

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 006

JC 690 044

By-Hobbs, Dan S., Ed.

The Tulsa Junior College: Consultants' Papers on Planning and Establishing a New Urban Junior College.
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma City.

Pub Date Jan 69

Note-121p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$6.15


Descriptors-*Campus Planning, Conferences, *Consultants, *Educational Planning, *Junior Colleges, *Master Plans, Planning

Identifiers-*Oklahoma

In December 1968, several national authorities met to discuss plans for the Tulsa Junior College and the problems that confront new, lay boards. Edmund J. Gleazer covered the role, growth, and future of junior colleges in general. B. Lamar Johnson spoke on junior colleges as they have evolved over several decades and specified five points as guides for Tulsa. In a second address, he emphasized that Tulsa, while comprehensive, must also be a model of the ideal, respective to innovation and improvement. B. J. Priest reviewed the kinds of leadership needed for an operational community college, especially in the urban area. J. W. Hobson examined the complexities of establishing a new college, identified steps in the process, and charted administrative, academic, physical, and financial structures. His second address stressed the need for sound planning, with examples of fiscal and physical requirements. D. M. Knoell discussed the responses of the urban college to the critical needs of both youth and adults for education beyond high school, and the acute problems of program relevance, staff preparation, etc. J. W. Fordyce outlined special considerations of a student-oriented college (physical, philosophical, curricular, personal, and evaluative). S. V. Martorana reviewed the guiding principles of site selection as related to educational goals. J. L. Wattenbarger examined site selection in terms of accessibility, environment, size, shape, topography, access to utilities, expansion space, cost, and beauty. (HH)

ED0 27006

The Tulsa Junior College



*Consultants' Papers
On Planning and Establishing
A New Urban Junior College*

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
STATE CAPITOL, OKLAHOMA CITY
JANUARY, 1969

JFC 690 044

The Tulsa Junior College

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 24 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Contributors

DR. EDMUND J. GLEAZER

Executive Director
American Association
of Junior Colleges

DR. B. LAMAR JOHNSON

Professor of Junior College Education
University of California
at Los Angeles

DR. BILL PRIEST

Chancellor
Dallas County
Junior College System

DR. JAMES HOBSON

Vice-Chancellor
University of California
at Los Angeles

DR. DOROTHY M. KNOELL

Director
Urban Community College Study
American Association
of Junior Colleges

DR. JOSEPH W. FORDYCE

President
Santa Fe Junior College
Gainesville, Florida

DR. S. V. MARTORANA

Vice-Chancellor
for Two-Year Colleges
State University of New York System

DR. JAMES WATTENBARGER

Director
Institute for Higher Education
University of Florida

DR. JAMES REYNOLDS

Professor and Consultant
in Junior College Education
University of Texas

The Tulsa Junior College

Consultants' Papers

On Planning and Establishing

A New Urban Junior College

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

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DAN S. HOBBS

Editor

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

State Capitol, Oklahoma City

January, 1969

The 1968 Oklahoma Legislature authorized the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to establish a new two-year state college to serve Tulsa County and surrounding area. Since Oklahoma had not created a new state institution of higher learning in 50 years, the State Regents were anxious that the new college be more than just a carbon copy of other institutions, but should rather strive to be an example for other urban junior colleges to emulate. Toward that end, the Regents authorized and encouraged the Chancellor to undertake a comprehensive program of research and planning leading toward its establishment and operation. The staff report coming out of that study is being published as a companion document to this one.

Foreword

In the process of accomplishing the staff research referred to above, the State Regents were fortunate in obtaining the services of a number of nationally known and respected consultants. Several of these outside consultants were invited to Oklahoma in December of 1968 for a two-day visit. They met with the State Regents and their staff on December 5, at which time the procedures for planning and establishing the Tulsa Junior College were reviewed in detail. On the following day, December 6, a conference was held in Tulsa, whose purpose was to inform the citizens of Tulsa County and surrounding area about the overall purposes and functions of an urban community junior college, as well as to provide the people of the area with up-to-date information about State Regents' planning for the establishment of the Tulsa Junior College.

Those consultants coming to Oklahoma for the meetings in Oklahoma City and Tulsa were invited to contribute research papers in connection with the planning of the Tulsa Junior College project, in order that the Board of Regents and administration of the new Tulsa Junior College might have access to the same experience and counsel which had been provided the State Regents by the consultants. Also, additional papers were solicited from other authorities in junior college education, with a view toward compiling a comprehensive planning document for establishing a new urban junior college. This report is the result of that compilation.

We are grateful to all of those who contributed of their time and creative talents in making this publication a reality. Those who participated in the special Tulsa conference on December 6, 1968, and who later contributed finished papers for this volume include: Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Junior College Education, University of California at Los Angeles; Dr. Bill Priest, Chancellor, Dallas County Junior College System; Dr. James Hobson, Vice-Chancellor, University of California at Los Angeles; Dr. S. V. Martorana, Vice-Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges, State University of New York System; and Dr. James Wattenbarger, Director, Institute for Higher Education, University of Florida.

In addition to the above, the following individuals contributed solicited papers on selected subjects related to junior college planning and operation: Dr. Joseph W. Fordyce, President, Santa Fe Junior College, Gainesville, Florida; Dr. Dorothy M. Knoell, Director, Urban Community College Study, American Association of Junior Colleges; and Dr. James Reynolds, Professor and Consultant in Junior College Education, University of Texas.

Finally, we are especially grateful to Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Executive Director, American Association of Junior Colleges, who was gracious enough to take time out from a demanding schedule to give the luncheon address at the Conference on Planning for the New Tulsa Junior College, which address is included in this volume as the initial paper.

E. T. Dunlap
Chancellor

Contents

Introduction by Dan S. Hobbs	9
Tulsa Joins the Movement by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.	13
Role and Responsibilities of the Junior College by B. Lamar Johnson	21
Leadership for the New Urban Junior College by Bill J. Priest	37
Steps in Beginning the Tulsa Junior College by James W. Hobson	45
The Urban Junior College in Service to the City by Dorothy M. Knoell	59
A Student-Oriented Community College by Joseph W. Fordyce	71
Guiding Principles for Selecting the Site by S. V. Martorana	81
Guidelines for Site Selection by James L. Wattenbarger	95
Principles of Site Selection by James W. Reynolds	103
Tulsa Junior College and Change by B. Lamar Johnson	107
Fiscal and Physical Planning Guides by James W. Hobson	121

Every two or three generations, a new kind of institution appears on the horizon in American higher education, one which catches fire and captures the imagination of the public for a time, then gradually cools and solidifies, making way for a new institution to replace it in the public favor. During the colonial stage of American history, the private college dominated the higher education scene. However, that institution was subsequently upstaged by the state university, which in turn was displaced by the land-grant college, which itself soon gave way to the normal school, an institution since evolved into the state college. The latest emerging institution to make its appearance was the American junior college, the only new star to appear in the galaxy of higher education in the 20th century.

Introduction

Although the junior college is still in process of becoming, and is therefore still relatively pliable, it is not without a recognizable form and a sense of its own mission; rather, it has achieved remarkable consensus within its own ranks as to its basic purposes, even though its ultimate destiny has not yet been determined. The junior college has matured, but it has not ceased to grow; it has become socially acceptable, but has not yet succumbed to social climbing. It has arrived, but has not yet departed. In short, it is still very much to be reckoned with in the latter stages of the 20th century.

As the junior college has matured, so has its literature. Today, most practitioners in the field—administrators, faculty members, counselors—have access to a vast array of junior college research and experience to rely upon. Administrators no longer need fly by the seat of their pants or use trial-and-error methods to arrive at basic policy or operational decisions. Community college faculty members need not flounder from lack of direction in charting new courses and programs, or in organizing for participation in academic governance. Likewise, counselors need not suffer from a scarcity of research pertaining to junior-college students. The publications of institutions, agencies and professional journals are replete with articles and research studies which furnish both the administrator and the scholar with knowledge about the present “state of the art” in the field of the junior college.

If there is a gap in the literature of junior colleges, it is probably in the area of research addressed to the needs of trustees and boards of regents for new community colleges. Nationally, new junior colleges are being founded at the rate of one-a-week, a pace which has been maintained over the past three years. Typically, a local board of trustees is created to govern the newly created junior college—a lay board with no previous experience as to what policies should be adopted or what procedures effected to make the new institution operational. The papers comprising this publication are designed to help bridge the gap between the creation of a new institution and the formal beginning of classes. Its purpose is to educate and inform new board members—primarily the Board of Regents for Tulsa Junior College, but secondarily any board of any new urban junior college.

The problems and issues treated in this volume are those which confront most lay boards of most junior colleges—problems related to the social functions of institutions, their educational programs, the kinds of leadership necessary for their success, criteria for site selection, policies and procedures for an effective student personnel program, as well as practical steps which a lay board might find helpful to assure a successful junior college program.

It is hoped that this publication will be helpful to the Board of Regents for the new Tulsa Junior College, as that institution strives from the outset to relate itself meaningfully to the problems of an urban society in a technological age. If in the process a contribution can be made to the literature of planning and establishing urban junior colleges, the experience will have been doubly gratifying.

D. S. H.

Consultants' Papers

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.

We meet here today to talk about a college — a community junior college. If our discussions possess a note of intensity and urgency, so it should be, because surging, compelling social and economic forces make such conversations more than appropriate for these times — they are inescapably necessary. For in planning this kind of college we manifest a point of view — a point of view about who participates in this society. We take positions — positions about social and economic mobility, about the value of the individual, his rights and obligations, and about the ways in which we shall govern ourselves. Of all social institutions, education has moved clearly into the forefront as the constructive means by which people will find their place in the sun. Education is the means for fulfillment of individual aspirations. Education is the way by which men can become capable of directing change through the capacity to govern themselves.

Tulsa Joins The Movement

The community junior college must be seen against this backdrop of profound and rapid social change. This institution has evolved because our kind of society requires it — demands it. This institution is a social invention brought into being largely in the decade of the sixties because there are elements in the American creed about the value of the individual, a fluid society, and a needed sense of community that make

Continued on next page

Dr. Gleazer is the Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges. He received his education at Graceland College, UCLA, Temple University and Harvard University, receiving the Doctor of Education Degree from Harvard in 1953. Dr. Gleazer served as President of Graceland College from 1946-1957, during which time he served as President of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Dr. Gleazer has travelled widely in the United States and abroad on educational assignments and has participated as a speaker and consultant at innumerable regional and national educational conferences.



Page 13

this kind of college a logical and tangible expression. In the sixties it became clear that educational opportunity is not a privilege for an economic or intellectual elite — not in this complex, urban nation. Educational opportunity is more in the nature of a right for the individual alongside of and just as precious as his other citizenship rights. For without it, he cannot earn his place in the community or establish his identity as an individual. And education is a requirement for perpetuation and renewal of our way of life. Without it we will not have the competence to maintain a complex and interdependent technological society nor will there be the level of enlightenment of our citizens to motivate them to participate in our corporate life and the wisdom to do so with ability and sensitivity.

The level of educational opportunity must rise. Both the aspirations of the individual and the requirements of our social and economic systems require education beyond the high school for most people. But this does not simply mean more of the same! The community college has come into prominence at an unprecedented rate because it gives promise of meeting educational needs not met by other institutions or of doing a better job in meeting these needs. The four-year colleges have their mission, but this new kind of educational institution has its *distinctive role* in concert with the universities, the colleges, and the secondary schools. Most people reaching age eighteen will require further education and training beyond the high school level. But they do not all require the same kind of education and training.

Almost everybody needs some education and training beyond the high school level. But many are not at all sure about what they want to study and for how long. Many are impatient to get out into the "real world." They are not ready to postpone for four years their efforts to get at it. Besides many of them have financial needs. They need a job for income and lots of them need a job for self-identity and a feeling of worth. These can enter the community college for a time: Why specify the period? What is sacred about two years or four? Why not provide learning experiences for whatever time that needs are met, then make it easy for the student to leave — to get at something else — and then easy for him to return to this institution or to another kind if that is more

suitable when he is ready for it? The community college gives this flexibility — it meets the prospective student where he is. It relates closely to business and industry in the community so the student has a sense of being part of that “real world” while he studies. The college is there as an educational resource center for him when he wants it — when he needs it. Open-door admissions policies are characteristic — there are no examinations, no probing by interviews, no measure of what the student can and will do which is a fraction as effective as giving him the opportunity to try with the help of skilled counselors.

Some of the students starting their work in community junior colleges will want to continue their program to a four-year program or perhaps beyond. If they have the capacity, they can take two years of work at the community college and in another two years qualify for the bachelor's degree at the four-year college. Perhaps one-third of our high school graduates are ready to work directly toward that goal.

A great deal of talk is heard these days about gifted students and superior and able students. But we make a mistake in picturing these as the cream at the top of the bottle — people are able, superior, gifted, in some ways and may be inferior or average in others. Superiority is often situational. It is more reasonable to think in terms of different kinds of intelligence—of different kinds of abilities. Those students who have capacity for preparation as nurses, electronic technicians, microwave technicians, dental hygienists, automotive technicians, may be considerably more able, gifted, in meeting the requirements of their vocation than the student who finds himself at home in the graduate schools of the universities. Only in the United States do there exist colleges like the one you plan for Tulsa which bring together on the same campus, under the same roof, those of such varied interests and objectives. In most countries the vocational line and the university preparatory line are kept separate. The student at an early age makes an almost irrevocable commitment to one or the other. And if he is a misfit in either line his chances of success are poor. The comprehensive community college gives opportunity for students beyond the high school to find their appropriate lines of educational development in an atmosphere which honors the social worth of a wide range of interests, capacities, aptitudes, and types of intelligence.

I see the community college in another vital role. In hundreds of cities across this land fragmentation has taken place — communication among people has broken down. The freeways, the blighted areas, the beltways have harrowed old neighborhood groupings — split and divided former communities. We need a new community of interest — a new cohesive force that can transcend these barriers as well as those of race, religion, social and economic differences. I have seen the community college become this kind of new integrating influence — a new community of interest to draw people together — a symbol actually of what the community would like to become. The community college is not limited in its outreach to “college-age” students. Take a look at the personnel in its classrooms during the day, late at night, or in the kind of “weekend college” offered by Miami-Dade Junior College in Miami and you will see that this community education center is for all the people. The community college has had an unlooked-for but immensely important effect in many places — it has provided a new basis for a viable community.

There are at least three reasons that community colleges have grown so rapidly in numbers of institutions and enrollments during this past decade. They have been low-cost to the student. Financial barriers have been lowered and people who have little hope of affording college work have had that opportunity. The fact that they are close to the homes of the prospective students has also been a motivating factor. There is plenty of research evidence that proximity makes a difference. But probably of most importance has been the remarkably varied educational programs offered by strong comprehensive community colleges. Two hundred programs in law-enforcement are now offered. Thousands of police officers or future police officers have enrolled in these programs which have been initiated within the last few years. Thousands of people are qualifying to be registered nurses through the associate degree program in nursing. The first such program was offered experimentally fifteen years ago. Now more than 300 such programs in community colleges and similar institutions offer educational opportunities to women and men for whom former programs were inappropriate. Not only do these people find a career but the health services of this country now count upon such programs as a major source of personnel. Some community colleges offer

fifty or more occupational programs ranging from petroleum technology to marine science technology, or supermarket management to agri-business. The conventional four-year liberal arts offerings do not fit the interests, the inclinations, or the circumstances of a very large segment of people who require and desire some educational experience beyond the high school—but these new programs do.

And there is another reason why community colleges have grown so rapidly. It is the very important matter of efficient and effective distribution of the state's resources — financial and personnel. Soon after World War II the G.I. Bill of Rights provided the greatest educational scholarship program ever seen. Veterans were able to take college work who could only dream of the opportunity before the war. These men and women wanted the same opportunities for their children. This kind of force plus the great interest in improving our educational services which was prompted by Sputnik I led to tremendous pressures on the Legislatures of the states to greatly expand and lift the quality of our colleges and universities. Political rivalries developed among state legislatures to see who would be successful in "bagging" a new state college for his district. Clearly there was not enough money to go around — to respond to all of the demands. Out of this kind of financial pressure came the development of state educational inventories and plans for higher education. What do we have in the way of colleges and universities? Who are they serving? How well are they doing? Where do gaps exist? What kinds of institutions do we need beyond those we have? How can we bring about some coordination in planning?

California was in the forefront of coordination with its Master plan for higher education which assigned specific roles to the university, the state colleges and the community colleges. New York and Florida chose somewhat different routes but the intent was the same. Every institution will not do everything. We will centralize university services where tremendous resources are needed in the way of libraries, graduate facilities, research centers. And we will de-centralize basic educational opportunities. We will put community junior colleges within commuting distance of most of our population. They will serve as distributing centers. Those students who want to and who can qualify can move on beyond

the level of the junior college into one of the smaller number of state colleges or units of the university. So New York State declared — "Comprehensive community colleges should be recognized and supported as the basic institutional approach to providing a broader public educational opportunity above the high school level in New York State." And California had already said something like that. Florida had its remarkable plan of community college development under way. More was gained from the taxpayer's dollars by this kind of diversification of educational opportunity with its provisions for planning and coordination of efforts.

State after state specified community colleges as an integral part of their plans. During the last few years more than fifty new junior colleges have opened each year. In 1964 I spoke to the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. They were preparing to endorse the proposed legislation for a new plan for higher education in that state which included a substantial place for junior colleges. I took a look at my notes a few days ago. In the opening paragraph I cited 750 institutions with a million students enrolled. Today, four years later, I report more than 1000 junior colleges with two million students enrolled. In several states more than half of the students beginning college work do so in junior colleges. Within five years this will be the national picture.

Educational voids have existed. New pools of talent are now being tapped. What evidence for this? Miami-Dade Junior College opened in 1960. It has 27,000 students this year on two campuses. In Dallas, Ft. Worth, Seattle, Cleveland, St. Louis, and other cities the evidence is similarly overwhelming. Without the new presence of these institutions a large proportion of the population of those cities and 20 others in which community colleges have been established since 1960, would not have had educational opportunity beyond the high school. And what difference does this make? It should make a great deal in the quality of life in the area, but if you want to take a look at the dollars and cents difference consider this:

The president of the Milwaukee Vocational, Technical and Adult Schools told me that he estimated that one class, completing its work in June 1967, increased the economic wealth of the community by the amount of \$186,570,000 payable over the next 30 years. He calculated

that the more than 2000 students who had taken one or two-year programs leading to an industrial or business competence had increased their earning power as a result of those educational programs by \$1.50 per hour as a conservative estimate. In restricting his observations to the measurable increased earning power of individuals he arrived at a dollar amount which supported his assertion that the School of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education is the greatest natural resource possessed by the City of Milwaukee.

Ladies and gentlemen, these figures of increased earning power are impressive and important, but is there any person in this room today who is not greatly concerned about the *quality* of our social relationships? There are plenty of indications in our environment that the big problems before us as a nation have to do with how we relate to each other — how we communicate — our ability to open doors of opportunity to the good life for those who want to qualify, and to inspire hope and strengthen the aspirations of those who because of life's circumstances have lacked hope and motivation. I am not here to suggest that the community college is a panacea — that it can cure all ills and accomplish all tasks. But in my work during the last ten years I have seen the community college serve as a rallying point for citizen interest even in the very process of its establishment. I have seen it reach out to people and involve them. I have heard testimony from thousands that this new kind of educational instrumentality with its open-door admissions policies, with financial barriers removed, and with its posture of meeting the prospective student where he is and tailoring educational programs to meet his specific needs, I say I have heard many declare that opportunity — which is what they wanted — opened up because the college was there.

In America we have formed social institutions needed to meet the changing circumstances of our lives as we have moved from frontier to frontier. The community college has emerged to serve these times — an institution to keep the avenues of mobility open and to serve as a cohesive community center in a time when a new sense of community is desperately needed. You have the chance to build an exemplary institution here in Tulsa. May you have the ability to marshal essential and informed citizen support so that you can match the best in the nation.

E. J. G.

Page 19

B. LAMAR JOHNSON

It is axiomatic that the range and nature of education in a nation emerges from its history, basic philosophy, and commitments. From the time of its inception—in the pronouncements of our founding fathers and, more importantly, in their action—this nation has been committed to education as an agent of change, regeneration, advancement. Franklin and Washington, Jefferson and John Adams—their words and their deeds in and for education—ring down through the ages.

Role and Responsibilities of the Junior College

Consistent with their outlook was the clarion call for education written into the Northwest Ordinance: "Religion, Morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

The ideal of democracy is to permit each individual to be educated to the level of his highest potential. This is of central importance, not only because of its value to the state and to society, but more particularly because the keystone of democracy is the almost sacred value placed on the single human personality. Development of the individual—each citizen and each citizen-in-preparation—is, and must be, a goal in and of itself, entirely apart from any contribution such achievement may make to the social order or the state.

Continued on next page

Dr. Johnson is Director of the Junior College Leadership Program at UCLA. He received his education at the University of Minnesota, where he received the Ph.D. Degree in 1930. He has published numerous books and monographs relating to the establishment of community junior colleges and is in wide demand as a consultant in the field of junior college education. He is a past President of the Association for Higher Education and has served on special assignment by the U.S. Department of State as an American specialist in higher education.



Page 21

"A free society nurtures the individual not alone for the contribution he may make to the social effort, but also and primarily for the sake of the contribution he may make to his own realization and development."¹

This idea has been stated superbly in these lines by Walt Whitman:

The American compact is altogether with individuals,

The only government is that which makes minute of individuals,

The whole theory of the universe directed to one single individual, namely to you.

Toward Universal Higher Education

It is all very well to quote and pay obeisance to pronouncements and poetic ideals, but what does our record show?

It discloses that our nation has made commitments to, and advances toward, universal education that far exceed those of any society in history. An increasing percentage of our population has been in school or college in every successive generation. By 1900, 11 per cent of our youth of high school age were in school. Today the percentage approaches 95. In 1900, 4 per cent of our college-age youth were in college. Today, college enrollments exceed 40 per cent of the college age group. And, the end of this progress is not in sight.

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, our nation was pressing toward an elementary education for all children. In the Fifties, we gave particular attention to secondary education for all American youth.

Just before mid-century—in 1947, to be exact—there appeared a pronouncement which signalled another new objective for American education. It appeared in the report of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in these words:

The time has come to make education through the 14th

¹*The Pursuit of Excellence, Education, and the Future of America.* (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1958) p. 5.

grade available in the same way that high school is now available.²

This assertion was challenged sharply by critics who saw it in the threat of mediocrity in higher education. The forces advancing the frontiers of education, however, once more proved inexorable.

By 1960, President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals recommended that two-year colleges be placed within commuting distance of all high school graduates, except those in sparsely settled regions.³

Four years later, the Educational Policies Commission proclaimed, ". . . the Nation's goal of universal opportunity must be expanded to include at least two further years of education, open to any high school graduate."⁴

In 1966, under the title, *Universal Higher Education*, a book was published further advancing and supporting the pronouncements and proposals of the Truman Commission, the Eisenhower Commission, and the Educational Policies Commission.⁵

In this volume twelve leaders of American thought and experts in higher education, including Frank H. Bowles, Henry Steele Commager, C. Robert Pace, and Nevitt Sanford, addressed themselves to the prospect of universal higher education. The authors did not question the validity of the goal, nor did they doubt its eventual achievement. Rather, they focused their attention on the necessity of reaching the goal, and on the "how" of educating students upon whom high school had made little impression.

In examining the historical background of the proposal, and evaluating the contemporary need for universal higher education, Commager pointed out, "Even now those with only high school education are at a disadvantage in the marketplace; that disadvantage will grow."⁶

²President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher Education for American Democracy*, Volume 1, Establishing the Goals. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947) p. 37.

³President's Commission on National Goals. *Goals for Americans*. (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960) pp. 7 and 91.

⁴Educational Policies Commission. *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond High School*. (Washington: National Education Association, 1964) p. 6.

⁵Earl J. McGrath. *Universal Higher Education*. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.)

⁶Henry Steele Commager. "Social, Political, Economic, and Personal Consequences." In McGrath, p. 43.

Bowles asserted, “. . . universal higher education . . . will reach farther than we can now see, and its values will be one of our legacies to the future.”⁷

The demand for extended—and, indeed, universal—higher education is accelerated by the cataclysmic changes which are occurring in our society. Eighty per cent of today's college graduates are entering positions that did not exist when they were born during the Forties. Half of what a graduate engineer knows today will be obsolete ten years from now; half of what he will need to know ten years from now is not yet known.⁸

Perhaps the comment of the rustic preacher is relevant to the situation in which we find ourselves: “Brethren, it ain't the things that you don't know that gets you into trouble. It's the things you do know that ain't so.”

More changes in how men live and work will occur during the next 30 or 35 years than were produced in all previous history. There is about 100 times as much to know now as was available in 1900. By the year 2000 there will be over a thousand times as much knowledge of all kinds to record, to sift, to store, to search out, to teach about, and, hopefully to use with some discrimination and effectiveness.⁹

With such an explosion of knowledge forecast, it is not surprising that leaders of America thought are predicting that changes equal to those brought to the nation by the railroads in the second half of the nineteenth century, and by the automobile in the first half of the twentieth, will be effected by the knowledge industry in the last half of the century. Clearly, we are moving from a society based on natural resources to a social structure built on human resources. The key institutions of our new age are the colleges, the universities, and the research centers. The

⁷Frank H. Bowles. “Observations and Comments.” In McGrath, p. 245.

⁸“Nine Jobs in your Future.” *Life* (March 19, 1965), p. 4.

⁹Randall M. Whaley. “Pressures from Exponential Increases in Knowledge.” In *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1965. (Washington, D.C. Association for Higher Education, 1965), p. 107.

growth industries of tomorrow will not be factories; they will be centers of education and research, surrounded by complexes of business, industry, and cultural development.

The Educational Policies Commission explains:

The goal of universal education beyond the high school is no more Utopian than the goal of full citizenship for all Americans, for the first is becoming prerequisite to the second. If a person is adjudged incapable of growth toward a free mind today, he has been adjudged incapable of the dignity of full citizenship in a free society. That is a judgment which no American conscious of his ideals and traditions can likely make.¹⁰

As universal higher education is currently being discussed it applies particularly to the junior college years.¹¹ We now are engaged in national endeavors which within the next quarter century—and perhaps sooner—will make junior college graduation as common as high school graduation today. If current trends continue, we (for some of us, I should suggest our children, or our grandchildren) may anticipate a 90 per cent college enrollment of youth 18 to 21 during the first decade of the 21st Century.¹²

In conformity with the trends and developments which we have examined the most notable characteristic of the American junior college today—and this will continue for the foreseeable future—is its explosive growth. Twenty-five years ago, junior college enrollments totaled 300,000. This year more than 2,000,000 students are attending the junior colleges of our nation. Junior may be growing up, but the end is nowhere in sight. National requirements for educated manpower in a technological

¹⁰Educational Policies Commission. *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

¹¹In this presentation, the terms junior college, community college and two-year college will be used interchangeably.

¹²This projection is based upon the fact that "the proportion of college-age youth in college in 1950 (27 per cent) was approximately the same as the proportion of high school-age youth in high school in 1920 (28 per cent); the estimated proportion of college-age youth expected to be in college in 1970 (49 per cent) is about the same as the proportion of high school-age youth in high school in 1930 (47 per cent)." William J. Haggerty. "Significance for High School and College Teacher Preparation." McGrath, *op. cit.*, p. 175. If these trends continue we may anticipate a 90 per cent enrollment of college-age youth in college during the first decade of the 21st Century.

society, supported by the democratic ideal of maximum development for every citizen, make crystal clear the enormous necessary expansion of our two-year college capability. Conservative estimates suggest a doubling and perhaps trebling of junior college enrollments within the next 10 years.

Six Trends When we examine the role and responsibilities of the community junior college, we must look beyond growth and the expansion of enrollments. As an aid to understanding the functions of this institution, I suggest that we consider six junior college trends.

1. *The junior college is assuming major responsibility for preparing students for upper division work at universities and other senior institutions.* When junior colleges first were established, their single purpose was to offer two years of work acceptable to universities. Even the term "junior college" implies their primary function. At the second meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1922, the junior college was defined as "an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade." The single goal was to prepare students for transfer.

Joliet Junior College in Illinois, founded in 1902, was the first public junior college to be established which still is in existence. It was opened under an agreement whereby the University of Chicago accepted two years of work done by students at the extended high school in Joliet.

Although preparation for transfer no longer is the only purpose of the junior college, recent events highlight the continued importance of this objective. Studies reveal that the two-year college prepares students for successful upper division work. It is, therefore, inevitable that as college and university enrollments skyrocket, the junior college will be expected to assume increased responsibility for the freshman and sophomore years.

In Florida, in 1964, classes opened in a new and different kind of state university. Offerings at this institution are limited to upper division, professional, and graduate work. To the junior colleges of Florida is assigned responsibility for the lower division preparation of students who attend Florida Atlantic University.

Writing under the title, "Higher Education in the 21st Century," in the June, 1963, issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*, Alvin C. Eurich foresees that by the year 2000 strong liberal arts colleges and universities will have discontinued their lower division operations since these will come "almost wholly within the province of the junior colleges."

2. *The junior college is assuming major responsibility for technical-vocational education.* Despite its importance, preparation for transfer is by no means the only purpose of the junior college. It also has responsibility for occupational education, general education, and adult education.

Frank Bowles points out that "opening the 13th and 14th grades to all high school graduates . . . is simple recognition, and none too soon, that there is no decent employment for the high school graduate."¹³

Professor Norman Harris of the University of Michigan has described the changing educational requirements of the labor force of our nation. He asserts that in 1930 an elementary education or less was adequate for 58 per cent of our employed population and a high school education for an additional 32 per cent. He suggests that within the next five years 58 per cent of our manpower will be employed in positions requiring at least a junior college education.¹⁴

There is evidence that preparation for employment, in all sections of the country, is recognized as an important responsibility of the two-year college. In reporting a survey of curriculum developments in 116 junior colleges in the North Central region of the country, President Isaac Beckes of Vincennes University states, "Those who have been calling for more comprehensive programs will find much for encouragement in reports from the 116 colleges."¹⁵ In his survey, Beckes identified 191 new programs in occupational fields, including 25 in electronic technology, 24 in data processing, 18 in nursing, and six each in law enforcement, distributive education, and medical technology.

¹³In McGrath, p. 6.

¹⁴Norman C. Harris. "The Community College and Middle Manpower," in *Technical-Vocational Education and the Community College*. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Educational Board. Williamsburg, Virginia, August 27-29, 1964.

A publication of the California State Department of Education lists 101 occupational-centered curricula in California two-year colleges under such headings as agriculture, business and commerce, health, technical, and the arts.¹⁶

3. *There is a definite trend towards the comprehensive junior college which includes in a single institution preparation for employment and education for transfer.* The need for both post-secondary technical-vocational education and expanded education for transfer is clear. Still, some educators argue that technical-vocational education should be provided in one institution, education for transfer in another. Those who hold this position suggest that it is difficult, and perhaps impossible, effectively to provide technical-vocational programs and transfer programs in the same two-year college.

There are those who have similar doubts about the comprehensive American high school. It was with this in mind that James B. Conant in the late Fifties studied the American high school. In introducing the report of his study, Conant raised about the high school the same question which some today raise about the junior college: "Can a school at one and the same time provide a good education for *all* the pupils as future citizens of a democracy, provide elective programs for the majority to develop useful skills, and educate adequately those with a talent for handling advanced academic subjects—particularly foreign languages and advanced mathematics? The answer to this question would seem to be of considerable importance for the future of American education. If the answer were clearly in the negative, then a radical change in the structure of American public secondary education would be in order. . . . On the other hand, if the answer is in the affirmative, then no radical change in the basic pattern of American education would seem to be required."¹⁷

Following his investigation, Conant without equivocation

¹⁵Address at March, 1963, Conference of North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.

¹⁶*Technical Education in the California Junior Colleges.* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1963.)

¹⁷James Bryant Conant. *The American High School Today.* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 15.

answered the question he had raised: "The question I set out to answer. I can now answer in the affirmative."¹⁸

In his foreword to Conant's report John W. Gardner, at that time president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, commented on the scope and significance of the study:

The focus of Dr. Conant's study is the "comprehensive" high school—a peculiarly American phenomenon . . . responsible . . . for providing good and appropriate education, both academic and vocational, for all young people within a democratic environment which the American people believe serves the principles they cherish.

There are those who say it cannot be done. When a man like James Conant says it *can* be done, the nation must take notice.¹⁹

There is an analogy between Conant's conclusions regarding the comprehensive American High School and the desirability of the current trend toward the comprehensive junior college. The multi-purpose two-year college can be expected to play a vital role, first in preparing students for transfer; second, in preparing them for immediate employment in technical and semiprofessional positions, and, third, in retraining adults for new jobs created in an age of automation.

In the multi-purpose junior college, a student may, if desirable, move directly from an occupational curriculum to a transfer curriculum, or vice versa, without changing colleges. Furthermore, in such a college the transfer student can achieve an understanding of vocational fields, and the vocational student will have an opportunity for general education.

The evidence suggests that the comprehensive junior college—like the comprehensive high school—is both desirable and feasible. Indeed, Merson goes so far as to suggest, "One can measure the strength of a community college by the diversity of its program." He further observes: "Fortunately, increasing numbers of two-year colleges are broadening their offerings to correspond with the range of interests of those they enroll, and with the needs of society."²⁰

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁹John W. Gardner. "Foreword." In Conant, pp. IX-X.

²⁰Thomas B. Merson, "The Community College: Theory and Practice." Address at Oregon State College, Corvallis. April 18, 1963. Mimeographed. p. 4.

4. *The junior college is an open door college.* By this I mean that any high school graduate is eligible for admission to most junior colleges. Indeed, in California and several other states anyone over 18 years of age who can profit from instruction offered at the college is welcomed. The concept of the open door college is consistent with our ideal of educating every citizen to the level of his highest potential. It also should be pointed out that this concept recognizes the fact that many young people are "late bloomers" who deserve a second chance, even after mediocre high school achievement. The records show that large numbers of these "late bloomers" go on to successful careers in business, the professions, and government.

In a national study of junior colleges with enrollments of more than 400, Schenz reports that 8 out of 10 junior colleges admit any high school graduate, and almost half of these admit anyone over 18 who can profit from the instruction offered.²¹

The fact that a student is admitted to a junior college does not, of course, imply that he is eligible to take all courses and curricula offered by the college; on the contrary, a number of programs are highly selective. Admission to programs in dental assisting, data processing, electronics, and registered nursing are, for example, typically restricted. Some colleges provide special courses for students with low academic ability—and limit the study of such students to these special offerings.

It is difficult to defend the admission of all comers unless we provide offerings and counseling adapted to the requirements of our clientele. If we fail in this, the junior college, in reality, becomes a "revolving door college."

5. *Guidance is recognized as an important responsibility and, according to some educators, a goal of the junior college.* The California Junior College Association included guidance as a purpose of the junior college in the list of goals which it prepared for use in the Restudy of Higher Education in California. In my own thinking, guidance is a means

²¹Robert F. Schenz. *An investigation of Junior College Courses and Curricula for Students with Low Ability*. Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation. (University of California, Los Angeles, 1963) p. 44.

to an end, rather than a goal in and of itself. Nevertheless, this is such an important responsibility—and is so recognized—that I single it out for special comment.

The need for guidance is highlighted by the fact that the junior college is, as we have noted, an open door college. The magnitude of the guidance task is suggested by evidence that from two-thirds to three-fourths of the students who enter junior colleges announce their intention to transfer to senior institutions, whereas actually less than one-third continue their education beyond junior college graduation. Thus, we have a paradoxical situation in which most students take programs and work toward goals for which they are not qualified. Too often, these students are wasting much of their time and energies, burdening their instructors, and retarding the progress of their classmates. This situation is particularly regretful because in a major number of cases students are qualified for other programs in the same colleges.

The problem does not, of course, have its roots in the junior college. Rather, it emerges from a contemporary society which places its stamp of prestige upon a university degree. Parents cherish for their sons and daughters, and young people for themselves, the rewards of an academic curriculum. Nor is the problem unique to the United States; I find it, literally, in all parts of the world. However, we have in American comprehensive junior colleges three advantages which I fail to find in most other nations. First, we have a flexibility in our programs which makes it possible for students to transfer from one curriculum to another; second, we have a variety of offerings adapted to the qualifications of students with diverse types and ranges of achievement; and, third, we have testing and counseling services through which expert assistance can be provided to students as the junior college performs its guidance function.

6. *The junior college is a community college.* Offerings and programs of junior colleges are planned to meet the needs of their communities, and to elicit the participation of local citizens in program planning, development, and operation.

For the Silver Anniversary issue of the *Junior College Journal* in 1955, I was invited to write an article on the most important junior

college development of the preceding quarter-century. At that time, I stated, "It is the considered judgment of this author that the most important junior college development of the past 25 years has been the emergence of the concept of the public junior college as a community college."²² Nothing has occurred in the past 12 years to change my view.

As a relatively new unit of our educational system, the two-year college is not under the heavy hand of tradition. It can provide, in addition to education for transfer, curricula adapted to local requirements. This results in junior college programs in petroleum technology in the oil fields of Texas; in agriculture in the wheat fields of Kansas; in a medical-secretary program at Rochester, Minnesota; in fashion design in the garment manufacturing center of New York City; in citri-culture in southern California; in insurance and banking in the financial center of Chicago; in forestry in northern Idaho. We might easily go on listing community centered programs, as well as reporting the participation of lay citizens through advisory committees.

Importantly, the two-year college also provides education, including technical-vocational education, for adults; forums for sponsors; concerts, art exhibits, and other cultural activities; and serves as a vital, coordinating educational agency for the entire community.

A Demand for Excellence

Nothing which I have said must be regarded as paying obeisance to quantity at the expense of quality. We are moving toward universal higher education. The achievement of this goal must not be permitted to interfere with the attainment of excellence in all segments of our system of higher education—in particular, in the two-year college.

It was 21 years ago that President Truman's Commission on Higher Education called for making education through the junior college year available in the same way that high school education is available. We have noted the criticisms of that proposal, based on fear that its adoption would lower the quality of our colleges and universities. Similarly, today some hold that universal higher education is incompatible

²²B. Lamar Johnson. "An Emerging Concept Points to the Future." *Junior College Journal*, XXV: 482-485. (April, 1955), p. 483.

with excellence. John Gardner, former President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and more recently Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, addresses himself to this issue as he asserts:

Arguments about quality in higher education tend to be rather heated and . . . pointless. . . . People who engage in these arguments remind me of the two washerwomen, whom Sidney Smith observed leaning out of their back windows and quarreling with each other across the alley; they could never agree, Smith pointed out, because they were arguing from different premises.

In the case of arguments over "elite" versus "mass" education, I am convinced that both premises should be abandoned because behind the arguments is the assumption that a society can choose to educate a few people exceedingly well or to educate a great number of people somewhat less well, but that it cannot do both.

The fallacy of this assumption is obvious. A modern society such as ours cannot choose to do one or the other. It has no choice but to do both.

The demand to educate everyone up to the level of his ability and the demand for excellence in higher education are not incompatible.

We must honor both goals.²³

Gardner further describes the commitment which we must have to excellence in higher education and relates this directly to the junior college as he explains:

. . . as things now stand the word excellence is all too often reserved for the dozen institutions which stand at the very 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 leads us down

²³John W. Gardner. "Quality in Higher Education." In *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1958. (Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1958), pp. 8-9.

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 completely meaningless result would be achieved if General Motors tried to add to its line of low-priced cars by marketing the front half of a Cadillac.

We shall have to be more flexible than that in our conception of excellence. We must develop a point of view that permits each kind of institution to achieve excellence in terms of its own objectives.²⁴

. . . we must recognize that there may be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor. We must learn to honor excellence (indeed, to *demand* it) in every socially accepted human activity, however humble the activity, and to scorn shoddiness, however exalted the activity. There may be excellent plumbers and incompetent plumbers, excellent philosophers and incompetent philosophers. An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity, will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.²⁵

Conclusion The trends which we have noted suggest five guidelines for the development of the educational program at Tulsa Junior College:

1. Tulsa Junior College must be a comprehensive junior college. It must offer general education, education for transfer, and technical vocational education.

2. Tulsa Junior College must be an open door college. As an urban college it must open its doors to hundreds and thousands of students to whom colleges may today be closed. This commitment suggests the need for providing a wide range of courses and curricula which are adapted to the requirements of the heterogeneous student population which the college will serve.

²⁴Gardner, p. 12.

²⁵*ibid.*, p. 15.

3. In all facets of its educational program—and this includes education for transfer and also technical vocational education—Tulsa Junior College must be committed to excellence. It must be responsive to the injunction suggested by John Gardner—both its pipes and its theories must hold water.

4. Guidance and counselling must be accepted as an essential responsibility at Tulsa Junior College. This obligation is particularly important in the open door comprehensive junior college with a heterogeneous student population.

5. Tulsa Junior College must be a community college. The offerings and programs of the college must be planned to meet the needs of the urban community which it serves, and it must elicit the participation of citizens in program planning, development, and operation.

If the educational program at Tulsa Junior College develops in conformity with these guidelines, the college can and will make a notable to the state and to the nation. This is the hope and expectation which I have for Tulsa Junior College.

B. L. J.

BILL J. PRIEST

As the title suggests, this paper will present an overview of the types and levels of leadership needed to transform an idea into an operational community college — serving the city which created it in an effective and efficient manner.

Leadership for the New Urban Junior College

A complete vacuum is usually found at the starting end of this span of time and effort — a vacuum even more pronounced than that which precipitates the development of a typical suburban community college.

Characteristics of the Urban College

An overview and interpretation of the leadership needed to fill this vacuum might logically begin with a summary of some characteristics of the urban college which influence the type of leadership needed. While some of these are similar to those found in a non-urban college, others differ to a varying extent, posing many special and unique demands and challenges for the leadership of this type of institution.

Type of Clientele

The urban community college typically attracts a high proportion of low unit (part-time) students, including a sizeable number of more mature students. There will be demands for extensive late afternoon

Continued on next page

Dr. Priest is Chancellor of the Dallas County Junior College District. He received his education at the University of California, where he earned his Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Administration. He is a past President of the American Association of Junior Colleges, the California Junior College Association and is currently a member of the Higher Education Advisory Committee to the Education Commission of the States. As the Chief Executive Officer of a large multi-campus Junior College District, he has gained wide recognition as an outstanding educational leader.



Page ³⁶37

and evening programs to serve these students, most of whom are employed full or part time. The range of cultural and socio-economic backgrounds will be especially pronounced.

Physical Setting

The college is likely to involve a more compact campus than its sprawling suburban counterpart. It may even be high-rise without outdoor recreation areas or conventional physical education facilities. These factors will result in more occupants sharing less space than in a typical suburban college, the extent of which has a definite bearing on interpersonal relations as well as group and individual tensions. This subject has been explored by the noted anthropologist Edward T. Hall, whose book, *The Hidden Dimension*, would be a good text for the level of leadership which is charged with planning facilities for an urban community college.

College Atmosphere or "Personality"

This facet of the urban community college is closely related to No. 2 above. As a result of its potentially compact nature and location in a bustling city setting, the college atmosphere is likely to be more urgent or direct and less casual than the conventional collegiate campus. The fact that the college is functioning along side the business and industrial community will likely influence approaches to many aspects of the college operation. This influence may be manifest in such ways as "peer" pressure to keep at least the public offices of the college "open for business" during the extended vacation and holiday periods for which many institutions close their doors.

Staff of the College

The personnel attracted to the urban community college may reflect the environmental setting in which they have chosen to work. This suggests that a "downtown" college may attract a different type of faculty than those who would insist on the more casual, less formal suburban campus.

Relations with the Community

Because of its location, its spectrum of occupational programs

and its many employed students, the urban community college will likely have close relationships with the business and industrial community. Also, the college may receive more scrutiny from non-enrollees than one located in the "boondocks". This factor may be a force for good or evil depending on reaction of the general public.

The foregoing summary of characteristics attempts to draw contrasts between the urban and the non-urban college which have implications for leadership, such as the comprehensive nature of the institution, its "open-door" policy, its probable commuter rather than residential student body, and others.

Leadership Needs of an Urban College

The specific leadership needs of a new urban community college might be categorized into several levels, placed according to the roles they play in the spectrum of tasks which must be carried out between the idea and the functioning college.

The Espousers

Before a college ever reaches the state of needing leadership at the policy, administrative or faculty level, there must be a group or an individual who decides that an urban community college is needed. It is very important how this decision is reached and by whom. If the decision is made and espoused by a prestigious individual or group, the project will be launched on a firm foundation. If the early leaders are "questionable" or do not command widespread respect and followership, the idea may be suspect or be met with apathy. If the initial impetus for the new community college comes from a state-level administrative or coordinating body, it is important that key local leadership be involved early and actively in the evolution.

Securing Acceptance and Support

After the idea has been accepted by an influential individual or group and the decision made to proceed, the second level of leadership which comes into play is the large scale public information program to "sell" the idea that a college should be developed. This program seeks to demonstrate the broad worth of the community college, to gain wide-

spread acceptance and support on the part of citizens. The community at large should be convinced that the institution will make a positive difference to the city, that it is worth an investment of time and money and will be a source of pride to residents. It is important that the college proposal be identified with quality and excellence early in the talking stage so that its image develops against this backdrop.

The Board of Trustees

Once the proposal for a college is advanced by the early leaders and accepted by the community at large, the leadership reins must be handed over to an official policy-making body. The early leaders should assume responsibility for influencing the quality of the Board of Trustees as this group holds a major key to the success of the endeavor. It is highly desirable that outstanding and respected citizens be induced to run for the board or accept appointments (depending on the legal framework). The board should not include professional educators, but rather a cross-section of outstanding lay leaders who believe their college has great destiny. They should be unimpeachably honest and should represent diversified occupations and interests (i.e. labor, management, conservative, liberal, etc.). Their new connection with the college should be visibly divorced from any material benefits to the board members.

It is important that trustees approach their role from a positive and supportive point of view, seeing themselves as proponents of the total program and the many diverse elements which comprise the comprehensive community college. Individuals who perceive themselves as "watch dogs" for a particular vested interest may do irreparable damage in their unwitting obstruction of vital components of the developing institution. Politics, in the parochial sense, has no place in this setting.

Tasks the board will face require the trustees to have a keen sense of judgement, a knowledge of the community, and the capacity to assume legal and fiscal responsibility delegated by statutes. When selection or election of the board members is completed, this fact should be dramatized to the public at large, involving the mass media to applaud the sound framework on which future steps are to be taken in development of the college.

Administrative Leadership

The trustees should be aware that the major element in sound progress, particularly in the early period, is the quality of the chief administrative officer they employ. There must be harmony in basic philosophy between the chief administrator and the board, individually and collectively. Experience and training are important, as is the ability to attract strong subordinate administrators and other professional employees. A clear understanding of the delineation between policy and administration should be reached in pre-employment discussions between the board and the new chief administrative officer.

In his new book, *This Is The Community College*, AAJC Executive Director Edmund J. Gleazer terms the choosing of a president as an unparalleled opportunity for the board to consider the basic aims of the institution.

Gleazer describes the interviewing process as something of a seminar for board and applicant as they test the validity of their ideas. He suggests that board discussions with the applicant seek to reveal the candidate's attitudes and abilities as measured against the following criteria:

Conviction of the worth and dignity of each individual for what he is and what he can become. Commitment to the idea that society ought to provide the opportunity for each person to continue appropriate education up to the limit of his potential.

Appreciation of the social worth of a wide range of aptitudes, talents, interests, and types of intelligence. Respect for translating these into suitable educational programs.

Understanding of the interpersonal processes by which the individual comes to be what he is. Appreciation for the interaction of the college and other social institutions and agencies—the community, family, and church organizations—in providing a social milieu for personal development.

Knowledge of community structure and processes. Capacity to identify structures of social power and the decision makers involved in various kinds of community issues.

Understanding of education in our society and viewpoints about its role. Acquaintance with critical contemporary issues in education. Appreciation of the responsibilities of elementary and secondary education as well as those of higher education. Commitment to community college services as part of a total educational program. Constructive and affirmative views toward the assignment of the comprehensive open-door institution.

Some understanding of the elements at work which are changing society throughout the world. Awareness of the significance of population growth,

shifts in population, changes in age composition of population, the dynamics of aspirations and ambitions in cultures on all continents, the rapidity of technological development, societal resistance to self-examination and criticism, and other developments foretelling social change.

Ability to listen, understand, interpret, and reconcile. Capacity to communicate.¹

Other Professional Personnel

Important though his role may be, the president cannot do the job alone and the new community college needs strong leadership at all levels in the professional staff. The board of trustees must recognize the need for and be willing to provide a fiscal framework which permits the president to recruit other competent key administrators and faculty personnel upon whose leadership and production capabilities the entire operation depends. This factor is especially significant in view of the supply and demand picture for community college personnel, both administrative and faculty. Some 50 new community colleges are opening in this country each year, and existing institutions are experiencing unprecedented growth. The demand for new faculty personnel has been estimated at more than 10,000 annually for the foreseeable future. Well qualified instructors are in short supply, and it is this market in which the new urban community college will be competing for personnel. The college should seek to assemble a staff of competent and dedicated faculty members with depth in their disciplines or specialties and with a commitment to serving the broad spectrum of student abilities found in the community college. Their primary interest should be in teaching rather than in research and writing.

Community Resources

The city's business and industrial community has much to give in the way of leadership for the new community college. This takes the form of involvement in identifying needs, developing the curriculum and servicing the technical-occupational programs of the college.

The curricula should be chosen after depth study of community occupational needs, a study in which business and industrial interests can play an active part. The most widely accepted approach to achieving and effectively using this resource on a continuing basis is through technical advisory committees representing the various occupational fields in which the college will offer programs.

Conclusion The foregoing overview has summarized several characteristics or attributes of the urban community college which influence the demands for leadership, followed by a commentary on the various levels at which strong leadership is needed as the new college evolves.

As concluding remarks, some generalizations concerning Leadership For The New Urban Community College might be appropriate—comments based on training, experience, personal value patterns and prejudices of the writer.

The chief difference between leadership in this setting and other leadership relates to the unique demands of contemporary urban America—demands which are complex, acute and dynamic. Consequently, to stay on top of this situation, the leaders—both staff and board—need to understand the volatility of the current American urban scene and recognize that fixations on narrow specifics are fraught with hazards.

In military parlance, the terms strategy and tactics are used to delineate the all-encompassing approach to the conquest of a major objective from the many ever changing, small but vital judgments which must be translated into action decisions as the big campaign proceeds. Education, particularly in the urban setting has its parallel. Its “general staff” and “field commanders” must have the capacity to think and arrive at decisions in a setting which perceives both the whole and its parts.

At a time when the supply-demand picture of talent in college teaching is not encouraging, any reference to leadership must certainly give proper weight to recruitment and retention of top quality faculty.

The emphasis placed on vital, insightful leadership at the policy and administrative level is crucial. However, it would be educational suicide to fail to recognize that, when all the great ideas have been processed and translated into policies and precedures, the success of the entire crusade rests on the shoulders of the instructor in the classroom, the laboratory or the shop.

A final plea would be for continuity during the formative years of the new community college project. Tulsa possesses a level of civic attitudes and traditions which should have a positive impact on the

development of a new college. There is a strong sense of community pride. The collective citizenry have a lofty image of themselves and their behavior is influenced by this image. They have the ability to act in concert when a project involving the future of their city is at stake. By means which will be most workable in this setting, the early leaders should get a firm commitment from some prime movers who are willing to shepherd the project for the next five years. By that time, given the other leadership elements mentioned, Tulsa, will be "off and running" and will have an educational establishment of which it can be proud and which will serve the city for many generations to come.

B. J. P.

JAMES W. HOBSON

The task of beginning the new Tulsa Junior College will be extremely complex. This new college cannot afford to drift or become guilty of permitting important decisions to be based on expediency. Urgency will be demanded but actions should be taken only after the board and staff are convinced the planning has been complete and decisions are based upon the best evidence available. The board and staff must agree that careful planning, both short-range and long-range is essential if the college is to provide a comprehensive educational program for the youth and adults of Tulsa and the surrounding area at a level of quality to fulfill the needs of this model city.

Steps in Beginning the Tulsa Junior College

Obviously this college will not be established just for today but for an anticipated long term future. Yet, plans and decisions of far reaching consequence must be made within a limited time period and under extreme pressure.

Fortunately, through the extensive work completed by the Chancellor, E. T. Dunlap, and the State Regents Staff, the new Tulsa Junior College Board will have detailed background data, planning standards and criteria to aid in the development of the college. Even with

Continued on next page

Dr. Hobson, a graduate of Michigan State University, is Vice-Chancellor for Administration of the University of California at Los Angeles. He has previously served as an Administrative Officer of the Oakland Community College in suburban Detroit, Michigan, the Junior College District of St. Louis in Missouri and the Lawrence Institute of Technology in Southfield, Michigan. He was a member of the charter staff in the founding of both the Junior College District of St. Louis and the Oakland Community College and has served as a consultant to a number of states in the area of junior college planning.



Page 45

this data the process of establishment is indeed complex. Chancellor Dunlap, fully realizing this fact, has suggested this report as an aid to the new board and staff of the college in planning the orderly development of this emerging institution.

The purpose of this report is to identify steps which are of importance in the establishment of a new community junior college and to develop a modified and simplistic critical path technique. This will broadly define the sequence of necessary steps from the appointment of the Board of Regents for administrative control to the first day of classes. A number of tasks will be identified which incorporate more than one decision or action item. Although they are identified independently, it is evident they are completely interacting. It would be possible to delineate upwards of 400 individual decision or action steps. Due to the limitations of this report only a generalized check list of activities are identified in sequential order. At the conclusion of this report, a description of a highly detailed computer based approach defining time periods as well as sequence, will be described for possible consideration by the Board in its ambitious undertaking.

This report is organized to describe in graphical form a number of crucial steps; first in the general administrative area followed by the areas of academic, physical facility and fiscal planning. These critical steps will be described in more detail in paragraph form immediately following the graphical presentation.

The process of establishing a community junior college, once its objectives have been defined, can be categorized as follows:

Administrative

Academic


Physical Plant

Fiscal

Administrative Diagram

STATE REGENTS' RESOLUTION
FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF
TULSA JUNIOR COLLEGE

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
CONTROL



Administrative Detail

Upon recommendation a resolution will be passed by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for the establishment of the Tulsa Junior College.

The appointment of a seven-man Board of Regents for administrative control will be accomplished by the Governor of Oklahoma. This then authorizes the Board appointees to meet, organize and develop board operating rules and procedures.

After organization the immediate responsibility is to determine: the qualifications required for choosing a college president, the recruitment process and then hiring of the chief executive. (The most crucial step in the development of the college is the proper selection of the president. It is recommended that the Board use every professional assistance available in defining the characteristics required, establishing the salary, recruiting and screening the applicants).

Clarification of the relationship between the Board and the new president, defining board policy and administrative decision areas, is clearly a necessary step to insure a smooth functioning team.


Operating money will be required in the early stages of development and proper steps should be taken to secure this from the State Regents.

Since the Board Members and the new staff will be responsible for funds, the purchase of Fidelity Bond Insurance will provide proper safeguards and protection to the individual board members as well as to the state.

A headquarters, even if temporary, should be provided to begin operations. Adequate space, furniture and equipment should be secured as a base of operation for the initial staff.

Following the president's appointment key staff members should be selected for the administrative team. These will normally be in the areas of: academic affairs, business and finance, personnel, student personnel, public relations and library.

Academic-Graphic



Academic Detail

The three branches of this function indicate concurrent interactive actions to be taken.

The Main Branch — The main branch first requires the development of a philosophy for the college as well as the definition of the objectives and scope. The objectives and philosophy will reflect steps taken in defining the educational needs of business, industry, parents and potential students.

The organization of citizen committees will aid in determining the breadth of course offerings especially in the technical-vocational area. From the previous information input, the pattern of the general education program will be determined. This program will reflect the philosophy and goals previously established.

By combining the information on general community service requirements, the total program offerings can be developed. The courses will need approval from the State Regents and will reflect criteria for acceptance of transfer credits by other senior colleges and universities.

Studies of teaching methods, most effective in the environment of Tulsa, should be made — weighing all the teaching innovations proved effective in other localities.

From the details of course offerings the enrollment projections by course should be computed and judgment made for the number of course sections.

The development of education policies should include the college calendar, scholastic standards, classification of students, attendance, credit, examinations and the like.

Course outlines will follow the development of course descriptions and will allow for approval of courses by the Board and the State Regents.

From the preceding work on the educational program, a college catalog can be constructed, published and distributed.

The academic organization should be designed after considering

the structure relevancy on the use of deans, division or department chairmen, administrator for extended day programs, curriculum committees, etc.

Within the framework of the organization, program and enrollment class schedules may be developed leading to the first enrollment of students and opening for instruction.

The Second Branch — Concurrent with the main branch of steps or tasks, a student personnel branch is developed starting with:

- a) Arrangement of an orientation program for new students;
- b) Relating the college program to high schools, counselors and the industrial community;
- c) Developing a procedure for registration of students (hopefully to utilize the latest technology available for computer implementation);
- d) Development of a program of student activities including a system to finance the program;
- e) Provide for a student government, student publication and calendar of activities.

Student placement plans should be made to include record keeping; contact with potential employers (both full and part-time); publicity for the placement service; and consideration for necessary medical and nursing care (which may include psychological or psychiatric attention).

Later consideration of alumni affairs and friends-of-the-college program will provide another needed service.

The Third Branch — Also for concurrent development, will provide for the employment and retention of academic personnel.

As a first step standards for faculty must be established in terms of education and experience, considering both the short-range and long-range requirements. The standards will also reflect teaching methods and workload factors.

Based on the standards and prevailing salary practice in the profession and in the local area, salary schedules should be developed. Academic rank might be considered and incorporated at this point.

The recruitment of a qualified faculty is of prime concern and in the early stages of the college development the search for qualified instructors will take a considerable portion of the president's time. College and university placement offices will be a part of the recruitment resources. However, especially in the early stages, many instructors in surrounding areas will take the initiative by applying direct. A decision on the utilization of high school teachers will no doubt be necessary.


It is generally agreed that the morale and efficiency of new instructors can be enhanced by a carefully planned and effectively administered program of orientation. This should develop into a type of continuing in-service education program.

An up-to-date system of faculty employment records will provide the needed resource for the continuous operation as well as input data for state, federal and accrediting agencies.

The best possible environment in which the faculty can work would include the provision of office space, staff lounge and food service. This should be available immediately upon their reporting for work to insure maximum productivity.

Policies developed and printed in a faculty handbook should include among others: attendance at professional meetings, participation in curriculum development, as well as in community relations and a system of faculty evaluation, workloads, vacation, leaves of absences and other terms of employment.

Physical Facilities- Graphic



Physical Facilities — Detail

An immediate decision as to the advisability of beginning classes in temporary quarters will set the time scheduling of the physical plant planning.

The first step for consideration in the regular construction process is generally the selection and appointment of an architect. It would be valuable to appoint this architect early in the establishment process even at this point when his function is essentially advisory.

A time schedule should be devised for the entire planning and construction period.


The development of educational specifications will: reflect the extent and nature of the educational program, suggest determination of space requirements, indicate individual space requirements, and provide bases for estimates on construction costs of buildings and site developments.

(Special consultants for the development of educational specifications is most often a wise investment).

The architect working from educational specifications and with knowledge of the staff thinking, will prepare schematic drawings, preliminary or design development drawings. After approval by the Board and the State Regents he will complete the working documents. These documents are the basis of construction bidding and awarding of a contract for construction. After the construction award, supervision on the progress is necessary. With the completion of construction as built drawings, guarantees and instructions for use and care of fixed equipment will be turned over to the college by the architect.

Relating again to the educational specifications, movable equipment lists are compiled for bid, purchase and installation.

Finance- Graphic



Finance Detail

The First Branch — As a first consideration, all fund sources must be determined and means of securing interim funds must be resolved.

Budget projections made will be in two phases; first, the pre-teaching period and second, the detailed budget reflecting the normal operating period. This detailed operating budget will reflect: enrollment projections, number of teachers, number of administrators, classified personnel, cost of building operations, instructional supplies, student services, student activities and the extent of any athletic programs. The operating budget will also reflect all sources of income, including student fees.

The next most important step is the establishment of accounting procedures. This will include, in addition to the regular books of accounts, a system for auxiliary enterprises such as bookstore and cafeteria and procedures for handling student-body funds.

With the development of policies, rules and regulations for making requisitions and purchases, a purchasing department should be established.

A modern mechanized payroll system should be conceived and implemented. This might well be done through a local bank who would process the payroll, particularly in the early stages of the developmental period.

Insurance is to be planned and purchased to cover: fire, theft and extended coverage, public liability, property damage, fidelity bonds, vandalism, automobile and the like — consistent with state law.

A cashier function should be established especially for the collection of student fees.

Auxiliary enterprises such as bookstore, food service and other self-supporting operations should be organized, with sufficient lead time to allow for the beginning of classes.

The Second Branch — This branch of the fiscal chart concerns itself with the major considerations in establishment of a non-academic personnel system generally operated under the business management administration. The nonacademic employees of the college provide admin-

istrative, professional, technical, clerical or service support for the instructional functions of the college. Position classifications should be established on the basis of duties and responsibilities wherein positions with the same duties and responsibilities are grouped together. Class titles need to be adopted as official titles for all regular purposes.

Salary ranges should be established reflecting the position classifications to provide proper internal comparison. In order to attract qualified applicants to the positions in the college, community wage surveys should be undertaken leading to the determination of proper rates of pay.

Nonacademic personnel policies must be established and published for internal consumption describing: appointment, promotion, demotion, performance reviews, leaves, vacation, overtime and the like.

After determination of policy and development of a classification system, the recruitment process can move forward smoothly without the conflicts caused by hiring personnel at varying salaries for similar positions.

The record system can be integrated with academic personnel records if the administrators wish to consolidate the record keeping function which can be mechanized from the beginning.

Conclusion The foregoing, surveys in general a number of the critical steps in sequence that are necessary in the establishment of the new college.

As pointed out earlier in this paper, it is possible by more advanced techniques to develop a comprehensive plan, on a step-by-step basis, related to the time intervals necessary for each function. This would be possible through the use of CPM.

Critical Path Method is a management control tool used to prepare, analyze and evaluate complex project schedules. It is a method for scheduling and evaluating activities which defines the sequential relationship of each identified activity within an overall program. It establishes the time limit within which each activity can be accomplished. Most important, it identifies the critical activities — those in which delay will produce failure to achieve scheduled project completion. As a schedule CPM is descriptive and easily understood.

Establishing a junior college involves deciding what actions are required, performing the actions, and analyzing the effects of these actions. Also essential in the process is estimating beforehand the length of time each action will require and the sequence in which each will be performed. The total process is complex, comprising several hundred interrelated activities. Firm deadlines such as the opening day of classes further complicate time and sequence. A CPM system can be designed to meet the particular perimeters of the Tulsa Junior College.

A CPM application to Junior College establishment has been developed and used successfully by the Cuyahoga Community College.

Note: In addition to the personal experience of the writer in the junior college establishment process, contributions from the materials of Dr. B. Lamar Johnson and Dr. Ellis Benson aided materially in the preparation of this paper.

J. W. H.

DOROTHY M. KNOELL

The urban community college which addresses itself to the challenges of the cities will not be simply an enlarged replica of its sister institutions in the suburbs, nor will it be a mere multi-campus replica of the suburban institution. The urban college must respond in a new,

The Urban Junior College In Service to the City

sometimes unique way to the critical needs of urban young people and adults for educational opportunity beyond the high school. New curriculums with opportunity for both educational and occupational mobility, new services which both support the instructional program and help the student establish his identity, new teaching and counseling staff to work effectively with the many disadvantaged students in urban colleges, new community services which no other type of institution offers and new instructional strategies—all these are needed by and for the urban community colleges.

Community-junior colleges have attained their present size and state of eminence as predominantly suburban institutions serving local youth who could not afford to go away to school, who were not sufficiently motivated to do so, or who increasingly find that they are not admissible to a four-year institution. Such students are afforded a taste of what college is like in their home communities, usually in liberal arts

Continued on next page

Dr. Knoell is currently Director of a Ford Foundation study involving out-of-college urban youth, for the Urban Community College Projects of the American Association of Junior Colleges in Washington, D.C. A graduate of the University of Chicago with a Ph.D. in Measurement and Research, Dr. Knoell is widely known for her research on junior college students. Her major publications include "From Junior to Senior Colleges": A National Study of the Transfer Student, co-authored with Leland L. Medsker, and a later study, "Toward Educational Opportunity for All".



58
Page 59

programs which may be transferred (and occasionally are) to the university. They are taught by instructors who are usually better prepared in their subject fields than the local high school teachers, but who lack the degree which would enable them to serve on a university faculty. The typical suburban campus now rivals the four-year college in attractiveness, thus heightening the feeling of local pride in the community college, as taxpayer, parent of a student, advisory committee member, or as a bona-fide student.

The urban community college is not needed or regarded in the same way. It shares the mission of the suburban institution of providing a range of educational opportunity for young people and adults who are not the traditional clientele of the university, in a non-residential setting which is to an extent collegiate but which embraces programs extending up through the lower division in college and down in some instances to adult basic education. Unless present trends are reversed, the population of the cities will become further polarized toward the upper and lower social classes, while the suburbs will embrace the growing middle class. The latter group shuns the cities because of the poor quality of the public schools and the high cost of attending the private ones. The urban upper class can buy quality education for its children through high school, and then appropriate collegiate education in residential colleges. It is therefore the large lower to lower middle class group which is most in need of the services which an urban community college could offer.

Both urban and suburban colleges should perform the so-called salvage function, i.e., giving young people a second, and often a final chance to demonstrate their intellectual potential. However, in the suburban community college the young man or woman who is helped is likely to be a middle class student who simply failed to live up to his or her potential in high school, often because of problems of maturation. The urban college, on the other hand, has the much harder job of rescuing the teenager who was the victim of a second- or third-rate public school education, either in a vocational school commonly regarded as a dumping ground for academic misfits or in a general curriculum leading to neither employment nor college. Both types of colleges need a full range of occupational curricula, but they should have different emphases. With

industry and retail business relocating in the suburbs in such large numbers, and with the suburbs still somewhat inaccessible to minority groups, the cities need new kinds of jobs and new programs of job training which will help lift residents out of poverty.

Functions concerned with general education, university-parallel programs, community services, and student personnel services are also common to both types of community colleges. Still, there are unique problems found by the urban institutions in performing these functions, which have been satisfactorily resolved in all too few urban settings.

Acute Problems for Urban Colleges Urban community colleges face certain problems which can be ignored by the suburban institutions, or compressed into their larger problems of very rapid growth and development. The urban problems stem jointly from the nature of the student body which the college should serve and the quality of the environment from which the students come (and in which they continue to live while in college). These are a few of the critical problems—some obvious to all, others relatively unexplored.

Relevance of the curriculum and course content:

“Lack of relevance” has become an over-employed criticism of much which is being offered in higher education. Still, the accusation is particularly apt when applied to the typical urban community college curricula. General education which has been transferrable to the university for a quarter-century may not meet the needs of lower class urban youth seeking their identity in an often hostile society. Social science offerings which ignore black authors, black scholars, the black version of history and society probably fail to bring about much real learning on the part of black students, yet such gaps in relevance do exist.

Staff preparation and development:

Curricular irrelevance is often a close correlate of staff inadequacy to adapt to the peculiar needs of an urban college in a metropolitan environment. Graduate schools do not equip new faculty with either the skills to teach the educationally disadvantaged youth, or the breadth of content to enable them to adapt their course offerings as the need occurs. Neither new instructors nor “retreads” from high schools, four-year colleges, and

government and industry begin teaching at the urban college with any real understanding of the pertinent characteristics of their urban students. Counselors and other student personnel staff members are seldom better prepared than their teaching colleagues to work effectively with urban youth who are educationally disadvantaged.

Student Mix:

Urban community colleges cannot attract a good student mix without making efforts which far exceed those of the suburban institutions. The latter tend to draw almost a random sample of the local high school graduating class, with a full range of abilities, socio-economic backgrounds, interests, and aspirations, levels of maturity, and other personality characteristics. The ability mix is probably the most difficult to attain in the urban institution, particularly in a multi-campus operation. Good students are siphoned off by the four-year institutions, almost without exception, while the poorest students are turned off early by their high school counselors. Socioeconomic mix is also difficult to achieve in the urban college, for the poorest cannot attend even free colleges. Strict adherence to self-selection leads to dull uniformity in the urban student population.

Restructuring of student services:

Financial aid and activities programs in urban colleges tend to be developed from the same mold as is used by small, suburban institutions. The vast resources of the city which could be tapped in order to broaden and deepen the urban student's in-class instruction are ignored as an eager staff works at building a self-contained, on-campus activities program. Little imagination is employed in administering the usually limited financial aid programs. Low-risk students are given safe jobs on campus which provide little more than spending money. High risk students are denied aid, if indeed they apply for admission with assistance.

Psychological barriers to college-going:

Urban colleges which have open-door admissions policies, free tuition, and comprehensive curricula, and which are accessible by public transportation from all parts of the city may still follow other practices or policies which disadvantaged students perceive as barriers. Placement tests, pre-admissions interviews, deadlines, forms, registration procedures—all these may deter the apprehensive applicant. Some campuses may be per-

ceived as off limits to a certain minority group, i.e., as another student group's turf.

Shared participation in community service:

Urban areas may be abundantly served by the public schools, four-year colleges and universities, non-profit organization and agencies, and the community college in the vast area of community service. Adult basic education, manpower training, lecture series, concerts, non-credit college courses, trips, and various other educational-cultural-social activities may be made available by some (or all or none) of the educational institutions, to some (or all or none) of the urban residents, at cost (or free or for a profit). Some groups are inevitably bypassed for failing to make their interests known, or because they cannot pay for the programs they might want. Various conceptions of an urban extension service have been suggested to parallel the time-honored agricultural extension programs. Additional exploration is needed.

Community control of urban campuses:

Residents of large urban areas have less opportunity to develop a sense of identity with their local community college, whether located on one campus or several. The local governing board cannot be as close to the taxpaying electorate of a major city as it may be in a suburban community. There is confusion about the role and functions of the several post-secondary institutions which often operate almost side by side in urban areas. The problem at this point in time has at least two formulations.

The first is how to get the urban less well-to-do to see the community college as *their* institution and to participate accordingly in its affairs.

The second and more difficult problem is how to meet the increasing demand for local campus control—selection of staff, approval of program, setting of standards—by the organized faculty on the one hand, and by the militant community on the other. The latter may include the students themselves, as adult

residents in the area served by the college, and quasi-political groups seeking local power and control.

These seven problem areas are the most pressing ones confronting the urban community college, with the exception of the selection of a site or multiple sites for the campus. The site problem requires decision-making activity which affects each of the other problem areas over time, for the perceived attractiveness and accessibility of the site(s) will determine in part the make-up of the student body and staff and this, in turn, the nature of the curriculum, services, and community program. Urban community colleges now run the full gamut from a "no campus" operation in Seattle, where the college program is dispersed throughout the city, to a one-campus college in San Francisco, which draws students from all parts of the city to its site at the end of the street-car line.

Exemplary Responses of Particular Colleges

Each urban community college is now making a very determined effort to respond more effectively to the needs of big city residents for educational opportunity beyond high school, whether at the traditional collegiate level or for adults at any level. The areas of intensive effort are recruitment and outreach programs, supporting services for the educationally disadvantaged, curriculum revision in both developmental and occupational areas, the employment of new kinds of staff and new roles for traditional staff, and community service for and with neighborhood groups not now being served. No urban college is able to address itself to all or even most of the problem areas simultaneously, but all are moving within their budgetary and personnel capabilities. Lack of plans for assessing change and evaluating the results of new programs and services is a serious limitation of the urban college activity. There is all too little evidence concerning the effectiveness of past and present programs, on the basis of which to evaluate the results of new efforts. New programs fail, in a sense, when external funding ceases, when staff is unavailable, and when interests change. However, there is no clear record of programs being abandoned because they were shown to be ineffective by some pre-established criteria.

Recruitment- Outreach Programs The Talent Search program of the U.S. Office of Education has provided encouragement and funding to urban colleges to develop special programs of community counseling and recruitment, to all of education rather than to the community college alone. Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland has established a community counseling center in its Hough area under this federal program, to give out information and assistance to the under-educated who have dropped out of school or college before achieving their full potential. The clientele is predominantly early school dropouts, i.e., before college, needing basic skill and occupational training offered under a variety of auspices. Some will enroll at the community college, once they have been given information about the opportunities available there; others may do so after a different kind of educational experience to prepare them for college. A majority of the users of the service will probably not attend college but all are expected to be helped to find appropriate educational opportunity and at the same time to set a new value on education for themselves and their families.

Miami-Dade Junior College in Florida has adopted an outreach program to recruit black students which operates through the county high schools. Counselors who normally expend considerable effort in placing graduates in selective or otherwise prestigious colleges have been employed by the community college to work late hours and Saturdays at their schools, to talk with high school seniors about opportunities at Miami-Dade. Application and registration forms could be filled out on the spot, with the help of the counselors. Enrollment among groups with low college-going rates has increased since the program was started and all view it as successful.

Supporting Services Los Angeles City College, under a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, has instituted a program to train and then employ them as aides to new students who are disadvantaged by virtue of their predicted failure in college, color, and socio-economic status. The college has made extensive use of student tutors in the past, in its developmental program for new students with low aptitude test scores. However, the staff believed that both performance and persistence could

be improved by the use of student counselor-aides—themselves disadvantaged—to inform, encourage, communicate, and otherwise supplement the services available to regular students. There has not yet been time for research on outcomes of the program, but students participating in it—counselor-aides and counselors—are enthusiastic and confident about outcomes.

The College of San Mateo has responded in still another way to the demands of the disadvantaged for university-transfer programs which are not conditional upon the successful completion of prior remedial programs. Supporting services are rendered by fellow students who are usually of the same race and who have been successful in college. Tutoring is the heart of the program, with the objective of giving the new disadvantaged students the tools to compete with regular students for satisfactory grades. Traditional orientation is replaced by what might be called an acclimatization to the often foreign environment of the college. Research is still sparse on the San Mateo program but the staying power of the first group to complete it has been quite good. The demand by the students for a vast expansion of the program is still another index of its success. College tutors are paid for their services to other college students who, in turn, tutor children in the community for pay. Thus, every student in the program tutors other students and all who are needy receive pay for their work.

Curriculum Development

One of the most critical needs of the urban colleges is for new curricula in which large numbers of disadvantaged students can be successful. Recognizing that many students will not want more than one year in college right after high school, a number of colleges have attempted to offer what has come to be called a developmental program. At its best, it assists the disadvantaged student in improving and strengthening his self-concepts, understanding the society in which he lives, explores occupational interests, and remedying his basic skills in communication and computation. The program differs from the remedial curriculum in that fixed academic standards are replaced by goals for individual student development at a pace best suited to his prior experience and potential.

Louis has developed one such program for students who normally fail in college, with Danforth Foundation funding for both the program and some needy students. The one-year program may lead to placement in one of the college's degree programs. However, many students completing the program are expected to take job training under non-college auspices or to accept employment in jobs which seem to offer opportunity for regular advancement. Passing grades are awarded to all who make progress in the program, whatever their particular rate or level. There is little opportunity for failure during or at the completion of the program, unless the student chooses to be a failure, for success is defined as a multi-faceted phenomenon. Other urban colleges are developing similar types of programs in lieu of the largely unsuccessful attempts to do mass remediation in the past.

Curriculum development in the area of social science technology and the human services is also notable in the urban colleges. The Wilson campus of Chicago City College, the south campus of Miami-Dade Junior College, and the Peralta Colleges in Oakland, California, are all involved in exemplary programs. The federally funded New Careers program for the under-educated adults in need of employment training have given impetus for this line of development. Service areas of particular interest are education, social welfare, recreation, corrections, and health. Ideally, opportunities for advancement can be offered, after appropriate education and experience, from the aide to the associate level, and beyond to the professional at the baccalaureate or graduate degree level. A core curriculum in the social sciences would also facilitate horizontal mobility for persons wanting to change from one service area to another. A number of urban colleges now conduct New Careers training and also offer associate degree programs in the same human service areas, some for transfer credit. Articulation of programs is still very imperfect but the structure is present for achieving it.

The Peralta Colleges are also experimenting with a Student Service Corps program which seeks to correlate campus and urban community more effectively. Disadvantaged students who are enrolled in human services and other curricula are employed in an OEO-funded work-study program which puts their talents to work in inner city neighbor-

hoods. The melding of experience acquired while growing up in such neighborhoods and skills learned in college is expected to have a positive effect on both neighborhood and college. The program will be successful only if the college curriculum is changed as a result of the application of knowledge to practical urban situations. The students work at cooperative buying, neighborhood journalism, recreation leadership, tutoring, and political education, in cooperation with often inadequately funded local groups. Multiple outcomes are expected from the program which college and community are both enthusiastic about.

Staff Deployment

New urban programs demand new kinds of staff and the retraining of old staff. One of the most promising developments is the use of community college students as subprofessional staff in the operation of college programs, e.g., as counselor aides and tutors. These same programs, together with the Student Service Corps, have recruited new types of professional staff which could, but probably would not be recruited by the traditional faculty departments. Such staff members have at least the minimum academic credentials and are further qualified by virtue of their inner city background. Their eventual acceptance by the regular staff and faculty is still uncertain but, in the interim, their contribution to the education of disadvantaged youth is considerable.

Community colleges are beginning to mount many new programs which the regular staff is incapable of handling. The potential of the students themselves, after one or two years of college, is still not fully fathomed. Still, there is little doubt that here is a vast reservoir of human talent which can be used now in some college programs, after some minimal orientation and training. The success of the urban colleges will to a considerable extent be dependent upon their ability to meld old and new types of faculty and staff to produce a first-rate program in a reputable institution.

Community Services

The Office of Economic Opportunity has funded a group of urban community colleges to enable them to experiment with the development of new adult programs for inner city residents now beyond the reaches of the colleges. The Family Education Program of the State University Urban Center in Brooklyn is a good example of

cooperative community programs. Head Start families in Bedford-Stuyvesant were recruited for a family program offered by the Urban Center, under which both family units and individual adults participate in carefully planned programs. Some are purely educational, others recreational, and still others a mixture of education and culture and fun. Head Start children in the program are expected to make greater gains than non-participating children and their parents are expected to demonstrate a variety of educational benefits from the multi-phase program developed by the Center.

The Peralta Colleges and Chicago City College were also funded by OEO for the development of adult programs. Both entail the involvement of community residents in the planning and execution of the programs. The assumption is that the college should not do *to* or *for* the people, but *with* them in accordance with their expressed educational needs. In Oakland the community, through its designated representatives, has had responsibility for the screening and selection of staff for its new programs. The Peralta Colleges are dispersing its programs and services through four community centers which were established explicitly for the OEO program. The Chicago program was launched with a series of basic adult education programs out close to where the people live. From the basic program the College will move to a much broader program of community service, free to all takers and designed with the close participation of the people to be served.

The most advanced thinkers believe that all urban community ***Prospectus*** college education will soon be community service, with distinctions fading between credit and non-credit, transferable and occupational, basic and remedial, collegiate and adult programs. The business of the urban community colleges is in any case education for young people and adults who can profit from such instruction. To be fully effective, education must be taken to where the people are, unless it can be shown that they can be attracted regularly to the campus. The yardstick by which the success of the urban college is measured is not the number of students who transfer, nor the number of programs listed in the catalog, but total number and variety of people who can and do take advantage of the opportunity available to all.

The proposal is not that the urban community college try to be all things to all people, to offer by itself all programs and services to the urban populace. Instead, the urban college should be aggressive in identifying unmet educational needs and in encouraging the appropriate educational or other agency to meet them. The urban community college is in danger of being displaced by still another, entirely new kind of community school, if it does not address itself to the challenges which distinguish it from the suburban college. There is good evidence at hand that most of the urban colleges are attempting to do so, with some modicum of success. Still, the job to be done remains large, and Tulsa can point the way for others.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

E. J. Gleazer, Jr., *This is the Community College*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968.

Ervin L. Harlacher, *Effective Junior College Programs of Community Service: Rationale, Guidelines, Practices*. Occasional report from the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, No. 10, Los Angeles, September, 1967.

Dorothy M. Knoell, *Toward Educational Opportunity for All*. Albany: The State University of New York, 1966.

_____, "Are Our Colleges Really Accessible to the Poor?" *Junior College Journal*, October, 1968 (see also other articles in this issue).

Bud Weidenthal, *The Community College Commitment to the Inner City*. Washington: AAJC, 1967.

D. M. K.

JOSEPH W. FORDYCE

In broad outline, leaders of the modern era of community junior colleges have well established principles and policies that should have given life and flavor to this new entry into the educational sweepstakes; the tragedy lies, as in so much of education, in the lack of detailed delineation and implementation. Certainly among leaders there is consensus in respect to the terms "community," "comprehensive," "occupational" and to the philosophies that they represent. Similarly, "student-centeredness" implies a philosophy that few engaged in public junior college education would deny; the degree to which innovative and experimental procedures and practices have been adopted that reflect these philosophies may very well represent a level of achievement not yet consonant with the theory.

A Student-Oriented Community College

Philosophical Considerations Certainly at no other sector of the total scope of public education can there be more opportunity and more demand for educational offerings that are indeed student-centered than at the community college. Such practices and procedures extend far beyond those ordinarily subsumed under the general heading of student personnel services, although as we shall indicate at a later point, there seems to be little opportunity for the development of a truly student-centered institution in the

Continued on next page

Dr. Fordyce is currently President of Santa Fe Junior College, Gainesville, Florida. A recognized authority in student personnel administration, he received his early education in West Virginia, and later earned graduate degrees from Harvard University and the University of Florida, at which institution he earned his doctorate in Guidance and Student Personnel Work in 1954. Dr. Fordyce is currently serving on the Board of Directors of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and was Chairman of the Student Personnel Commission of that organization from 1963 to 1965. He has published extensively in the psychological journals and the *Junior College Journal*.



Page 71

absence of a highly defined and adequately implemented program of student personnel services to provide much of the student-centeredness and to be the impetus and the aegis for much of the rest of it.

It goes almost without saying that a student-centered community college is basically a teaching-learning facility, and the degree and extent of student-centeredness of any particular institution can be measured to the degree that it does indeed facilitate learning and hence the growth of its students. Such an institution recognizes that teaching consists of something more than drill and lecture and that teaching is, above all, a kind of behaving on the part of dedicated human beings and their relationships with others who are less mature, less wise, or less knowledgeable. It follows that on a student-centered campus every worker—president, teacher, counselor, custodian—is a learning facilitator, an assistant in helping students change behavior in the direction of and consonant with the aims of the institution.

It follows then that the beginning point must be the establishment of goals and aims that are indeed concerned with human growth and development, and it is in the establishment of these aims that most any college can take a meaningful step toward the establishment of itself as a student-oriented institution. Such statement of aims must go further than an indication of the kind of academic programs offered by the institution. Goals and aims must be stated, for maximum meaningfulness, in the form of ends, ends that can be described as desirable changes in human behavior. Neither will it serve the purpose to leave this statement of aims and purposes in the form of broad generalities, although such form can indeed be a most desirable starting place. To give substance, the goal broadly stated must, in turn, be carefully examined in relation to the specific kind of educational activities most likely to produce favorable results, and in this process of examination the goal itself can be defined in much more detailed and much more meaningful terms. The basic question then becomes: What kinds of educational activities, be they formal instruction, inter-collegiate athletics, participation in a play, or whatever else, are most likely to produce the changes in human behavior to which the general statement of aims has avowed allegiance?

Our folk wisdom, as well as our sophisticated psychology, has long since demonstrated that nothing succeeds like success. Yet most colleges have continued to build in, actually have taken great pride in, forced failure, generally as a substitute for the time-consuming process of ferreting out the real nature of the successful teaching experience. The height of this tragedy is realized most fully with the recognition of the number of institutions who, in their confusion of hardness with goodness, actually conduct their "evaluations" primarily on the basis of the number of individuals who do *not* succeed in what is supposed to be the business of the institution.

A success philosophy, on the contrary, is the essence of student-centeredness. It suggests a number of ancillary postulates, among them the almost unlimited faith in the essentially untapped potential of the human being, *every* human being. It also suggests the necessity, as a substitution for "high standards," of a high level of expectation for reasonable standards of performance. Especially for the community junior college, with its commitment to universal higher education, it suggests that success occasionally, and perhaps often, must be measured not by miles, but by yards, feet, and even inches.

On the basis of these sorts of considerations, one community college has adopted a platform that it refers to as "Seven Points of Commitment":

1. The student is the central focus for the process of learning.
2. Teaching occurs only when students learn.
3. Effective educational experiences will modify behavior in a positive manner.
4. All human beings are motivated to achieve that which they believe is good.
5. Education should be an exciting, creative, and rewarding experience for the student and for the teacher.
6. All human beings have worth, dignity, and potential.
7. Experimentation and innovation are reflections of attitudes; when they are translated into practice, the process of education can be significantly advanced.

Not every college would be willing to accept this platform as its own; it is our contention that every college that purports to be student-centered will devote its most creative energies to the determination of its own.

Student-centeredness suggests that the format of education be carefully examined and re-examined. Rules and regulations, the procedures of the institution, should be examined, and frequently re-examined and rewritten, in terms of their contribution to the facilitating of the learning experience. Policies and procedures should be not only open-door, but, to the greatest extent possible, open-ended. The time factor in learning, especially as it has been determined by years of unthinking tradition, must be re-examined in light of the new and unparalleled responsibilities of the community college. Punitive grading systems with their false, or at least unfounded, but presumed motivational values should be discarded in favor of non-threatening systems of evaluation of student growth and development. Course content should be re-examined in respect to the possibility of more meaningful packaging. Who is to say that every meaningful learning experience needs be encapsulated in a three-semester-hour course?

College Facilities

We have only begun to explore the role of the physical environment in respect to its contribution to the learning process. Efficiency and economy, with perhaps an occasional nod toward aesthetic quality, have been the key words, and architects and educators have only recently started to give some attention to the humanization of facilities. Certainly the interplay of colors, the utilization of textures, the adequacy and relationship of spaces exert constant and pervasive influence upon the inhabitants of an environment. The log as teaching space may have sufficed for the truly inspired teacher, but even he without doubt would have been more effective as a facilitator of learning had an environment that complemented and supported the educative processes been available. As in most areas of human judgment and human value, we perhaps know more negatively than we do positively about what constitutes a good human physical environment; but as architectural psychology or psychological architecture flowers into something more of a science than is its present

state of art, improvements can and will be noted. Meanwhile, all educators can, by taking careful thought and using unusually good common judgment, avoid some of the most blatant pitfalls that signify so readily that campuses were built with no thought to the fact that they were to be inhabited by teachers and learners.

Curricular Offerings

The pattern of curricular offerings will reveal, perhaps as much as any other facet, the degree to which an institution is dedicated to student-centeredness. Certainly the diversity of backgrounds of the student population of a typical community college demands an equal degree of diversity in the educational offerings. These offerings must have a relevance, a concern with "here-and-now," if students are to find them meaningful or even palatable. Such a concept does not suggest that the curriculum must be shaped and reshaped by every minute whim and passing fancy, but it does suggest that there must be a constant refinement in the relation of subject matter to the real needs and concerns of the students who comprise the clientele of the college.

Curricular considerations must include a redefinition of the role of general education, of liberal education, of occupational education. Certainly the false dichotomies, especially those that tended to relegate certain kinds of education to positions of less importance or less prestige, have little place in a student-oriented community college. A re-thinking can help us realize that the best of occupational education can indeed be most liberalizing and that liberal education can hardly be a freedom-producing experience if it is devoid of occupational implications.

Personnel Services

It seems almost anomalous to say that student personnel services must be designed with students in mind, and yet it does seem necessary to say so. Recent history and recent investigations have shown that student personnel workers may be as far divorced and alienated from the real needs and concerns of students as the most traditional instructor or administrator. It is perhaps as easy to inaugurate and perpetuate student personnel programs (testing programs, registration rituals) for their own sake as it is to teach Latin for Latin's sake or art for art's sake. In instances of student unrest and uprising over the last several years, rare has it been that a student personnel worker has emerged as the leader in the

restoration of the rightful functioning of the institution. The Raines-Carnegie Study demonstrated dramatically the great gap between practice and promise of junior college student personnel programs.

Yet the fact remains (or my faith remains strong) that a campus is extremely unlikely to qualify as student-centered that does not possess a pervasive and meaningful program of student personnel services. As we have noted elsewhere, "I am convinced that student personnel work can and must come to full fruition in a comprehensive junior college. No other educational institution can afford the broad expanse of educational opportunities that provide a setting in which student choices can be so fully implemented. By the same token, students generally have reached a level of maturity and a time of life when most important decisions can and must be made. Opportunities and necessities then combine to make the junior college the ideal setting for the most effective student personnel programs."

The effects of student personnel services upon the student can and should be both direct and indirect: direct in the sense of providing specific contribution toward human behavioral change, and indirect in the sense of assisting the student to take full advantage of the other educational opportunities available to him within the institution. Even in the indirect services, however, (placement, financial aid, registration, academic advisement) procedures can be developed that remove them from the purely mechanical into the realm of growth-producing experiences. Certainly much can be done to prevent the negative effect toward readiness to learn that may frequently be observed in their practice at some institutions. The potential services of these procedures in facilitating the learning facilitators can hardly be over-emphasized.

A by-product of these services is the attention that may be directed toward the selection and nurturing of the faculty and staff of the institution. Not only is it necessary for a student-centered institution that student services themselves should be adequately staffed by professionals possessing the highest possible degree of efficiency and dedication, but that the entire faculty must be selected with the primary criterion that of possessing the so-called student personnel point-of-view and, hopefully, at least mildly sophisticated and sympathetic with the potentialities of

student personnel services. Reciprocal relationships and mutual understanding and respect for the contributions that each can make is an essential characteristic of the entire faculty of a student-oriented institution. A college that truly serves its students is not one that is characterized by inefficiency or confusion of roles. On the contrary, one of the most important contributions to the education of students may very well be their opportunity to witness effective, democratic, and dedicated participation on the part of every member of the staff and faculty.

Yet it is in the direct student personnel services (chiefly counseling and related educational processes) that student-centeredness can reach full fruition.

We would basically define counseling as teaching with the individual student as the subject matter. Traditionally, counseling has been considered as a face-to-face, person-to-person kind of relationship to the extent that the expression "individual counseling" was considered to be redundant and the expression "group counseling" a contradiction in terms. In more recent years, however, emphasis has shifted from technique to purpose and result, with the rather happy conclusion that many of the favorable outcomes previously believed to accrue only from individual, one-to-one relationships are believed to be equally resultant from far less expensive group procedures. A number of colleges are now experimenting with a course designed as central to the general education program that provides intensive group experience, the purpose of which is self-discovery and increased self-realization on a highly individualized basis.

Adoption of these or similar programs of activities takes a boldness, a spirit of adventure, and a willingness occasionally to be wrong. Who has ever heard of a college that boldly and clearly has stated that opportunities for individual counseling, for example, might indeed be preferable to a formal class in Greek Drama for meeting certain ones of its aims for a particular student whose needs have been clearly isolated and defined. Yet such action might be typical of the kind that is necessary and most desirable if we are indeed to match college resources with student needs. It is only as we are dedicated to such a proposition that student services can indeed become the integral aspect of higher education that we have long in vain expected them to be and that colleges can indeed

approach their task in the scientific method appropriate to the age in which we live.

If we genuinely believe in student-centeredness, we will indeed forsake our reticence about the appropriateness of the study of man. We will indeed begin to believe that the proper study of mankind is man—not man in the generic, but the individual himself of himself. It is only as man knows himself that he can become a fully participating citizen of his nation and of his world and that he can become the flexible, innovative, re-creating individual demanded of an educative, democratic society.

Evaluation Finally, it is our contention that a student-centered institution is research directed. The college dedicated to student growth will almost by definition be determined continuously to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of its services. Only by having and using appropriate evaluative devices can there be a true appraisal of the worth of the enterprise and, in turn, be provided an adequate base for further appropriate development of the services and programs of the institution.

Institutional evaluation is a complex and complicated task, made so by the difficulty of the control of variables, the multiple possible interpretations of time factors, and, perhaps most treacherous of all, the determination of adequate criteria. The complexities of these problems, however, should not in any sense be considered insurmountable barriers either to the continuation and expansion of the development of the services that we believe to be so vital in meeting legitimate educational aims, nor in the evaluation and assessment of these services with the constant goal of improving them. Rather than discouraging us from attempting this all-important process, recognition of the problems and complexities should enable us to pursue our evaluations on a continually more effective and sophisticated level.

Throughout this discussion, we have attempted to indicate that the determination of a college to serve its individual students must indeed be a reflection of the true and abiding character of that institution. We have said that there are many areas and many relationships in which the institution has an opportunity to prove to the student that his development is the institution's most important reason for existence and that the

institution has indeed a character and constitution worthy of the student's time and energies. Student-centeredness is not soft, vague, and merely permissive; it is, on the contrary, total and disciplined dedication to the greatest of all callings, assistance to a fellow human being as he seeks maximum and optimum achievement of an almost limitless potential.

J. W. F.

S. V. MARTORANA

A public community-junior college can be extremely helped or seriously handicapped in fulfilling the educational purposes for which it is founded by the site and physical facilities from which it operates. Founders of new community-junior colleges, therefore, should be especially sensitive to the relationships that exist between the educational program elements of these institutions and the characteristics of campus sites.

Guiding Principles for Site Selection

In other words, the first and most important point to be established in a discussion of principles and procedures to guide decision makers in selecting a location for a new community-junior college is that the unique educational objectives of this type of post-high school institution must be kept constantly in mind. All other decisions and judgments must flow from the recognized and accepted objectives of the college. Only when this is remembered and followed by the responsible authorities as the paramount guiding principle will other supporting principles and guidelines make sense and be useful.

This paper begins, therefore, with a brief discussion of some of the relationships between educational purposes and principles in site selection believed to be of major importance in getting new community-junior colleges under way. Sections follow which present procedures for

Continued on next page

Dr. Martorana is Vice-Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges for the State University of New York. He received his education at the State University College at Buffalo, New York and the University of Chicago, where he received the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees. Prior to assuming his present position as the New York State coordinator for junior college education, Dr. Martorana served as Director of the Office of Planning in Higher Education for the State of New York, having also served in a variety of administrative roles in the U.S. Office of Education and in junior colleges in several states.



80
Page 81

selection of sites and for involving local and state-level interests in the final decisions for locating the new institution.

Relating Site Selection to Educational Goals

During the past six decades or so over which the public community-junior colleges came to be recognized as a firm and important component of post-high school and higher education in American education, convictions about the educational services and programs to be provided by this new type of college crystallized in the minds of both educators and public leaders. As a result, there is today relatively little debate as to the objectives that community-junior colleges should seek to accomplish in their programs of instruction and related public services. The major points of consensus can be stated concisely and related to guiding principles of site selection in the following manner.

Educational Goal No. 1

A public community-junior college is generally strongly committed to an "open door" admissions policy that provides opportunity for associate degree programs (basic, lower-division college education and vocational, technical, and semi-professional training) and related instruction to all highschool graduates in the colleges' service area and to all adults (whether or not they graduated from high school) who can profit by such further education and training.

Related principles for site selection. — To be in keeping with an "open door" admissions policy a public community-junior college must be as accessible as possible to all of the population in the service area. This means that the college site should be near the center of population or, if somewhat off center, toward the direction that population growth in the future is likely to take. Further, it must be on good roads and on main routes of public transportation. Since many of the students in community-junior colleges travel by personal auto, adequate parking space is an essential to encouraging and facilitating student attendance.

Educational Goal No. 2

A community-junior college is usually committed to providing a full range of educational programs and services that will meet the interests, abilities, and talents of the full spectrum of post-high-school

youth and adults who are engaged in programs at the Associate-degree level in higher education. This means that the college will attempt in every way to find, develop, and offer all sorts of programs and services that can be helpful to the student, including vocational preparation, liberal arts and university-parallel courses of freshman and sophomore level, and assistance in remedial and compensatory educational programs that will help the student to recover from deficiencies in his earlier educational experience.

Related principles in site selection. — The physical locus of a community-junior college must provide for planned use of land and facilities to support a wide, comprehensive array of vocational courses, technical and semi-professional programs, and a wide range of liberal arts courses of freshman and sophomore higher educational level. All of these programs require the educational support of libraries, general classrooms, special meeting rooms, and general laboratories. The vocational, technical, and semi-professional programs will call for an extensive commitment of space to large special purpose laboratories and shops.

An idea of the large commitment of physical space involved in support of a program of this sort is provided by looking at two community colleges located to serve population centers about the size of that of Tulsa. Hudson Valley Community College in the Capital District Area of New York State with a population base of about 500,000 has a campus of 125 acres and offers more than 30 different specialties of a vocational, technical, and semi-professional nature. Monroe Community College, located in Rochester, New York, serves over 750,000 people. It recently moved into a new completely developed campus of over 100 acres and, though only five years old, is offering more than 25 career specialties of Associate degree level in addition to university-parallel, liberal arts, and basic vocational programs. Illustrative of the special programs offered at these two community colleges are dental hygiene, dental assisting, electronics technology, data processing, nursing, medical secretarial, general secretarial, bio-medical engineering technology, and recreational leadership.

Educational Goal No. 3

Development of individual capabilities, interests, and talents and recognition of the identity of every student as a person is a primary

objective of a public community-junior college. The institution seeks constantly to let the student understand that it respects his individual background and that it is committed to help him toward greater personal, social, cultural, and economic fulfillment in every way possible.

Related principles in site selection. — The community-junior college campus should instill in the student a pride in his college campus, a realization that on it provision is made for assessment of his personal talent and interest, and a realization that on the campus he enjoys reasonably gracious and commodious facilities for study, contemplation, and out-of-class relaxation. To do this the physical setting of the campus should be attractive, the general environs indicative of a serious public intent to elevate student aspirations and achievement, and the over-all physical space adequate to provide for full complement of student recreational, co-curricular, and cultural enrichment programs for all classifications of students who enroll.

In order to achieve the goal indicated it is essential also that the campus be chosen and planned to prevent the development of a large monolithic college in which the identity of the individual student is lost. If, for example, an enrollment of 8000 can be foreseen, it would be wiser to develop two campuses each of 4000 than to build only one to have 8000.

The heavy emphasis of community-junior colleges is to serve the student who lives at home and commutes daily to college. Therefore, student housing facilities are not available resources whereby stress on the identity of the individual student can be demonstrated. In place of this, however, the more creative and effective urban community-junior colleges are exploring and refining other means and techniques for making students "feel at home" and at ease on the campus. This requires large commitments to student lounges, recreational areas, locker rooms and other storage spaces for personal belongings, individual and small group discussion and study spaces, special rooms for listening to recordings and viewing television programs, and other types of facilities that recognize the extended periods that students will spend on the campus. This concept under the heading "Twenty-four Hour Learning Center," was a key one in the extensive planning sessions conducted recently by Borough of Manhattan Community College in New York City which brought together local,

state, and national leaders in the field of community-junior college facilities planning to help envision the shape that the college's new campus is to take.

Educational Goal No. 4

The community-junior college is a center for community social and cultural enrichment as well as one which contributes to educational advancement of the locality it serves.

Related principles in site selection. — This objective, as do those already mentioned, emphasizes the essential qualities of accessibility, space to have special purpose facilities such as meeting rooms and food services, and the need of space for parking of private automobiles. When planned to be a cultural and social enrichment, a community-junior college usually finds ready and responsive audiences in the population, even when there already exists in the area a good number of well known and established programs and resources. In Nassau County, for example, where some of the finest dramatic and literary productions are close at hand, Nassau Community College developed its annual Walt Whitman Festival for which it is becoming widely famous.

Educational Goal No. 5

Community-junior colleges strive toward instructional excellence, geared to the needs of each individual student and employing all techniques and aides that contribute to the highest achievements in teaching. These colleges, therefore, are recognized for their emphasis on instruction rather than on research and scholarly production which are emphasized in the universities.

Related principles in site selection. — Among the concepts and techniques that contribute to excellence of instruction are the availability and use of such techniques as cooperative work-study programs and new media of communication such as closed circuit TV, computer assisted learning, dial accessed library resources, and electronically equipped study carrels at which students can study independently. Use of these aides and techniques, coupled with frequent and regular student-teacher-counselor conferences, seem the strongest bases for good teaching and learning. As a consequence, community-junior colleges are turning to planning and

development of "learning and instructional resource centers." These buildings are, in effect, the depots where all sorts of special devices, aides, and resources for instruction are concentrated and made available on a massive scale to students and faculty alike. "Instructional Resources Centers" are planned in the capital construction programs of all new community colleges in New York State.

To implement all this, a public community-junior college should have a large campus located in the "hub" of modern socio-technological, and commercial and industrial progress. Utilities involving "heavy use" loads should be planned, space for faculty offices is essential, and public access for teachers, students, special consultants and resources people is very important.

One contrast between Community-Junior College Planning and Four-Year College or University Planning should be noted: Community-junior colleges concentrate on instruction as their chief objective; while four-year colleges and universities are in addition committed to basic research and scholarly production. Campuses for community-junior colleges need not, therefore, make provision for such resources as research libraries or highly advanced research laboratories and equipment.

Conclusions Concerning Site Characteristics

Taken altogether, the foregoing discussion brings out the conclusions that an effective site for a public community-junior college (as suggested in the research paper) should have these characteristics:

1. Space — 40 acres if an urban setting (100 acres if in a suburban or rural setting).
2. Accessibility — near good roads, on routes of public transportation, etc.
3. Good esthetics and environment — neighborhood, age or obsolescence of surroundings, etc.
4. Sound "buildability" qualities — drainage, sound soil base, etc.
5. Adequate utilities — electricity, water, gas, sewage, etc.

Given these basic essentials of educational primacy, the authorities responsible for founding a new community-junior college, of course, should

seek to acquire a site at the lowest possible costs. Wise use of public funds requires that expenditures for capital resources, as for all costs, be kept to the lowest level possible consistent with the offering of sound educational programs and services. Guidelines relative to costs, however, cannot be offered validly in the absence of specific information about many factors in the local community. In New York State, experience with prevailing wagescales, land acquisition rates, and general building costs supports the current practice of estimating land acquisition and capital construction for an initial campus at about \$4,500 per full-time equivalent student to be accommodated on the campus. In other states where different wage scales and building cost factors exist, a different factor in estimating costs could be validly expected.

Procedures for Sound Site Selection

If the general practice among urban community-junior colleges is accepted as a valid guide, an early decision as to location upon which all others will depend is whether or not the new college is to operate from a single or from a number of coordinated sites. Although there are instances of community-junior colleges which serve relatively large populations from a single campus, the trend over the nation is for "district wide" planning which seeks, as already indicated, to prevent the development of a single monolithic institution and to reach out into the total community by establishing several campus locations. Examples of urban community-junior colleges which still serve their clienteles from a single campus are found in Baltimore, Maryland; Phoenix, Arizona; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The number of colleges in this classification is decreasing, however, and much smaller than the list of urban community-junior colleges that are operating on a multi-campus plan. Among the latter group would be those in St. Louis, Miami, Chicago, and Cleveland.

The conclusion seems to be increasingly accepted that it is difficult if not impossible to maintain the fundamental educational characteristics and purposes of a comprehensive public community-junior college and simultaneously to serve all segments of the population in a large metropolitan center.

Almost inevitably authorities responsible for a new community-

junior college will have to choose the site or sites from which the college will operate from among a number that will be identified as possibilities. Beyond being alerted to the need to keep constantly in mind the importance of relating the basic principles of site selection to the over-all educational purposes of a community-junior college, the decision makers should also be cautioned against starting too quickly to discuss actual parcels of property until the general principles identified to guide selection have been translated into a rather detailed and specific list of criteria for evaluation of all locations proposed in the new college's service area.

Whether it is to be the sole site or the first of a planned number of coordinated sites in a community-junior college service area, the initial site for a new college should stand the test of being the best among all possible alternatives.

The check-list of criteria for evaluating sites used in New York State has six major sections of varying importance weighted as follows:

Accessibility	250	points
Site Characteristics	250	points
(Buildability)		
Costs	175	
Size	150	
Environment	100	
Integration with Regional Planning	<u>75</u>	
	1000	Maximum

Though it is possible to argue the merits of the various factors and therefore the total score under sites of varying conditions, the use of such a rating scheme will provide a reasonably objective device for ranking the different sites under consideration.

Armed with such a device for objectifying their observations and judgments a team of three or four persons expert in various aspects of site evaluation can exercise strong discriminatory capacity in pointing out the relative merits of one proposed site to another. Use of such a "site selection consultant team" is quite common, especially when a local decision is highly controversial or special technical issues are present.

Generally speaking, four types of expertise should be included among the persons serving on the "site selection consultant team." Each of the four areas covers an essential consideration concerning the character and quality of a location for a public comprehensive community college.

Because the site, as has been repeatedly stressed in this paper, must be one that contributes positively to the successful accomplishment of the educational purposes of a public community-junior college, one of the members of the team should be an individual who is knowledgeable and experienced in the administration and development of such institutions. Indeed, this element of the over-all evaluation is considered to be so important that often more than one such expert is included in the consultant group.

Another area of examination that calls for experienced advice is that of the architectural and engineering characteristics of proposed sites. For coverage of such questions as: What advantages or disadvantages does a proposed location have for architectural development of the buildings? Have the necessary tests of soil conditions been made and are the results acceptable and what problems, if any, will be encountered when the necessary utilities at the campus are developed or tried into other existing systems? It is essential that a person qualified as an architectural or civil engineer be on the team.

A third member ought to be an individual who understands and is experienced in the field of city or regional planning. This person would be responsible for examining the relationships the proposed site hold to existing civic planning, zoning requirements, possible far reaching shifts in highway and mass transit systems and related programs which must be critically evaluated early to forestall the possibility of embarrassing developments with respect to the way that the college will ultimately relate to the community which immediately surrounds it.

Finally, there is the question of costs, ease of acquisition of title to property, relationship to properties that would have to be condemned or acquired through procedures of eminent domain and related legal and quasi-legal matters. In this regard, someone with sensitivity and training

in the field of land acquisition for educational use will be a helpful person on the team. This does not mean to say that the consultant team will be expected to advise on or settle fully the questions relating to cost and ease of acquisition that will be identified and connected with proposed sites. This is too extensive and intensive a task for an *ad hoc* consultant group to complete within normal allowances of time and resources provided for their work. The full examination of these questions and final details concerning purchases or other means of acquisition must ultimately be handled by qualified legal and business staff of the authorities under which the college operates. The point of having someone with depth of background in the area of relative costs and problems of land acquisition is to assure that this point of sensitivity is present among the makeup of the consultant team and that possible complications that can arise from these considerations will be given due consideration during the very initial stages of deliberation about the advantages or disadvantages of proposed locations.

Where would such a consultant team come from? The answer to this question, which almost always is asked when the idea of a special consultant team is suggested to assist in the identification and selection of a community-junior college site is: Preferably from among persons who have been actively engaged in this kind of work in other localities and even other states than the one in which the new institution is being established. The reasons for such a reply are fairly obvious. They derive from the fact that selection of a site for a new college almost always generates a great deal of local interest and often a high degree of emotional involvement within the community. There is merit, therefore, in getting advice and information that evaluate different site proposals from persons who have established reputations for professional service in this work and who, because they are not local personnel, can maintain an attitude of objectivity in their examinations and reports.

There are many actual case histories of the selection of sites of public community-junior colleges that show the merits of use of an outside consultant team like the one suggested. One that attracted widespread attention was that for Sullivan Community College in New York State. The local issues surrounding the choice from among three sites, each

strongly supported by different local factions, became so intense that the community was severely fractioned over them and ultimately court actions were taken by some of the rivalling parties. It was not until a special consultant team from outside the state was brought in to examine the several sites and report recommendations on them to the local and state officials that the matter was settled. The fact that the objectivity of the consultant group was unquestionable contributed heavily to resolution of the problem and restoration of community support for the college.

Local and State Approval of Locations

By its very nature and from its basic educational functions a public community-junior college must be an institution that is a closely functioning unit of its community. It follows, therefore, that the local constituency which the college will have to serve ought to have some voice in locating their institution. Simultaneously, it must be observed, however, that there is also a broader interest in the community-junior college which must be recognized in locating the institution. The larger interest is represented in the state which generally has at least two types of involvement demanding its attention. First, land acquisition and capital costs of public community-junior colleges are increasingly becoming a state responsibility and, second, educational programs and services of these institutions must be placed meaningfully into a broad, well-planned, and coordinated enterprise for post-high school education that is sound and meaningful from both local and statewide perspectives.

The simple conclusion that flows from the fact that there is both a local and statewide interest in locations of public community-junior colleges is that both the local constituency and the general state citizenry ought to be represented in the decisions involved. This is what actually happens in most states with well-established procedures for planning and developing their public community-junior college systems. However, the actual mechanisms for preservation of local and state voice in the decisions vary widely. In many states, like California, New York, Florida, Illinois, and Michigan, there are both local and state agencies with official roles to play in locating new community-junior colleges. In these states, generally speaking the local and state agencies have worked out ways that

criteria believed to be essential to the interests of each level are established, accepted, and used in site selections.

Although not legally required and often not officially structured, the principle suggested in the last sentence of the preceding paragraph is also followed in site selection of new community-junior colleges in states which have no legally empowered agency for the governance of public community-junior colleges. Such states include Massachusetts, Minnesota, Kentucky, and Colorado.

The local community leadership ought to be consulted, given a chance to react, and given opportunity to participate in the formulation of the general criteria upon which decision as to location of the institution will be made. Awareness of the reasons why accessibility to the population to be served; adequacy of space for buildings and facilities to support a complete, comprehensive program; and pleasantness of surroundings, for example, are important to development of effectiveness in community-junior college educational services and will contribute to local acceptance and support of decisions as to location when they are made and finally become matters of public knowledge.

Increasingly among the several states, however, it is becoming evident that the final decision as to location of a new community-junior college must be one in which a state agency has a very influential role if not final authority. This conclusion is based not only on the fact already mentioned that the state's tax funds are growing in support of community-junior college capital costs, but also from the facts that state-level agencies are involved in the administration of Federal programs of fiscal support for college building and, finally, they coordinate and plan for the long-range effectiveness and improvement of all higher educational programs on a statewide basis.

Summary and Conclusion

Selection of a site for a community-junior college is a decision which once made is characterized by its relative permanency and irrevocability. This fact, together with the general observations that site selection is a matter involving investment of sizeable amounts of money and one around which both local and state-wide interests and pressures can develop, dictates that responsible officials

be counselled to approach the decision with as much prior study, objectivity of approach and procedure, and firmness of educational principle as they possibly can.

Paramount among the considerations which must be kept in mind when a site for a new community-junior college is chosen is the unique educational role that this institution is expected to perform in a well-planned and coordinated system of post-high school education in a state. Other supporting considerations require that expert assistance be procured by authorities responsible for the new institution to judge proposed sites from the standpoints of architectural-engineering characteristics; accommodation to local, regional, and statewide planning; and ease and expense of acquisition and development. Such assistance by knowledgeable and experienced professional personnel from outside the locality and state where the new college is being considered is generally a good idea to assure impersonal evaluation and freedom from local pressures.

In the final analysis, the agency responsible at the state level for the long-range planning and coordination of higher education, including community-junior college education has to bear heaviest responsibility for the location of a new institution. In such states as Oklahoma where there is a long-standing practice and acceptance of the importance of maintaining a statewide perspective in higher educational affairs, the setting for a thorough and judicious determination of the location of the new college in Tulsa appears to be advantageous and the promise held for its future development, therefore, very bright.

S. V. M.

JAMES L. WATTENBARGER

The rapid development of the community junior colleges in the various states has pointed up both good and poor examples of solutions to the problems associated with site selection. Seldom, if ever, does the selection of a specific site meet with support and approval of all citizens. In a few instances the progress of the college itself has been severely hampered and often delayed by bitter arguments, harsh recriminations and petulant personal battles over this designation.

Guidelines For Site Selection

In most of these instances the situations to some extent could have been avoided. There are sound professionally valid procedures which can be used. There are enough objective data which can be obtained to enable unemotional decisions to be reached. There is no need to permit site selection decisions to be made by intrigue, patronage, or even by ignorance.

The community junior college is a different kind of college. It is designed to bring higher education to the people—not to limit it to a few. Its purpose is to serve as many as can take advantage of its educational services—not to establish barriers to eliminate a portion of the population. The community junior college is not an “ivory tower” institution—it is an integral part of “main street.”

Continued on next page

Dr. Wattenbarger is Professor and Director of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida, Gainesville. He received his education at the University of Florida, where he received the Doctor of Education Degree in 1950. As Executive Officer of the State Junior College Board in Florida for ten years, Dr. Wattenbarger was the principal architect of the plan which brought junior colleges in Florida within commuting distance of 99% of that state's population. During that period of time he helped to plan and establish some 24 public junior colleges in Florida.



²⁴
Page 95

The early development of these institutions followed the pattern previously established by the four year liberal arts colleges. Sites were chosen in terms of how well they could be isolated from the rest of society. Often inaccessible, usually outside of a small town, sometimes surrounded by a fence, brick wall or at least a psychological barrier, these institutions often intentionally emphasized the gap between town and gown.

Although the early development of community junior colleges followed this pattern, such is not the case in recent years! Since 1960 the emphasis has shifted to the urban needs for this educational opportunity. New community colleges have been established to serve St. Louis, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Dallas, Ft. Worth, Miami, Tampa, Boston, Jacksonville, Seattle, Pittsburg, and Washington, D.C. New institutions and/or new campuses of existing colleges have increased the service capabilities of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, and other cities where earlier development had occurred.

Along with these developments the concept of the multi-campus institution has become the major basis for site selection in urban areas. This concept is actually a part of the basic community college philosophy—accessibility to students. The ability of an individual to get to an institution is a major factor in determining how well he may use an educational opportunity. Perhaps the ideal location would be “just down the block” from every person’s home. Obviously this is impossible so the compromise is to make this statement true insofar as is possible. There must be, of course, a large enough group of students available to permit economical, efficient, and quality operation of the institution. While evidence as to the optimum size of a college campus is not available, there is enough experience in various parts of the country to substantiate the assumption that approximately 50000 full time day students is a maximum desirable size in most situations and that 3000 FTE day students is not too small.

In urban areas this fact means that long range planning requires consideration of the multi-campus organization. The alternatives might be establishing institutions that grow too large or subdividing the district into smaller independent college attendance areas. Neither of these solutions will prove to be particularly desirable.

If this concept is accepted early in the planning for a new urban area then the following guidelines relative to multi-campus site selection are pertinent:

1. All sites will be interrelated. It is, therefore, imperative that the first site be identified with due consideration given to all others which will be needed in the future. The total area of the district to be served is the basic important consideration. All sites must relate to each other within the total area to be served.
2. The immediate and the long range patterns of highways, freeways, and throughways is also a most important consideration. Access in an urban area is measured in time required for travel, not in distance traveled.
3. All segments of the population to be served must be considered. It is undesirable to label any single campus as one designed to serve a limited segment of the population by program or location.
4. Public transportation systems should be considered. Any method of cutting down personal auto travel will be helpful.
5. Consideration should be given to developing more than one site at the same time in most urban areas when the population to be served exceeds 200,000.

There are several specific examples of this multi-campus community college development which can be examined. Dallas County Junior College District and Tarrant County Junior College (Fort Worth) in Texas have demonstrated this principle in an excellent fashion. Miami-Dade Junior College, Hillsborough Junior College (Tampa), St. Petersburg Junior College, Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, Valencia Junior College (Orlando), as well as several others in Florida are all operated and/or planned for multi-campus organization. St. Louis Junior College District as well as several other recently developed institutions began operation on a multi-campus basis. This pattern is more common than unusual in the large California institutions. The reasons for this type of planning are similar in all of these instances.

It should be remembered, however, that although each site in a multi-campus organization has a relationship to the other sites, each site must be evaluated separately in regard to specific criteria which are described herein. These criteria have been evolved over a period of years and are applicable in all situations. They must be considered in relationship to each other and although a particular site may rate very low in regard to one criterion, it may still be a valuable potential site because of the outstanding manner in which it meets other criteria.

Accessibility The basic purpose of a community college is to make education beyond high school available to all people in the community.

A site then, must be as accessible as possible to as many people as possible. It should be located in a center of the population to be served. The minimum time for the maximum number of students to travel to the site should be a basic measurement. Traffic patterns as controlled by roads should be a major concern. Safety of ingress and egress for vehicular traffic is of primary importance. Safe and rapid movement to and from the site in all seasons of the year should be considered in evaluating the level of accessibility. In some instances the availability of nearby student employment opportunities may be considered since in most instances more than half the enrollment will work part time. The availability of public transportation (if available) should also be considered. The community junior college of the near future will operate in the night time as well as day, making all of these factors important in relationship to after-dark traffic as well as daytime traffic. A knowledge of the urban development plans of a modern city is essential in determining a location of a community junior college site.

Environment The surrounding area immediately adjacent to a proposed site must be evaluated in terms of the environment. It is important

that the zoning laws in operation protect the college site from noxious odors, undesirable noises, and deleterious moral influences. The surrounding area should be zoned to eliminate the types of industrial and business development which would be undesirable and disruptive to the educational process. Specific traffic hazards, easements which prevent proper campus development, air traffic patterns, and similar problems should be avoided.

Attractive residences, selected business, light industry and similar sur-

roundings will engender pride and at the same time will not interfere with the educational process.

Topography The site should be carefully evaluated in terms of the general topographic condition. Gently rolling contours are much to be desired. No barriers such as rivers, quarries, railroads, etc., should split the sites. Consideration of the value of natural resources for instruction may be an important item. A careful check on surface and subsurface drainage conditions substantiated by engineering studies and test borings are essential. The amount of usable land is a major criterion. Tree cover should be considered. Beauty cannot be over-emphasized.

Shape The shape of the site should be generally a rectangle. The sides should be regular and compact. A long thin rectangle is not as desirable as a short fat one. Consideration of local weather phenomena will aid in developing the proper orientation of the site. The possible future need to expand cannot be ignored and this factor should be considered as important.

Size The time to obtain land is before buildings are constructed. After the college is constructed it becomes difficult to use properly additional land especially as it relates to well developed campus master development plans. Later land will be more expensive, more difficult to obtain, and harder to incorporate into the total plan. The actual size then should be as large as practicable with the understanding that an "inner city" site will be smaller than a suburban site. A rule of thumb which has been a valid and defensible minimum is to provide a basic 100 acres plus 2 acres for each 100 students, making 200 acres a minimum size for a 5000 student college. This must be usable land free from any kind of obstructions. Inner city sites may be smaller but must be judged in reference to other bases.

Utilities The availability of utilities may affect the cost of the site considerably. If the college must furnish its own water and sewage, a sizable item of cost is added. Electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal are costly items when they are not readily available.

Availability Although it would seem unnecessary to mention it, the availability of a site is an important consideration. If it would require legal action such as condemnation to obtain the site, it may not be as desirable as others which are more readily available. The present use of the land may affect its availability for immediate future use.

Potential for Campus Development The site should be clearly one which has potential for sound campus development. The possible groupings of buildings, landscaping, and potential circulation patterns should be functional, economical, and attractive—they should be such as would “touch the heart and enlarge the vision.” The campus development plan should encourage orderly expansion with proper balance in design. A functional use of the land should be possible with proper attention to vehicular traffic on the periphery and pedestrian traffic in the heart.

Common admonishments such as these listed below should be considered in the campus development plan and therefore potentially considered during the site selection.

1. Buildings should not be scattered too far apart.
2. Recognition from the beginning that growth is inevitable is essential.
3. Even in the latter part of the 1900's pedestrian traffic is important. Plan for it.
4. Odd shaped buildings for no real purpose should be avoided.
5. A community college should not be designed to shut people out but rather to invite them in.
6. Certain facilities require special servicing considerations; the library and the receiving center are two examples.
7. Campus zoning is as important as zoning the adjacent areas.
8. Flexibility should be built into the campus development plan.

Page 100 In order to implement the guidelines described herein and to avoid the mistakes suggested above, it is important to consider carefully

the steps required in site selection. These may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. There should be an analysis of all factors which may conceivably affect the selection of a site location.
2. These should be clearly stated as criteria against which each site will be evaluated.
3. The Board selecting a site should adopt these as its criteria. This should be done prior to examination of any suggested site.
4. There should be an analysis of all demographic and/or other information which will influence the site selection.
5. Using this information, general areas where possible site location may be found should be identified.
6. Specific locations should then be identified and a determination made regarding their availability.
7. Individuals offering sites should be given an opportunity to submit information regarding sites they would like to offer.
8. Complete data regarding each site should be collected. Such data should include (but not be limited to) legal description, general description including size, shape, topography, easements, and test boring information, etc., availability of utilities, police and fire protection, and related public services. (Engineering studies and detailed borings may be delayed until sites have been evaluated and those which are clearly unacceptable eliminated.)
9. Each site should then be evaluated and placed in a priority ranking based upon these objective data.

10. Evaluation should be carried out by an uninterested group of five (or three) persons who are knowledgeable about community college sites.
11. These persons should report fully on
 - a) suitability of each site under consideration for college use
 - b) extent to which previously approved criteria are met
 - c) analysis of initial and continuing costs
 - d) relative desirability or a priority ranking.
12. Report of selection team should be presented to the Board.
13. Board should make its decision and arrange to obtain the selected site(s).

J. L. W.

JAMES W. REYNOLDS

There are many junior colleges in this country in which the leaders may have wished that the physical plant developed over a 20-year period could be picked up bodily and set down on a more appropriate site. Chances are, that if such an act were possible, which, of course, it is not, problems growing out of an inappropriate site would disappear. The moral of this story is simply that site selection is of great importance. Mistakes made are paid for by the junior college over all the years of its life.

Principles of Site Selection

Site selection committees invariably are subjected to many pressures, among which are political, financial, and personal. Frequently, mistakes in site selection grow out of yielding to such pressures. To withstand such pressures, and keep the possibility of mistakes to a minimum, there are certain principles which if followed will accomplish both of these ends.

These principles have been developed over the years out of many selections of site. Since conditions vary from locality to locality the principles are stated broadly. The attainment of breadth in the statements has not been made at the expense of providing definite directions for procedure.

Continued on next page

Dr. Reynolds, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Texas at Austin, is a nationally recognized authority on junior college education. He holds a Doctor of Philosophy degree from the University of Chicago, where he received the Susan Colver Rosenberger Prize for Research in 1946. His previous teaching career includes professorships at the University of Georgia, 1945-46, University of Chicago, summer, 1946, and George Peabody College for Teachers, 1946-48. Dr. Reynolds has written extensively for the Junior College Journal, Journal of Educational Research, and other journals. He also has published a book, "The Junior College". He is a past president of the Association for Higher Education.



The author is indebted for the statement of principles to Dr. Dow Patterson, California State Board of Education. The principles as stated here are adapted from Dr. Patterson's article, "Planning the Junior College Site," American School Board Journal, April, 1961, pps. 30-31.

Page 103

Size of the Site

One very common mistake made in relation to this principle is that of providing a site that is too small. When this mistake is made, the educational program of the junior college is restricted, and space for natural expansion is not available. It is assumed the program for the Tulsa Junior College will approximate that of the other state junior colleges in Oklahoma. It is assumed also that the enrollment will exceed 2,000 students. To serve an enrollment and a program of this nature adequately, the site should include 100 to 125 acres.

If an agriculture program is contemplated for this junior college, additional acreage will be needed for laboratory purposes. Since this land does not need to adjoin the main campus, size recommendations are left to the judgment of those responsible for developing this program.

Care should be exercised in selecting a site of this acreage to be sure that all of the land is usable. Moreover, the site should be approximately rectangular in shape. Irregular shaped sites present serious problems for efficient campus lay-out.

Topography and Soils

The site should be selected with particular attention to natural drainage. If possible, it should have a slightly rolling surface and under no condition should it be lower than the surrounding land. It should be so situated, and contours should be such that rainwater will run off naturally.

Test borings should be made to ascertain the nature of the subsoil. Two criteria should be observed in regard to the subsoil: (1) good drainage, and (2) good footings for foundations.

Good topsoil is needed even though a substantial portion of it will be covered by buildings, walks, service roads, and parking lots. The uncovered portion will be used for lawns, shrubbery, and flower beds for which a good topsoil will be very much needed.

Location

The most desirable location for the site is in a quiet neighborhood. The site should be located well away from industrial areas to avoid air pollution, noise, and industrial odors. While the location must be made with serious consideration to accessibility, it should not be adjacent to a major highway. The factors here are safety, noise and air pollution. Care

should be exercised to locate the site away from prevailing flight patterns of commercial airlines. The noise made by commercial aircraft taking off or landing can be very disturbing.

Occasionally, abandoned military or industrial sites are taken over by junior colleges. Such a step should be studied with great care. The factors which made the location desirable for its original purpose often do not work with equal advantage for a junior college.

Accessibility The factor of accessibility is in some respects only the other side of the coin of location. Obviously, there is a close relationship between these two factors.

It is assumed that the junior college for Tulsa will enroll day students only; that no dormitories are contemplated. On this basis, accessibility is best served by being near major thoroughfares but not immediately adjacent to them. For students, accessibility means the provision of adequate parking facilities.

A second group for whom accessibility must be provided are those who make up the several service agencies needed by the college. The same criteria should prevail as those suggested for the students. In addition the site should be so selected as to make possible the needed service roads.

Finally, the principle of accessibility applies to such public utilities as water, sewer, gas, and electric lines. Fire protection should also be available.

Financial Cost Factors relating to financial cost of the site are subject to far too many local conditions to warrant a positive statement of principles. There is, however, one precaution that should be observed. Penny pinching in the purchase of the site can prove in the long run the most expensive outlay made. True bargains in the matter of cost are always to be welcomed, but illusory bargains should be strictly avoided.

**Community
Use**

Another assumption made about the contemplated junior college for Tulsa is that it will have many attributes of a community college. This will mean that in addition to adult education, the college will present dramatic, musical, and artistic programs for the community as well as the college, that the facilities of the college will be available for serving reasonable community purposes. The extent that the community can be brought into the college program will depend to no small degree on the location of the site and to its accessibility.

Attractiveness

The success of any educational institution depends to no small degree on the attractiveness of the site. While it is true that there are times when emergencies such as unanticipated heavy enrollments as at the end of World War II may dictate the use of temporary and unsightly buildings, if the site is naturally attractive, such eye-sores can be removed.

The factor of public relations is served well by an attractive site. Students are more likely to develop pride when the college appears well in its physical aspects. The whole area tends to develop the same feel. "The college" becomes "our college," and for the future welfare of the junior college, this element of pride is of paramount importance.

The seven principles here enunciated cover the major areas to be considered in site selection. If they are followed scrupulously by those who select the site, there is no guarantee that mistakes won't be made. There is a guarantee, however, that the number and magnitude of any mistakes made will be at an absolute minimum.

J. W. R.

B. LAMAR JOHNSON

In an earlier paper I have suggested that Tulsa Junior College should develop an educational program which is consistent with widely accepted current trends in the junior college. To this end, Tulsa Junior College should, I urged, be a comprehensive, open door community college which is committed to excellence in all aspects of its operation.

Tulsa Junior College and Change

I now turn to a second proposal which at first thought may seem to conflict with my initial suggestions. It is this:

Tulsa Junior College Must Be Different

Let me explain what I have in mind. Tulsa has been nationally singled out for recognition and designation as a model city. This high honor represents a notable commitment. It clearly places a particular responsibility upon the citizenry of the city and of the state to make certain that Tulsa Junior College becomes a model junior college which is, in the finest sense, worthy of the city which it serves.

Former President Cross of the University of Oklahoma once asserted, "We must build a University which is worthy of our football team."

To paraphrase President Cross, I urge, "Tulsa must build a junior college which is worthy of the highest ideals to which the model city of Tulsa is committed." This commitment will include, but will go beyond, my earlier suggestion of conformity to currently accepted junior college trends.

The future of the junior college is inextricably interwoven with that of society. Our world is turbulent with social, political, economic, and scientific change of great force, swift pace and high order complexity. Men and women who were born in the day of the horse and buggy, the spinning wheel and the sailing ship, are living in the age of the automobile and the airplane, the radio and the television. They have seen electricity replace steam as a source of power, and are now seeing atomic

energy begin to replace electricity. The generation currently in college will spend its years of greatest productivity in a society as different from that of today's as is today's from that of the early decades of the twentieth century. Interplanetary travel, and the transplantation of human organs, as well as the creation of artificial ones, offer, for example, possibilities which stagger the imagination.

Although change has occurred in education, it has failed to keep pace with other developments in society. The necessity for change is, however, currently recognized, and innovation and experimentation have become "in words" in American education.

The junior college is the most rapidly growing and most dynamic unit in American education. It is itself an innovation—a completely new and relatively young institution, indigenous to our nation. Since it is not yet handicapped by the heavy hand of tradition, there are those who suggest that the junior college offers the best opportunity for change and improvement in our nation's educational scene.

It is clear that if the junior college is to meet the heavy responsibilities which society is assigning to it, it must achieve the highest level of educational efficiency. It dare not be laggard. It must innovate and improve; it must increase its productivity and achievement.

And certainly, a model junior college in a model city must be looked to for leadership in new developments, efficiency, and in the finest sense, innovation.

In the pages which follow, I shall draw upon some of the findings of my recently completed 18-month national survey of innovations in junior college instruction as a possible basis for projecting developments at the junior college which you are planning.

Made with the assistance of a grant from the ESSO Education Foundation, the findings of my survey were largely based on visits to 76 junior colleges in 22 states, and on conferences with representatives of an additional 82 colleges in 12 of these states. These visits were supplemented by letters and written reports from colleges in 27 states and the District of Columbia. Approximately four out of every ten of the 565 public

junior colleges listed in the 1967 *Junior College Directory*¹ participated in the survey.²

Encouraging Innovation and Improvement

This is not the place, nor is this the time to report the findings of my survey. This is being done elsewhere.³ I shall, however, refer to selected aspects of my findings which can have relevance to Tulsa Junior College—and, in particular, to its commitment, to be a model community junior college. I shall first describe some of the plans which junior colleges use as an aid to encouraging innovation and improvement.

As an aid to stimulating innovation, experimentation, and improvement, some colleges have developed plans under which faculty members visit centers of innovation. Perhaps the most ambitious junior college undertaking of this type was the Delta College Innovations Project. During the entire 15-week summer semester in 1966, 14 faculty members at Delta were employed to devote full time to seeking out innovative practices which, with possible modifications, might be useful to their college. Representatives of the Project team visited 64 innovative centers—most of them junior colleges, but also a few senior institutions and research agencies—in nine states. As a result of the Project, varied new plans and procedures have been adopted in teaching, counseling, and community service. Some of these are notable and will have far-reaching consequences; for example, those designed to meet the needs of low-ability students; and the production and use of single concept films in teaching. The most important outcome of the Project, however, in the words of one member of the project team, was the emergence “of an atmosphere for change. Such an atmosphere depends not on a desire to change for the sake of change, not on a glowing account that one has read but has not had the opportunity to observe or discuss with the people involved; it is an atmosphere which has been created because a large segment of the faculty and staff have an awareness of what is happening around the nation and a desire to be part of a dynamic movement.”

¹William A. Harper. *1967 Junior College Directory*. Washington, D.C. American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

²For a report of the survey, see B. Lamar Johnson. *Islands of Innovation Expanding*. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969.

³B. Lamar Johnson. *Islands of Innovation Expanding*. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969.

One of the major problems in launching innovations relates to the provision of faculty time for working on plans. The interests and enthusiasms of staff members are often reflected in their "extra-time work" on new ideas and plans for teaching. At times, the introduction of innovations does not actually require additional staff time; some new plans may, in reality, be time-saving for staff members.

On the other hand, many new ideas do require for their development time beyond that available to faculty members. It is with this in mind that some junior colleges provide released time for faculty members during the college year and also employ them in summers to work on new plans and programs.

This method is used in the Junior College District of St. Louis where four percent of district professional salary funds are "budgeted for innovation"—two percent available for expenditure by individual campuses and two percent for allocation by the district office. These funds are largely used for employing faculty members to work on new plans and developments during the summer months. Staff members are encouraged to apply for summer employment grants, and those who have had little experience in planning projects are given assistance in preparing proposals. Application forms describe the purposes and nature of the project on which work is to be done, methods of procedure, and plans for evaluation, so that faculty members applying are well aware of what will be expected of them.

At the close of the summer, each faculty member prepares a report on what he has done and on plans for putting his proposal into action, as well as for evaluating it. Bound volumes of these reports provide an illuminating history of innovative developments in the Junior College Districts of St. Louis.

Junior colleges are increasingly recognizing the need for agents of change. An agent of change may be a dean of instruction or a president, an instructor or a department head, or even a committee of faculty members and/or administrators charged with the responsibility to stimulate change. But whether an individual or a group, the change agent must have certain characteristics. For ease of grammatical construction, let us

assume the change agent is an individual. He must have the capacity to stimulate creative thinking and planning, and the ability to gain support for experiments.

I have suggested that junior colleges appoint, as agents of change, vice presidents in charge of heresy.⁴ Advanced in a somewhat different context by Philip Coombs in 1960, this proposal would provide a staff member, relieved of all administrative responsibility, whose duty it would be to keep abreast of national developments and to initiate plans for exploiting them at his own institution, as well as to develop completely new plans for local use and application.⁵ Our vice president would be a dreamer. He would attend conferences and assemble "far-out" proposals. He would needle administrators and his faculty colleagues and, in turn, be needled by them. He would study the findings of research and analyze their implications for his college. He would be a harbinger and instigator of change. And he would be, in the most persuasive sense of the word, a "huckster."

Kendall College, Illinois, has created a position which largely meets these specifications. Although the position is officially designated director of educational development, on campus it is referred to as "vice president in charge of heresy," or by students occasionally as the "innovative dervish." The position is nonadministrative in nature. The holder teaches a class and regards himself as a faculty member, in turn being so regarded by his staff colleagues. His responsibilities and activities closely parallel those which I have outlined for a vice president in charge of heresy.

At Roger Williams College, Rhode Island, the director of planning and development upon occasion is referred to, both on campus and in the public press, as vice president in charge of heresy. And the Dallas County Junior College District has established a district-wide position of specialist in educational planning, the responsibilities of which are notably similar to those of a vice president whose duties and intentions are strictly heretical.

⁴B. Lamar Johnson, "Needed: Experimental Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, XXXVI (Oct. 1965), 17-20.

⁵Philip H. Coombs, *The Technical Frontiers of Education*, The Twenty-seventh Sir John Adams Lecture at the University of California, Los Angeles, March 16, 1960 (Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, 1960), pp. 14-15.

As already suggested, an agent of change need not be an individual, but may be a committee. Monroe Community College, for example, has an Educational Systems Committee which consists of twelve faculty members representing various departments, who are interested in experimental and innovative developments. It is the purpose of the committee both to initiate and to screen proposals for innovation. Individual staff members are encouraged to plan innovations and present them to the committee which, in turn, makes its recommendation to the president.

In the Los Rios Junior College District, California, too, a committee serves as an agent of change. During the 1967-68 college year, the District appropriated \$10,000 for each of its two colleges (American River and Sacramento City) to be used for new developments. A faculty committee on innovation at each college administered these funds, which were specifically earmarked for encouraging innovation and helping to support it. During the year, the funds were expended for such items as equipment for teaching foreign languages; for financing visits of faculty members to colleges which have innovative developments in instruction; and for financing the attendance of faculty members at conferences on innovations in teaching—including conferences on multimedia instruction. Results of initial efforts have proved so satisfactory that, for 1968-69, the district appropriation for each college has been increased to \$25,000.

Different colleges use different plans for stimulating new developments and improvements: faculty visits to centers of innovation, budgeting for innovation, systematically provided agents of change—whether they be committees or individuals, such as vice presidents in charge of heresy. In all of these plans, the actual involvement of faculty members in planning and projecting new developments is of central importance.

A Few Developments During my survey, I identified a variety of plans and projections of plans for teaching which junior colleges reported to be new. From a multiplicity of possibilities, I shall refer to three developments which have a possible relevance to plans for Tulsa College:

1. Sidewalk College.
2. Audio-tutorial Teaching.
3. The Sensorium.

Sidewalk College

In November I was in the offices of the Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education discussing plans for launching the new junior college in Tulsa. During a discussion of criteria for selecting a site, I raised these questions: "Why have a site for the college? Why not have the college located in and extend its fingers of operation into all sections of urban Tulsa—rather than being confined to a single campus? Why not, for example, try out a sidewalk college?"

There were some raised eyebrows in the conference room, and yet as we discussed the concept of the sidewalk college there was a realization that it has much to commend it. It brings the college to its students. It certainly and in reality becomes a community college.

I am not, of course, seriously suggesting that Tulsa Junior College should not have a campus. It should, in fact, have an outstanding plant, and the finest facilities. I would however, suggest that Tulsa Junior College also consider adopting some of the concepts of the "sidewalk college" as they have been proposed by McDaniel. Sidewalk College would make full use of community resources as the locale for teaching classes. This proposal is not, of course, entirely new. Evening divisions of junior colleges often teach courses in off campus facilities, employ part-time teachers, provide special short courses, and identify themselves with local training needs. The difference between this and Sidewalk College is that these endeavors are not a division of sidewalk college; they are *the* college. As McDaniel explains, "The sideshow becomes the main tent. The college is not a place; it is an educational service."

Noting that the usual method of starting a junior college "is to get two hundred acres, fifteen to twenty million dollars, a team of architects, and a package of 'recommended standards'," McDaniel asks, "Can a community deviate from this model?"

He urges that deviation is possible. Already we are beginning to witness some decentralization in vocational education. But McDaniel asserts we have not gone far enough. "Sidewalk college must have its symbol. That symbol must be great teaching, not Mark Hopkins on a

log, but Mark Hopkins with the tools of modern communication, working within a community to make that community better."⁶

As I have indicated, I am not suggesting that Tulsa Junior College become a "sidewalk college." I am, however, suggesting that Tulsa Junior College adopt basic aspects of the sidewalk college idea in developing its program. This envisages the college stretching out its tentacles into all sections of the Tulsa metropolitan area and into most aspects of its life.

As an illustration of one development which might occur in a sidewalk motivated community junior college, I shall report an experience I had some months ago during a visit to Rock Valley College in Rockford, Illinois. As President Clifford Erickson was telling me about new developments at Rock Valley, he casually remarked, "You know, Lamar, we have a one billion dollar educational laboratory here."

At this point I interrupted to ask: "Did you say 'one billion' or 'one million'?" When I was assured the word was *billion*, I was both mystified and incredulous. As the day progressed, however, I came to understand what President Erickson had in mind. For I learned of the Rock Valley College Career Advancement Program (commonly referred to as CAP), a cooperative work-study program in which the industrial complex of metropolitan Rockford becomes indeed an educational laboratory for the college.

At the time of my visit to Rockford, 32 companies had signed up for CAP, a program which offers the high school graduate an opportunity to prepare for employment in a variety of technological fields through a cooperative work-study plan. The student attends college for half a day and is employed in a Rockford industry for half a day. His work in industry is coordinated with his classroom instruction and he is cooperatively supervised by the college and his employer. By attending summer school, a student in the program can complete requirements for the associate degree in two years. Although CAP is initially limited to selected technological fields, it can be expanded to include, for example, health and business-related occupations.

⁶See J. W. McDaniel, "Sidewalk College," in B. Lamar Johnson, editor. *The Experimental Junior College*. UCLA Junior College Leadership Program Occasional Report No. 12 (Los Angeles. University of California, Los Angeles. School of Education. pp. 99-102.)

During my visit to Rock Valley, I learned of the extent to which CAP is a jointly planned college-industry undertaking. The program is publicized by both the college and the participating industries in advertisements in the classified sections of area newspapers, over radio and television, and in direct mail to high school seniors. The spirit of what is being done is suggested by this quotation from a classified advertisement:

JOIN THE CAP TEAM TODAY!

The name of the game? CAP . . . the
Career Advancement Program at Sundstrand.

The prize? A very bright future for
Graduating High School seniors seeking
technical training . . .

. . . Enjoy the benefits of professional
classroom instruction and on-the-job
experience which will provide you with
a bi-weekly pay check . . .

Don't waste another moment! Call for an
appointment or drop in . . . Join the CAP
program today . . .

Work-study plans—of which CAP is an imaginative and community-centered-example—are consistent with junior college trends and with the role and objectives of the two-year college. Under such plans students may earn money which will make it possible for them to continue their education. In addition, the college adds to its educational resources a spectrum of community facilities of incalculable value. The college also serves the citizenry in cooperative endeavors representative of the finest traditions of the community college.

I cherish for Tulsa Junior College a multi-billion dollar educational laboratory in the industrial, business, governmental, cultural, and professional communities of metropolitan Tulsa.

Audio-tutorial Instruction

The most discussed—though at times skeptically—recent development in junior college teaching is audio-tutorial teaching, a plan of

programmed instruction which also embodies a systems approach to instruction. This plan requires the specific definition of desired instructional outcomes and, following learning experiences, a feedback to students on their achievement of these objectives. Typically, audio-tutorial teaching includes (along with the use of multimedia instructional facilities) General Assembly Sessions (GAS) of all students in a course; Small Assembly Sessions (SAS) for purposes of discussion and testing of groups of students in a course; and Individual Study Sessions (ISS) during which students individually study programmed assignments, often in open laboratories at hours of their own convenience from early morning to late in the evening.

Pioneered in a freshman botany course by Samuel Postlethwait, Professor of Botany at Purdue University, audio-tutorial instruction was first used in a junior college in the Junior College District of St. Louis in a course in botany beginning in 1963-64 and in another course, biology, in 1964-65. Audio-tutorial teaching has, however, had its largest development in Oakland Community College, Michigan, which opened in 1965 with an enrollment of 4,000 students and with all courses taught by this plan.

Audio-tutorial teaching, as typically practiced, does not yet make it possible for a student to advance to the completion of a course at his own rate and thus break the lock-step in learning. Enabling students to advance, at their own rate, from assignment to assignment, and achieve either early or delayed completion of a course is a goal toward which audio-tutorial plans might well be directed. Even under present plans, however, a student is able to advance at his own rate within given assignment periods. In a course in biology, for example, with ready access to the learning laboratory, a student may complete a week's work in a day or two.

General Assembly Sessions are ordinarily held weekly and are usually one hour in length. At these meetings of all students in a particular course, learning experiences which can best be provided in large groups are offered. These sessions provide opportunities for "master teachers," the best that a college can provide, to motivate and "raise the sights" of sizeable numbers of students. Special lectures—including those by guest speakers, panel discussions and long films may also be featured. Upon

occasion, previous assignments are reviewed and new units of instruction are introduced.

Small Assembly Sessions—also usually held weekly—are, in a sense, discussion-quiz sections in which students have an opportunity to discuss materials of the course and in which they may also be tested on what they have learned in it. In addition, these sessions provide an opportunity for students to raise questions and to evaluate and comment on instructional materials and procedures used in the course. At times, informal, unscheduled, and non-structured sessions may be held as by-products of independent study.

Students attend Individual Study Sessions for an indeterminate number of hours each week—the number dependent upon such factors as the ability of the student, his capacity to apply himself to study, and the nature of the materials to be learned. These sessions are usually held in specially designed laboratories equipped with individual study carrels—small desks enclosed on three sides to insure quiet and privacy—which are often equipped with slide and film projectors and audio-tape-playing machines. Additional materials appropriate to the course served by the laboratory are also provided; for example, books, recordings, slides, films, charts, microscopes, live specimens, drafting equipment, and art prints.

Usually, students are permitted to come to the laboratories—frequently open from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.—at their convenience. In individual study sessions, students study assignments which have been programmed in some detail, and which are therefore planned to be largely self-directive. Nevertheless, instructors or tutors are available for the purpose of providing personal assistance when it is needed.

Individual Study Sessions—with students individually studying programmed assignments and engaging in various learning experiences—operationally, perhaps, comprise the heart of audio-tutorial teaching, with its emphasis upon individual learning.

As pointed out earlier, plans for using audio-tutorial teaching vary from institution to institution. At some colleges, GAS (or perhaps SAS) are reduced in number and importance—at others, increased in both number and importance; at some colleges, students are scheduled for ISS,

rather than being permitted to attend at their convenience; and at some institutions great emphasis is placed on out-of-laboratory learning experiences (in the community, in the concert hall, or practice room, in the art gallery or studio, in student forums and discussions, in field trips) as contrasted with little stress on such experiences at other institutions.

Characteristic of all plans, however, is the careful definition of instructional objectives, programmed planning of learning experiences, provisions for group sessions (GAS and SAS) and especially for individual sessions (ISS), individualization in study and learning, and feedback as a basis for improvement.

I am not at all certain that Tulsa Junior College will or should, on any large scale, adopt a plan of audio-tutorial teaching. I have, however, described this approach to instruction as representative of those which faculty members may wish to consider as they plan teaching which utilizes multi-media learning facilities as an aid to vitalizing and personalizing instruction and learning.

Sensorium

Largely a dream for the future is a proposal for a sensorium at Laney College, California. Folk at Laney point out that the average classroom is basically a replica of that of 300 years ago: four walls and a ceiling, semi-comfortable seating, poor lighting, a blackboard, and a teacher's desk. In the modern version, lighting and seating may have been improved, and motion picture equipment, slides, recordings, and perhaps closed circuit television added. But, even under the most favorable circumstances, the teacher's control of his classroom environment is severely limited.

In an attempt to alter this situation, Laney College opened a "sensorium" on an experimental basis during the 1967-68 college year. Implying access to and utilization of the total sensory apparatus of the student, the sensorium is conceived to be an architectural space with an almost completely controlled environment:

- a. Traveling and stereophonic sound.
- b. Three-dimensional projection—that is, simultaneous projection at front, sides, and rear.

- c. Atmospheric control—the capacity to change temperatures from 40° to 80° in a matter of minutes, and the capacity to whip up winds—even gales—at will.
- d. Aromatic control—a wide selection of aromas and odors diffused through the air-conditioning system on programmed call.
- e. Touch control—wheels outfitted with a continuum of textures from smooth to rough, from glass through fur to hardened emery surfaces, attached to specially designated seats.
- f. Taste control—specially formulated pills with several flavors, some being layered to constitute a continuum of taste from sweet to sour.
- g. Motion control—seats mounted on a movable floor which can be tilted, shaken, or shimmied at will.

Few of these controls were available in the experimental sensorium of 1967-68. All are, however, projected for future development at Laney, together with others yet to be devised.

Initially, the sensorium is used in teaching art appreciation, with English composition soon to follow. From one fourth to one third of the sessions of participating classes will be held in the sensorium, which will also be available for occasional experimental use by teachers in varied fields. Typically, a class hour in the sensorium is to be divided into three parts: (a) a period of preparation before the presentation of substantive material designed to enhance concentration, attention, and an “associative set”; (b) the presentation of subject matter with the assistance of effective environmental aids; and (c) the reinforcement of learning—again with the physical involvement of students in their environment.

The Laney plan is more than gadgetry. In one sense it is an application of McLuhan’s assertion, “The medium is the message.” In another sense it is an attempt to apply learning theory to teaching in the junior college—as “experience is simultaneously *felt, thought, and moved through.*” Perhaps the functioning sensorium may be succinctly described as a multi-sensory reinforcement in learning.

Conclusion I have great expectations for Tulsa Junior College as a model junior college in a model city. May it be a comprehensive open-door community college which is committed to excellence in all areas of operation. May it be boldly imaginative in planning and developing its educational program—curriculum, teaching, counseling and guidance, out-of-class activities, and community service. Perhaps Tulsa Junior College will have some characteristics of the sidewalk college, will utilize teaching procedures—including audio-tutorial instruction—which individualize and personalize learning, and will devise vitally creative instructional facilities which emulate or even go beyond the sensorium.

The times in which we live demand vigorous and creative leadership in education, and particularly in the junior college. May Tulsa Junior College be a model junior college to which our nation can look to leadership in urban community college development.

B. L. J.

JAMES W. HOBSON

Education planning costs in time, money, energy and talent. Unfortunately, so does non-planning. Too many college districts seem willing to pay this price. As Samuel Sava of the Kettering Foundation once pointed out at the National Conference on the Experimental Junior College at UCLA, 70% of the junior colleges created in 1966 were just copies, sad copies, of existing four-year institutions.¹ In developing these institutions, no in-depth analysis was made of community needs, modern educational methods, systems, facilities needs or financial needs to see how best their college should function as unique community institutions.

Fiscal and Physical Planning Guides

Comprehensive planning should not be thought of purely as a set of enrollment projections or pre-architectural specifications but should, instead, account for all facets of the community, the college and relationship between the two.

The purpose of this paper is to give assistance to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in defining the basic elements for projecting the operating budget and the physical facilities requirements for the Tulsa Junior College.

It is an accepted fact that a budget for an educational institution is simply a translation into dollars of the educational plan of the institution. By necessity it is detailed and explicit in its terms. Since at this point in time none of the educational planning for the Tulsa Junior College has been accomplished, a detailed or accurate budget projection will be impossible. However, some gross determinations can be made and will prove to be valuable in this stage of planning.

In the past ten years, I have been fortunate to be part of the charter staff of three new two-year colleges and have had the opportunity to consult with several other emerging or developing institutions. It may be useful to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education if I might present a composite case study of these newly developed institutions. This can be a guide in developing gross determinations of fiscal and

¹Tadlock & Ebey, "Pound-Wise" Planning, *Junior College Journal*, November, 1967.

physical needs as well as becoming a guide for the formation of detailed needs of the future.

Since the cost of developing temporary and permanent facilities is part of the fiscal projection, let me begin with the facility planning phase of this composite study.

The Board of Trustees and staff in this "case study" are in agreement that careful planning, both short-range and long-range, is essential if the college is to provide a comprehensive educational program for the youth and adults of the community.

The educational system projected by the Board and Staff was intended to serve not only as a contributing force in the solution of the community's educational problem but as a catalyst for community development concerned with economic, political, and social problems. It was planned toward being an entity which meets community requirements of the moment, builds toward the future of the community and becomes capable of change in order to accommodate future shifts in community needs, student needs and educational approaches.

In order to be sure that this educational program was evolved realistically, as it related to the objects and needs so defined, the college had to concern itself with such basic issues as:

1. Philosophy and objectives
2. Study of community requirements
3. Study of population growth and mobility
4. Number and location of other educational and social resources
5. Projected enrollments (reflecting increased interest in college education)
6. Size of campus

The educational program had to be based on philosophies and objectives which reflected the educational needs of the community. Since the board and staff of the college were committed to the philosophy of the comprehensive junior college, the educational objectives had to therefore fit within this framework and be so defined that there be no question concerning the true functions of the college.

Philosophy and Objectives

As a community college, the board of trustees and staff were concerned with a wide spectrum of educational needs for the post highschool citizens of the district. The board of trustees accepted as its responsibility the leadership and plans to evolve and maintain an educational program to serve the current needs of the area and to be flexible enough to meet the changing and unknown needs of the future. The college proposed to offer academic, technical-vocational, general education, developmental and counseling programs, directed toward the improvement of the individual student and thus the community.

Study of Community Needs

An initial assessment of community needs, as they related to the formation of the college, included a survey of attitudes of the people of the community. This included their characteristics, interests and aspirations, as reflected by the city/county planning board, chambers of commerce, school district superintendents, secondary school counselors, high school students and lay advisory committees.

Although demographic studies were also necessary the college felt that they were often wasted in that an exhaustive statistical community survey was not always relevant to the problem for which it was conducted. It was believed that a survey could be conducted by the collection of data which only had direct and specific relevance to questions involved for the college.

Study of Population Growth and Mobility

A preparatory step to defining the educational requirements was the development of reliable enrollment forecasts dealing with those segments of the community population to be reached. It included head-start, nursery, kindergarten, elementary, high school, and adults. Data for current conditions and 5-10 year projections were obtained in the following categories:

Number	Employment status
Age distribution	Socio-economic background
Sex distribution	Aptitude distribution
Ethnic distribution	Interests
Marital status	Aspirations

Educational and Social Resources Other Organizations existing within the community were identified, such as:

Education:

Existing school and colleges
Vocational institutions
Commercial schools
Adult education programs
Business sponsored educational programs

Social:

Community service organizations
Community center programs
Day-care centers
Church sponsored programs

Projected Enrollments

Since 1940, throughout the United States, the percentage of college age groups attending college each year has increased at the rate of one percent a year in addition to the annual increase caused by population growth. Using this fact, the enrollment projection of college age (18-21) youth would increase the college population to 44.9 percent in 1973 with relation to the population base.

It was further determined that of the high school seniors at that time, 55% desired some form of post high school education. This fact, augmented by the knowledge that the college would attract many older students, who did not formerly have the opportunity to attend college, showed a very large potential enrollment for this college. However, there were a large number of variables involved in these circumstances which made any sensible projected junior college enrollment almost impossible.

These variables were:

1. Availability and location of physical facilities
2. Respectability of the academic program
3. Breadth of the technical program
4. Monetary cost to the student
5. Admission and retention standards
6. The economic condition of the geographic area

Combining all the data referred to and tempering these with determinations based on the variables, the college considered the beginning enrollment as 20% of the high school graduation. The percentage increase

was at the rate of 1% per year plus arbitrary figures concerning out-of-school students, transfer students from other colleges and a retention of 50% of the students for second year work. This was based, however, on the use of temporary facilities. When permanent facilities should be available, the figure was to be raised from 20% to 25% and increased 1% per year to 30%.

Size of Campus

The concept of the community college is that it serve the immediate community in order to be an educational center for post-high school education. Optimum campus sizes have been argued for years but in general most junior college educators believed the optimum size junior college campus should be from 3,000 to 5,000 F.T.E.S.

This belief is based upon several variables — class size, breadth and depth of the curriculum, personal attention, faculty unit and morale, cost of operation, cost of facilities and service to the community. This optimum size consideration leads to the decision to design the campus for 4500 students.

Financing for the Development of Facilities

The next step taken by the college was to estimate the needed financial outlay for the capital construction to house the projected student enrollment and educational program.

Taken into consideration were the following costs: site purchase, master planning, land development, architect fees, campus construction, landscaping, and equipment. The development, of course, was sequenced to meet the needs as determined by previous studies. For gross dollar needs, experience from other colleges and local building costs were used. Past estimates indicated an approximate cost of \$3,000.00 per student for campus enrollment where the capacity was 3,000 - 4,000 students. Facility expansion beyond this capacity was estimated at \$2,500.00 per student. In addition, classroom furniture, equipment and library books were estimated at 10% of the campus development cost.

For the program outlined to be completed, funds had to be secured. The following sources were available in varying degrees.

1. State capital outlay matching funds
2. Higher Educational Facilities Act
3. Vocational Act of 1963
4. Nursing Act of 1964
5. N.D.E.A. funds for equipment
6. Additional local millage
7. Surplus operating monies available from initial period of operation.

Financing for Operation

Information gathered from previous studies allowed for more discrete determination of necessary staff and resources requirements. A translation of the program offering, after they were determined, was made delineating the size and type of staff. The projection of enrollment ranges by program area determined the financial considerations — allocation of programs by type, location and timetable was used to approach a financial schedule. However, some gross determinations based on other experience were first made.

The estimated operating costs based upon costs of comparable programs within the state, as well as out of state, provided certain basic information. Beginning operations are costly. At the same time, the nation's economy was expanding at a rate of approximately 3% per year, which applied to the operating cost of the institution. If the college had been operating for several years, the estimated operational cost per student would have been estimated at \$750.00 per year. This cost would definitely be higher during the first year, so it was estimated at \$950.00, excluding costs of new equipment, library books, etc. An assumption was made on a stabilized cost of \$750.00 per year after the third year. A factor of 3% per year increase thereafter, in line with the increased economy, indicated an estimate as follows:

1st year	\$950.00/FTES
2nd year	\$850.00/FTES
3rd year	\$800.00/FTES
4th year	\$750.00/FTES
5th year	\$775.00/FTES
6th year	\$800.00/FTES
7th year	\$825.00/FTES

Operating income came from three main sources (1) property tax of \$0.10-0.20 per \$100.00 assessed valuation, (2) state funds of \$250.00 - \$285.00 per full-time equivalent student, and (3) student fee of \$200.00 - \$260.00 per full time student.

The assessed valuation of the college district was increasing each year by a factor of 3-4%.

From these combined figures a simple chart was developed to relate these factors:

YEAR	TAX REVENUE	STATE AID	FEES	TOTAL REVENUE	OPERATING COSTS	BALANCE	ACCUMULATED BALANCE
------	-------------	-----------	------	---------------	-----------------	---------	---------------------

Although the foregoing will serve as a guide for developing some budget figures in gross terms, today's technology could provide a means for more meaningful figures as well as to provide for the Tulsa Junior College Board and Staff, a device to aid in decision making. A simulation model is one technique which could aid materially.

The Simulation Model A simulation model is a collection of mathematical expressions that attempt to interrelate analytically all of the parameters which define the major components of a system. The most significant property of a simulation model is that the model has the same predictive response to a set of specified variables as the actual response of the real system to the same set of variables.

To formulate such a model it would be necessary first to identify and then to quantify all of the parameters and variables that describe the ensemble. An analytical framework would then be developed which functionally relates to all of the parameters in a logical fashion. To compare the resource impact of changes in the parameters in a particular network, it is convenient to assess the final results in terms of a common denominator . . . dollars.

In general, the costs of a college may be defined in terms of

personnel, physical space, equipment, and general supporting costs. For the purpose of analysis, these costs can be divided into:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. Instruction | All of the relevant costs and faculty generated by students taking courses. |
| B. Instructional Support | Support personnel, supplies, equipment, and facilities needed to serve the faculty in their teaching. |
| C. Administrative/Service | Costs of general administration, library, student aid, etc. |
| D. Physical Space and Maintenance of Operation | Related costs to the above. |

A number of institutions, although admittedly not junior colleges, have simulated the total operation of a college over a period of time. This simulation is precisely what is needed for comprehensive planning by simulating the operation of the college and by relating the facilities, student needs, educational program and their respective costs. Mathematical models can be developed for a direct access computer to simulate the operation over a ten-year period, or to respond to alternative solutions to current or future decision-making demands.

Also perfected today is a computer program to aid in the determination of space needs for new college construction. This can provide a greater degree of building utilization than could be obtained in the past. This program, when combined with detailed educational specifications, can materially aid any college building program by providing precise information for the architect, which not only speeds the process but has decided cost advantages.

J. W. H.