution. The nature of the community college, as a community-based institution, encouraged the questioning of the

community and its leaders as to what they perceived to be appropriate criteria for assessing the excellence of the community college in their area.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was based on the perceptions of criteria for excellence for comprehensive two-year community colleges held by the leaders of the communities these institutions served. Chapter III described the the research design, a particular set of methods that were chosen for the study of the research problem (Riley, 1963).

Descriptive Research as Methodology

After comparative studies of methodologies, it was concluded that the most appropriate methodology for this research study was descriptive research. Descriptive research, according to Huck, Cormier and Bounds (1974), describes things the way they are. According to Gay (1976, p. 10), it involves the "collecting of data to answer questions concerning status of the subject of the study." Descriptive research was determined to meet the primary need for an initial study of the problem, the identification of selected criteria for excellence for two-year community colleges as perceived by the leaders of the communities these institutions serve.

Descriptive data are typically collected through questionnaires, interviews, or observation (Gay, 1976). The questionnaire method was chosen as the most appropriate for the purposes of this research because

of the distance between communities selected for study and the limited time schedules of community leaders.

Procedures

Selection of the Communities for the Study

Four communities were selected according to the following procedure:

1. The community had to be served by a comprehensive public two-year community college in the state of Kansas or Oklahoma.

2. The community college must have been identified as a "quality" institution of its type (i.e., rural or urban) in its respective state. The quality institutions were selected through scaled ratings and recommendations of the presidents of the two states' 33 state-supported community colleges (see Appendix A). Each president was contacted by letter and asked to identify the top two urban and the top two rural community colleges in their respective states (Appendix B). Frequency of selection was used to identify the top rural and the top urban college in each state. The response rate for this identification was 100 percent from the community college presidents of Kansas, and 85.71 percent from the Oklahoma community college presidents.

Identification of Community Leaders

Hunter, in his study of Community Power Structure (1953), identified four groups within the community that could be assumed to have leadership connections. The groups identified were business, government, civic association, and society. For the purposes of this study, the community leaders were drawn from these four groups.

This reputational method of determining community leaders had been criticized by some writers (Polsby, 1959; Wolfinger, 1960). D'Antonio and Erickson (1962) found, however, that the reputational technique seemed to measure general community influence and that there was a high degree of reliability, as high correlations were found between individuals chosen as influential in a specific area and those chosen as general community leaders. In addition, Gamson's (1966) findings indicated that the reputational leaders had been the actual leaders in the communities he studied.

To determine leaders from each of the four communities identified as being served by a "quality" community college, a panel was formed consisting of the community college president and four individuals with the following group identifications:

1. Business--one of the communities' major industrialists,
2. Government--the mayor of the community,
3. Civic Association--the president of the Rotary Club, and
4. Society--the editor of the society page for the community newspaper.

A personal letter and response form (Appendices C and D) were sent to each member of the panel explaining the purpose of the study and asking for the names and addresses of at least eight individuals who they would identify as leaders of their community. The response sheet results were compiled and the individuals who had been named at least twice were designated at community leaders. After two weeks a follow-up letter was sent to those individuals who had not responded (Appendix E).

The community colleges and the number of leaders identified for each of their respective communities were as follows:

1. Barton County Community College - 7 community leaders
   Great Bend, Kansas

2. Johnson County Community College - 7 community leaders
   Overland Park, Kansas

3. Northern Oklahoma College - 7 community leaders
   Tonkawa, Oklahoma

4. Rose State College - 5 community leaders
   Midwest City, Oklahoma

The community panels of 1, 2, and 3 had a response return of 80 percent; community 4 had a response rate of 60 percent.

Instrument

In the construction of an instrument that would examine the research questions presented in Chapter I, 10 criteria were selected for testing as a part of each of the five principal functions. In each case the items were specifically related to the tradtional institutional measures of excellence in higher education (i.e., input, output, student/institution involvement, and institutional characteristics). Throughout the questionnaire, the numbers relating to the traditional measure within each function remained constant, with two criteria each measuring the input and output categories and with three criteria each assessing the aspects of student/institutional involvement and institutional characteristics. Fourteen general miscellaneous institutional criteria were added as the sixth function to be analyzed in regard to the traditional focus of institutional excellence. The instrumental matrix can be viewed in Table I.

The responses to section I of the research instrument were set on a Likert scale. Response ranges varied from strongly agree to strongly disagree; the number value was 1 to 5, respectively.

TABLE I

CRITERION PLACEMENT IN CONSTRUCTION OF INSTRUMENT

Functions of the Community College	Traditional Criteria			
	Input	Output	Involvement	Institutional
Academic Transfer	# 3, 4	# 1, 2	# 8, 9, 10	# 5, 6, 7
Occupational/ Technical	# 3, 4	# 1, 2	# 8, 9, 10	# 5, 6, 7
Remedial/ Compensatory	# 3, 4	# 1, 2	# 8, 9 ,10	# 5, 6, 7
Student Services	# 3, 4	# 2, 6	# 1, 5, 9	# 7, 8, 10
Community Education/Services	# 3, 4	# 1, 2	# 8, 9, 10	# 5, 6, 7
General	# 1	# 2, 4, 11, 12	# 6, 7, 5	# 3, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14

Three other sections were included within the instrument. These included the relative value rankings of the five functions related to the community college by Cohen and Brawer (1982), the minimum and maximum criteria for institution and function size and personal data of the respondents, including questions concerning their own involvement with the community college. The research instrument in its totality is presented in Appendix F.

Validity of the Research Instrument

Kerlinger (1979, p. 139) defined validity as the extent to which a test "measures what the test maker wants to measure and thinks he is measuring." Gay (1981) asserted that validity was the most important quality of any test.

There are two basic approaches in determining the validity of an instrument. The first, which was used in this study, was content validity. According to Kerlinger (1979, p. 39), content validity is "directed at the substance or content of what is being measured," to see how well the test items represented the total content of the desired measured. Gay (1981) noted that there was no formula that computed content validity, nor was there a way to express it quantitatively, but that content validity should be determined by expert judgment.

For the purposes of this research, an expert panel was established consisting of four community college presidents, two from Kansas and two from Oklahoma. The researcher asked the panel of experts for their review of the questionnaire relative to each of the following questions:

1. Did the items measure the perceptions of the community leaders relative to the function of the community college and the traditional criteria of excellence in higher education?
2. Did the language of the instrument communicate effectively?
3. Was there redundancy within the items?

The recommendations and suggestions of panel members were considered by the researcher in the revision of the instrument prior to initial mailing.

Reliability of the Instrument

Kerlinger (1979, p. 132) asserted that instrument reliability related to its "stability, predictability, dependability [and] consistency." There are many different ways for estimating this important concept of measurement.

The reliability of the instrument designed for this study was measured by coefficient alpha, a measurement of internal consistency. In the alpha measure, reliability coefficients varied from 0.00 to 1.00, with 0.00 indicating very low reliability and 1.00 indicating perfect reliability. Table II displayed the alpha level for the various parts of the instrument used for this study.

TABLE II

INSTRUMENT RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS

Function	Academic Transfer	Occupational/ Technical	Remedial/ Compensatory	Student Services
Alpha Level	0.7834	0.8879	0.8809	0.8445

Function	Community Education/ Services	Miscellaneous	Total
Alpha Level	0.8590	0.3550	0.9550

Method of Analysis

The data collected were analyzed descriptively. Descriptive statistics has been frequently used in studies that were concerned with the assessment of attitudes, opinions, demographic information, conditions, and procedures (Gay, 1981). Descriptive statistical methods allow the researcher to derive certain indices from the raw data that characterized or summarized an entire set of data (Huck, Cormier, and Bounds,

1974) and tell something about a particular group of responses (Bartz, 1981). Descriptive statistics for the purpose of this study were determined by the researcher to be the most appropriate.

The specified research questions were addressed through the following methods of analysis:

Research Questions 1-6: These questions were answered through tables displaying measures of central tendencies and variances for each function and the criteria assigned to that emphasis area. The type of community college (i.e., rural or urban) will not be included as part of the data analysis.

Arithmetic means, the best single statistical value describing central tendency of a set of scores (Bartz, 1976), and standard deviations, the most stable measure of variability (Gay, 1976) based on the average squared deviation of the individual scores from the mean, are the units of analysis used for the tables.

Research Question 7: This question was answered through the display of raw data frequency distribution tables. Frequency distributions can answer several important questions as described by Huck, Cormier, and Bounds (1974):

A. What were the most frequently occurring responses?

B. Can any pattern be identified in the distribution of scores?

Research Question 8: This question was answered in a manner consistent with research questions 1 through 6, with a display of the measures of central tendencies and variances for the criteria designated to this area of emphasis.

Research Question 9: This question was answered through a synthesized comparison of the tabulated results of the research analysis of

questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8, with the researcher's references to a comprehensive review of literature relating to traditional criteria for excellence in institutions of higher education. The tables reflected the means and standard deviations of the respondents' perceptions to the traditional categories of criteria for excellence. These were included within the discussion of each function as presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to present and analyze the data collected to determine the appropriate criteria for excellence for two-year community colleges. Community leaders were asked to indicate the importance of selected criteria in the assessment of each institution and its functions. Tables which summarized the opinions of respondents were included for each function and were used to present the analysis of those opinions in relation to the traditional means of evaluating institutional excellence in higher education as presented in the literature in the field.

Chapter IV consisted of two major sections. Section one summarized the respondents' perceptions of the relative value of each institutional function (i.e., academic-transfer, occupational/technical, remedial/compensatory, student services, and community education/services), the respondents' perceptions of the relative importance of the selected criteria for excellence for each function, the respondents' opinions regarding the maximum and minimum criteria of size for institution and function, and the respondents' perceptions of general miscellaneous criteria for institutional excellence. This section ends with written comments submitted by respondents relating to criteria for excellence for their

institution. Section two focused on the characteristics and background of the respondents.

Of the 26 leaders identified in the four communities, 18 or 69.23 percent responded, 50 percent from the rural communities, and 50 percent from the urban communities. One individual did not complete the questionnaire in its entirety; however, the usable responses were included in the data pool.

The mean value response of 1.00 to 2.00 encompassed the response range of strongly agree to agree of the instrument designed for this study. In the evaluation of data presented in Chapter III, a mean value response of 1.00 to 2.00 with a standard deviation of less than 1.00 was established as essential for consideration as one of the criteria for excellence for each of the specific functions as perceived by community leaders.

Section 1. Criteria Analysis

Functional Importance

Research Question 1. What were community leaders' perceptions of the overall importance of the various community college functions in relation to institutional excellence?

To determine the respondents' perceptions of the relative value of each institutional function, they were asked to rank each area of emphasis from 1 to 5, with 1 being the most important to institutional excellence. The central measures of tendency and the standard deviations of each of these function values may be seen in Table III.

TABLE III

CENTRAL MEASURES OF TENDENCY AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTION VALUE

Function	Mean	Median	Mode	S.
Academic-Transfer	1.882	2.000	1.000	1.111
Occupational-Technical	1.882	2.000	1.000	0.928
Community Education-Services	2.765	3.000	1.000	1.393
Remedial-Compensatory	3.882	4.000	3.000	0.857
Student Services	4.412	5.000	5.000	0.795

*Mean values are as follows: 1.00 = most important and 5.00 = least important.

TABLE IV

FREQUENCIES OF COMMUNITY LEADERS' RANKINGS OF INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS

Function	1	2	3	4	5
Academic-Transfer	8	5	3	1	1
Occupational-Technical	7	6	3	1	0
Remedial-Compensatory	0	0	7	5	5
Student Services	0	1	0	7	9
Community Education-Services	4	4	3	4	2

*n = 17 (1 response missing).

It is interesting to note that in considering the five principal functions, the respondents ranked the academic-transfer and the occupational/technical functions of equal primary importance in the determination of institutional excellence for the two-year community college. The community education/service function was regarded as the third most important area of emphasis, remedial/compensatory as the fourth, and student services as the fifth.

One individual indicated that he could not give relative rankings to all five areas of emphasis, giving the functions of academic-transfer, occupational/technical, and community education/services all a ranking of 1, remedial/compensatory a 4, and student services a 5. This response can be noted by reviewing the frequency table of the leaders' rankings in Table IV (see page 43).

Academic-Transfer Function

Research Question 2. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence in academic-transfer programs at community colleges?

Two methods of analysis were used in the examination of this research question. First, an item-by-item analysis of the total responses to the criteria for excellence relating to the academic-transfer function was compiled, as reflected in Table V.

Five specific criteria exhibited relatively high agreement among the respondents as criteria for excellence for the academic-transfer function. These criteria were as follows:

Criteria 2: Student success after transfer to a four-year college or university,

TABLE V

ACADEMIC TRANSFER CRITERIA ITEM ANALYSIS

Criterion	Mean Value Response	Standard Deviation	Correlation to 10 Criteria of Transfer Function
1. Number of students who transfer to a four-year college or university	3.72	1.406	0.741
2. Student success after transfer to a four-year college or university	1.56	0.616	0.621
3. Admittance of only those students with a 3.0 grade average or better	2.39	0.778	0.450
4. Articulation/transfer agreements with other colleges and universities	1.89	0.676	0.798
5. Number of books in library	3.28	1.179	0.537
6. Size of academic transfer budget compared to number of students served in these programs	3.17	1.043	0.856
7. Academic leadership	1.61	0.608	0.600
8. Faculty's knowledge of academic subject matter and degrees earned	1.50	0.618	0.650
9. Faculty's support and encouragement of students' activities in academic honor organization	2.11	0.900	0.703
10. Academic advising of students in course selection and transfer capabilities to specific four-year colleges and universities	1.44	0.856	0.570

*Mean values are as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree.

Criteria 4: Articulation/transfer agreements with other colleges and universities,

Criteria 7: Academic leadership,

Criteria 8: Faculty's knowledge of academic subject matter and degrees earned,

Criteria 10: Academic advising of students in course selection and transfer capabilities to specific four-year colleges and universities.

Second, an analysis of criteria groupings according to their relation to traditional measures used in the assessment of excellence in higher education was completed. These data are presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI

ACADEMIC TRANSFER CRITERIA AS THEY RELATE TO TRADITIONAL MEASURES OF HIGHER EDUCATION EXCELLENCE

	Input	Output	Involvement	Institutional
Academic-Transfer Criteria	$\bar{X}$ 2.200	$\bar{X}$ 2.735	$\bar{X}$ 1.782	$\bar{X}$ 2.843
	S 0.561	S 0.504	S 0.482	S 0.375

Through a review of Table VI, one may see that the student/institutional involvement criteria were held to be the most important in establishing quality in academic-transfer programs in two-year colleges. A specific breakdown of the involvement category can be seen by reviewing criteria 8, 9, and 10 of Table V (see page 45).

Occupational-Technical Function

Research Question 3. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for occupational/technical programs at community colleges?

The second primary function of the community college was the occupational/technical function. While apparent on a very small scale in the early development of the community college movement, this curricular function has greatly increased in size and stature since the end of the 1960's.

The traditional involvement criteria, again as in the academic-transfer function, were the most frequently agreed upon criteria for excellence for the occupational/technical area. The data for this grouping of responses are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII

OCCUPATIONAL/TECHNICAL CRITERIA AS THEY RELATE TO TRADITIONAL MEASURES OF HIGHER EDUCATION EXCELLENCE

	Input	Output	Involvement	Institutional
Occupational-Technical Criteria	$\bar{X}$ 2.294 S 0.561	$\bar{X}$ 2.912 S 0.318	$\bar{X}$ 1.902 S 0.511	$\bar{X}$ 3.255 S 0.433

The data for the specific responses included within this grouping may be found in criteria 8, 9, and 10 of Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

OCCUPATIONAL-TECHNICAL CRITERIA ITEM ANALYSIS

Criterion	Mean Value Response	Standard Deviation	Correlation to 10 Criteria of Transfer Function
1. Number of students who get jobs upon program completion	4.00	1.085	0.860
2. On-the-job success of student upon program completion	1.50	0.618	0.654
3. Admittance of only those students who have exhibited medium to high aptitude for program content	2.61	1.145	0.569
4. Contacts and working agreements for training with business and industry	1.72	0.826	0.598
5. Possession and/or access to updated equipment and materials	3.94	1.110	0.836
6. Size of occupational/technical budget compared to number of students served in these programs	3.56	1.199	0.840
7. Recognized institutional leadership in occupational/technical field	1.72	0.752	0.681
8. Faculty's knowledge of occupational technical subject matter and their "on-the-job" experience	1.61	0.850	0.674
9. Faculty's support and encouragement of students' activities in professional/technical organizations	2.00	0.840	0.712
10. Occupational advising for job placement	1.78	0.878	0.669

*Mean values are as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree.

Two of the three criteria included within the involvement grouping were identified as selected criteria for excellence for the occupational-technical function. These were criteria 8, faculty's knowledge of occupational-technical subject matter and their on-the-job experience and criteria 10, occupational advising for job placement. The means of these criteria were 1.61 and 1.78, respectively, as presented in Table VIII.

An item-by-item analysis of the selected criteria for excellence as they applied to the occupational/technical function highlighted several criteria other than the traditional involvement criteria items. The criterion rated highest in terms of the respondents' agreement was criterion 2, on the job success of the student upon program completion. This response seemed to parallel closely the trend toward the competency-based programs within the occupational/technical field. There were two other specific criteria outside of the involvement category with relatively high agreement among the respondents. These were criterion 4, contacts and working agreements for training with business and industry with a mean value of 1.72 and a standard deviation of 0.826, and criterion 7, recognized institutional leadership in the occupational/technical field with a mean value of 1.72 and a standard deviation of 0.752.

Remedial-Compensatory Function

Research Question 4. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for remedial/compensatory programs at community colleges?

The two criteria receiving the highest relative agreement in the respondents' perceptions of necessary criteria for excellence for remedial/compensatory programs at the two-year community college were personal

advising and confidence building, and faculty's knowledge of remedial/compensatory techniques and materials and their educational accomplishments. These criteria had mean value responses of 1.61 and standard deviations of 0.698 and 0.778, respectively.

Other criteria that were identified as priority items in the quality of remedial/compensatory programs were leadership in remedial/compensatory techniques, faculty support and encouragement of the student and the remedial/compensatory program outside the classroom, the success of the student upon enrollment in college equivalent classes, and the availability of materials and equipment that facilitate alternate modes of learning. Table IX displays the opinions expressed by the community leaders concerning the specific criteria necessary for remedial/compensatory programs.

Within the traditional criteria groupings, the involvement category was again given first priority, with a mean value of 1.765 and a standard deviation of 0.562. The distribution of the responses is presented in Table X. It is interesting to note that the institutional category had the second highest agreement with a mean of 2.451 and a standard deviation of 0.310. This was contrary to the data representing the academic-transfer and the occupational/technical functions. The institutional category in these functions received the lowest rating of the four traditional categories.

Student Services Function

Research Question 5. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for student services programs at community colleges?

TABLE IX

REMEDIAL/COMPENSATORY CRITERIA ITEM ANALYSIS

Criterion	Mean Value Response	Standard Deviation	Correlation to 10 Criteria of Transfer Function
1. Remediation of students' educational weaknesses	3.78	1.215	0.762
2. Success of student upon enrollment in college equivalent classes	1.94	0.802	0.528
3. Admittance of students with educational weaknesses due to intellectual/mental handicapping conditions	3.28	1.227	0.798
4. Admittance of students with educational weaknesses due to weak educational background	3.50	1.249	0.736
5. Availability of materials and equipment that facilitate alternate modes of learning	1.94	0.725	0.682
6. Size of remedial/compensatory programs budget compared to number of students served in the programs	3.22	1.060	0.852
7. Leadership in remedial/compensatory techniques	1.78	0.732	0.631
8. Personal advising and confidence building	1.61	0.698	0.679
9. Faculty support and encouragement of student and remedial/compensatory program outside of classroom	1.78	0.732	0.704
10. Faculty's knowledge of remedial/compensatory techniques and materials, and their educational accomplishments	1.61	0.778	0.633

*Mean values are as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree.

TABLE X

REMEDIAL/COMPENSATORY CRITERIA AS THEY RELATED TO TRADITIONAL MEASURES OF HIGHER EDUCATION EXCELLENCE

		Input		Output		Involvement		Institutional
Remedial/ Compensatory Criteria	$\bar{X}$	3.588	$\bar{X}$	3.029	$\bar{X}$	1.765	$\bar{X}$	2.451
	S	0.775	S	0.483	S	0.562	S	0.310

The criterion with the highest relative agreement among the responding community leaders for the student services function was personal guidance and counseling of students. This criterion received a mean value of 1.61 with a standard deviation of 0.698.

Other specific criteria that were identified as important to the excellence of the student services function at the community college were student services leadership, provision of financial aid for needy students, and facilities for student use (i.e., student union, gymnasium) through student services. A summary of the responses to the criteria item analysis is contained in Table XI.

On the basis of the responses to the specific criteria presented in Table XI, the traditional evaluation of excellence categorized as first priority in terms of the student services function was the input grouping. This category consisted of criteria 3 and 4 from Table X. The mean for this category of responses was 2.059 with a standard deviation of 0.609.

It is interesting to note that in the student services area the input category received the highest priority. None of the four traditional groupings, however, had a mean value of higher than 2.0 nor lower than 3.0, indicating a degree of consensus throughout the categorical areas. The means and standard deviations of the responses for this research question are presented in Table XII.

Community Education/Services Function

Research Question 6. What were community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence in community education/services programs at community colleges?

TABLE XI

STUDENT SERVICES CRITERIA ITEM ANALYSIS

Criterion	Mean Value Response	Standard Deviation	Correlation to 10 Criteria of Transfer Function
1. Personal guidance and counseling of students	1.61	0.698	0.714
2. Student success in demonstrating competencies of basic emotional and physical well-being	2.06	0.938	0.728
3. Provision of comprehensive testing process for students prior to enrollment	2.00	0.970	0.609
4. Provision of financial aid to needy students	1.89	0.900	0.683
5. Provision of extracurricular activities for students	3.33	1.328	0.663
6. Number of students who are directly serviced and extent of services provided	3.39	1.092	0.717
7. Size of student services budget and array of services offered	3.28	1.127	0.595
8. Student services leadership	1.89	0.832	0.662
9. Number of faculty and staff involved in student services programs	2.50	1.043	0.701
10. Facilities available for student use, i.e., student union, gymnasium through student services	1.89	0.963	0.487

*Mean values are as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree.

TABLE XII

STUDENT SERVICES CRITERIA AS THEY RELATED TO TRADITIONAL MEASURES OF HIGHER EDUCATION EXCELLENCE

	Input	Output	Involvement	Institutional
Student Services Criteria	$\bar{X}$ 2.059	$\bar{X}$ 2.882	$\bar{X}$ 2.627	$\bar{X}$ 2.490
	S 0.609	S 0.485	S 0.484	S 0.393

As might be expected by the very nature of community education/services, the traditional category of involvement was classified as the first priority in determining criteria for excellence. This grouping exhibited a mean value of 1.647, with a standard deviation of 0.478. The criteria falling into this category were items 8, 9, and 10 of Table XIV. The data for the other traditional categories are presented in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

COMMUNITY EDUCATION/SERVICES CRITERIA AS THEY RELATED TO TRADITIONAL MEASURES OF HIGHER EDUCATION EXCELLENCE

	Input	Output	Involvement	Institutional
Community Education/ Services	$\bar{X}$ 2.059 S 0.527	$\bar{X}$ 2.941 S 0.243	$\bar{X}$ 1.647 S 0.478	$\bar{X}$ 2.529 S 0.237

The specific criterion receiving the highest relative agreement was in the involvement category. This criterion was number 10, instructor knowledge of subject matter. It had a mean value of 1.17 and a standard deviation of 0.514. The second two most highly regarded criteria were number 3, courses that reflect individual community interests; and number 9, cooperation and interaction with other community agencies and businesses. Each of these recorded a mean value of 1.56 with standard deviations of 0.705 and 0.616, respectively. There were more criteria agreed upon within this function than any of the other four, previously discussed.

TABLE XIV

COMMUNITY EDUCATION/SERVICES CRITERIA ITEM ANALYSIS

Criterion	Mean Value Response	Standard Deviation	Correlation to 10 Criteria of Transfer Function
1. Number of individuals participating in the program	3.94	1.110	0.736
2. Learner's satisfaction with educational experience	1.61	0.698	0.782
3. Courses that reflect individual/community interests	1.56	0.705	0.749
4. Adult participation only	2.33	1.085	0.554
5. Availability of classroom space and materials during day and evening hours	1.78	0.732	0.607
6. Size of community education/ services budget and array of courses offered	3.56	1.199	0.655
7. Community leadership	1.83	0.707	0.712
8. Advisory board of community members	1.94	0.938	0.685
9. Cooperation and interaction with other community agencies and businesses	1.56	0.616	0.757
10. Instructor's knowledge of subject matter	1.17	0.514	0.725

*Mean values are as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree.

Other specific criteria that were identified by community leaders for the community education/services function were learners' satisfaction with the educational experience, availability of classroom space and materials during day and evening hours, community leadership, and an advisory board of community members. The range and distribution of responses can be viewed in Table XIV.

Size Criteria

Research Question 7. What were community leaders' perceptions of minimum and maximum size for a quality community college and its various functions?

The community leaders were asked to cite a minimum and maximum enrollment necessary for a quality community college as a total institution and then to cite minimum and maximum enrollments necessary for each function to achieve excellence. Seven of the respondents did not answer any part of this section of the instrument. One indicated that he did not have any input, one stated he did not know, one considered the size factor of no relevance to the quality of an institution, and four had no response. The remaining 61 percent of the community leaders responded selectively to various portions of this section of the questionnaire. These leaders indicated that the minimum enrollment for their institution before quality would be lowered would range from 100 to 5,000, and the the maximum enrollment for their institution before quality would be lowered would range from 1,800 to no limit. This reaction response seemed to indicate that size may be of little importance in community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for colleges within their communities. The data compiled from this section of the questionnaire can be reviewed in Table XV.

TABLE XV

MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM ENROLLMENT FREQUENCY TABLE

Minimum Enrollment for Institution		Maximum Enrollment for Institution	
Enrollment	Frequency	Enrollment	Frequency
5,000	5	No Limit	2
4,000	1	18,000	1
1,200	2	15,000	3
1,000	1	12,000	2
750	1	10,000	2
700	1	1,500	1
500	1		
No Response	7	No Response	7

Minimum Enrollment for Academic Transfers		Maximum Enrollment for Academic Transfers	
Enrollment	Frequency	Enrollment	Frequency
3,000	2	No Limit	1
2,000	1	18,000	1
600	1	10,000	1
400	1	8,000	2
250	2	3,000	1
No Response	10	No Response	2

Minimum Enrollment for Occupational/Technical		Maximum Enrollment for Occupational/Technical	
Enrollment	Frequency	Enrollment	Frequency
4,000	1	No Limit	2
3,000	1	8,000	1
2,000	1	5,000	1
1,000	1	3,000	1
300	2	1,000	1
200	1	400	1
100	1		
No Response	10	No Response	11

Minimum Enrollment for Remedial/Compensatory		Maximum Enrollment for Remedial/Compensatory	
Enrollment	Frequency	Enrollment	Frequency
500	3	No Limit	1
200	1	4,000	1
100	2	2,000	1
75	1	1,000	1
50	1	500	1
No Response	10	200	1
		150	1
No Response	10	No Response	11

Minimum Enrollment for Community Education/Services		Maximum Enrollment for Community Education/Services	
Enrollment	Frequency	Enrollment	Frequency
500	3	No Limit	2
250	1	4,000	1
200	2	2,500	1
75	1	1,000	1
0	1	500	1
		400	1
No Response	10	No Response	11

Miscellaneous Criteria for Institutional Excellence

Research Question 8. What were community leaders' perceptions of miscellaneous criteria for excellence at community colleges?

Community leaders gave top priority within the miscellaneous institutional criteria to the criterion of good teaching. The rating of this specific criterion was the highest of the entire study with a mean value response of 1.11 and a standard deviation of 0.323. The second and third criteria with a high relative agreement within this general section were faculty members' ability to interact with the students in the classroom with a mean value response of 1.28 and a standard deviation of 0.461, and leadership of the institution with a mean value response of 1.33 and a standard deviation of 0.594.

Other criteria deemed important to general institutional excellence by the community leaders were fulfillment of the educational wants, needs and aspirations of the people of the community, impact of the institution on the community's growth and change, innovation in the ways and means of providing education, and students' reported satisfaction with the education received. Table XVI contains a résumé of the responses of the community leaders to the criteria presented within this general criteria category.

The community leaders' responses to the specific criteria accorded first priority to the traditional category of student/institutional involvement. The criteria items designated to this grouping were numbers 5, 6, and 7 of Table XVI. The overall response mean for this category was 1.556 with a standard deviation of 0.379. Table XVII presents the data for all four categories as they relate to the miscellaneous criteria.

TABLE XVI

MISCELLANEOUS CRITERIA ITEM ANALYSIS

Criterion	Mean Value Response	Standard Deviation	Correlation to 10 Criteria of Transfer Function
1. Admittance of all students who aspire to attend	2.17	1.150	0.643
2. Fulfillment of the educational wants, needs, and aspirations of people of community	1.44	0.784	0.650
3. Innovation in ways and means of providing education	1.94	0.539	0.197
4. Impact of institution on community's growth and change	1.78	0.808	0.408
5. Good teaching	1.11	0.323	0.223
6. Faculty's ability to interact with students in classroom	1.28	0.461	0.219
7. Faculty's ability to interact with students outside classroom	2.28	1.018	0.177
8. Appearance of physical plant	4.33	0.594	0.550
9. Size of budget compared to number of students served	3.83	0.857	0.335
10. Leadership of institution	1.33	0.594	0.248
11. Economic status attained by graduates	3.50	0.924	0.590
12. Students' reported satisfaction with education received	1.83	0.786	0.506
13. Average salaries of instructors in comparison to national standards	3.56	1.042	0.042
14. Amount of private support from foundation or endowment associations	3.33	1.029	0.225

*Mean values are as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree.

TABLE XVII

GENERAL CRITERIA AS THEY RELATED TO TRADITIONAL MEASURES OF HIGHER EDUCATION EXCELLENCE

	Input	Output	Involvement	Institutional
General Criteria	$\bar{X}$ 2.167 S 1.150	$\bar{X}$ 2.139 S 0.602	$\bar{X}$ 1.556 S 0.379	$\bar{X}$ 3.056 S 0.297

Written Comments of Responding Community-Leaders

Three of the 18 responding community leaders made additional remarks expression support of specific criteria for their own community college. One such comment credited the executive leadership of the institution for the quality of the local program: "The excellence of our local program is directly related to the strength of the individual serving as president." Another stated that "quality of the faculty" was the most important criterion for excellence for any institution of higher education. The third community leader making additional comments offered a "quality" formula as to how the institution in his community had become excellent: "The growth of enrollment + a positive community image + the wealth of the area = an outstanding educational institution."

Section 2. Respondents' Characteristics and Background

This section of Chapter IV presents and analyzes the characteristics and background of the responding community leaders. Personal characteristics of the respondents discussed were age, level of education,

occupation and years in the community. Data concerning the respondents' background focused directly on whether or not they or members of their family had ever attended a community college.

Personal Characteristics of Community Leaders

Age. The responding community leaders ranged from 33 to 62 years of age. The distribution of the respondents' ages may be seen in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY LEADERS

Age in Years	Frequency	Central Measures of Tendency
33	1	$\bar{X}$ 49.8
35	1	Median 51.0
41	1	
42	2	Mode 55.0
47	1	
48	1	
49	1	
51	1	
54	1	
55	3	
56	1	
61	2	(1 response
62	1	missing)

Education Level. All community leaders had attended school for at least 12 years, with the largest percentage, 35.3, graduating from

college. The educational level of the respondents can be reviewed in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF COMMUNITY LEADERS

Educational Level in Years	Frequency	Central Measures of Tendency
12	1	$\bar{X}$ 16.5
13	1	Median 16.0
15	2	
16	6	Mode 16.0
18	4	(1 response missing)
19	3	

Occupation. Five of the community leaders were involved in banking as a profession, for 27.7 percent of the total respondents. Three individuals were involved in organizational executive management and three in private business (e.g., insurance broker, realtor, veterinarian). The occupations of all the respondents can be seen in Table XX.

Years in Community. As can be noted in Table XXI, 50 percent of the community leaders responding to this study had lived in their respective communities for more than 23 years. It should be noted, however, that three of the respondents have lived in their communities for five years or less.

TABLE XX

OCCUPATIONS OF COMMUNITY LEADERS

Occupation	Frequency	Occupation	Frequency
Banking	5	Newspaper Publisher	2
Organizational Management	3	Attorneys	2
Private Business	3	City Offices	2
		Engineer	1

TABLE XXI

DISTRIBUTION OF YEARS LIVED IN COMMUNITY

Years in Community	Frequency	Central Measures of Tendency	
2	2		
5	1	$\bar{X}$	23.8
8	1		
16	1	Median	23.0
20	3		
23	1	Mode	20.0
25	1		
30	2		
31	1		
35	1		
40	1		
41	1		
56	1	(1 response missing)	

Community College Background of Responding Community Leaders

Of the responding community leaders, 44 percent had personally attended a community college in some capacity. The attendance distribution according to types of classes attended was presented in Table XXII. Eleven of the 18 respondents, 61 percent, had had a family member attend a community college. A breakdown of the types of classes attended may be seen in Table XXIII.

Summary

The data presented in this chapter identified selected criteria for excellence for two-year community colleges in Kansas and Oklahoma, as perceived by leaders of the communities in which they serve. The leaders ranked the academic-transfer and occupational/technical functions of equal importance in determining institutional excellence, along with 33 specific criteria related to the institution and each of its five functions. These criteria were analyzed in relation to the traditional modes of determining excellence in institutions of higher education. The traditional student/institution involvement category was deemed to be the most appropriate by leaders for the community college in the miscellaneous criterion grouping and in four out of the five functional criterion groupings.

Chapter V will continue with a discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

TABLE XXII

TYPES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE CLASSES ATTENDED BY COMMUNITY LEADERS

Type of Class	Number	Percent
Academic-Transfer	8	44.4
Occupational/Technical	2	11.1
Remedial/Compensatory	1	5.9
Community Education/ Services	2	11.1

TABLE XXIII

TYPES OF CLASSES ATTENDED BY FAMILIES OF COMMUNITY LEADERS

Type of Class	Number	Percent
Academic-Transfer	9	50.0
Occupational/Technical	5	27.8
Remedial/Compensatory	2	11.1
Community Education/ Services	4	22.2

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study was designed to investigate and identify criteria for excellence for two-year community colleges as perceived by leaders of the communities which they serve. The population for this research project was selected from four communities that had been identified as being served by a quality community college in the states of Kansas and Oklahoma. Leaders in each of these four communities were identified and surveyed concerning their perceptions of criteria for excellence for the two-year colleges in their respective communities.

The initial purpose of the study was to determine which selected criteria community leaders would identify as important to the quality of a comprehensive two-year institution and its various assigned functions. The leaders were asked to rank order the functions of the modern community college with regard to their importance in determining institutional excellence. Specific criteria were placed into the functional emphasis areas of academic-transfer, occupational/technical, remedial/compensatory, student services, community education/services, and miscellaneous. Criterion questions concerning minimum and maximum enrollment of the institution and its curricular functions were also included.

The second purpose of this study was to analyze the specific criteria within each function in regard to the criterion categories traditionally used in determining excellence in institutions of higher education. The

community leaders' perceptions of the applicability of those traditional categories to the community college, a somewhat nontraditional institution of higher education, were examined through categorical data analysis. The categories of traditional criteria for excellence that were used for this study were input, output, student/institution involvement, and institutional characteristics.

Findings

The study was designed to answer the research questions noted in Chapter I. The findings of the study were presented in the following segments:

1. Community leaders' perceptions of the importance of the community college functions in relation to institutional excellence (research question 1).

2. Selected criteria for excellence for community colleges as perceived by leaders of the communities served (research questions 2 through 8).

3. Relationship of the selected criteria for excellence selected by community leaders for their community colleges and the traditional criteria used for institutions of higher education (research question 9).

Community Leaders' Perceptions of the Importance of the Community College Function in Relation to Institutional Excellence

The leaders of the communities participating in the study ranked the quality of the academic-transfer and occupational/technical functions as being of equal primary importance in determining institutional excellence

for comprehensive two-year colleges, with mean values of 1.882, median values of 2.000, and modes of 1.000. There was a slightly wider range of scores within the academic-transfer function with a standard deviation of 1.111 compared with the occupational/technical function with a standard deviation of 0.928. The community education/services function was ranked third in institutional importance with a mean of 2.765, a median of 3.000, and a mode of 1.000. The remedial/compensatory function was ranked fourth, and student services was ranked fifth.

The review of literature tended to support this ranking of functional importance. The community college movement had started with the academic-transfer function as the major area of emphasis for most community colleges. In the late 1960's, the occupational/technical field began to experience a surging growth in both programs and numbers of students attending those programs until, in the mid-1970's, it had reached a parity with the academic-transfer function in determined importance to the community college and its mission. The 1980's have been cited in the literature as the growth era for the community education/services function.

Selected Criteria for Excellence for Community Colleges as Perceived by Leaders of the Communities Served

Within each emphasis area, specific criteria were identified by community leaders as important in the evaluation of the quality of their community college and its functions. The following specific criteria were selected by the respondents in the order of their relative agreement.

Academic-Transfer

1. Academic advising of students in course selection transfer capabilities to specific four-year colleges and universities.

2. Faculty's knowledge of academic subject matter and degrees earned.

3. Student success after transfer to a four-year college or university.

4. Academic leadership.

5. Articulation/transfer agreements with other colleges and universities.

Occupational/Technical

1. On-the-job success of the student upon program completion.

2. Faculty's knowledge of occupational/technical subject matter and their "on-the-job experience."

3. Contacts and working agreements for training with business and industry.

4. Recognized institutional leadership in the occupational/technical field.

5. Occupational advising for job placement.

Remedial/Compensatory

1. Personal advising and confidence building.

2. Faculty's knowledge of remedial/compensatory techniques and materials and their educational accomplishments.

3. Faculty's support and encouragement of the student and the remedial/compensatory program outside of the classroom.

4. Leadership in remedial/compensatory techniques.

5. Availability of materials and equipment that facilitated alternate modes of learning.

6. Success of the student upon enrollment in college equivalent classes.

Student Services

1. Personal guidance and counseling of students.

2. Student services leadership.

3. Provision of financial aid to needy students.

4. Facilities available for student use (i.e., student union, gymnasium, through student services).

Community Education/Services

1. Instructors' knowledge of subject matter.

2. Cooperation and interaction with other community agencies and businesses.

3. Courses that reflected individual/community interests.

4. Learners' satisfaction with the educational experience.

5. Availability of classroom space and materials during days and evening hours.

6. Community leadership.

7. Advisory board of community members.

Miscellaneous

1. Good teaching.

2. Leadership of the institution.

3. Fulfillment of the educational wants, needs, and aspirations of the people of the community.

4. Impact of the institution on the community's growth and change.

5. Students' reported satisfaction with the education received.

6. Innovation in the ways and means of providing education.

Minimum and Maximum Enrollment Criteria

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1970) outlined minimum and maximum enrollments for the two-year community colleges if they were to offer quality programming and instruction. The recommendation of the Commission was for optimum enrollments for community colleges to range from 2,000 to 5,000 daytime students.

The response rate to this section of the questionnaire did not meet expectations, with a percentage of 61.11 of the responding community leaders reacting to one or all of the specific questions regarding size as related to excellence at the community college level. Only 38.89 percent of the responding community leaders completed the section in its entirety. This reaction response seemed to indicate that size may be of little importance in community leaders' perceptions of criteria for excellence for colleges within their communities.

Relationship of Selected Criteria for Excellence Identified by Community Leaders for Their Community Colleges and Traditional Criteria Used for Institutions

In four of the specific functional areas, in addition to the miscellaneous category of institutional criteria for excellence, the traditional involvement grouping was rated highest in terms of its applicability to the nature of community colleges by responding community leaders. The student services function was the only area where the involvement criteria were not thought to be of primary importance in the determination of excellence for that area. Top priority for this function was the traditional input category. It is important to note, however, that the highest relative agreement among the community leaders within the student services function had a mean value of 2.059, and the lowest agreement had a mean value of 2.882. This range of means over the four traditional categories of excellence seemed to indicate that for the student service function there was common agreement regarding the criteria presented.

Conclusions

The study identified selected criteria for determining excellence in community colleges as perceived by leaders of the communities served. A list of broad criteria was drawn from the findings of the study and presented as important determinants of excellence for community colleges in Kansas and Oklahoma.

1. The traditional category of criteria for excellence for institutions of higher education that was judged by community leaders to be

the most important and to have the highest applicability to the community college was the involvement category. This category had the highest relative agreement of community leaders in four out of the five functional areas. It was also identified as first priority in the miscellaneous criterion section of the instrument.

2. The quality of the academic-transfer, occupational/technical, and community education/services programs should be considered primary to the community colleges as they strive for excellence. The community leaders judged the academic-transfer and the occupational/technical functions to be of equal importance to the community college. The community education/services function was identified as the third most critical function influencing institutional excellence.

3. Leadership of the institution regarding function and program areas was considered an important criterion for excellence. This criterion was identified by community leaders in all five of the functional categories and in the miscellaneous listing as one of the top criteria for excellence for the community college of their area.

4. Community leaders selected advisement criteria as another important determinant of institutional excellence. Advisement was selected in all five of the functional categories as a specific criterion for excellence.

5. The criterion of faculty quality was considered to be of top priority in the search for institutional excellence. The faculty quality criterion was identified in the academic-transfer, occupational/technical, remedial/compensatory, community education/services functions, and in the miscellaneous institutional grouping.

6. Community leaders' relative agreement with regard to the importance of interaction of the community college and its programs with external agencies was exhibited in their selection of the following specific criteria: articulation/transfer agreements with other colleges and universities for the academic-transfer function, contacts and working agreements for training with business and industry for the occupational/technical function, cooperation with other community agencies and businesses for the community education/services function.

7. In four of the five functional areas of emphasis (i.e., academic-transfer, occupational/technical, remedial/compensatory, and community education/services), the criterion of student success and satisfaction was noted by community leaders as an important determinant of institutional excellence. Student satisfaction was identified within the miscellaneous criterion category and the community education/services function. Student success upon completion of the program was noted in the academic-transfer, occupational/technical, and remedial/compensatory functions.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of this study:

1. Further research should be conducted on the topic of criteria for excellence for community colleges. This study should be replicated in other communities and regions to determine whether there is agreement across the United States regarding criterion values. Other populations besides community leaders should be questioned regarding their perceptions of criteria for excellence for the community college (e.g.,

students, administration, faculty, local residents) and comparisons made.

2. Higher education institutions of all types (e.g., public and private colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges and research universities) should proceed to identify a specific set of criteria for institutional excellence that are primary to their own educational roles and missions. One of the strengths of American higher education has been its diversity (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976). It is time to recognize this diversity in the examination of institutional excellence.

Traditional criteria work just so long as the same events and problems occur. There is a need to explore their relevance to higher education today and to seek to identify untraditional criteria that are more applicable.

3. Leadership was identified as the primary criterion for the community colleges in all aspects of institutional operation. Further study is needed to examine the qualities of leadership that would lend support and direction to the other criteria for excellence that have been identified in this study.

4. Further study is recommended focusing on how advisement practices and policies can enhance institutional quality for community colleges. The advisement of students was identified by the community leaders of this study in all five of the functional areas as being an important determinant in the evaluation of the community college. Successful advisement programs in all of the functions of the community colleges should be examined and widely distributed to colleges and professionals in the field.

5. Research should be conducted concerning community colleges' optimal level of interaction with external agencies in their communities. Suggestions and guidelines for institutions wishing to give more focus to this criterion should be widely distributed.

6. The involvement category of criteria for excellence for higher education institutions should be examined more closely in relation to the community college and its functions. Additional research should be conducted with regard to the identification and use of specific criteria that would relate to each function within the institution and to the institution as a whole.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Arvil V., and Krislov, Joseph. 1978. "Evaluating the Quality of American Universities: A New Approach." Research in Higher Education, 8, 97-109.

Astin, Alexander, W. 1965. "College Preferences for Very Able Students." College and University, Spring, 282-297.

_____. 1971. Predicting Academic Performance in College. New York: Free Press.

_____. 1977. Four Critical Years: Effects of College on Beliefs, Attitudes and Knowledge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

_____, and Henson, James N. 1977. "New Measures of College Selectivity." Research in Higher Education, 6, 1-8.

_____, and Panos, Robert J. 1969. The Education and Vocational Development of College Students. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

_____, and Scherrei, Rita A. 1980. Maximizing Leadership Effectiveness: Impact of Administrative Style on Faculty and Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Atwell, Charles A., Vaughan, George B., and Sullins, W. Robert. 1982. Reexamining Community Services in the Community College: Toward Consensus and Commitment. Topical Paper No. 76. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

Bartz, A. E. 1981. Basic Statistical Concepts. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co.

Blau, Peter M., and Margulies, Rebecca Z. 1974-75. "The Reputations of American Professional Schools." Change, 6, Winter, 42-47.

Brick, M. 1965. Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement. New York: Teachers College Press.

Brown, David G. 1967. The Mobile Professors. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Brubacher, J. S., and Rudy, W. 1976. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. 1970. The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1975. More Than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. 1980. Three Thousand Futures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cartter, Alan M. 1966. An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Centra, John A., and Rock, Donald. 1970. College Environments and Student Academic Achievement. Research Bulletin ED 053-205. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Clark, Mary Jo, Harnett, Rodney T., and Baird, Leonard L. 1976. Assessing Dimensions of Quality in Doctoral Education: A Technical Report of a National Study in Three Fields. ED 173-144. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. 1982. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Lombardi, John. 1979. "Can the Community Colleges Survive Success?" Change, 2 (8), 24-27.

Cole, Jonathan R., and Lipton, James A. 1977. "The Reputation of American Medical Schools." Social Forces, 55, 662-684.

Collins, C. C. 1970. "Some Student Characteristics and Their Implications for Student Personnel Work." In Terry O'Banion and Alice Thursten, Junior College Student Personnel Work: Practice and Potential. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Cosand, J. P. 1979. Perspective: Community Colleges in the 1980's. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Council of Universities and Colleges; and Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

Cross, K. P. 1970. Unpublished Study of Community Colleges' Programs for Poorly Prepared Students. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

_____. 1976. Accent on Learning: Improving Instruction and Reshaping the Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

D'Antonio, William, and Erickson, Eugene. 1962. "The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power." American Sociological Review, 17, 362-376.

Eells, Walter Crosby. 1941. Why Junior College Terminal Education? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Newcomb, Theodore M. 1969. The Impact of College on Students. Vol. I. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Feldman, Marvin J. 1982. "The Community College Comes of Age." Educational Record, Spring, 26-28.

Flager, Eleanor. 1981. "Is Open Door a Revolving Door at Kentucky's Universities?" The Louisville Times, May 5, 1, 8.

Furniss, W. Todd. 1978. "Responding With Quality." In The Closing System of Academic Employment. ED 160-032. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Gamson, William. 1966. "Reputation and Resources in Community Politics." American Journal of Sociology, 72, 121-131.

Gardner, J. W. 1961. Excellence, Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper.

Gay, L. R. 1976, 1981. Educational Research. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. 1980. The Community College: Values, Visions, and Vitality. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Gourman, Jack. 1977. The Gourman Report: A Rating of Undergraduate Programs in American and International Universities. Los Angeles: National Education Standards.

Gregg, Russell T., and Sims, Paul D. 1972. "Quality of Faculties and Programs of Graduate Departments of Educational Administration." Educational Administration Quarterly, 8, 67-92.

Gruson, Edward S., Levine, David O., and Lustberg, Lawrence S. 1977. Issues and Accreditation Eligibility and Institutional Quality. ED 184-415. Cambridge, Mass.: Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education.

Harlacher, E. L. 1969. The Community Dimension of the Community College. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., and Bounds, W. G. 1974. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper & Row.

Hunter, F. 1953. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press.

Kerlinger, Fred N. 1979. Behavioral Research: A Conceptual Approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Koos, L. V. 1970. The Community College Student. Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press.

Kuh, G. D. 1977. "Admissions." In William T. Packwood (Ed.), College Student Personnel Services. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.

Kuh, George D. 1981. Indices of Quality in the Undergraduate Experience. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Levine, Arthur E. 1982. "Quality in Baccalaureate Programs: What to Look for When David Riesman Can't Visit." Educational Board, Winter, 13-18.

Lombardi, J. 1978. "Resurgence of Occupational Education." Topical Paper No. 65. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, ED 148-418.

_____. 1978. "Community Education: Threat to College Status?" Topical Paper No. 68. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, ED 156-296.

_____. 1979. "The Decline of Transfer Education." Topical Paper No. 70. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, ED 179-273.

Medsker, Leland L., and Tillery, Dale. 1971. Breaking the Access Barriers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Meeth, L. Richard. 1974. Quality Education for Less Money. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Menges, Robert J. 1981. "Instructional Methods." In Arthur W. Chickering and Associates (Ed.), The Modern American College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, H. F., Jr. 1976. New Jersey Two-Year College Transfer Students. Research Report 76-1. Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Higher Education, ED 136-882.

Millet, John D. 1979. "The States Face Issues of Quality in Higher Education." Paper presented to Invitational Seminar for Members of Statewide Coordinating and Governing Boards, July 31, 1979, Columbus, Ohio, ED 177-960.

Monroe, Charles R. 1972. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morphet, Edgar L., Jesser, David L., and Ludka, Arthur P. 1972. Planning and Providing for Excellence in Education. New York: Citation Press.

Morrison, J. L., and Ferrante, R. 1973. "The Public Two Year College and the Culturally Different." Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, La., February, 1973, ED 073-765.

Pace, C. Robert. 1979. Measuring Outcomes of College: Fifty Years of Findings and Recommendations for the Future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

_____. 1980. "Measuring the Quality of Student Effort." In Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality. 1980 Current Issues in Higher Education. No. 1, 10-16. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, ED 194-004.

Parker, G. G. 1974. Career Education and Transfer Program Enrollments in 2-Year Colleges, 1973-1974. ACT Special Report No. 11. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, ED 103-031.

Pascarella, Ernest T. 1980. "Student-Faculty Informal Contact and College Outcomes." Review of Educational Research, 50, 545-595.

Polsby, Nelson. 1959. "Three Problems in the Analysis of Community Power." American Sociological Review, 24, 796-803.

President's Commission on Higher Education. 1947. Higher Education for American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Government Publishing Office.

President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. 1957. Second Report to the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Print-Office.

Priest, Bill J. 1980. "Quality in Higher Education: A Community College Perspective." IEP Paper No. 056. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 202-279.

Rock, Donald A., Centra, John A., and Linn, Robert L. 1970. "Relationships Between College Characteristics and Student Achievement." American Education Research Association Journal, 7, 109-121.

Roose, Kenneth D., and Anderson, Charles J. 1970. A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education.

Roueche, John E., and Snow, Jerry J. 1977. Overcoming Learning Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sanford, R. Nevitt. 1967. Where Colleges Fail: A Study of the Student as a Person. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Solmon, L. C. 1972. The Definition and Impact of College Quality. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, ED 065-080.

_____. 1975. "The Definition of College Quality and Its Impact on Earning." Explorations in Economic Research, 2, 537-587.

Solomon, Roger Brumley. 1976. A Different Drummer . . . The CCC College. Atlanta, Ga.: Life-Long Learning Library.

Thornton, J. W., Jr. 1972. The Community Junior College. 3rd edition. New York: Wiley.

Troutt, William E. 1979. "Regional Accreditation Evaluative Criteria and Quality Assurance." Journal of Higher Education, 50, 199-210.

Vaughan, George B. 1983. "President Truman Endorsed Community College Manifesto." Community and Junior College Journal, 53 (7), 21-24.

Watts, Susan (Ed.). 1977. The College Handbook. 16th edition. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1977.

Willingham, Warren W. 1980. "The Case for Personal Qualities in Admissions." College Board Review, 116, A2-A8.

Wolfinger, Raymond. 1960. "Reputation and Reality in the Study of Community Power." American Sociological Review, 25, 636-644.

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN KANSAS AND OKLAHOMA

Kansas

1. Dr. Paul Hines, President
Allen County Community College
1801 North Cottonwood
Iola, Kansas 66749
316/365-5116

2. Dr. Thomas Saffell, President
Garden City Community College
Box 977, 801 Campus Drive
Garden City, Kansas 67846
316/276-7611

3. Dr. Jimmie L. Downing, President
Barton County Community College
Great Bend, Kansas 67530
316/792-2701

4. Dr. Bill R. Spencer, President
Highland Community College
Box 68
Highland, Kansas 66035
913/442-3238

5. Dr. Carl L. Heinrich, President
Butler County Community College
Box 888
El Dorado, Kansas 67042
316/321-5083

6. Dr. James H. Stringer, President
Hutchinson Community College
1300 North Plum
Hutchinson, Kansas 67501
316/665-3500

7. Dr. James P. Ihrig, President
Cloud County Community College
2221 Campus Drive
Concordia, Kansas 66901
913/243-1435

8. Mr. M. Leon Foster, President
Independence Community College
Box 708, College Avenue
and Brookside Drive
Independence, Kansas 67301
316/331-4100

9. Dr. Russell H. Graham, President
Coffeyville Community College
Coffeyville, Kansas 67337
316/251-7700

10. Dr. Charles J. Carlsen, President
Johnson County Community College
12345 College at Quivira
Overland Park, Kansas 66210
913/888-8500

11. Dr. James H. Tangeman, President
Colby Community College
1255 S. Range
Colby, Kansas 67701
913/462-3984

12. Dr. Alton Davies, President
Kansas City, Kansas Community
College
7250 State Avenue
Kansas City, Kansas 66112
913/334-1100

13. Dr. Gwen Nelson, President
Cowley County Community College
125 South Second
Arkansas City, Kansas 67005
316/442-0430

14. Dr. Gery Hochanadel, President
Labette Community College
200 South 14th, Box 957
Parsons, Kansas 67357
316/421-6700

15. Dr. Jean Thomas-Sims, President
Dodge City Community College
14th Avenue and Bypass 50
Dodge City, Kansas 67801

16. Dr. J. C. Sanders, President
Neosho County Community College
1000 South Allen
Chanute, Kansas 66720
316/431-2820

17. Acting President
Fort Scott Community College
2108 South Horton
Fort Scott, Kansas 66701
316/223-2700

18. Dr. James Hooper, President
Seward County Community College
Liberal, Kansas 67901
316/624-1951

19. Dr. John Gwaltney, President
Pratt Community College
Highway 61
Pratt, Kansas 67124
316/672-5641

Oklahoma

1. Dr. Joe E. White, President
Carl Albert Junior College
P.O. Box 606
Poteau, Oklahoma 74953
918/647-2124

2. Dr. Richard H. Mosier, President
Rogers State College
College Hill
Claremore, Oklahoma 74017
918/341-7510

3. Dr. Carl O. Westbrook, President
Connors State College
Warner, Oklahoma 74469
918/463-2931

4. Dr. James M. Miller, President
Eastern Oklahoma State College
Wilburton, Oklahoma 74578
918/465-2361

5. Dr. Bill S. Cole, President
El Reno Junior College
P.O. Box 370
El Reno, Oklahoma 73036
405/262-2552

6. Dr. Clyde R. Kindell, President
Murray State College
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460
405/371-2371

7. Dr. Bobby Wright, President
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College
Second and I Sts., N.E.
Miami, Oklahoma 74354
918/542-8441

8. Dr. Edwin E. Vineyard, President
Northern Oklahoma College
Tonkawa, Oklahoma 74653
405/628-2581

9. Dr. Joe Packnett, President
Oscar Rose Junior College
6420 S.E. 15th
Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110
405/733-7311

10. Dr. Gregory Fitch, President
Seminole Junior College
P.O. Box 351
Seminole, Oklahoma 74868
405/382-9950

11. Dr. Don Newport, President
South Oklahoma City Jr. College
7777 South May Avenue
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73159
405/682-1611

12. Dr. Alfred M. Phillips, President
Tulsa Junior College
909 South Boston Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119
918/587-6561

13. Dr. W. C. Burris, President
Western Oklahoma State College
2801 North Main Street
Altus, Oklahoma 73521
405/477-2000

14. Mr. Harry Patterson, President
Sayre Junior College
Sayre, Oklahoma 73662
405/928-5531

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN KANSAS AND OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

May 11, 1983

I am a student at Oklahoma State University working toward my Ed.D. in Higher Education Administration. My dissertation topic is focused on criteria for excellence in community colleges, as perceived by leaders of communities served. The purpose of this study is to examine the criteria for excellence identified by community leaders, in contrast with the more traditional criteria for excellence identified for other institutions of higher education.

The study will begin with the identification of "quality" comprehensive public two-year colleges in Kansas and Oklahoma derived through the recommendations of community college residents. It is assumed for the purpose of the study that presidents have the ability and insight to view institutions in their respective states objectively, weighing strengths and weaknesses of institutions other than their own.

Enclosed is a listing of the fourteen public two-year colleges in the state of Oklahoma. Please identify the top two urban and the top two rural community colleges in Oklahoma that reflect your personal assessment of the quality institutions of your state by placing an R (rural) or U (urban) by the names of the institutions that you select.

Please be assured that your response will be held in the strictest confidence. Your selection will be used for no other purpose than to identify communities to survey regarding perceptions of excellence for the public two-year colleges in your state. If you would like an abstract of the results or additional information about this study, please feel free to contact me at 405/624-7244 or 405/372-2834.

Time, of course, is of concern. Therefore, please complete your response within the next few days and return it to me via the enclosed self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. With your help, I hope to explore objectively the topic of excellence in two-year colleges for Oklahoma. Thank you very much for your support.

Sincerely,

Jerrilee K. Mosier

Enclosures

Public Two-Year Colleges in Oklahoma

____ Carl Albert Junior College
Poteau, Oklahoma

____ Connors State College
Warner, Oklahoma

____ Eastern Oklahoma State College
Wilburton, Oklahoma

____ El Reno Junior College
El Reno, Oklahoma

____ Murray State College
Tishomingo, Oklahoma

____ Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College
Miami, Oklahoma

____ Northern Oklahoma College
Tonkawa, Oklahoma

____ Oscar Rose Junior College
Midwest City, Oklahoma

____ Rogers State College
Claremore, Oklahoma

____ Sayre Junior College
Sayre, Oklahoma

____ Seminole Junior College
Seminole, Oklahoma

____ South Oklahoma City Junior College
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

____ Tulsa Junior College
Tulsa, Oklahoma

____ Western Oklahoma State College
Altus, Oklahoma

Thank you very much for your assistance and support.

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

May 11, 1983

I am a student at Oklahoma State University working toward my Ed.D. in Higher Education Administration. My dissertation topic is focused on criteria for excellence in community colleges, as perceived by leaders of communities served. The purpose of this study is to examine the criteria for excellence identified by community leaders, in contrast with the more traditional criteria for excellence identified for other institutions of higher education.

The study will begin with the identification of "quality" comprehensive public two-year colleges in Kansas and Oklahoma derived through the recommendations of community college residents. It is assumed for the purpose of the study that presidents have the ability and insight to view institutions in their respective states objectively, weighing strengths and weaknesses of institutions other than their own.

Enclosed is a listing of the fourteen public two-year colleges in the state of Kansas. Please identify the top two urban and the top two rural community colleges in Kansas that reflect your personal assessment of the quality institutions of your state by placing an R (rural) or U (urban) by the names of the institutions that you select.

Please be assured that your response will be held in the strictest confidence. Your selection will be used for no other purpose than to identify communities to survey regarding perceptions of excellence for the public two-year colleges in your state. If you would like an abstract of the results or additional information about this study, please feel free to contact me at 405/624-7244 or 405/372-2834.

Time, of course, is of concern. Therefore, please complete your response within the next few days and return it to me via the enclosed self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. With your help, I hope to explore objectively the topic of excellence in two-year colleges for Kansas. Thank you very much for your support.

Sincerely,

Jerrilee K. Mosier

Enclosures

Public Two-Year Colleges in Kansas

____ Allen County Community College
Iola, Kansas

____ Barton County Community College
Great Bend, Kansas

____ Butler County Community College
El Dorado, Kansas

____ Cloud County Community College
Concordia, Kansas

____ Coffeyville Community College
Coffeyville, Kansas

____ Colby Community College
Colby, Kansas

____ Cowley County Community College
Arkansas City, Kansas

____ Dodge City Community College
Dodge City, Kansas

____ Fort Scott Community College
Fort Scott, Kansas

____ Garden City Community College
Garden City, Kansas

____ Highland Community College
Highland, Kansas

____ Hutchinson Community College
Hutchinson, Kansas

____ Independence Community College
Independence, Kansas

____ Johnson County Community College
Overland Park, Kansas

____ Kansas City, Kansas Community College
Kansas City, Kansas

____ Labette Community College
Parsons, Kansas

____ Neosho County Community College
Chanute, Kansas

____ Pratt Community College
Pratt, Kansas

____ Seward County Community College
Liberal, Kansas

Thank you very much for your assistance and support.

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO PANEL MEMBERS

July 14, 1983

Ms. Judy Katz
SUN Publications
I-435 at Metcalf Avenue
Overland Park, Kansas 66212

Dear Ms. Katz:

As a candidate for an Ed.D. degree in Higher Education Administration at Oklahoma State University, my dissertation topic is focused on criteria for excellence for community colleges as perceived by the leaders of the communities served. The initial procedure for the study was the identification of the "quality" comprehensive public two-year colleges in Kansas and Oklahoma. These were determined on the basis of recommendations from community college presidents in the two states. This procedure has led to the selection of _____ College as the top _____ community college in the state of _____.

The second phase of this study involves the identification of leaders of the communities served by the "quality" institutions. These leaders will be identified through your recommendation, as well as the recommendations of the following persons:

a. President of the community college
b. Mayor of the community
c. President of a civic club
d. One of the major industrialists of the community.

For an individual to be identified as a community leader, he/she must be identified on two of the respective lists. Your assistance and support is extremely important to the success of this phase of the study.

Enclosed is a response sheet for the names and addresses for the eight individuals that you would identify as leaders in your community. Please complete these and return to me via the enclosed, self addressed, postage paid envelope, as soon as possible.

If you have any questions concerning your participation in this study, please feel free to contact me at: 405/624-7244 or 405/372-2834. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Jerrilee Kay Mosier

Enclosures

APPENDIX D

RESPONSE SHEET

Recommended Community Leaders

Please identify at least eight individuals that you would consider to be leaders of your community. If there are others, you may add them at the end of the response sheet.

1. Name _____
   Occupation _____
   Address _____
   _____

2. Name _____
   Occupation _____
   Address _____
   _____

3. Name _____
   Occupation _____
   Address _____
   _____

4. Name _____
   Occupation _____
   Address _____
   _____

5. Name _____
   Occupation _____
   Address _____
   _____

6. Name _____
   Occupation _____
   Address _____
   _____

7. Name _____
   Occupation _____
   Address _____
   _____

8. Name _____
   Occupation _____
   Address _____
   _____

APPENDIX E

SECOND LETTER TO PANEL MEMBERS

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

August 2, 1983

Mr. Dallas Martz
Director of Training
General Motors
7447 S.E. 74th
Oklahoma City, OK 73135

Dear Mr. Martz:

Several weeks ago I sent you a letter requesting your help in identifying the community leaders of Midwest City. To date, I have not received your response.

The purpose of this correspondence is to encourage you to take a few minutes of your time to complete the enclosed response sheet and return it to me via the enclosed, self-addressed, postage-paid envelope as soon as possible.

I am working toward my doctorate degree in higher education administration at Oklahoma State University. My dissertation topic is focused on "Selected Criteria for Excellence for Two-Year Community Colleges as Perceived by Leaders of the Communities Served." Rose State College was identified as the top urban community junior college in the state of Oklahoma. Your help in identifying the community leaders is imperative to the successful completion of this study.

If you have any questions concerning your participation in this study, please feel free to contact me at 405/372-2834 before August 6, or at 316/321-5083 after August 6.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jerrilee Mosier

Enclosures

APPENDIX F

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Directions: The following statements represent various criteria for excellence traditionally used in institutions of higher education. Please read each item carefully and respond by encircling the number which best indicates your opinion of each criteria for excellence and whether it should be properly applied to your community college.

Strongly Agree	SA	Circle 1
Agree	A	Circle 2
Uncertain	U	Circle 3
Disagree	D	Circle 4
Strongly Disagree	SD	Circle 5

Section 1

General

Criteria for excellence for our community college should include:

1.	Admittance of all students who aspire to attend	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Fulfillment of the educational wants, needs, and aspirations of the people of the community	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Innovation in the ways and means of providing education	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Impact of the institution on the community's growth and change	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Good teaching	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Faculty members' ability to interact with the students in the classroom	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Faculty members' ability to interact with the students outside of the classroom	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Appearance of the physical plant	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Size of the budget compared to the number of students served	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Leadership of the institution	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Economic status attained by our graduates	1 2 3 4 5
12.	Students' reported satisfaction with the education received	1 2 3 4 5

13. Average salaries of instructors in comparison to national standards 1 2 3 4 5

14. Amount of private support from foundation or endowment associations 1 2 3 4 5

Glossary of Terms

Academic-Transfer	The preparation of students for the first two years of the baccalaurate degree
Occupational/Technical	The preparation of students for the job market upon completion of the two-year program
Remedial/Compensatory	The preparation of students with the necessary skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic
Students Services	The aiding of students who want to learn how to secure certain basic necessities, i.e., housing, food, health (mental and physical), and employment
Community Education/Services	The promotion of the concept of lifelong learning to improve the quality of life for individuals in the community

Academic-Transfer Function

Criteria for excellence for the academic-transfer programs at our community college should include:

1. The number of students who transfer to a four-year college or university 1 2 3 4 5

2. Student success after transfer to a four-year college or university 1 2 3 4 5

3. Admittance of only those students with a 3.0 grade average or better 1 2 3 4 5

4. Articulation/transfer agreements with other colleges and universities 1 2 3 4 5

5. The number of books or materials in the library 1 2 3 4 5

6. Size of the academic-transfer budget compared to the number of students served in these programs 1 2 3 4 5

7.	Academic leadership	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Faculty's knowledge of academic subject matter and degrees earned	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Faculty's support and encouragement of students' activities in academic/honor organizations	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Academic advising of students in course selection and transfer capabilities to specific four-year colleges and universities	1	2	3	4	5

Occupational/Technical Function

Criteria for excellence for the occupational/technical programs at our community college should include:

1.	The number of students who get jobs upon program completion	1	2	3	4	5
2.	On-the-job success of the student upon program completion	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Admittance of only those students who have exhibited medium to high aptitude for the program content	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Contacts and working agreements for training with business and industry	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Possession and/or access to updated equipment and materials	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Size of the occupational/technical budget compared to the number of students served in these programs	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Recognized institutional leadership in the occupational/technical field	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Faculty's knowledge of occupational/technical subject matter and their "on-the'job" experience	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Faculty's support and encouragement of students' activities in professional/technical organizations	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Occupational advising for job placement	1	2	3	4	5

Remedial/Compensatory Function

Criteria for excellence for the remedial/compensatory programs at our community college should include:

1.	Remediation of the students' educational weaknesses	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The success of the student upon enrollment in college equivalent classes	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Admittance of students with educational weaknesses due to intellectual/mental handicapping conditions	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Admittance of students with educational weaknesses due to a weak educational background	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Availability of materials and equipment that facilitate alternate modes of learning	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Size of remedial/compensatory programs budget compared to the number of students served in these programs	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Leadership in remedial/compensatory techniques	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Personal advising and confidence building	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Faculty's support and encouragement of the student and the remedial/compensatory program outside of the classroom	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Faculty's knowledge of remedial/compensatory techniques and materials and their educational accomplishments	1	2	3	4	5

Student Services Function

Criteria for excellence for the student services function at our community college should include:

1.	Personal guidance and counseling of students	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Student success in demonstrating competencies of basic emotional and physical well-being	1	2	3	4	5
3.	A provision of a comprehensive testing program for students prior to enrollment	1	2	3	4	5
4.	A provision of financial aid to needy students	1	2	3	4	5

5.	The provision of extra-curricular activities for students (i.e., athletics, band)	1	2	3	4	5
6.	The number of students who are directly serviced and the extent of the service provided	1	2	3	4	5
7.	The size of student services budget and the array of services offered	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Student services leadership	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Number of faculty and staff involved in the student services programs	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Facilities available for student use (i.e., student union, gymnasium, through student services	1	2	3	4	5

Community Education/Services Function

Criteria for excellence for the community education/services programs at our community college should include:

1.	The number of individuals participating in the programs	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The learner's satisfaction with the educational experience	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Courses that reflect individual/community interests	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Adult participation only	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Availability of classroom space and materials during day and evening hours	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Size of the community education/services budget and the array of courses offered	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Community leadership	1	2	3	4	5
8.	An advisory board of community members	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Cooperation and interaction with other community agencies and businesses	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Instructor's knowledge of subject matter	1	2	3	4	5

Section 2

Directions: Please rank the following community college functions according to your opinion as to their importance in determining institutional excellence.

____ Academic-Transfer

____ Occupational/Technical

____ Remedial/Compensatory

____ Community Education/Services

____ Student Services

Section 3

Directions: Please fill in the blank with a figure that reflects your opinion to the statement content.

1. If our community college enrolled fewer than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.
   a. If the academic-transfer program enrolled fewer than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.
   b. If the occupational/technical programs enrolled fewer than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.
   c. If the remedial/compensatory program enrolled fewer than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.
   d. If the community education/services program enrolled fewer than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.

2. If our community college enrolled more than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.
   a. If the academic-transfer program enrolled more than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.
   b. If the occupational/technical programs enrolled more than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.
   c. If the remedial/compensatory program enrolled more than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.
   d. If the sommunity education/services program enrolled more than _____ students, the quality would be lowered.

Section 4

Directions: Please respond to the following by filling in the blank with the information that reflects your personal data:

1. Age ___ (years)

2. Occupation _____

3. Level of Education _____

4. Years lived in the community ____

5. Have you ever attended a community college? ____ (yes or no)

   If yes, what types of classes did you attend? (Check all that apply.)

   Academic-transfer classes ___
   Occupational/technical classes ___
   Remedial/compensatory classes ___
   Community education/service classes ___

6. Have you ever had a family member attend a community college? _____ (yes or no)

   If yes, what types of classes did they attend? (Check all that apply.)

   Academic-transfer classes ___
   Occupational/technical classes ___
   Remedial/compensatory classes ___
   Community education/service classes ___

PLEASE MAKE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS THAT YOU FEEL ARE PERTINENT TO YOUR COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND ITS CRITERIA FOR EXCELLENCE: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX G

LETTER TO COMMUNITY LEADERS

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

August 26, 1983

Dear Community Leader:

With the current interest and attention given to the status of American education, it has become increasingly important to reevaluate our criteria of excellence for our educational institutions. As a doctoral candidate at Oklahoma State University, I am attempting to identify selected criteria for excellence for two-year community colleges in the states of Kansas and Oklahoma as perceived by the leaders of the communities served. As a part of my study, _____ Community College was identified as the top _____ community college in the state of _____.

To help in the selection of the community leaders, a panel was formed consisting of individuals working in various capacities within the _____ community. It was from this panel that you were identified as a leader in your community.

It is essential to the success of this study that you complete and return to me as soon as possible the enclosed questionnaire. For your convenience the questionnaire can just be folded in half, stapled, and mailed.

If you have any questions concerning your participation in this study, please call me at 316/321-5083 or 316/321-7913. I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

With your help, I hope to explore objectively the topic of excellence in two-year colleges. Thank you very much for your support.

Sincerely,

Jerrilee K. Mosier

JKM/cf

Enclosure

VITA

Jerrilee Kay Mosier

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: CRITERIA FOR EXCELLENCE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES AS PERCEIVED BY LOCAL COMMUNITY LEADERS

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Hoxie, Kansas, July 25, 1954, the daughter of Richard H. and Mary M. Mosier.

Education: Graduated from Colby High School, Colby, Kansas, in May, 1972; received the Bachelor of Science in Education degree from Oklahoma State University with a major in Special Education/Mental Retardation in May, 1976; received the Master of Science degree from the University of Tulsa with a major in Special Education/Learning Disabilities in May, 1980; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1983.

Professional Experience: Special Education teacher at Winfield, Kansas, for Cowley County Special Services Cooperative, 1976-1978; Special Education teacher at Leeper Middle School, Claremore, Oklahoma, 1978-1980; Coordinator/Instructor for the Special Services and Paraprofessional Programs at Butler County Community College, El Dorado, Kansas, 1980-1982; Graduate Associate for the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education, Oklahoma State University, 1982-1983; Division Chairperson for Institutional Support Services, Butler County Community College, El Dorado, Kansas, 1983 to present.

Professional Organizations: American Association for Higher Education, Association for the Study of Higher Education, American Association for Community Junior Colleges, Phi Delta Kappa.