To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Joyce Sue Hopson entitled "A Study of the Key Elements of Interagency Collaboration and Their Relationship to Community Education Within the States of Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Charles K. Tanner, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Robert K. Rowe

Roger W. Haskell

Michael C. Hannum

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Beck
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

4

Thesis
T36
.H454
Copy 2

A STUDY OF THE KEY ELEMENTS OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO COMMUNITY EDUCATION WITHIN THE STATES OF ALABAMA, MISSISSIPPI AND TENNESSEE

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Joyce Sue Hopson

August 1978

136615

DEDICATION

This dissertation, "A Study of the Key Elements of Interagency Collaboration and Their Relationship to Community Education Within the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee," is dedicated to my mother, Mrs. Charley Hopson. Her love, patience, understanding, and faith made it possible for me to complete this work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. C. Kenneth Tanner, Chairman of the doctoral committee, for his insightful guidance, intellectual prods, and valuable time.

Dr. Robert Roney, Dr. Michael Hannum, and Dr. Roger Haskell also served on the committee. The author is grateful for their cooperation, inspiration, and interest.

Representative Mike Robertson acted as a liaison between the Department of Education in Mississippi and Tennessee and the author. This assistance was most helpful.

A special expression of thanks is extended to Gary Lindle for providing advice on computer programs and statistical methods.

Finally, appreciation is extended to family and friends whose kindness and understanding provided encouragement and frequent counsel.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze the key elements of interagency collaboration and determine their relationships with community education within the states of Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee. These three states form the cooperative known as the University of Alabama, Birmingham Regional Center for Community Education. This regional center was established in July 1971 for the purpose of assisting the development and expansion of community education in these three states.

Procedures utilized in the data collection for this research involved questionnaires administered to the three census groups. Questions focusing on "ideal" and "real" dimensions of community education operations were administered to directors and coordinators, executive directors of planning agencies and development districts, and principals of schools that were designated as community schools by community educators. Either the "ideal" or "real" questionnaire was sent to the community education directors and coordinators, and the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts as was determined randomly by the coin-flip method. The community school principals were studied by the real questionnaire only.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to compare the mean scores. Since the groups studied were of an unequal number, the researcher was required to test the assumption of equal variance. The procedure applied to test homogeneity of variance was Bartlett-

Box F. When a significant F ratio was found by the one-way analysis of variance, Scheffe's multiple comparison test was applied to identify the group means that were significantly different.

The major findings were that there was a significant difference between the "ideal" and "real" perceptions of agency-school collaboration. Four of the six key elements in the "ideal" situation were perceived to be significantly different from the "real" situation. These four key elements were: (1) community involvement, (2) feasibility analysis, (3) community school director, and (4) implementation. Analysis of variance between the three states across the six key elements found that no significant difference existed. The respondents perceived all of the six key elements to be of vital importance to maintaining and improving interagency collaboration and community education. These elements discussed in the order of perceived importance were as follows:

1. Evaluation--94 percent of the total respondents perceived this element as important in improving and changing interagency collaboration and community education.

2. Community involvement--93 percent of the total respondents perceived this element as vital in achieving growth in relation to interagency collaboration and community education.

3. Community school director--90 percent of the total respondents were in agreement concerning the importance of this variable in agency-school collaboration ventures.

4. Feasibility analysis--88 percent of the total respondents confirmed the importance of this element in agency-school collaboration.

5. Implementation--82 percent of the total respondents perceived this element as vital to interagency collaboration and community education.

6. Structure--77 percent perceived this element as vital to the establishment of guidelines and procedures for examining interagency collaboration and community education.

Based on the findings, four recommendations were made. First, ways should be explored in which this research can be used as a model for a diagnostic and prescriptive tool for schools to assess (1) interagency collaboration and (2) other components of community education such as pre-school programs, adult education, health services, and recreation.

Second, adequate study of the key elements of interagency collaboration should be made by school and community members interested in the integrating of agency-school services. Every community is different; therefore, it is essential to know the community and its needs, services, problems, available resources, and other relevant variables prior to the development of interagency collaboration ventures.

Third, an endeavor should be made to provide for increased involvement of citizens in their local schools through community school advisory councils; there should be maximum use of public school facilities by the citizens of each community; and community educational programs should be encouraged on a county wide or multi-county wide basis in an effort to have the best possible programs for the least cost without duplication.

Fourth, this research suggests the following areas for further study.

1. Utilize the study design to examine one of the six key elements of interagency collaboration in depth.

2. Replicate the study at another Regional Center of Community Education which forms a cooperative with two or more states.

3. Replicate the study buy with a selected population or sample from community education across the nation.

4. Replicate the study involving two or more states with the respondents being state school board members, state department of education community education specialists, and city and/or county superintendents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Description and Statement of the Problem	3
	Introduction to the problem	3
	Statement of the problem	5
	Purpose of the study	6
	Scope and Importance of the Problem	7
	Statement of Assumptions	10
	Statement of Hypothesis and Questions	11
	Hypotheses	12
	Research questions	12
	Definition of Terms	12
	Methodology	14
	Setting	15
	The population	15
	Instrumentation	17
	Reliability of the questionnaires	18
	Procedures for the collection of data	19
	Statistical methods	20
	Organization of the Study	21
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	23
	The Nature of the Community	23
	The role of education	27
	Organizational theory	30

CHAPTER PAGE

The impact of social service agencies. 33
Community Education: The Developing Concept 38
The administrative implementation of community education. 43
Lifelong Learning. 57
Expanded uses of school facilities 61
Citizen involvement. 65
Interagency collaboration. 69
Change: Its Impact on the Social Scene. 74
Community Education in Rural Areas 78
Future Requirements for Successful Community Education Programs 83
Summary. 87
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA 89
Record of Response 90
Test of Hypotheses 95
Hypothesis 1 95
Hypothesis 2 102
Analysis of Research Questions 102
Research question number 1 104
Research question number 2 105
Research question number 3 108
Research qeustion number 4 109
Research question number 5 110
Research question number 6 111
Summary. 113

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 114

Summary 114

Findings and Conclusions. 119

Recommendations. 126

LIST OF REFERENCES. 129

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 140

APPENDICES. 148

Appendix A. 149

Appendix B. 162

VITA. 168

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Record of Response for the Total Population.	91
II.	Record of Response on the Ideal Dimension (Two Groups Only).	92
III.	Record of Response on the Real Dimension (Three Groups).	93
IV.	Record of Response on the State Dimension (Ideal and Real).	94
V.	The Ideal and Real Situation of Community Education and Interagency Collaboration as Indicated by the Means of the Key Elements.	97
VI.	Analysis of Variance Summaries for the Key Elements of Interagency Collaboration on the Ideal and Real Dimension.	98
VII.	Analysis of Variance Summaries for the Key Elements of Interagency Collaboration on the Respondent Position Dimension.	99
VIII.	Results of Scheffe's Test Comparing the Ideal and Real Dimension with the Respondent Position Dimension . . .	101
IX.	Analysis of Variance Summaries for Key Elements of Interagency Collaboration on the State Dimension . . .	103
X.	Percent of Perceptions on the Importance of the Key Elements of Interagency Collaboration to Community Education (Total Group).	106

TABLE PAGE

XI. Results of Scheffe's Test Comparing the Ideal and Real Dimension with the State Dimension. 107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The responsibility of the school as a public agency is tremendous. Education is a "cradle to the grave" process. Through collaboration with other agencies, the school can become a Community School.

> Because education is a much bigger word than it used to be and because only a fraction of what one learns takes place within the pale of the school, it stands to reason that schools must begin to establish linkages with other agencies which affect the primal triad of child and parents. Further, for those linkages to be effective, for them to promote significant change at the "grass roots level," they must meet the real needs of individuals as a consequence of coordination rather than as a consequence of coincidence. Since its inception, the Community Education philosophy has committed itself to this goal facilitating cooperation and coordination between schools, agencies, and individuals in order to promote positive and significant change. It is in this arena that the strength of Community Education lies; it is here that it can slay the bureaucratic monoliths.[1]

The Community Education philosophy incorporates basic beliefs which attempt to improve life for all community members. These beliefs are: (1) education is a birth to death process, (2) schools belong to all people, (3) agencies are established to serve people, (4) the first six years of a child's life are the most important, and (5) the attitude of a parent affects a child's progress in school.[2] These basic beliefs by community educators have accrued wide acceptance by the "many publics" throughout the United States. It has therefore, become apparent to community educators at all levels that interagency collaboration is a fundamental element in the success of their efforts.[3]

Although there are many definitions presented on community education, most of the definitions do recognize the necessity for interagency cooperation or collaboration. Public Law 93-380 proposed a definition which included interagency collaboration as an integral tenet of community education when it stated that community education "operated in conjunction with other groups in the community, community organizations, and local governmental agencies to provide educational, recreational, cultural, and other related community services . . . ."[4]

Seay's definition of community education also stated the necessity of interagency collaboration as follows: "Community education is the process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of the people--all of the people--of the community."[5]

The concept of interagency collaboration entails the retrieval of resources to solve individual, group, and community problems. Although the application of those resources is not a simple matter, it represents a total effort of the community toward improvement.[6] Seay presented further evidence for a collaborative venture between the school and the community: "School-community cooperation is a two-way street. The school helps solve community problems and people of the community provide special resources for the instructional program of the school."[7]

I. DESCRIPTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction to the Problem

Community education, as a collaborative venture, serves as a viable base from which to plan the delivery of human services. As agencies and programs develop to meet increasing needs there is the danger, through lack of collaboration and planning that (a) duplication of services with concomitant reduction in cost-effectiveness will result, and (b) communities, families, and individuals will receive inadequate services.[8]

Certainly no single agency, institution, group, or individual alone has thus far provided a fully satisfactory method of maximizing education to allow the fullest possible actualization for all people.[9] Can it be that the educational process has become so complex that collaborative efforts among the public agencies is a must? It is logical to believe that the greatest "new" service that can be provided to communities, families, and individuals is to coordinate and collaborate existing services and bring them closer to the people.

There must exist a structure for participation which is mutually acceptable to both the school and community. Such a structure is a bridge which the community and school travel in the exchange of ideas, information, needs, goals, and aspirations. The bridge must be accessible for social traffic to move smoothly in both directions while encouraging all, even the most eccentric traveler, to cross over to the other side.[10]

George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in 1972 referred at least twice to the need for national dissemination of the community education concept and concluded with this statement: "What we need in this country is policies and priorities not new programs. We're pouring good money into bad programs."[11] This would demand the delivery of all the variable elements of community education such as education, health, social, cultural, recreational, and so forth in a more responsive and designated manner. Just as the integral parts of an automotive transmission must be meshed into synchronous rotation in order to facilitate gear shifting, so must the public agencies be woven together in order to provide adequate services to the entire community.

If we are to make an impact on such problems as illiteracy, delinquency, suicide, crime, violence, drug abuse, child abuse, and so forth, we must make efforts to improve self-concepts, provide for individual self-fulfillment, and develop a more functional citizenry through the employment of all community resources. One viable alternative is the introduction of the community education concept which calls for interagency collaboration. The implementation of this concept involves an evolutionary process with several basic components such as community organization and development, utilization of K-12 school programs, citizen involvement and participation, interagency collaboration, lifelong learning and enrichment programs, and expanded use of school facilities.[12]

For this evolutionary process to begin there must be school system support. Without an understanding of the concept and a

commitment to the purpose of community education by school administrators, board of education, school faculties, and community leaders, achieving a successful and comprehensive community education program is difficult. A vital step in acquiring and maintaining support is identification of individuals who have human, technical, and conceptual skills that will assist them in being effective leaders.[13] System-wide coordination of community education is required as well as a new position at each community school location usually titled community school director or community school coordinator. In some school districts where several community school centers have been established one director and several coordinators may exist who together with their staff are responsible for developing a functioning community education effort to insure an efficient and effective organization that works toward implementing the total concept.[14] The director and coordinator must include in their team existing community leaders such as principals and agency personnel. The degree that these three individual groups can work together will directly influence the effectiveness of the community education program.

Statement of the Problem

Educators have assessed the needs of the American society and, as a result, have prescribed the community education concept as a remedy for the dismay. Through collaboration with other agencies, community education promotes the development and utilization of all resources including, but not limited to, formal schools and other human service resources. The ultimate goal of the community

education movement is the creation of humanistic and self-actualizing communities throughout the United States of America. In spite of such expressed assurance of societal improvement via community education and interagency collaboration, little actual collaboration has been documented. Thus, the problem that this study dealt with was the failure of the public schools and the state agencies to collaborate their efforts in order to provide individuals with adequate services.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to determine the current relationship and needs of community education and interagency collaboration within the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee based upon the analysis of the key elements of agency-school collaboration.[15]

A further purpose was to show how this relationship would (1) allow the school to change its role as determined by the real needs of a rapidly changing society and (2) foster a philosophy in which education was an amalgam of many experiences: home, school, job, peer group, media, church, agencies, and so forth. The study was designed to examine the "ideal" perceptions--that which "ought to be"--and the "real" perceptions--that which "is"--of interagency collaboration to determine the differences if any.

II. SCOPE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Public education in the United States has a long historical basis for its existence. This existence has expanded from the early beginnings in which the purpose of education was to teach youth how to read and write so as better to be able to interpret the Bible; expanded through the Kalamazoo decision in 1874 to include secondary schools to prepare youth for vocations and higher education; and further expanded through the 1954 Brown vs. the Topeka Board of Education, Supreme Court decision (equal educational opportunities cannot be denied on the basis of race, color, or creed).[17] However, in the historical context, public education began with the kindergarten program and ended with the senior year in high school. In other words, the accepted common definition of public education was a definition which labelled education as being highly perscriptive and learning was prescribed before knowledge of the learner was available to the teacher. The rewards were structured and given only upon precise completion of certain pre-prescribed goals and objectives which led in the final analysis to what we have called a diploma, be it at the end of the eighth grade, the twelfth grade, or college.[18]

The concept of community education has broader goals and objectives than the traditional schools as well as having a broader clientele base which it serves.[19] In an effort to affect the lives of the clientele in a positive manner, community education programs attempt to achieve effective utilization of human, physical, and financial resources for both individual needs and improvement of the

total community. This dynamic approach of public education encourages the development of a comprehensive and coordinated delivery system for providing educational, recreational, social, and cultural services for all people in a community.

Today's complex specialized society faces a major problem in providing a means whereby individuals and communities can assess their needs, identify their problems, and find practical solutions to them. The National Education Association (NEA) recognized the need for a more expanded role for public education and the NEA Representative Assembly at Minneapolis endorsed community education in July, 1977. The endorsement read as follows:

> National Education Association (NEA) believes that the concept of community education encourages schools to provide leadership in solving community problems. It believes that community education:
>
> a. encourages expanded utilization of school facilities by the total community;
>
> b. encourages and strengthens adult, vocational, and technical education programs;
>
> c. increases awareness and heightens public responsiveness to the educational system;
>
> d. provides for more productive use of leisure time;
>
> e. promotes interagency and interpersonal cooperation;
>
> f. creates a better environment for all.[19]

The Association has urged its state affiliates to become involved in the promotion, expansion, and implementation of such programs in their states.

The community education concept has the potential to impact meaningfully on a world reaching out and grasping for alternatives to

self-destructive paths that mankind has, at times, followed. The essence of this concept is a belief in the community and its closeness with each individual. Urban America exemplifies the loss of this needed perspective between the community and the self. This loss predicated the necessity for the community education movement in Flint, Michigan between 1932 and 1935. The vision of Charles S. Mott and Frank J. Manley was that of the regeneration of the city as a focal point for activities and services designed to offer opportunity to improve the life changes for citizens of all ages.[20]

Although community education is not a new idea in education, it is being widely promoted and diffused across the country. A closer look at one of its major tenents--interagency collaboration--was necessary to add to the growing wealth of objective knowledge regarding community education.

In order to study interagency collaboration in depth, the six key elements of agency-school collaboration provided for collection of data and allowed for the development of some recommendations. Although these recommendations were intended to provide techniques, methods and/or ideas for change, they were not to be interpreted as a panacea for the development of agency-school collaborative relationships.

The study delimited the research to three groups--community education directors and coordinators, the principals of schools which have been selected as community school, and the executive directors employed by planning and/or development districts. Further delimitations were imposed upon the study by setting the geographic perimeter around the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee. A census

was surveyed in the three states involving community education directors and coordinators, and principals of schools selected as community education centers. This census was based on a compiled list provided by three state departments of education naming all the community education directors and coordinators as of February, 1978. The list of principals were selected from the state department of education directories after the directors and coordinators of community education had listed the schools that they were coordinating within their state. A census was surveyed in the three states concerning the executive directors employed by planning and/or development districts.

III. STATEMENT OF ASSUMPTIONS

The basic assumptions underlying this study were as follows:

1. Responses of the subjects were honest and accurate within the limits of their perceptions.

2. The subjects had a reasonably accurate perception of what was meant by the "ideal" and "real" situation in connection with the six key elements of interagency collaboration and their relationship with community education.

3. The improved relationship between agency collaboration and community education was found in the degree that interagency collaboration improved services, provided services not ordinarily available from the school, made the public more aware of non-school services, and made services more assessible to the public.

4. The survey-questionnaire method of inquiry, although possessing certain limitations, provided a systematic means of

collecting information and opinions from which an investigator could draw conclusions.[21]

5. The rate of returns of mail questionnaires, to be satisfactory, had to be at least 65 to 75 percent or more.

6. The polled groups for this study, chosen by census on all three counts provided data for analysis that could be generalized to the states of Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee.

7. The "ideal" and "real" questionnaires were divided into six sections headed by the key elements of interagency collaboration. The statements under each element heading generated one composite score. (See Appendix A for key headings.)

IV. STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESIS AND QUESTIONS

Based on the "gaps" found in the literature two research hypotheses and six questions were tested.

Hypotheses

The first null hypothesis was as follows:

1. There was no significant difference in the perceptions of community education directors and coordinators, executive directors of planning agencies and development districts, and principals of schools which were designated as community schools by community educators between the "ideal" and "real" situations of agency-school collaboration at an alpha level of .05.

A second hypothesis tested in the null form was as follows:

2. There was no significant difference between the "ideal" and "real" situations of agency-school collaboration among the

respondents from the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee.

The analysis of the hypotheses was followed by an attempt to explore six research questions through statistical analysis of the mean scores of the responses of community school directors and coordinators, principals of schools which were selected as community schools, and agency personnel collected by the "ideal" and "real" questionnaires (see Appendix A).

Research Questions

1. How important is community involvement to purposeful agency-school collaboration?

2. Does the community education concept lend itself to the collaboration of community resources?

3. How important is the role of the community school director and coordinator in interagency collaboration?

4. Is formal structure important to agency-school collaboration programs?

5. Do community-school based action programs which enlist community participation and agency-school collaboration effect change and aid in communication at all effected levels?

6. Are local community-school and agency services assessed to determine the effectiveness of programs and activities in relationship to needs and goals?

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms were used throughout this study of community education and interagency collaboration. For purposes of

clarity, consistency, and easy referral the proposed definitions were incorporated in this section.

Change agent. A change agent is a person or agency representative who instigates social action.[22]

Community change. Community change (also known as social action, social change, or community action) is a relatively formal, deliberate, organized and short-term attempt to promote some type of change in a community and/or its residents.[23]

Community education. Community education can be thought of as a way of viewing education in the locality setting, a means by which people, their problems, and community resources are central to designing an educational program. The traditional role of the school is expanded to one identifying needs, problems, and concerns of the community and then assisting in the development and utilization of programs toward improving the entire community. Thus, community education is a concept based on the process of total education for children, youth, and adults.[24]

Community school. The community school is a site serving as a center for community education. Sometimes referred to as the "lighted school house," the community school attempts to facilitate education to all groups of people at all times of the day and year.[25]

Human services. This term is used to represent all these public and private services that have a demonstrable effect upon the health and welfare of individuals, families, and communities.

Interagency collaboration. This term was used to imply more intensive, long-term, and planned concerted efforts by community organizations and governmental agencies than is usually implied by interagency coordination or interagency cooperation.[26]

Intervention or planned change. Intervention or planned change is the development of specific strategies for achieving specific change objectives. This often involves a person with professional planning skills being supported by some community agency in promoting a change attempt.[27]

Planning and development. The combination of specific counties of a state into a collaborative situation for the purpose of assisting local government in responding to local problems, programs, needs and opportunities.

Self-actualization. When man's physical, relatedness, maintenance, and protective needs are fulfilled, the need to extend his potential for self-development becomes apparent. This is the action patterns that are directed toward the end state of becoming one's ideal self.[28]

Synergy. The taking place of united action and the enhancement of relative strength of each societal component through combined and correlated forces.[29]

VI. METHODOLOGY

This section comprises descriptions of the setting for the study, the population and sample being studied, the reliability of

the questionnaire, the procedures for the collection of data and follow-up, and the appropriate statistical methods for analysis of the data.

Setting

The states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee were chosen for the study. The three states were chosen because together they create the cooperative known as the University of Alabama in Birmingham Regional Center for Community Education. This regional center was established in cooperation with the Mott Foundation in July of 1971 for the purpose of assisting the development and expansion of community education in these three states.

Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee have several commonalities which accentuates the need for the cooperative as follows: (1) all three states are located in the Southeastern portion of the United States sharing a common state border; (2) all three states are comparatively poor by most economic indicators; (3) all three states are largely rural and agricultural in nature; and (4) all three states are similar in their outlook toward education. The latest estimation is total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools per pupil in average daily attendance, as compiled by the National Education Association, places Tennessee 44th, Alabama as 47th, and Mississippi as 49th in rank compared to the other fifty states.[30]

The Population

A census of the community school directors and coordinators within the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee was studied.

The census was based on the three lists of community education directors and coordinators as was provided to this researcher by the Department of Education of each of the states. Compilation of the three lists revealed an alphabetically-ordered list of 68 directors and coordinators as of February 1978. The group was randomly divided into two equal sub-groups of 34 each to determine who received the "ideal" and "real" questionnaires.

There were 100 principals of schools that had been selected as community education centers studied by census. The list of principals was developed from state education directories once the researcher had retrieved from the community education directors and coordinators the names of the schools in which they were affiliated. All principals received only the "real" questionnaires.

The executive directors of each of the planning and/or development districts in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee were studied through census also. The three states were divided into planning and/or development districts as follows:

State	Number of Planning and/or Development Districts
Alabama	12
Mississippi	12
Tennessee	9

This created a grand total of 33 planning and/or development districts (see Appendix B). Random assignment of the instruments was utilized in order to determine which executive directors of the planning and/or development districts received the "ideal" and which received the "real" questionnaires.

Instrumentation

Educators use questionnaires to obtain facts about past, present, and anticipated events, conditions, and practices and to make inquires concerning attitudes and opinions.[31] For many studies, presenting respondents with carefully selected and ordered questions is the only practical way to elicit the data required to confirm or disconfirm a hypothesis.[32]

There are several factors which improve the researcher's chances for response such as the following:

1. The questionnaire length
2. The attractiveness of the questionnaire
3. The ease with which the questionnaire can be completed and returned
4. Coding and quality printing
5. Offering the sample population results or an abstract of the study.[33]

The study made use of two questionnaires (developed by Tassee) stating the same questions but in a different tense. The "ideal" questionnaire phrased questions concerning the way the respondents believed community education and interagency collaboration "ought to be." The "real" questionnaire phrased questions concerning the respondents belief of how community education and interagency collaboration actually "is."

Questionnaires were based on topic areas considered to be important to agency-school collaboration in community education programs. The response categories allow for a choice of five degrees

of reaction. The responses were coded, verified and processed by the University of Tennessee Computer Center. Number of values will be assigned to the responses as follows:

Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Neutral	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1

Reliability of the Questionnaires

According to Asher, reliability is a concept indicating replicability of studies, agreement among observers, or relationships among similar measures.[34] "Objectivity is reliability, and reliability is objectivity."[35] Kerlinger offered further insight when he defined an objective procedure as "one in which agreement among observers is at a maximum."[36]

A very important type of reliability is internal consistency which is the result of the interrelationship of items among themselves in a test on a dimension of behavior. The "ideal" and "real" questionnaires were tested for internal consistency reliability by Hoyt's analysis of variance approach. This test of reliability was performed for each of the six key elements or scales used in the analysis of data. All reliability coefficients were .84 or greater as established by Tassee in 1972; therefore, it can be assumed that the instrument will produce similar results over time.[37]

Procedures for the Collection of Data

On April 26, 1978, questionnaires (see Appendix A) were mailed along with stamped self-addressed return envelopes and cover letter. Community education directors and coordinators were requested to send the names of the community schools and principals with whom they worked. No demographic data were requested and all questionnaires were selectively coded. On May 15, 1978, the 100 principals of community schools were mailed "real" questionnaires.

In developing specific procedures for use in the study, the researcher took advantage of many resources as follows:

1. Available literature in the field of community education and interagency collaboration.

2. Courses of study concerning community education at The University of Tennessee.

3. Conversations and correspondence with the director of the Regional Center of Community Education for the Mott Region.

4. A state board of education meeting to hear a community educator speak on community education in Tennessee.

5. Available literature from the Federal Community Education Clearinghouse in Rockville, Maryland.

6. Dissertation abstracts on community education as was supplied by the National Community Education Association in Flint, Michigan.

7. The Directory of Local Planning Agencies in the Southeastern United States, Metropolitan Development Agency listing planning and development districts.

8. Questionnaires developed and validated by Tassee in an unpublished dissertation entitled, "A Study of the Key Elements of Agency-School Cooperation and Their Relationship to Community Education."

The literature provided an opportunity to study the early beginnings of the community education movement, the present educational needs and societal reactions, and the future aspirations of more adequate and actualized groups of community members throughout the United States.

In regard to obtaining data, one would do well to follow the advice of Drucker as follows:

> It is not possible to be effective unless one first decides what one wants to accomplish. It is not possible to manage, in other words unless one first has a goal. It is not even possible to design the structure of an organization unless one knows what it is supposed to be doing and how to measure whether it is doing it.[38]

The preceding quote entails the purpose of the "ideal" and "real" questionnaires which were used to collect data for analysis of the key elements of agency-school collaboration.

Statistical Methods

One-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the entire set of dependent variables--the six key elements of interagency collaboration. If the one-way analysis indicated a significant difference among the treatment groups, the researcher was confident that the treatment groups differed with respect to at least one dependent variable.

If the returned questionnaires from the two treatment groups were of an unequal number, the researcher was obligated to test the assumption of equal variances. The test that was applicable for this purpose was Barteltt-Box F.

The one-way analysis of variance procedure was appropriate because it tested simultaneously the equality of the mean vectors of each scale which constitute the dependent variable of concern. When a significant F ratio was found, a multiple comparison or post hoc comparison was utilized to help the researcher determine the dependent variable that was contributing to the overall significant F statistic. Scheffe's Multiple Range Test was used for multiple comparison procedures because Scheffe's test handles unequal cell size and is the most conservative post hoc procedure.[39]

VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I gives an introduction, a description and statement of the problem, the scope and adequacy of the problem, a statement of assumptions, a statement of the hypothesis and six questions, definitions of terms, the methodology, and the organization of the study.

Chapter II will present a review of the literature and research related to the study in the areas treating community education and interagency collaboration.

Chapter III will give an analysis of the data as collected from the two questionnaires administered to the community school

directors and coordinators, executive directors if planning agencies and development districts, and community school principals.

Chapter IV will present the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter is reviewed the literature related to the assumption that community education, as a collaborative venture, serves as a viable base from which to plan the delivery of adequate human services to all community members. Community, education, organizational theory, and social services are discussed in the first section to provide a base of understanding for other sections and arguments presented. The developing concept of community education and the administrative implementation of this concept are introduced in the second section. In the third section the topic of lifelong learning which is accelerated by complete utilization of community resources and facilities, citizen involvement, and inter-agency collaboration is discussed. The inevitability and necessity of change in a society which is protean and explosive is presented in the fourth section. The elements of a rural community education program are discussed in the fifth section. Future requirements for community education which will aid in improvement of the educational situation for the community are outlined in the sixth section. A summary of the basic propositions discussed in this chapter are presented in the last section.

I. THE NATURE OF THE COMMUNITY

In order to understand community education, one should first look at the meaning of the words which make up the term. One should

also analyze the components associated with the concept. While there is almost universal understanding of what a "school" is, there is considerably less agreement on the meaning of the word "community." The word "community" comes from the Latin word Communis, meaning fellowship or common relations and feelings.[40] In its medieval usage the word was perhaps more descriptive, meaning a group of fellows or fellow townsmen. Dictionaries define community as a social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, have a common cultural and historical heritage, share a government; and also as a social group sharing common interests or characteristics and perceiving itself (or being perceived) as different from the larger society.[41]

John Dewey emphasized the fact that community life depended primarily upon communications and the acceptance of common aims, beliefs, aspirations, knowledge, and goals: "Men live in a community in virtue of the things they have in common; and communications is the way in which they come to possess things in common."[42]

Another perspective on describing the community is to place it at either of two opposite poles. These polarities have been variously described as the range from rural to urban, from folk culture to mass culture, from simple organization to complex, and from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft.[43] According to the German sociologist, Ferdinand Tonnies, the gemeinschaft is the type of society which tends to foster a strong sense of community identity and kinship. Whereas, he viewed the gesellschaft society as fostering a loss of sense of belonging, a loss of personal identity, a lack of concern for others, and creation of an environment which in many ways is abnormal for man. Thus,

according to Tonnies, the old gemeinschaft community of our forefathers has disappeared, and in many communities the primary group has been disarranged.[44]

In order to provide a common basis for comparison of people and groups, the following definition of community is offered: a community is "that combination of social units and systems which perform the major social functions having locality relevance."[45] In simpler terms, the organization of social activities and units designed in such a way so as to facilitate the daily living of given sets of people. All of the people in our democratic communities have a right to meaningful participation in community affairs. In past years this was merely the right to vote--to elect representatives or to approve or disapprove bond issues. In recent years the community--parents, teachers, students, citizenry at large--has begun to demand a larger role in identifying community service needs and ways of achieving them. As a result, people are beginning to give greater consideration in their personal and professional lives to the dynamic whole instead of trying to address only a portion of their problems.[46]

The constancy of change along with diverse crises, constraints, and challenges has affected everyone's existence in organizational and institutional community life in America. There is increasing conflict between individual needs resulting from bureaucratic practices and priorities which limit opportunities for face-to-face communication to resolve problems. Writers are currently telling us how the complexity of society and change can bring about a shock or sickness in the

future. Toffler, in his interesting book, Future Shock, even predicts that some radically different schemes of family life will be attempted.[47] The "problem of the city," increasing bureaucracy and institutional complexity, social disorder and alienation, rising crime rates, rising divorce rates, and various other frustrations are evidence that social change is even now affecting all phases of community life. Thus, communities are subjected to great forces which paralyze their capacity for action and in some cases self-preservation. The condition of anomie is not unknown in our society. Anomie reflects a planlessness of living which is a kind of living that "defeats itself because achievement no longer has any criterion of value and happiness always lies beyond any present achievement."[48]

All communities are experiencing impersonal human ties as a result of two major changes: population growth and urbanization.[49] More than 85 percent of our population live in 212 urban areas that comprise approximately 3 percent of the land area.[50] The term "urbanization" is more than a population movement; it describes entirely different living patterns.[51] Consequently, all communities, cities, and states are experiencing a nightmarish task in locating resources, providing services, and managing resultant complex human relationships. Furthermore, the rapidity of urbanized advancement has created a wide cultural gap. The inability to fill this gap through training or education has contributed to a situation where community needs and educational goals are often out of harmony. As urbanization advances, communities are lacking in cohesion and communication as is explained by Mills when he stated:

> They are not communities in any real sense of the word, but unplanned monstrosities in which as men and women we are segregated into narrowed routines and milieux. We do not meet one another as persons in the several aspects of our total life, but know one another only fractionally; as the man who fixes the car, or as that girl who serves our lunch, or as the woman who takes care of our child at school. Pre-ju-dgment--prejudice--flourishes when people meet people only in this manner. The humanist reality of others does not, cannot, come through.
>
> . . . we develop, in our defense, a blasé manner that reaches deeper than a manner. We do not, accordingly, experience genuine clash of viewpoint. And when we do, we tend to consider it merely rude. We are sunk in our routines, we do not transcend them, even in discussion, much less by action. We do not gain a view of the structure of our society as a whole and of our role within it. Our cities are composed of narrow slots, and we, as the people in these slots, are more and more confined to our own rather narrow ranges. As we reach for each other, we do so only by stereotype. Each is trapped by his confining circle; and is split from easily identifiable groups . . . .[52]

The definition of community noted that those social units performing societal functions must be combined to serve the needs of a given public. The school is one of these major units and it should be utilized in the development of a sense of belonging, a feeling of identification, and an intimate association among community members. The community and the school are inseparable. It has been established beyond any reasonable doubt that community and family background play a large role in determining scholastic aptitude and school achievement.

The Role of Education

The educational system is the one remaining public unit that is common to all groups in our society; thus, making it necessary to capitalize on this similarity between communities. Recent writers have questioned whether the concept of education is being used as "the great equalizer of the conditions of men."[53]

> . . . Writers have called for an expanded definition of education, one which does not equate it with schooling per se. Rather, education is regarded as a process of becoming--one begun at birth and continuing until death. Seen in this light, education is a system with many components designed to help persons in their quest for self-actualization.[54]

Several theorists have attempted to define education in more expanded terms. For example, Maslow defined education as that system which helps individuals in their quest for self-actualization.[55] This refers to man's desire for self-fulfillment; namely, to the tendency for one to become actualized in what he is potentially. In order to become self-actualized, Maslow stated through the writing of Goble the need for a synergic society.

> The synergic society creates an environment where people can develop their potential and satisfy their innate psychological needs. The good society is one which is fulfilling and makes self-actualization possible. A healthy society would be one which fulfills the most potentialities of the greatest number of people.[56]

Combs and Syngg stated the principal goal of education is the development of "adequate personalities."[57] Adequate personality is not synonymous with conformity; it is much closer to self-actualized.[58] To further clarify adequate personality, Combs described the truly adequate person in terms of (1) positive view of self, (2) identification with others, (3) acceptance of and openness to experience, and (4) the richness and availability of the perceptual field.[59]

Gestalt theorists describe education as the integration of the fragmented parts of a person's life so as to react as a total organism.[60] Therefore, education is an amalgam of many experiences: home, school, job, peer group, media, church, agencies, and so forth.[61]

A more relevant definition by H. G. Wells states that, "Education is the preparation of the individual for the community."[62] While Dewey defined education as, "that reconstruction or reorganization which adds to the meaning of experience and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience.[63] Drucker stated that educators have always known that the most important thing that youngsters will have to learn is "not this or that subject matter," but that "they will have to learn how to learn."[64]

Education is viewed by many as the escalator by means of which the poor can rise to the middle class and finally the assumption that those who know what is right will do what is right. From Jefferson to Horace Mann to John Dewey to John Gardner we have believed that through education we could achieve equality of opportunity, reduce poverty and crime, and bring about a stable, yet creative society.[65] The school has thus been seen as support for a political theory of gradualism as a foundation for the American Dream. Totten and Manley describe the American Dream as the desire to "preserve and extend liberty and individual opportunity and the dream of equality and greater well-being for all."[66]

Perhaps, the most operative role of today's education was put forth by the American Association of School Administrators:

> . . . to establish with all pupils in the transmission of the culture, the moral and spiritual values, and the fundamental understandings essential to the improvement of the culture, and necessary for the responsible living together of free men in a free society.[67]

Organizational Theory

Modern society is to a large degree a bureaucratic society; that is, many of its functional requirements such as education and social intergration are controlled by complex organizations. Complex organizations may be termed as: "the arrangement of personnel for facilitating the accomplishment of some agreed purpose through the allocation of functions and responsibilities."[68] Or, defined more simply, formal organization is "a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons."[69] Not only does modern society as a whole tend to be bureaucratic, but the most powerful social units of the community are bureaucracies also.[70] In addition to big business and labor, which are often cited as bureaucracies, military organizations, school systems, political parties, medical organizations, and many others make up the bureaucratic jungle.[71]

The structure of an organization may be seen through its constituent personnel and the roles they play in its functioning. Thus, we ordinarily think of an organization as having some kind of "management" or "administration"--a group of people carrying some kind of special responsibility for the organization's affairs, usually formulated as "policy formation" or "decision making."[72]

Since it is assumed that an organization is defined by a type of goal, the focus of its value system must be legitimation of this goal in terms of the functional significance of its attainment for the superordinate system; and secondly, the legitimation of this goal over the other possible interests and values of the organization and its members.[73]

According to Etzioni, the means that one uses to gain commitment to goals and to stimulate activity toward goals depends upon three variables--the nature of the goals to be achieved, the kind of involvement one wishes from those who are to do the work, and the nature of the tasks which define this work. Furthermore, he presents three kinds of goals: order, economic, and cultural.[74]

If the primary goal of the organization is order and tasks are largely routine, the most efficient means to compliance are coercive. The price one pays for this efficiency, however, is that involvement of participants is alienative.[75] If the goal of the organization is primarily economic and the tasks are seen as largely instrumental means to this end, then the most efficient means to compliance is utilitarian--that is, to purchase participation.[76] In this kind of organization, one's involvement is liked largely with what he perceives his participation will bring materially. If the goals are cultural, they require moral commitment of the community.[77] School goals are generally considered to be cultural in nature. These are achieved through normative compliance strategies. One engages in activities of the organization because they are good, professionally sound, aid individuals in working toward self-actualization, and make sense.

The primary exigencies of an organization concern the procurement of the resources necessary for it to attain its goal or carry out its function. The organization will itself have to have institutionalized procedures by which these resources are brought to bear in the concrete processes of goal-attainment. In this context, goals are

considered as a desired state of affairs. "Real" goals are those to which the organization's means are directed, and the participants are committed to in contradistinction to the "ideal" goals which may or may not be the actual goals of an organization.

Organizational theory offers a means of viewing fresh knowledge and new insights into our modern complex society. The administrator of an organization can acquire a theoretical understanding of the challenges of bureaucratic and organizational behavior. Douglas McGregor, in his book, The Human Side of Enterprise, introduces two analyses of organizational behavior which he labeled Theory X and Theory Y. The former represents the conventional pyramidal structure based on authority and responsibility; the latter allows more freedom for subordinates in decision making. Theory Y assumes, in part, that "under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized."[78] Furthermore, individuals exercising "a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems are widely, not narrowly distributed in the population."[79]

McGregor suggests that in those cases where the administrator operates in the realm of Theory Y, subordinates confirm administrative actions and beliefs and the cycle perpetuates itself. He concludes that "Theory X places exclusive reliance upon external control of human behavior, while Theory Y relies heavily on self-control and self-direction."[80] Therefore, the emphasis of Theory Y is on creativity, satisfaction, and self-fulfillment. If this same emphasis is utilized

by administrators of community organizations, the social, psychological, economic, health, conservation, and other problems which face this nation now and in the future will be faced by self-directed individuals in a more effective manner.

Our large, tall, hierarchial organizational patterns are literally strangling our schools and the people in them. Ways need to be found that will free school and individual teachers to depart, to explore, and to be unique in serving the individual and the community. Many times the reverse has been true. The educational organization, copying many standard procedures that have long ago been abandoned by business and industry, has moved the decision-making process further away from the operational level, the classroom. In order to become more effective, many organizations have moved the decision-making process as close to the operating level as possible. However, the organizational pattern in education has been that of providing solutions from the central office.

After examining some of the intricacies of organizational theory, a brief discussion of social service agencies will add further credence to the development of community education and interagency collaboration.

The Impact of Social Service Agencies

The rise of a complex, urbanized society has created the need for institutionalized measures of facilitating interpersonal competence and social functioning while intervening in areas of social dysfunction.[81] The emergence and contributions of social services are being

increasingly recognized as indispensable to the well-being of society, and social work has become the core discipline of the welfare effort.

The beginnings of social service agencies have been inextricably bound up with the fundamental economic conditions and changes within the social order and with the concomitant philosophies expressed therein. From the breakup of the old feudal order through the successive changes of mercantilism, commercialism, and industrialism, there has persisted the basic and unavoidable fact of human needs. In order to meet these needs, society established specific services based on the premise of individual responsibility. The individual who could not meet his own needs had brought that condition upon himself through his own ignorance and incapacity. The solution was to meet that need as sparingly as possible without tempting the individual to become dependent. Several years passed before the realization that there were factors larger than and beyond any individual's control. The awakening to this realization presented the period of community welfare organization. The Charity Organization Society was the first city-wide charity program in the United States. This society (COS) was established in 1877 in Buffalo, New York and aimed at the coordination among existing welfare services and agencies. Its purpose was to develop a machinery and a technique whereby relief could be expeditiously and economically administered without duplication and competition.[82]

During the early years of the twentieth century, before the emergence of extensive public welfare services, social workers functioned largely in the voluntary agencies and were preoccupied with the

development of social work's own distinctive helping methods, coordination of proliferating programs, social planning, and social action.[83] From 1917-1935 a positive approach was beginning to replace the negativism of the past three centuries. Community members saw the rise and the rapid growth of community chests and councils of social service agencies.[84] The entry of the United States into World War I in 1917, led to a mushroom growth of "war chests," or financial federations concerned with making war appeals. In the period following, the many war chests were made over into peacetime community chests.

Government social service did not become actively aroused until 1931-1932. At this time the economic depression made it impossible for family welfare societies and voluntary organizations to care for the needs of the unemployed. From this time forward, federal government programs have continued to be more and more essential in the American society. Communities have been made aware of this need by experts of all description, by governmental officials, by politicians, and by officials of various industrial and commercial corporations.

An important contribution to growth and development of social services is a community's human resources. Skilled workers must be available if various adults are to keep up with societal or technological changes that affect their jobs. Management and leadership training programs must be developed if community and business leaders are to maintain and improve their abilities to solve various problems. Thus, if the goals of communities and society are to be realized, human resources development is a necessary condition for achieving them.

There is a critical need for a much greater coordination of human services delivery at the community level. With an ever increasing population, the need for human services greatly increases. The integration of social service agencies with the schools is suggested as a viable means of meeting the increasing needs of community life. Why the schools? Should some other existing agency accept this responsibility, or should we develop some new super structure?

While many educators may wish to avoid the expended responsibility for the school, there is considerable logic in the assumption of this role. Minzy and LeTarte state reasons for the acceptance of this broadened role for the school as follows:

> Schools often overlap the boundaries of several other governmental units. Because of this, they can serve as a unifying force, providing a nonthreatening base to interagency and intraagency cooperation. Schools are publicly owned, usually built through special tax levies voted for by members of the community. For this reason, people have a sense of ownership, feeling comfortable about using them. In addition, public schools cut across the socioeconomic boundaries of the community. Children from all income levels attend the school. Thus, a better access to all families than is possible through any other community agency is provided. Within this context the public school has established bonds of trust with parents and children, which allow it to be one of the most respected community institutions.[88]

The location of the school buildings provides easy accessibility to large populations and is within walking distance for many individuals. The schools' facilities are available at times when adults can use them. The school can serve as the educational center of a community for the youth during the day when adults are normally at work. It is, then, available in the evening for community use when adults can take advantage of the opportunity.[86]

Mr. Willard Wirtz, former U. S. Secretary of Labor, addressed this issue in his Task Force III: Jobs, Income, and Human Services Recommendations at the Appalachian Conference on Balanced Growth and Economic Development held in Charleston, West Virginia during October of 1977. He recommended that there be increased emphasis for providing more "direct support for local development of articulated and coordinated interagency programs for lifeling learning opportunities."[87] This recommendation was based on the realization that a high percentage of adults in Appalachia missed the advantages of education in the past and are entitled to another opportunity, and that changing career patterns--especially among women and older people--no longer permit confining education to the young.[88] Mr. Wirtz also recommended special analysis of what parts of career and job learning can be most efficiently and economically done in the schools. This suggests that in addition to sharing a common facility with all age-groups of the community, there is also the need to reorganize many programs into interagency partnerships which make more effective use of available human and economic resources.

It appears that at least four main rationales for examining the interagency collaboration idea exist: (1) quality of services, (2) quantity of services, (3) visibility of services, and (4) provision of services at a lower cost.[89] Collaboration facilitates the sharing of professional expertise and experience, therefore, improving the quality of services to be rendered. The number of services and people served can be increased through collaboration of agencies and schools while making both more visible in the community. Increased visibility

is regarded by the community and funding resources as signs of successful services which should be continued. Since no single public agency has unlimited resources available, collaboration allows participating agencies to support each other and to tap other sources of funds, reducing costly duplication in time and effort.

The inevitability and rapidity of change in America has taught us that we must learn to educate for change. There are many agencies and organizations in each community that provide programs and services of an actual or potential educational nature. To realize the benefits of mutual planning and collaboration, the common concerns of these agencies and the schools is essential if educational programs are to be collaborated and community-oriented. The educational system can no longer remain autonomous and separate from the rest of the community. Nor can various agencies and organizations providing educational services afford programs that will meet all community needs. Consequently, there is a need for some collaborative venture between the educational system and other agencies if maximum service to each community is to be provided.

II. COMMUNITY EDUCATION: THE DEVELOPING CONCEPT

Schools are the main intersection of all community life. They are the one neighborhood institution that is readily accessible to every man, woman, and child in the neighborhood regardless of class, creed, or color. This democratic nature of the schools provides a comfortable place for the development of the community education concept. The concept is based on the principle that those affected

by any program or decision-making process should have input in the planning and decision making. Furthermore, the concept focuses primarily upon the community as the source and center of education, upon all its relevant sites, institutions, agencies, organizations, and people. Or, community education may be described as an operational philosophy of education, comprehensive in scope and of high potential, equally applicable to any organization, association, or agency that provides learning opportunities for community members.[90] More simply stated, Clark viewed community education as:

> . . . a concept which recognizes that both learning and education are lifelong processes, and that it is essential to address educational programming to the lifelong desires and needs of the entire community. It is a philosophy and a system which subscribes to the efficient utilization of all human, physical, and financial resources of the community. It further stresses the need for interinstitutional and agency cooperation and coordination. Another integral element of this concept is the systematic involvement of community members in educational decision making.[91]

Community education is not a new concept. Seay noted that "the current American concept of community education has developed out of three centuries of experience with schools and with nonschool agencies that have performed various educational functions for the people of communities."[92] However, community education as it is practiced in most communities today, had its inception in Flint, Michigan between 1932-1935. Through the efforts of such pioneers as Frank Manley and Charles Stewart Mott, the Flint schools became community centers and began to assume responsibility for improvements in the quality of life within the communities they served. A philanthropic foundation, The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, was

established for purposes of helping American communities in their growth and development. This foundation has directed its resources toward implementation, dissemination, and training in community education across the country with the result that there are now approximately 5,000 schools in 700 school districts designated as community schools. More than 90 universities are providing dissemination and training as well.[93] In addition, it was determined by Migocki (1976) in his study on Community Education and SEA's that at that time there were 15 states with fulltime community education positions.[94] Funds from the Community School Act of 1974 have provided 32 states the opportunity to hire staff, and it is anticipated that by 1977-78 nearly 40 states will have received funding for community education development at the state education association level under provisions of the Community School Act.[95]

Regional centers for community education development, many supported in part by over three million dollars in grants from the foundation, are located all over the country to provide information on community education, training on how to get it going, and special advice to particular communities with interest.[96]

It has been clearly presented that community education is not a new concept. Then, why the sudden interest and phenomenal rate of growth in a concept that has languished for years: there are at least six basic reasons for this sudden development:

1. Major demographic and sociological changes. The appearance of megalopolis and urban sprawl along with bureaucratic upheaval have dissolved community living. The cities are of such magnitude that

few citizens are able to participate actively in government. The average person moves 14 times in his lifetime and, as a result, has no real contact with a stable community.[97] Poverty, crime, delinquency, drugs, and unemployment have increased at a frightening pace.

2. Dissatisfaction with the accomplishments of the public schools as they currently operate. The schools seem riddled with hypocrisy. They speak of community involvement, yet the involvement is usually superficial. They speak of educating the whole child, yet operate as though a child's total education is accomplished under their direction. Their objectives state that education is a lifetime endeavor, yet operate as though education is terminated with school programs.

3. Recognized need for collaboration of community services. The increase in population and the trend toward urbanization is demanding the need for more human services. Without collaboration, there is the danger that communities, families, and individuals will be underserved; or, that duplication of services with concomitant reduction in cost-effectiveness will result.

4. Inability of the home to provide the early childhood environment considered essential as a basis for further education and productive life.

5. Recognition of the educative potential of community agencies in addition to the school.

6. Commitment to the promotion of the community education concept by state legislatures and Congress.[98] The early 1970's have been a period of renewed interest in consolidating support for

community facilites and programs which involve schools. Two major federal bills--The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and The Community Schools Act of 1974--were enacted into law.

These sudden developments have thrown the present decade of the seventies into a search for alternative schools with some going so far as to advocate the "de-schooling" of society.[99] Most of those who have advocated educational reform seem to have accepted the unchangeability of the school. Until schools become involved in the community--the total community--and until the schools face up to the external problems that limit the education of children, our feelings of frustrations will continue and magnify in scope and depth.

The power of the developing concept of the community in education was sensed long ago by many perceptive educational leaders. More than 50 years ago Joseph K. Hart stated that we could not educate children in a school and that only a good community can carry on good education:

> The democratic problem in education is not primarily one of training children; it is the problem of making a community in which children cannot help growing up to be democratic, intelligent, disciplined, reverent of the goods of life, and eager to share in the tasks of the age. A school cannot produce this result; nothing but a community can do so; consequently, we can never be satisfied that we have met the educational problem of our day when we have good schools. We must have good communities.[100]

The responsibility must be recognized. If the total community and the quality of its life are responsible for an educational failure, then it follows if we wish to improve the results of education we must do something to improve the total life of the community. This means we must develop a community that is totally mobilized for education.

For several reasons, the educational system seems to be the logical institution for promoting the community education concept. Each public school system has publicly owned facilities in each neighborhood. These facilities incorporate a variety of meeting rooms, audio-visual equipment, duplicating processes, and human talent that is required in any attempt to organize the community. The public school is viewed by the general public as nonpolitical. It is designed to serve the total community rather than special interest groups. The importance of the need for the public school system to promote the community education concept and accept a broader responsibility of its role to include the entire community is expressed by Hansen:

> A school that reflects the needs, interests, and highest educational and social ideals of its own immediate community (and the larger state, national, and world communities of which it is a part) provides a better education, academically and socially, than the school that stands apart. A public school is simply not doing an effective job unless the life of the school is integrated with the life of the community.[101]

It is becoming increasingly evident that schools must initiate a more positive and active leadership role in their respective communities. This is because of the unique nature of public education in this country which affords it an opportunity to greatly assist in community growth, and also because it makes good sense educationally to become involved in the community's problems.

The Administrative Implementation of Community Education

Regardless of all the theories, methodologies, and techniques available, we still know least about implementation. Bennis defines

implementation as "a process which includes the development of understanding and commitment toward a particular change and techniques whereby it can become integral to the client system's operations."[102] This process for planned change involves "a change agent, a client system, and the collaborative attempt to apply valid knowledge to the client's knowledge."[103] He summarized the importance of these elements as follows:

1. The client system should have as much understanding of the change and its consequences, as much influence in developing and controlling the fate of the change, and as much trust in the initiator of the change as is possible.

2. The change effort should be perceived as being as self-motivated and voluntary as possible. This can be effected through the legitimization and reinforcement of the change by the top management group and by the significant reference groups adjacent to the client system. It is also made possible by providing the utmost in true volition.

3. The change program must include emotional and value as well as cognitive (informational) elements for successful implementation. It is doubtful that relying solely on rational persuasion (expert power) is sufficient. Most organizations possess the knowledge to cure their ills; the medicine is utilization.

4. The change agent can be crucial in reducing the resistance to change. As long as the change agent acts congruently with the principles of the program and as long as the client has a chance to test competence and motives (his own and the change agents), the

agent should be able to provide the psychological support so necessary during the risky phases of change. The quality of the client-agent relationship is pivotal to the success of the change program.[104]

An understanding of these elements of implementation is essential in the development and administration of community education. It is an evolutionary process which must begin and grow through the involvement of those to be effected by it. Both programs and process imply involvement, and it would certainly seem illogical to suppose that a concept proclaiming the need for without such involvement at its inception.

Implementing the community education concept is often a difficult, complex, and ambitious task for most schools and communities. Interest in community education may develop in many loci within the community. Since it is to operate through the school system, however, it is imperative that the board of education, as the governing body of the school district, be the object of the first efforts of those desiring to implement a program. However, under no circumstances should the board of education decide unilaterally to begin community education.

If the board is interested in pursuing the concept, then several things should happen. Many additional exposures to community education should be made to the community and to the professional staff. School administrators must be made aware of the concept and its relation to their program. If the program is to succeed, the educational administrator will spend more of his time and effort relating to people he does not manage than to those he does manage such as teachers and students. Teachers must be exposed to this basic change in program and

philosophy. Noncertificated staff must be made aware of what is going on, and community members must also be included in these introductory presentations. This will demand a community relations expert. Past preparation in administration has been school oriented within school parameters. Seldom is the educational administrator an expert in community relations.[105]

However, this role is critical to the development and maintenance of a community school. In the early 1950's, Paul Misner provided educational leaders with a challenge as follows:

> The greatest single responsibility for the achievement of school-community cooperation during the next 25 years rests squarely with the school administrators of the nation. These individuals will need to posses unlimited faith in people and exquisite and consummate skills in the exercise of educational leadership. They will need to be unafraid that lay participation and cooperation will threaten or undermine the proper functions and responsibilities of the professional organization. They will have confidence that when citizens have the opportunity to understand fully the great complexity of the educational process, they will readily and intelligently distinguish between lay and professional functions.[106]

It is imperative that we accept the challenge and realize that we need to help each other in our quest to become more effective. School administrators must continue to seek ways to draw more people into the educational process. In order to do this, we must shift our thinking from what a "community" means to where a "sense of community" can be found.

Administration of community schools is not the same as administering traditional schools. Leadership to achieve desirable conditions for the community education movement requires specific knowledge and highly developed skills. Weaver suggests the following training goals for community education leaders:

1. Develop a knowledge base in the philosophy of community education and educational leadership.

2. Develop a knowledge base in the behavioral sciences and communication arts.

3. Develop ability to analyze the elements in the leadership situation and select appropriate leadership styles.

4. Develop and apply required styles of leadership.

5. Develop personal requisites to community education leadership success.

6. Develop technical, human, and conceptual skills appropriate to community education leadership.[107]

Even though the development of new concepts of administration may be a process distinguished by controversy and many difficulties, such a development is paramount if true community education is to be developed. The traditional school administrator can make his position one which afford him an enormous opportunity for facilitating the community education program. They can help in the formulation of proposed statements of policy for board action, can help in the development of incentives and the establishment of machinery to encourage staff members to examine future needs, can participate in experimental curriculum endeavors, and can utilize a community and life-centered emphasis in the learning experiences they provide.

Administration in such a program must design the conditions which increase intelligence and proceed by cooperating with all community resources. Present preparation for administrators help them deal with the people they control, but their success in total community

education depends more on their ability to deal effectively with the people they do not control than those they do control.

New roles and duties for principals are mandated. The employment of a community school director and coordinator is absolutely essential. Also, most communities feel it necessary to organize community advisory councils in order to stay abreast of community needs. Perhaps, a closer look at the role of the principal, the role of the community school director and coordinator, and the organization of the community school advisory council may provide a clearer understanding of the process of implementation of community education.

The role of the principal. Traditionally the school has operated during the regular school day. School principals have realized that it is a waste to allow excellent facilities to remain idle for large segments of time, particularly during evenings, weekends, and summers. They have also realized that every community has members who are interested in self-improvement through additional education, increased recreation, more opportunities for interaction and socialization.[108] Thus, many innovative principals are realizing the necessity of role change in order to more adequately meet their community's needs. The principal of each community school is seen as central in the development and coordination of the community's involvement in decision making, participation, and problem-solving activities. The idea to augment the responsibilities of the principal in light of the other societal and physical problems he faces may seem to be overwhelming. However, this inclusion of the community with the school may well result in a lessening of some of the very problems that seem to be

insurmountable. The principal must maintain a philosophical view that the school building belongs to everyone; a commitment to the continuing education of the community; that education is a gestalt rather than fragmented parts of a process; that education when motivated, even in later life, often has stronger impact than early education; that education is a right, not a privilege; and, finally, that the school is a focal point for dispensing social services to the community.[109]

As the principal accepts a broader view of education, he must communicate this new vision to the school staff as well as the community. He will have broadened responsibilities in establishing the school as a catalytic force which brings formal educational activities like the adult education program and the pre-school program together in cooperation with avocational activities such as recreational programs and cultural programs for citizens of all ages. In addition, the social service agencies of the community should be collaborated with the community school to bring their services to the local clientele.

The community school director and coordinator. The director and coordinator are key roles in the present and future development of community education. In some programs, the director is the key person; whereas, other programs select the coordinator as the more dominant role. Therefore, this study will discuss the role of the director which may be interchangeable, dominant, or subordinate to that of the coordinator.

The director is responsible to the school principal and serves as a community agent. His responsibilities lie in bringing all the

components of community education together into a working process for individual and community fulfillment and betterment.[110] In his role as a catalytic agent, he brings together the many agencies and services that exist in a community. The community school director also serves in the role of ombudsman, a role not uncommon to many Scandinavian nations. The ombudsman is an information source, a person that knows about services.[111]

There are certain identifiable personal traits which should be sought in the selection of a director. A good director should be a highly motivated individual who is task-oriented so that his goals take precedence over his time. He should work well with people and be able to establish good rapport in a short period of time. He should be a good administrator, able to organize, execute, delegate, and plan. His personal qualities are very important and are described by Totten as follows:

> Above all else, the director must be creative and have a warm, outgoing personality. He must like people and be capable of showing compassion without pity. He must be the kind of person to be trusted by people of all ages. He must be free from prejudice with respect to people of any race and/or socio-economic circumstances. Humility and consistency are two essential qualities. The director must be in good emotional and physical health and capable of sustained energy and vigor for long periods of time. Flexibility and adaptability are essential personal qualities. The director should be a good team member and a skillful leader.[112]

The nature of the director's job is extremely varied. He is at the grass roots level and should make it his job to know about needs and services and to bring the two together. He will find himself serving on committees of various kinds, surveying the community, working with other agencies, developing and supervising programs,

serving as a resource person to the local school staff, visiting homes, speaking at public meetings, employing staff, developing budgets, seeking funding, and administering programs.[113] He is a student of social service. He accepts the responsibility for bringing together people who have never interacted under a traditional educational structure. He is assisting the administration and faculty and informing the community of the goals and aspirations of the school program. The information and feedback is a two-way street. The community school director informs, shares information, and educates the administration and faculty regarding the issues, problems, and most important resources that are available in the community. As an educator of tomorrow, he must possess a scholarly and down-to-earth knowledge of learning theory as it relates to school and community. He, therefore, must possess thorough knowledge of and be productive in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and supervision. He may be called upon to be a counselor and advise on many occasions. Strength in leadership, communication, and human relations skills are essential to his successful performance. His business is composed of people and helping people solve a great variety of human problems. Hence, he must be able to assess the needs of people; then, he must plan, implement, and administer programs of learning to help people fulfill their unmet needs. In doing this, he must develop expertise in approaching nonschool agencies for assistance and in bringing into contact all of the efforts of other organizations and groups to serve the learning needs of people.[114]

In order to implement a community education program in such a manner as to insure its longevity and success, Minzey and LeTarte suggest that the director acquire information as follows:

1. The history of the community. This would include information about the beginning of the community and its development.

2. Governmental organizations. Many communities are fractional parts of many different political units. Of particular importance would be the knowledge of how the school relates to these governments both financially and politically.

3. Business and industry. Information should be obtained on the general activity of business, such as shopping centers and private enterprises, including special organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, which represents them.

4. Religion. Information of value in this category would include the kinds and numbers of denominations and sects which represent the various segments of the population.

5. Education. It is not only necessary to know about the public school system and the area it covers, but other educational operations as well. This includes parochial and private schools, institutions of higher education, and any other groups which engage in some type of education.

6. Agencies. Information concerning agencies which would include any type of social agencies which deal with particular problems such as unemployment, welfare, health, recreation, and so forth.

7. Communication systems. It would be necessary to know all the media sources such as radio, television, newspapers, and other publications.

8. Community members. Information concerning the people who live in the community should include such things as educational level, income, employment, family size, transiency, housing patterns, wants, and needs.[115]

No other position is so important to the operation of community education as that of the director. Regardless of the other inputs, the success or failure of the program will depend upon who fills this position. Too often in our complex society the individual with needs and the service agencies are unaware of each other. The ombudsman, the community school director, serves in a role that brings the client and the service agency together. As urbanization increases, and particularly in neighborhoods that are considered disorganized, the role of the community school director becomes increasingly important.

The community school advisory council. No single educator can know and understand all that needs to be known about a community. From the viewpoint of community education, educators should draw plans according to goals set by the citizens. Educational planning should create those conditions that will fulfill the desires of the citizens as developed by them. This planning by citizens can be actualized through a community school advisory council (CSAC) which provides opportunities for broad based community involvement. The organization of the community school advisory council is a process and should grow out of the function it is going to serve. The main goal is to establish a mechanism by which citizens will begin to analyze their situation and then determine future directions.[116] The goal that should be sought is two-way communication. The current direction of most communication is

downward. Messages are directed to consumers and clientele with little or no opportunity for feedback. By promoting a technique which allows all community members to voice their feelings and opinions, an understanding of community needs and problems will be developed. In addition to being an important communication link to the community in general and to the fiscal authorities which depend on patron expression when making choices in the application of resources, the advisory committee is important to providing program direction and coordination services to the several agencies involved. An advisory committee should not be involved in normal operational arrangements, but may be called upon to give advice when the staffs have difficulty in particular operational areas. Staff members should join in framing and periodically reviewing the operational arrangements.[117]

The CSAC should concern itself with everything which affect citizens in the community in which it exists. According to Clark and Schoop, the methodology for selecting council members should be delegated to an ad hoc committee consisting of a cross-section of community members. The uniqueness of each community indicates that the the process of selection must be thoroughly discussed in order to determine which form or modification would be most effective for that community.[118] They also suggest that this same ad hoc committee should make recommendations for: (1) council organization, (2) council composition, (3) terms of office, and (4) operating procedures.[119]

The membership of the community school advisory council should be representative of the community it serves. It is advisable that the nucleus of the council, initially, be appointed by the community

school director in a subtle and non-threatening way. After two or three meetings the director can suggest a means by which the membership can be expanded and a process be designed by which to designate leadership.

Particular attention should be given to the involvement of agencies, service organizations, local government, churches, community associations, parents, teen-agers, senior citizens, school personnel, and citizens at large. It is suggested that the number of council members ranges from eight to fifteen while other citizens serve on special task forces.[120] These members must feel free to bring community schools to the attention of the principal, the community school director, and the faculty of the school. In addition, school personnel must develop attitudes that allow them to share decision making in certain areas with the advisory council.

Woons suggests that membership terms be staggered. The initial council appointments should be made with one-third of the terms lasting three years, one-third lasting two years, and one-third of the terms lasting only one year.[121] No council member should serve more than two terms or six years continuously. Vacancies are filled by the remaining council members usually through a process of nomination.

It is imperative that all members of the community advisory council recognize that they are serving in an advisory capacity and should never place themselves in a position of making demands. This could very well create a confrontation condition between the council and another organization, institution, or agency in the community. A group such as this has no administrative authority. This does not lessen the

importance of the group. The emphasis is given to the development of creative ideas to be implemented by the community school director and other members of the administrative staff. The role and function of each community's council will vary; yet, there may be basic goals and objectives which are common to most community school advisory councils. Nance suggested ten specific purposes:

1. To discover and recognize problems, carry on study and planning, and make recommendations regarding the solutions of those problems for consideration by the responsible authorities.

2. To provide a means through which civic groups or individual citizens can present plans and secure cooperation for the purpose of enriching community life.

3. To assist in the development of programs geared to the needs and wants of the community in utilizing the human, physical, and financial resources of the community in that programming.

4. To provide a means of communication, a channel for disseminating information in providing interpretation of information to all civic organizations and individual residents of the community regarding community school projects.

5. To provide a "sense of community" in support of projects necessitating full community support.

6. To stimulate member organizations and individuals on the community school advisory councils to conduct a periodic self-evaluation of its operation.

7. To operate programs that are of service to all civic organizations and residents which cannot be undertaken by any single organization or individual within the community.

8. To maintain relations with sources of assistance on local, state, or national levels.

9. To provide a means of democratic action in meeting local needs through existing agencies, organizations, and institutions.

10. To identify through the operation of the community school advisory council, potential community leaders and to develop their qualities of leadership through community involvement.[122]

III. LIFELONG LEARNING

The most distinguishing mark of the community education program is its close involvement with the life of the entire community. Hence, the education-centered community provides education for all. It not only helps people to help themselves. The operational philosophy of community education is based on the concept that learning is a lifelong process and that schools at all levels should help provide various kinds of learning experiences for community members of all ages.[123]

Educational institutions should not restrict their goals and programs to one small portion of a person's life, but instead should recognize the significant roles they can play in providing lifelong learning. The nature of the learning provided should be based upon the community members' needs and desires. It is essential, then, for educational institutions to develop and utilize valid techniques for assessing wants and needs of community members. Every institution must

share responsibility for fostering lifelong learning and developing a commitment to self-education.

Lifelong learning is more accurately described as the totality of learning that takes place during the life of an individual.[124] Among its many purposes, lifelong learning is or should be concerned with improving the quality of human life. This concern should be not simply for the individual but should also reflect a concern for the quality of life at the community level as well. Lifelong learning should provide for a new sense of community. It should provide a new way of looking at community resources as well as the individual comprising it.

Lifelong learning is also lifelong teaching. This means that every member of the community must see himself as a teacher. Everyone has knowledge of worth to offer others.[125] At the same time, lifelong learning study groups can provide the means whereby the community could look at its own problems.

As more and more Americans experience anomie in our urbanized society, we must chart a course in the future which fosters lifelong learning experiences. Furthermore, lifelong learning centers need to be concerned with equating life experiences to academic credit. This is not to say that the experience of one individual is equal to that of another; therefore, ways of equating the value or significance of experience must be found. Criterion referenced tests offer one viable solution.

Including the lifelong Learning Amendment in Part B of Title I of the Higher Education Act in the Education Amendments of 1976 has

been one of the key events in the evolution of the lifelong learning concept. This amendment will aid in promoting the strategy for achieving lifelong learning which can be a strategy for achieving certain basic goals in education.

Equality. Under a system of lifelong learning, success or failure in schooling would be less dramatic and decisive. Many young people for whom schooling has been unsatisfactory could get work experience before undertaking further education. Systems would be designed to encourage, stimulate, and facilitate movement from work to education and back to work. Therefore, lifelong learning is a long-term strategy that builds upon the present short-term changes that are already underway. It acknowledges what we now know--that all people develop and change throughout life. Lifelong learning also contributes to equality in helping the family provide a rich learning environment for the child. A strong program of parent and family education should be a cornerstone of a strong lifelong learning strategy. If every child is given a good early start in life, if options for continued learning are kept open throughout life, then the chances of attaining equality will be increased.[126]

Relating education to work. It has become very difficult to forecast needed manpower in any particular job because of rapid changes in industry, the knowledge explosion, and the shifting values of society. This suggests the need to restructure both jobs and education in order to shorten the period of preparation for most jobs, while increasing the opportunity to advance to higher levels of competency and responsibility through an intermixture of work and advanced levels of study.

Such a change would ease the problem of matching education to the needs of the labor market, fit better the emerging career patterns of most people, and probably result in a better utilization of community resources. Not only would the goal of matching job requirements and work be better realized within a lifelong learning strategy, but also the savings through collaborated resources would help pay for the increased costs of strategy.[127]

Appreciation of work values. Educators in career and vocational-technical areas have tried to reduce the gap between the values learned by youth in school and the values of the work place. A lifelong learning strategy would aid in developing an appreciation of work values by increasing the occasions in which there would be a mix of generations along with a mix of education and work With more adults as students and more young people as workers, the sharp divisions between the worlds of work and education should disappear.[128]

Motivation of students. A lifelong learning strategy would seek alternatives to school for those young people for whom education has no meaning and would ease the entry back to schooling when an individual found the need and desire for it. For example, the dropout problem, particularly in our city schools, remains severe. Much of this is because of the monotony of isolation of the school from the world that matters to young people. Yet, these same people can and do learn intensively when they discover a reason to learn--usually in association with the need to get or keep a job.

Many times students continue in school because they know it is a "must" in modern society--not because they have any real interest in

study. In the present system, they feel they must take the opportunity for education or lose it forever. A lifelong learning strategy would encourage people to sample many interests both in education and work.

It is also well known by all educators of adults that most adult students are more highly motivated than youth and learn most subjects more quickly than youth. Youth studying in the same classes with adults are often spurred to higher levels of accomplishment than when studying only with peers. That is one gain from lifelong learning. Another gain is in efficiency. Educational resources devoted to teaching motivated students do much more than when the students are not motivated.[129]

Expanded Uses of School Facilities

The community education philosophy embraces the motion of providing educational, social, health, recreational, and other human services to the entire community; and further, it endorses the ideal of community involvement in the operations and possibilities of school facilities. At the present, there are untapped uses of school buildings and school personnel. Community education envisions a host of adaptations beyond regular kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) educational programs including:

1. Adult high school completion courses;
2. Education interest and personal development courses for adults and children;
3. Physical fitness programs for all;
4. Social and civic activities;

5. Classes of personal interest and self-improvement such as sewing, auto repair, and health education.[130]

Utilization of school facilities is the concern of many community and educational leaders. Sylvia Porter, nationally syndicated columnist, wrote of the waste and disuse of idle public school facilities:

> Our public schools are to an appalling degree unused for long periods representing an abuse of schools and an extravagance that Americans simply cannot afford . . . . Most of the schools financed and maintained by taxes are closed for a startling 50 percent of the time.[131]

For example, there are existing school buildings, both public and private, which have special facilities such as shops, home economics facilities, and auditoriums which are both accessible and available. Such facilities should not be duplicated unless there is a definite need to provide for community education. In a likewise manner, lodge halls, churches, government buildings, theaters, public parks, recreation areas, facilities of business and industry, YMCA and YWCA facilities, and even private homes provide suitable space where community education activities can take place. A part of facility planning is to make effective use of existing facilities through identification and collaboration. Expensive duplication is an unacceptable and potentially dangerous approach in facility planning.

From the community education point of view, the school plant is a community center. The services to be rendered vary from one community to another; therefore, no set pattern or standard set of plans for community school buildings and grounds can be set. However, a number of fundamental ideas should be considered when plans are developed.

Since the facilities are to be used by children, youth, and adults, consideration must be given to those facilities that can be used in common. The byword of the community school is "multipurpose."[132] The plant should be functionally geared to serving the program of a community school. It should be flexible, therefore, being able to serve a variety of needs and capable of being modified to serve new needs as they develop. The plant must be convenient to the clientele it serves, especially the walk-in group. If the plant is attractive and inviting, more people will want to come in. A zoned facility will permit the opening of the parts of the building required to serve a particular program. Also, year-around comfort control is important and includes attention to visual, sonic, and heating and cooling aspects.[133]

Consideration of the areas surrounding the school can frequently proceed from the assumption that such areas will include all the traditional facilities plus those needed to serve the additional activities of persons not currently provided for in such planning. The traditional school site has guidelines which may not afford enough space for the community education program. School plant planners often give such figures as ten acres plus one acre for each 100 students in an elementary school and 30 to 40 acres plus one acre for each 100 students for secondary schools.[134] Added school usage and additional activities may necessitate more space. As the needs are identified adjustments may be necessary in order to do an adequate job.

Instead of being used to only one-third of their potential, our traditional schools could become community schools and be open to all ages, 12 months a year, 12 to 18 hours a day, seven days a week,

and be used to their full potential. Instead of taxpayers getting a 25 percent return on their investment in schools and paying in addition for many other duplicated services, we would be getting a full return on our investment plus interest through additional, better organized services.[135] For little additional cost, building use can be doubled. In the same sense, new buildings should be built to community specifications, taking into account utilization by the entire community. Therefore, it is necessary to form planning committees which will accomplish needs identification. Preferably, this will be done before an architect is selected. Ringers suggests program specifications should set forth:

1. The philosophy, goals, and objectives of the program in general and specifically for the project;

2. The community to be served--numbers and characteristics--patrons and staff;

3. The program to be conducted;

4. Physical characteristics desired--types, sizes, and properties of spaces; cirulation and service facilities; site considerations.[136]

Despite these specifications, it is not enough to have a well-planned facility. Operating policies are even more important. If a community education program is to be successful, the policies must also be responsive to the program. Obviously, extensive demands will be made on a facility with both day and evening school. Custodial services must be extended and scheduled to conform to the broader use.

The staff of a jointly occupied and/or operated facility must be more versatile, more flexible, and more receptive to change.

Citizen Involvement

Community education relies upon democratic methods which allow for citizen involvement. An important principle on which community education is based is that those affected by the decision-making process should have input in the planning and decision making.

Although efforts to promote citizen involvement are frequently time consuming, they hold great promise for enhancing two way communication and reducing the distrust and misunderstanding that can exist between the school and the community. In fact, two-way communication is the basis for citizen involvement and good public relations. Sumption and Engstrom state this importance very succinctly as follows:

> The typical school-community relations approach has been predicated on the necessity of bringing the community along with predetermined school plans and programs. The approach has been one of 'selling' rather than 'buying' of telling rather than asking.[137]

Citizen involvement ideas cannot be merely attached to our present obsolete administrative structure. To take this route could lead to dysfunctional conditions for education with frustration of all concerned. We need a new theory and practice of administration designed for total community education, an education in which all the people of the community are involved. Such education mandates citizen involvement in educational programs. However, complete community control of education could mean a narrow provincial, even racist education for some communities. Such a development could surely be a threat to a true democratic education.[138]

Currently there is a tremendous gap between what many community members want from their educational system and what they seem to be getting.[139] This gap can be narrowed and bridged only when community members are intimately involved in the community's educational process. Professionals who have often resisted citizen involvement will have to change their attitudes. Often times, lack of experience and inadequate conceptualization of community participation is responsible for much of the controversy.

Citizen involvement need not be unilateral. Community members should work closely with the professional staff in community assessment and in determining where the community is and where they want it to go. Together they should determine what groups and interests make up their service population and how the people see their wants and needs. Community members of all ages and backgrounds can be involved both directly and indirectly in various procedures for identifying and evaluation needs and concerns. They can work together on broad goals and specific objectives and cooperatively establish program priorities and plans.[140] This involvement of community members in the educational process does not diminish the role and responsibility of the professional educator. The educator should play a highly significant part in providing facilitative leadership which encourages and supports citizens willing to assume an active role in the comprehensive educational process of the community. Educators must also use their trained insights and abilities in the organizing, conducting and reporting of resultant programs and services.

As citizens become involved, the community becomes truly educative. Education then becomes distinguishable and different from schooling. The schools do not become irrelevant under this premise; they must play vital roles in coordinating all educative activities and might even assume new roles. All resources in the community are viewed as potential learning forces and factors.

The individuals involved in community planning should, in representation, be a microcosm of their community. Their responsibilities will include goal definition, publicizing and reporting activities and progress to the larger community, and the assessment of the planning process. Ringers suggests that the benefits derived from citizen involvement in the planning processes are manifold:

1. Promotes more effective and novel linkages of existing resources;

2. Engenders pride of participation which fosters support of this and future programs;

3. Provides opportunity for administrators to be accessible, human and responsive;

4. Educates participants, creates a pool of communicators and resource people for the project;

5. Eases community tensions and feelings of powerlessness;

6. Establishes a sense of community in the project by creating the "we-did-it-ourselves" type of esprit de corps;

7. Fosters mutual respect between effective administrators and involved community members;

8. May identify future staff/volunteers for the completed project;

9. Aids in prioritizing needs; and

10. Creates a forum for resolving differences.[141]

Citizen involvement offers a primary means of community problem solving. This can be achieved through efficient utilization of all community resources: human, physical, and financial. Each resource has unlimited potential which should be tapped effectively in order to maximize citizen involvement.

In every community live many persons with job skills, hobby skills, and other special interests of many kinds. The three criteria that should govern the selection and utilization of human resources are: (1) the quality of experience in relation to the immediate educational objectives, (2) their ability to communicate their experiences, and (3) their willingness to do so.[142]

The physical resources of schools have been developed, built, and paid for by community members to meet their identified learning needs. The time to recognize this fact and break away from the tradition of utilizing the schools so little by so few is now.

In order to maximize the use of limited financial resources, it is essential for all educationally oriented institutions, agencies, and organizations to work closely together, complement one another, cost-share at times, and work together toward the mutual goal of providing the best services for the total money available. It is essential for community agencies to perceive citizens, rather than institutions, as the ultimate source of all revenue for public agencies and as the primary.

Interagency Collaboration

There are many agencies and organizations in each community that provide programs and services of an actual or potential educational nature. The collaboration of these agencies with educative services is an integral part of the community education philosophy. This joining of community resources with educational services for the mutual benefit of community members is termed as interagency collaboration. Further discussion of the words used in this term is necessary for clarification.

Harold B. Gores, President of Educational Facilities Laboratories, characterizes the community school as being interagency by the fact that several human service delivery systems are joined at a common address.[143] In addition to sharing a common address and facility, communities are reorganizing many of their programs into interagency partnerships which make more effective use of available human, economic, and financial resources.

Warren Bennis and others state that a collaborative relationship between the change agent and the client system is an essential component of planned change. They define a collaborative relationship as a complex series of expectations and encounters which include:

1. A joint effort that involves mutual determination of goals;

2. A spirit of inquiry--a reliance on determination based on data, publicly shared;

3. A relationship growing out of a concrete, here-and-now encounter.

4. A voluntary relationship between change agent and client with either party free to terminate the relationship after joint consultation;

5. A power distribution in which the client and change agent have equal or almost equal opportunity to influence one another;

6. An emphasis on methodological, rather than specific, substantive goals.[144]

The primary idea involved in interagency collaboration calls for allowing the public schools to facilitate the development of a system which coordinates the activities and services of other agencies and organizations, service clubs, youth groups, and social service agencies into a total program for a community. This collaborative venture also allows the community school to serve as a base for coordination and collaboration between agencies which will aid in eliminating gaps in and overlap and duplication of community services.

There are many reasons why interagency collaboration is possible and necessary. With increased emphasis on accountability, fiscal bodies are required to expose and justify expenditures for each program. Reluctance to enlarge the level of public support for separate programs encourages agency heads to consider new ways to deliver needed services. Declining enrollments have put schools on the defensive while the promise of school closing meets with communal dismay. Accommodating community service agencies in a school facility increases the viability of the school as a community center and sometimes brings a partner to share operational costs. The isolation brought about by urbanization presents a need for community facilities that can serve as

a new focal point for neighborhoods or communities of interest--cultural, intellectual, and recreational. The schools gain through improved standing in the community which, in turn, should be reflected in the student population. The child who has grown to school age in a community where all service agencies are working in collaboration should be a more ready learner. At the same time, Palmer found significant decreases in school vandalism that corresponded with the introduction of community education in a small midwestern community.[145] During the same period, auto theft, typically a teenage crime, also decreased.[146]

Since the mid 1960's, increasing emphasis has been placed on the concept of interagency collaboration of human services to respond to client needs. The impetus for interagency collaboration has come from the federal, state, and local levels of government. The federal thrust has come through legislative proposals, funding of integrated services research and demonstration projects, and an increased emphasis on requirements for coordination of planning and service delivery in the various legislative approaches to human service revenue sharing.[147] The state and local push grew from the more pragmatic attempt to meet increased service demand and rising costs for service provision by better utilizing revenues and facilities.

There are several factors which are most conducive to interagency collaboration within the community as follows:

1. Stable, adequate funding;

2. A strong project director who can mobilize resources, merge conflicting opinions or groups, plan effectively, and relate

to a broad cross-section of community residents, leaders, and service providers;

3. Community receptivity to the need for services and the desire to effectively deliver services through an integrated mechanism;

4. An administrative structure which allows an individual (director) or group (community school director, superintendent, principal, advisory council and community members) to plan and implement programs;

5. A staff which exhibits a strong desire to increase service delivery effectiveness through collaboration of agency services; and

6. Long-term planning which considers project goals to purpose, methods to collaborate service delivery, and current and future funding sources.[148]

The preceding factors must be included in order to develop and implement a thorough collaborative venture between schools and agencies. An example of this collaboration is described in the Bethlehem Area Community Education Project.[149] This project grew out of an effort to minimize the duplication of services and a desire to utilize more fully the existing resources of traditional education programs which were not currently used at full capacity on a full-time basis.

The holistic approach to service delivery, in which an agency provides a multitude of services, characterized the Bethlehem Project. Starting from the traditional educational structure, the Project implementors added new educational programs to serve the entire family rather than the five through 18 year old age group. In recognition of the inter-related nature of educational and other problems, the

Project integrated existing community services such as child guidance, job counseling, elderly assistance, congregate meals, and so forth. Although the impetus of the project was to provide a wide range of services to aid residents, the desire to utilize resources more fully and thereby maximize investments also influenced the decision to expand educational services.

A human services committee was developed to plan the project and secure funds. When the project was initiated, a community education commission was formed from among elected officials and representatives of project participants. The commission provides overall-program coordination and seeks collaboration; however, it has no real implementation powers. The members frequently need to recommend actions to their agencies. A community education coordinator provides overall supervision of the project and each neighborhood center has a community education director who provides day-to-day supervision of the program and staff.

After looking at the Bethlehem Area Community Education Project, it becomes obvious that collaboration "is always an achievement not a gift."[150] Its attainment is assured through open confrontation of differences, through conflicts faced and resolved, through limited areas of collaboration as fuller trust develops. The methods of collaboration must be learned, and they typically call for achievement of more complex skills and understanding on the part of the change agents and clients alike rather than what coercive strategies would typically demand.

IV. CHANGE: ITS IMPACT ON THE SOCIAL SCENE

It is an accepted fact that we are experiencing change at a rapid rate. At one time change could have been described in linear terms, but today change has taken on entirely new dimensions. It is protean, explosive, accelerated, and unpredicatable. Perhaps, the factor of change which has possibly evoked the most extreme reactions is that of overpopulation. According to a report made by the United Nations, the current world population is over three billion people and this figure will rise to four billion by the year 2000.[151] In another study, Shinn projected that by the year 2000, seven billion people will share the earth's surface. At any rate, overcrowding is and will be a threat to comfortable living. Besides the obvious results of overcrowding, we are experiencing rising pollution, declining natural resources, declining public services, and perhaps declining standards of living. Change is occurring so fast that much of society is in a constant state of "future shock," to use Toffler's term. Therefore, the demands on the present educational system are becoming overwhelming. Along with this and resulting from it, is a spectre of urban decay. Schools in the city are finding themselves with a growing lower class population. As the white middle class flees to the suburbs, the ghetto will continue to inbreed without sufficient heterogeneity of peer contacts to provide any constructive, upward societal models. And as city schools fail to cope with a rapidly diminishing tax base, the urban child will suffer.

It is evident that overpopulation, urbanization, ethnic conflict, migration, crime, plus a thousand other examples of our

efforts to shape change seem increasingly inept and futile.[152] Thus, this question seems appropriate: How can we prevent future shock in American communities selectively adjusting the tempos of change, raising or lowering levels of stimulation, when governments--including those with the best intentions--seem unable even to point change in the right direction?[153]

A prevalent concern in this change-oriented society is and must be the improvement of the human side of things called the "quality of life." This concern with the quality of life has developed out of a growing realization that the advantages of modern technology and automation are not being directed at solving human problems. The effective utilization of the technological advances may be one force which can provide hope for mankind. Yet, paradoxically this contains an inherent problem which disrupts the social scene; many people find themselves obsolete in their youth. The number of unskilled workers grows as education fails to adapt to the need for lifelong learning and training. Toffler states the need for adaptability as follows:

> . . . tomorrow's individual will have to cope with even more hectic change than we do today. For education the lesson is clear; its prime objective must be to increase the individuals 'cope-ability'--the speed and economy with which he can adapt to continued change. And the faster the rate of change, the more attention must be devoted to discerning the pattern of future events.
>
> It is no longer sufficient for Johnny to understand the past. It is not even enough for him to understand the present, for the here-and-now environment will soon vanish. Johnny must learn to anticipate the directions and rate of change. He must, to put it technically, learn to make repeated, probabilistic, increasing long-range assumptions about the future. And so must Johnny's teacher.[154]

Another force which has the capacity for both salvation and destruction are the news media. The communication industry has awakened interest in many areas which need attention, but at the same time, people are poorly equipped to integrate and cope with the exponential growth of information. Therefore, education must intervene and provide the training necessary to help in forming the adaptive reactions needed with rapid progress. The most effective way to change people's actions is to modify their attitudes and beliefs by providing relevant and emotionally satisying new experiences. One response that schools can make in order to provide these new experiences is suggested: proper utilization of all resources.

Although the magnitude of change in the educational system being suggested calls for financial expenditures which are tremendous, the pay-off will be secured through the savings in human resources and unduplicated services. People in government, people in industry, and people on the street are realizing this simple fact--we cannot afford not to change the schools.[155]

The government, whose primary purpose is national survival, has realized that the human mind is our basic and most valuable national resource. While industry must look to the schools to provide the expertise to support and expand our vast technological society. Also, people are becoming increasingly aware of our potential for developing the good life. This does not just mean the rich life, but a qualitative improvement in the very nature of life. We have begun to realize that the new frontier is not outer space, but the human potential.[156]

When we look at the enormous gap between our collective human needs and the nature and scope of learning experiences provided by educational institutions of our society, it becomes evident that major changes are necessary. These changes should not be made in an unplanned fashion nor effected just for the sake of change; procedures should be created to provide those learning experiences which can best improve the quality of living for every individual and the entire community.

To achieve change in communities through education may require a variety of approaches in planning and implementing of programs. Some suggestions the change agent may utilize in the community are as follows:

1. Learn who the community influentials or leaders are in order to understand how they affect the decision-making process.

2. Identify with and utilize existing groups and organizations that will support community change attempts. Sometimes referred to as intervention or planned change, this approach involves the coordination of two or more groups on a program of change.

3. Affiliate with an organization whose function can include directing or guiding change programs. These organizations often perform a change-agent role, where their employees are skilled at the means utilized to achieve various changes or goals.

4. Form committees or groups around particular content areas or particular needs. This would involve the collaboration of an agency or organization that possessed various physical and organizational resources with groups that possessed special skills and/or accessibility to a particular clientele.[157]

V. COMMUNITY EDUCATION IN RURAL AREAS

Of primary importance in the community education process is the need to provide educational opportunities for everyone especially in the rural areas. Yet, there are a number of problems in the rural areas which could be remediated through educational measures. Rural education is defined here as that which occurs in school systems which have fewer of the advantages inherent in heavily populated trade and manufacturing centers and at the same time fewer of the disadvantages that accrue to such areas.[158]

Excessively high dropout rates, fewer desirable social and recreational opportunities, curriculum unsuited to preparing for life adjustments, and apathy resulting from lack of opportunity for meaningful involvement in school policy decisions are among the problems of rural schools which community education is designed to affect positively.[159]

Although Cowhig's study of dropout rates revealed that rural youngsters dropped out at a rate not much higher than that for urban youth (28 percent as opposed to 21 percent), the difference gave cause for concern.[160] Furthermore, he suggests that higher retardation in rural areas and less adequate school facilities might be contributors to the higher rates at which students leave school. Mahlstede and Thomas support the contention that fewer facilities have a negative effect, for their interviews with dropouts yielded suggestions for curriculum expansion often beyond the capabilities of small rural schools.[161] Cushman (1967) points out the rural school has a most

difficult task because it must prepare youth for the potential of either urban or rural living.[162] This dual role for poorly financed and furnished schools presents a hardship that affects youth in a negative way. Griessman and Densley write that "school holding power in rural areas will improve when administrators, teachers, and counselors work together and strive to involve the parents of potential dropouts."[163]

Add the need for broader curricula with rural schools' lower per pupil expenditure ($221 rural average vs. $297 urban average ["Statistics of Rural Schools," 1956]) and it becomes obvious that it would be highly unusual if deficiencies did not crop up in the curricula of rural schools. In the past twenty years this ratio of rural average to urban average has not changed. In 1976-77 the public school revenue receipts per pupil in average daily attendance came to an average of $1,825. Eighteen states placed above the national average with Alaska showing $3,530; New York showing $2,653; and ranking number eighteen was Colorado at $1,838. At the same time, Alabama fell in 46th position with only $1,268 in per pupil expenditure in average daily attendance; Tennessee ranked 49th with $1,218; and, Mississippi fell in 50th position with $1,136.[164] The urban states, because of their industrial growth, have the means to ascertain higher revenue receipts. Many rural states have very little industrial growth. As a result, these states cannot even come near the national average.

Another necessary but often lacking ingredient in a rural school district is the recreation-socialization component. This is

the rural school deficiency most obviously and easily remedied by a community education program. Although social and recreational opportunities vary from locale to locale, the characteristic sparsity of population dictates that there will be fewer organized recreation and social activities available in a rural district. The advent of radio, television, and rapid transportation has made urban recreational activities more readily available to the rural residents; the question is whether the activities are appropriate and conducive to satisfying the needs of rural community residents. A community education program assumes the responsibility for assessing the local social needs, for avoiding wasteful duplication of activities, and for planning recreational programs which will fill voids and/or replace undesirable social outlets. Furthermore, an effective community school program would not only plan social and recreational events, but would work toward full community participation. One of the most valuable contributions to be made to a rural community is to reestablish the school as a social center; to staff that center with a person (community school director) responsible for its leadership, direction, and maintenance; and to provide activities which will attract and involve community members.

For years a number of small rural schools have been community centers in every sense of the word--filling social and educational needs as readily as the most advanced modern community education programs. Clapp used the term community school as early as 1934 in reference to a rural school designed to provide community education services to a Kentucky community. She wrote:

> A school in a rural district has a unique opportunity to function socially . . . . A community school foregoes its separateness. It is influential because it belongs to the people. They share its ideas and ideals and its work. It takes from them as it gives to them. There are no bounds as far as I can see to what it could accomplish in social reconstruction if it had enough wisdom, insight, devotion, and energy. It demands all these, for changes in living and learning are not produced by imparting information about different conditions or by gathering statistical data about what exists, but by creating by people, with people, for people.[165]

If the feeling of ownership and membership to which Clapp alluded were still prevalent, there would be little need to argue for any type of organizational or philosophical change in the school. The community school does not try to replace the church, the home, the peer group, the natural recreational outlets, or the neighborhood social gathering. It views itself as an amalgam of many experiences and seeks to improve the quality of existing opportunities, to fill remaining voids, and to coordinate activities so that wasteful duplication can be reduced.

If helping to provide rural areas with social and recreational opportunities is the most easily accomplished goal of a community school program, perhaps the most difficult goal is to provide a suitable curriculum. There are at least three ways that a community school program can have a positive effect on curriculum:

1. The community school advisory council, by being broadly representative of the community, can make the entire community's desires known regarding curriculum offerings;

2. The community school program can enrich the curriculum by utilizing its many resources; and

3. The citizens can have a voice in curriculum design through the community school advisory council and will probably be more likely to underwrite additional expenditures for curriculum improvement. The idea that only educators can make curriculum decisions is one which must be given up by professional educators if they are going to be truly community-oriented. This is not to say that community members alone will make the decisions but that the realities of their needs and desires will be taken into consideration before continuing to offer curricula which equip rural youngsters neither for the city nor for the farm.

Rogers and Svenning note that another deficiency of rural education is the apathetic attitudes of many small schools. They do not state that apathy is unique to rural schools, but do imply that there is a greater need for innovations in rural schools.[166] Perhaps, apathy pertaining to school situations is the result of never having been meaningfully involved. Generally speaking, community members attend school eight to twelve to sixteen (or more) years, pay taxes, elect school boards, support school functions, and supply children to the schools and yet, are not meaningfully involved. This is because most of one's relationships with the schools are passive--things are done to and for the citizen, not by and with him. A resident receives schooling, receives tax bills, receives expenditure accountings, receives board rulings, receives pupil progress reports, and receives the school calendar. Yet, this involvement is meaningless because the events, changes, and decisions occur with or without him or his

approval. And for the increasing number of residents who have no children, the school offers even less meaningful involvement.

A community education program attempts to remedy community apathy by: (1) involving those community members affected by decision making in the decision-making process, and (2) developing and utilizing the community school advisory council as a forum for the voices of all community members.

VI. FUTURE REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Community education has the potential for a major impact upon the entire society. It suggests a means of encouraging the involvement of citizens in their own destiny which may be termed as participatory democracy. It provides broadened opportunities for pursuing an enriched life through educational, cultural, and recreational pursuits.

Community education in the future must be established on the premise that people must be involved in community decisions that affect them; on process rather than program. If community education remains committed only to providing program opportunities and not providing problem-solving and involvement opportunities, it will fail.[167]

There is little doubt that the problems that the future will bring are immense. The top major trends cited earlier--overpopulation and urbanization--are likely to continue in an upward swing. According to Robert L. Shinn, associated with these two trends are five movements in operation which will reshape our society. These are listed as follows:

1. The worldwide population increase will present many ethical and social problems to the society. The tendency toward increased family planning will create many worldwide ethical and religious conflicts and problems in addition to the technological problem presented by a large population. Many of the concepts and beliefs that presently hold will have to be reconsidered.

2. Technology will create broad changes beyond the obvious impact of new inventions and gadgetry. Cybernetics will expand the power of man in ways that we cannot yet perceptualize. The effects of the computer will change life to the same or greater extent than did the automobile. Their ability to verbalize has already been shown.

3. The trend toward urbanization will be directed toward suburban living rather than city residence. Large megalopolises will be vested that will change the lifestyle of man to an extent that is difficult to predict.

4. The military situation will become increasingly complex. There will be 30 new nuclear powers by 1980. This increases the chances of military disaster but also increases the impulses of man for international control.

5. Human rights will continue to be a major issue. As of May 1978, 35 states have already ratified the Equal Rights Amendement. The United States has a tradition of freedom and justice. It now faces the ethical problem of making good that tradition.[168]

Educators, in preparing for the future, cannot ignore the general direction the society is taking when establishing educational programs that will be relevant to the individual and to the society as a whole.

Goodlad points out that there is little relationship between school success and goals that are claimed as educational aims; that there is an unwillingness on the part of educators to state the purposes to be served by education, schools with certain tasks coming at specified times is not in concert with our knowledge concerning individual difference and how children learn.[169] Because we have established no specific goals, generation of students are denied whatever educational program is out of fashion at a particular time. Even Walt Whitman in his poem, Leaves of Grass, sensed the true way in which education takes place and the individuality of each learner.

> There was a child went forth everyday,
> And the first object he looked upon, that
> object he became.
> And that object became part of him for the
> day or a certain part of the day,
> Or for many years or stretching cycles of
> years.
> The early lilacs became part of this child
> And the grass and white and red morning
> glories, and white and red clover, and
> the song of the phoebe-bird,
> And the third month lambs and the sows
> pink-faint litter, and the mare's
> foal and the cow's calf,
> And the noisy brood of the barnyard or
> by the mire of the pond-side.[170]

This poem emphasizes that the child's educational experience is more than schoolhouse learning. The community environment has much to offer in educating the whole child. Recognizing this, educators must initiate a transition back to some very basic elements which include utilization of all community resources. We must turn our attention back to local human involvement in very basic issues and problems if we are to survive. Education must seek methods of relating the world of work

and leisure to the school life of the individual. As the school ties itself more closely to its community, curricular relevance will necessarily take on increased importance.

Accomplishing educational relevance of the school to the community will require an acceptance of new roles by educators. For the public school administrator, a broadened student population to serve and an expanded staff to provide these services will require preparation in new administrative skills.

Teachers in public schools will be required to use the community as a resource and laboratory. Parents and community members may be helpful in providing instructional assistance. This will allow for much greater interaction between students and community members and community resources will occur.

As new professional roles in the public schools are created, trained people will be needed. Colleges and universities will be required to modify curriculum to prepare those entering teaching to work within this revised structure. Community education directors, as well as specialists in group process, community assessment and adult education, will need advanced and specialized training.

State departments of education must also assume new responsibilities. This may take the form of new financial support, expanded technical assistance to districts in developing programs, or revised objectives as to what a school district is funded to accomplish.

Community educators must envision the total community and educational process. They will need to become synergists in their efforts to

develop collaborative procedures, bringing about the combined action of separate agencies toward common goals.

VII. SUMMARY

In summary, this review of the literature has dealt with a basic understanding of the terms, community and education. The role of organizational theory and the impact of social services offered clarity in understanding the development of the community education concept. The theory that traditional schoolhouse-oriented programs, however good, have shown themselves lacking in the ability to meet total individual needs introduced a proposal which called for a closer alignment between community and schools. It was established by a review of the writings of a number of accepted leaders in the field of science, psychology, economics, education, and so forth that two major changes--population growth and urbanization--are and will continue to present communities with problems such as anomie, social decline, and cultural gap.

A second proposition dealing with the developing concept of community education provided discussion of the theory that the administrative implementation of a community school requires specific knowledge and highly developed skills. This will require new roles for school personnel and the inclusion of community members in needs assessment and problem-solving.

The third proposition provided for discussion was that community education is comprehensive in scope and high potential, equally applicable to any organization, association, or agency that offers learning

opportunities for community members. It recognizes that learning is life-long and suggests the maximum utilization of all human, physical, and financial resources of a community. It is a concept that advocates democratic involvement of community members in needs assessment, problem-solving, and stresses that educational curriculum, programs, and services should be community-centered. It further stresses agency collaboration as an integral element of community education.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The major purpose of this study was to determine (through perception) the relationships and needs of community education and interagency collaboration within the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee. This was done by examining the perceptions for difference, if any, among the three census groups regarding the "ideal" and "real" situations. Six sets of variables designed to measure the relationships within community education were utilized. The census groups surveyed in the three states were 68 community education directors and coordinators, 33 executive directors of planning agencies and development districts, and 100 principals of schools that were designated as community schools by community educators. The "ideal" and "real" perceptions of the three groups and the three states were analyzed and compared with each other on the same dimension.

The research findings are presented in four parts. Part one presents information concerning the record of response. The second presents the results of testing the original hypotheses of the study in order to assess adequately the relationships between community education and interagency collaboration. Part three restates each of the research questions and offers an analysis of them, while part four presents a summary of the findings.

I. RECORD OF RESPONSE

Three census groups were surveyed with a total population of 201 with 161 responses for a return rate of 80 percent. The total population list was compiled in a variety of ways. The Department of Education from each of the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee furnished a list of 68 community education directors and coordinators. The Directory of Local Planning Agencies in the Southeastern United States provided the names and addresses of the 33 executive directors of the planning agencies and development districts. The community education directors and coordinators submitted a list of 100 principals of schools designated as community schools.

Response rates for the total population can be seen in Table I. The highest percentage of questionnaires returned came from community education directors and coordinators (85 percent), while community school principals had the lowest return (76 percent). The executive directors of planning agencies and development districts also had a high return of 82 percent.

Table II and III present the record of response on the "ideal" and "real" dimension while Table IV shows the record of response according to state. The response rate for community education directors and coordinators was 91 percent on the "ideal" dimension and 79 percent on the "real" dimension. The executive directors were consistent with a return of 82 percent on both the "ideal" and "real" dimensions. Community school principals were studied on the "real" dimension only and their return response was 76 percent.

TABLE I

RECORD OF RESPONSE FOR THE TOTAL POPULATION

Census Groups	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Community Education Directors and Coordinators	68	58	85
Executive Directors of Planning Agencies and Development Districts	33	27	82
Community School Principals	100	76	76
Total	201	161	80

TABLE II

RECORD OF RESPONSE ON THE IDEAL DIMENSION (TWO GROUPS ONLY)

Census Groups	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Community Education Directors and Coordinators	34	31	91
Executive Directors of Planning Agencies and Development Districts	17	14	82
Total	51	45	87

TABLE III

RECORD OF RESPONSE ON THE REAL DIMENSION (THREE GROUPS)

Census Groups	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Community Education Directors and Coordinators	34	27	79
Executive Directors of Planning Agencies and Development Districts	16	13	82
Community School Principals	100	76	76
Total	150	116	79

TABLE IV

RECORD OF RESPONSE ON THE STATE DIMENSION (IDEAL AND REAL)

Census Groups	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Alabama			
Community Education Directors and Coordinators	30	27	90
Executive Directors of Planning Agencies and Development Districts	12	10	83
Community School Principals	48	36	75
Total	90	73	83
Mississippi			
Community Education Directors and Coordinators	7	5	71
Executive Directors of Planning Agencies and Development Districts	12	10	83
Community School Principals	15	10	67
Total	34	25	74
Tennessee			
Community Education Directors and Coordinators	31	26	84
Executive Directors of Planning Agencies and Development Districts	9	7	78
Community School Principals	37	30	81
Total	77	63	81

Of the three states studied, Alabama's community education directors had the highest record of response at 90 percent. Tennessee followed second at 84 percent and Mississippi was last at 71 percent. The executive directors of Alabama and Mississippi had an equal return of 83 percent while the same group in Tennessee had a return of 78 percent. Tennessee had the highest number of community school principals to return questionnaires (81 percent) while Alabama and Mississippi had a return rate of 75 and 67 percent respectively.

II. TESTS OF HYPOTHESES

Two hypotheses were presented in Chapter I and each hypothesis is treated separately in this section. The data obtained along with an explanation are also reported in this section. In order to test the hypotheses, the analysis of variance--an inferential statistical procedure--was utilized because it compares two or more groups in terms of mean scores. However, the various groups did not contain the same number of subjects; therefore, the researcher was required to test the assumption of equal variances. The procedure used for testing equal variances was Bartlett-Box F. When significant differences were found as indicated by the F test with Bartlett-Box F showing equal variances, the Scheffe multiple comparison test was applied to pinpoint the differences.

Hypothesis 1

The first null hypothesis was as follows:

There was no significant difference in the perception of

community education directors and coordinators, executive directors of planning agencies and development districts, and principals of schools which were designated as community schools by community educators between the "ideal" and "real" situations of agency-school collaboration at an alpha level of .05.

Table V presents the group means for the "ideal" and "real" respondent groups and shows that the "ideal" situation was significantly higher than the "real." Table VI presents the perceptions of the total respondents (161) on all six variables concerning the "ideal" and "real" dimension. This table shows significant F ratios of all six variables; therefore, there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions of the "ideal" and "real" situations. Since this analysis of variance compared only the means of two groups and the variances were found to be equal, a multiple comparison test was not relevant.

Table VII also pertained to the first hypothesis. As seen in this table, community education directors and coordinators, executive directors of planning agencies and development districts, and community school principals perceived the "ideal" situation of interagency collaboration to be significantly higher than the "real" situation at an alpha level of .05 on four of the six variables. Therefore, it was found that four of the six variables were significantly different or that some variables other than chance was acting to set apart the perceptions about the four areas. These four variables were: (1) community involvement, (2) feasibility analysis, (3) community school director, and (4) implementation. When the F ratios were found to be

TABLE V

THE IDEAL AND REAL SITUATION OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION AND INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION AS INDICATED BY THE MEANS OF THE KEY ELEMENTS

Source	Mean
Community Involvement	
Ideal	4.5814*
Real	4.1892
Feasibility	
Ideal	4.6000*
Real	3.9911
Community School Director	
Ideal	4.5556*
Real	4.2566
Structure	
Ideal	4.5455*
Real	3.9478
Implementation	
Ideal	4.2273*
Real	3.9397
Evaluation	
Ideal	4.6047*
Real	4.1466

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARIES FOR THE KEY ELEMENTS OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION ON THE IDEAL AND REAL DIMENSION

Source	D.F.	S.S.	M.S.	F
Community Involvement				
Between Groups	1	4.7675	4.7675	12.181*
Within Groups	152	59.4918	0.3914	
Total	153	64.2592		
Feasibility Analysis				
Between Groups	1	11.9031	11.9031	28.043*
Within Groups	155	65.7906	0.4245	
Total	156	77.6937		
Community School Director				
Between Groups	1	2.8754	2.8754	5.851*
Within Groups	156	76.6681	0.4915	
Total	157	79.5435		
Structure				
Between Groups	1	11.3663	11.3663	19.272*
Within Groups	157	92.5954	0.5898	
Total	158	103.9617		
Implementation				
Between Groups	1	2.6389	2.6389	4.946*
Within Groups	158	84.3042	0.5336	
Total	159	86.9430		
Evaluation				
Between Groups	1	6.5831	6.5831	14.199*
Within Groups	157	72.7872	0.4636	
Total	158	79.3702		

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARIES FOR THE KEY ELEMENTS OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION ON THE RESPONDENT POSITION DIMENSION

Source	D.F.	S.S.	M.S.	F
Community Involvement				
Between Groups	2	8.1068	4.0534	10.900*
Within Groups	151	56.1525	0.3719	
Total	153	64.2593		
Feasibility Analysis				
Between Groups	2	17.2754	8.6377	22.017*
Within Groups	154	60.4186	0.3923	
Total	156	77.6940		
Community School Director				
Between Groups	2	17.0290	8.5145	21.111*
Within Groups	155	62.5146	0.4033	
Total	157	79.5436		
Structure				
Between Groups	2	3.2176	1.6088	2.491
Within Groups	156	100.7442	0.6458	
Total	158	103.9618		
Implementation				
Between Groups	2	9.6945	4.8472	9.851*
Within Groups	157	77.2491	0.4920	
Total	159	86.9435		
Evaluation				
Between Groups	2	2.2285	1.1143	2.253
Within Groups	156	77.1418	0.4945	
Total	158	79.3704		

*Significant at the .05 level.

significant, the researcher was required to test the assumption of equal variances. Bartlett-Box F found the variances to be equal on all four variables. Consequently, the Scheffe's multiple comparison test was applied in order to determine which of the group means were significantly different from the others. Each variable was observed separately.

Table VIII presents results of the Scheffe's multiple comparison test which compared thre three groups on the "ideal" and "real" dimension with the respondent position dimension. The community involvement variable was perceived in the "ideal" situation to be significantly higher than the "real" situation at the .05 level. On this variable the perceptions of executive directors of planning agencies and development districts were significantly lower than the perceptions of both community education directors and coordinators and community school principals.

Perceptions of the three groups concerning the feasibility analysis variable were observed. Each of the three groups perceived the "ideal" situation significantly different from the "real" situation. Also shown in Table VIII, Sheffe's multiple comparison test found that all three respondent groups were significantly different in their perceptions of the relationships of interagency collaboration with community education and this variable. Community education directors and coordinators had the highest mean with community school principals having the second highest mean.

TABLE VIII

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE'S TEST COMPARING THE IDEAL AND REAL DIMENSION WITH THE RESPONDENT POSITION·DIMENSION

Key Element	Group Subsets According to Respondent Position		
Community Involvement			
Group	A	B	C
Mean	3.8519	4.3026	4.5294
Feasibility Analysis			
Group	A	B	C
Mean	3.6296	4.0556	4.5517
Community School Director			
Group	A	B	C
Mean	3.7037	4.3289	4.6727
Structure			
Group	A	B	C
Mean	3.8519	4.0921	4.2679
Implementation			
Group	A	B	C
Mean	3.5185	4.0263	4.2456
Evaluation			
Group	A	B	C
Mean	4.0741	4.2368	4.4107

A = Executive Directors of Planning Agencies and Development Districts.

B = Community School Principals.

C = Community Educators.

The implementation variable was perceived in the "ideal" situation to be significantly higher than the "real" situation. Furthermore, Scheffe's test showed that the perceptions of the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts were significantly lower than the perceptions of community education directors and coordinators and community school principals.

Hypothesis 2

A second hypothesis was tested in the null form as follows:

There was no significant difference between the "ideal" and "real" situations of agency-school collaboration among the respondents from the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee.

An analysis of variance was made among the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee with respect to the six sets of variables. Table IX shows that one variable, feasibility analysis, was perceived in the "ideal" situation to be significantly different from the "real" situation at the alpha level of .05. Bartlett-Box F for homogeneity of variance, however, showed unequal variances and the null hypothesis was accepted for feasibility analysis as well as the other five variables.

III. ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

An exploration of six research questions was made through analysis of variance summaries and the frequency of response by community education directors and coordinators, executive directors of planning agencies and development districts, and community school

TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARIES FOR THE KEY ELEMENTS OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION ON THE STATE DIMENSION

Source	D.F.	S.S.	M.S.	F
Community Involvement				
Between Groups	2	2.1133	1.0567	2.567
Within Groups	151	62.1460	0.4116	
Total	153	64.2593		
Feasibility Analysis				
Between Groups	2	3.1372	1.5686	3.240*
Within Groups	154	74.5569	0.4841	
Total	156	77.6941		
Community School Director				
Between Groups	2	2.8657	1.4328	2.896
Within Groups	155	76.6779	0.4947	
Total	157	79.5436		
Structure				
Between Groups	2	1.6506	0.8253	1.258
Within Groups	156	102.3113	0.6558	
Total	158	103.9619		
Implementation				
Between Groups	2	2.5092	1.2546	2.333
Within Groups	157	84.4346	0.5378	
Total	159	86.9438		
Evaluation				
Between Groups	2	2.9032	1.4516	2.961
Within Group	156	76.4674	0.4902	
Total	158	79.3706		

*Significant at the .05 level.

principals. The six research questions are treated in this section.

Research Question Number 1

How important is community involvement to purposeful agency-school collaboration?

There were nine items on the instrument that directly related to this question. These nine items stipulated the requirements of community involvement as follows: (1) encouraging community involvement; (2) providing self-generating activities; (3) establishing community advisory councils; (4) involving councils in setting priorities; (5) allowing councils to recommend changes in policies; (6) including agency representatives on community councils; (7) identifying wants and needs by community groups; (8) involving agencies and schools in setting priorities; and (9) allowing agencies and schools to produce projects of interest to both. These items were combined in the analysis to generate a composite score for community involvement.

Inspection of the variable community involvement was performed to determine how important the three groups perceived it to be in securing purposeful agency-school collaboration. Table VI, page 98, reveals that community involvement in the "ideal" situation was perceived to be significantly different from the "real" situation at an alpha level of .05. Table VIII, page 101, shows that group mean for the perceptions of the executive director of planning agencies and development districts were observed to be significantly lower than those of community education directors and coordinators and community school principals. Therefore, those respondents involved in the

community and school relationship view this element as highly important. Table X presents the percent of response among the three groups on the key elements. Community involvement was perceived to be of vital importance; in fact, 93 percent of the responses were affirmative on this postulate.

Research Question Number 2

Does the community education concept lend itself to the collaboration of community resources?

Twelve items of the instrument were related to this question: (1) developing a sense of pride; (2) maintaining direct communications; (3) identifying wants and needs; (4) aiding in reduction of juvenile delinquency; (5) making maximum use of human and physical resources; (6) aiding in reduction of community problems; (7) developing a climate for innovation and change; (8) offering opportunities for agencies to collaborate; (9) allowing agencies to recommend changes in school programs; (10) producing greater support for agencies; (11) making the goals of agencies and schools more fully realized; and (12) providing a better system of communications between schools and agencies. These 12 items were combined to generate a composite score for feasibility analysis by the three respondent groups.

Table VII, page 99, shows that all three groups perceived the feasibility analysis variable significantly different. Table IX, page 103, shows that this variable was perceived in the "ideal" situation to be significantly different from the "real" situation. Furthermore, Table XI presents results of the Scheffe's test which compared

TABLE X

PERCENT OF PERCEPTIONS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE KEY ELEMENTS OF INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION TO COMMUNITY EDUCATION (TOTAL GROUP)

Key Elements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Community Involvement	0.6	0.0	6.5	54.5	38.3
Feasibility Analysis	0.6	1.3	10.2	56.7	31.2
Community School Director	0.0	1.9	8.2	43.7	46.2
Structure	0.0	2.5	20.1	40.9	36.5
Implementation	0.6	2.5	15.0	58.1	23.7
Evaluation	1.3	1.3	3.8	56.6	37.1

TABLE XI

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE'S TEST COMPARING THE IDEAL AND REAL DIMENSION WITH THE STATE DIMENSION

Key Element	Group Subsets According to State		
Community Involvement			
Group	Mississippi	Tennessee	Alabama
Mean	4.0400	4.3167	4.3768
Feasibility Analysis			
Group	Alabama	Tennessee	Mississippi
Mean	4.2899	4.1429	3.8800
Community School Director			
Group	Mississippi	Tennessee	Alabama
Mean	4.0400	4.3607	4.4306
Structure			
Group	Mississippi	Tennessee	Alabama
Mean	3.9200	4.0806	4.2083
Implementation			
Group	Mississippi	Tennessee	Alabama
Mean	3.7600	4.0000	4.1250
Evaluation			
Group	Tennessee	Mississippi	Alabama
Mean	4.1290	4.2000	4.4167

the three groups on the "ideal" and "real" dimension with the state dimension. The analysis of the states indicated that the three respondent groups perceived Alabama to be significantly higher than Mississippi concerning the "ideal" situation of agency-school collaboration at .05 level, however, Bartlett-Box F found unequal variance and the null hypothesis of no significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents from the three states was not rejected. Also, in Table X, page 106, it is shown that 88 percent of the respondents perceived the community education concept adaptable to collaboration of community resources, therefore, being highly feasible.

Research Question Number 3

How important is the role of the community school director in interagency collaboration?

There were 11 items on the instrument that directly addressed this question. The 11 questions together addressed the requirements for the role of community school director which are: (1) working with agencies, organizations, and groups in each school area; (2) providing leadership in collaborating joint-projects; (3) collaborating and coordinating a system of reporting on projects; (4) being knowledgeable in the politics of change; (5) being a community leader; (6) being a change agent; (7) participating in community activities and organizations; (8) being knowledgeable of the educational problems; (9) attending conferences and workshops relevant to agency-school operations; (10) acting as a "bridge" between agencies, school, and community; and (11) being assessible to all community members. The

preceding 11 items were combined to generate a composite score for the role of community school director.

Analysis of the community school director variable was made in order to determine how important the role was in developing interagency collaboaration. Table VII, page 99, indicates that the respondent groups perceived significant difference on this variable with interagency collaboration and its relationship to community education. Table VIII, page 101, presents the results of Scheffe's test which found that the perceptions of each of the respondent groups were significantly different from the other concerning the community school director variable. The community school directors and coordinators had the highest group mean and community school principals was second highest. Table X, page 106, indicates that 90 percent of the total respondents perceived the community school director variable to be vital to interagency collaboration.

Research Question Number 4

Is formal structure important to agency-school collaboration programs?

There were 11 items on the instrument that dealt directly with this question. Certain basic requirements are necessary to establish formal structure in agency-school collaboration programs. Some of the requirements are: (1) developing formal agreements between agencies and schools; (2) establishing procedures for working with agencies; (3) developing guidelines for interagency projects; (4) establishing a set of guidelines for interagency collaboration; (5) utilizing

facilities fully; (6) avoiding unnecessary duplication of facilities; (7) making use of joint planning of school and community facilities; (8) sharing of staff among agencies and schools; (9) allowing for joint inservice programs; (10) increasing the efficient use of public and private funds; and (11) improving the expenditure of funds by both schools and agencies. These 11 items were combined to generate a composite score for formal structure. Analysis of the "ideal" and "real" situation of the structure variable with interagency collaboration and its relationships with community education showed that the respondents perceived structure in the "ideal" situation to be significantly different from the "real" situation. However, when the respondent groups were analyzed with the structure variable, the results of Scheffe's test in Table VIII, page 101, showed that the three groups showed no significanct difference in perception. Table IX, page 103, shows that 77 percent of the respondents agreed that formal structure was a necessary ingredient of agency-school collaboration.

Research Question Number 5

Do community-school based action programs which enlist community participation and agency-school collaboration effect change and aid in communication at all effect levels?

There were 11 items on the instrument that dealt directly with this question. These items pertain to the requirements for implementation of community-school based action programs which effect change and aid in communication at all effected levels. These requirements are:

(1) acting as a catalyst for change; (2) decentralizing community services; (3) serving to minimize bureaucracy; (4) establishing collaborative procedures with governmental service agencies; (5) providing for maximum free use of facilities; (6) housing community agencies in school facilities; (7) collaborating school and agency staffs; (8) establishing communications and understandings; (9) effecting changes within agencies; (10) effecting community change; and (11) effecting school change. These preceding 11 items were combined to generate a composite score for implementation of agency-school collaboration.

An examination of the implementation variable was made to discover if this element effected change and aided in communication. The analysis of variance summary in Table VII, page 98, shows that implementation was perceived significantly different by the three respondent groups. As can be seen in Table VIII, page 101, the Scheffe's test found that the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts perceived the importance of the variable significantly lower than the community education directors and coordinators and the community school principals. Table X, page 106, indicates that 82 percent of the respondents were affirmative on the postulate that proper implementation will effect change and aid in communication at all effected levels.

Research Question Number 6

Are local community-school and agency services assessed to determine the effectiveness of programs and activities in relationship to needs and goals?

There were nine items on the instrument that were directly related to this question on evaluation of agency-school collaboration. Criteria for assessing the effectiveness of programs and activities in community education and interagency collaboration are: (1) working collaboratively with volunteer and civic organizations; (2) working collaboratively with business and industry; (3) assessing joint projects by the agencies, schools, and community; (4) improving services; (5) creating agency services not ordinarily provided by the school; (6) making services more assessable to residents; (7) providing for an equal sharing of the recognition for joint efforts; (8) making the public more aware of services provided by non-school agencies; and (9) allowing continuous reassessment of community needs and goals. The preceding items were combined to generate a composite score for evaluation.

Inspection of the evaluation variable indicated that the "ideal" situation was perceived by the respondents to be significantly higher than the "real" situation at the alpha level of .05. However, when the respondent groups were analyzed with the evaluation variable, the results of Scheffe's test in Table VIII, page 101, showed that the three groups showed no significant difference in perception. As can be observed in Table X, page 106, 94 percent of the respondents were in agreement that evaluation is essential in determining the effectiveness of programs and activities in relationship to the needs and goals of community education and interagency collaboration.

IV. SUMMARY

Chapter III has presented the analysis of data to (1) enable assessment of the hypotheses; (2) examine research questions presented in Chapter I; and (3) to present findings which are pertinent to the purpose of this study--determining the relationship of community education and interagency collaboration within the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee. The findings and interpretations have been presented statistically by tables and written description deemed appropriate by the researcher. The one-way analysis of variance was used in the study of the two hypotheses. An alpha level of probability .05 was established and maintained in analyses of the hypotheses. Mean scores were used in reporting cell differences. The research questions were studied by analyzing how important community education directors and coordinators, executive directors of planning agencies and development districts, and principals of community schools perceived the key elements to be in the establishment of interagency collaboration. In order to examine the perceptions of the three groups totally on each element, composite scores were generated by combining all the items on the instrument that related to each particular element.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship and need of community education and interagency collaboration within the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee based upon the analysis of the key elements of agency-school collaboration. Chapter III addressed this relationship in both written and tabular form.

Table V, page 97, shows that the "ideal" situation is significantly different from the "real." Table VI, page 98, shows that the "ideal" situation was perceived to be significantly higher than the "real" situation by all respondents of all six of the key elements of interagency collaboration. When the responses were analyzed according to the position of the respondents, four of the six elements were perceived significantly different at the probability of .05. Community educators and coomunity school principals had higher perceptions than the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts. When the states were analyzed among each other, Alabama was perceived to be significantly higher than Mississippi at .05 level, however, Bartlett-Box F found unequal variance and the null hypothesis of no significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents from the three states was accepted.

The review of the literature indicated that, in spite of the obvious benefits of interagency collaboration, little actual

collaboration has been documented in the United States. This study has substantiated that proposition. The relationship of community education and interagency collaboration within the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee was found in the "ideal" situation to be significantly higher than the "real" situation. The relationship shows that much collaboration is lacking. This is not to say that community education can mean that schools are all things to all people, certainly it does imply that the community school should provide a catalytic and coordinating role in the community. It must, however, acknowledge its responsibility to identify and effectively deal with community needs.

This role of coordinating efforts and developing collaboration with other agencies is admittedly a sensitive one for the schools. The Community Schools Act of 1974 specifically cited the importance of promoting the efficient use of public education facilities to better serve the citizens of a community and to coordinate the activities of local governmental agencies and other community organizations. Therefore, the school should be willing to change its role if it happens to be addressing needs which are different from what the citizens assess as the real needs. The review of literature revealed studies which stated that currently there is a tremendous gap between what many community members want from their educational system and what they appear to be getting. This gap can be narrowed and bridged only when community members--old and young, rich and poor, white, black, yellow, brown, or red, of whatever political, religious, and societal conviction, and regardless of their educational levels--are

involved in the community's educational process. But, this involvement of community members in the educational process should in no way diminish the role and responsibility of the professional educator. Rather, it enhances and extends both. The professional should play a highly significant part in providing facilitative leadership which encourages and supports citizens willing to assume an active role in the comprehensive educational process of the community. Educators should also use their insights and skills in the organizing, conducting, and reporting of resultant program and services. Often, community involvement is achieved through use of community advisory councils. These councils should never exist merely as token in nature, but should address themselves to specific program areas.

Even though society is in a constant state of change and becoming overwhelmed by such problems as overpopulation and urbanization, the schools can collaborate with governmental agencies to resolve much of the dilemma. This study substantiated Eyster's proposition that collaboration of service-oriented groups has the potential of improving the: (1) quality of services, (2) quantity of services, (3) visibility of services, and (4) reduction of costly duplication in time and effort.

It's Minzey's view that if schools are to succeed in meeting the real needs of community members, educators should purport an operational philosophy based on the concept that learning is a lifelong process and that schools at all levels should help provide various kinds of learning experiences for community members of all ages. This philosophy, as was substantiated in this study, should incorporate the idea that

education is an amalgam of many experiences. If the lifelong learning movement can accomplish the amalgamation of experiences as criteria for educational credit for the individual learner, a major breakthrough will have been accomplished. Leaders of the lifelong learning movement should not become locked into the notion that the experience of one individual is equal to that of another. New ways of equating the value or significance of the experience must be found.

The proposition that education is a "cradle to grave" process presents many challenges and responsibilities for the public schools. They should accept the responsibility of assisting the citizenry in keeping abreast of change within the society. The public schools will need to train for the wise, purposeful, and enjoyable use of leisure time. They should accept the responsibility of providing second chance opportunities to those individuals in the society who, for a variety of reasons, did not complete high school. The public schools should expand the use of their facilities, personnel, and leadership. They should become increasingly involved in vocational training, retaining, and readjustment because of technological advances and expanding job automation.

The proposition that traditional schoolhouse-oriented programs, however good, have shown themselves lacking in the ability to meet total individual needs calls for a closer alignment between community and schools as was illustrated by examples of social dilemma and learning experiences outside the school. Therefore, it seems reasonable and essential that educational concepts which offer the potential to cope with the increasing demands of a change-oriented

society be inspected closely. Although community education is not a new idea in education, recent years have witnessed tremendous progress in its growth and development. The apparent success and growing interest in community education, as is substantiated by the passage of the Community Schools Act, presented a challenge to the researcher to more closely investigate one of its components--namely, interagency collaboration.

A review of the literature established a basic understanding of community education. It also revealed that most studies of community education had been primarily related to philosophy and concepts.

The population under investigation in this study consisted of community education directors and coordinators (N=68), executive directors of planning agencies and districts (N=33), and principals of schools (N=100), which were designated as community schools by community educators. The total population of the three census groups from Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee was 201. The rate of return was an average of 80 percent or 161 respondents. Community education directors and coordinators and the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts were randomly subdivided into two equal sub-groups to determine who received the "ideal" and "real" questionnaires. The principals were not randomly sub-divided and the entire group received only the "real" questionnaire.

In order to test the hypotheses and answer the research questions, it was necessary to collect data on the "ideal" and "real" perceptions of the three groups selected. Six dependent variables

made up the sections of the two questionnaires prepared for use in the study of the interagency collaboration aspect of community education. The survey sections dealt with the elements as follows:

1. Community Involvement,
2. Feasibility Analysis,
3. Community School Director,
4. Structure,
5. Implementation, and
6. Evaluation.

Date for use in the analysis of the selected variables were collected in Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee and the University of Tennessee Computer Center provided assistance in processing the data for analysis.

Hypotheses one and two were statistically analyzed by use of one-way analysis of variance tests. The .05 alpha level of significance was selected as the critical of rejection.

II. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the data provided for findings and conclusions as follows:

1. Significant differences were perceived between the "ideal" and "real" situation by all the respondent groups. Since the mean on the "ideal" dimension was significantly higher than on the "real" dimension, it was concluded that as community education continues to spread to more and more school districts throughout the United States, the need to close a gap between the basic philosophy and fundamental

tenets and actual practice will increase in geometric proportions across the six key element areas. Even the most avid proponent of community education would agree with Minzey in his observation:

> . . . that there is a vast difference between the philosophical claims of community education and the actual programs which are in operation. More specifically, they acknowledge that much of what is called community education is, in reality, programs in adult education or recreation, and as such, are neither unique nor capable of accomplishing all that community educators claim can be accomplished by means of the community education concept.[171]

Unfortunately, in many community schools the adding on of evening activities with no change in the program for children during the day and no widespread involvement of the people in the educational process has been the policy. In short, the major community resource, namely, people, are not being used to any considerable degree and until they are involved we do not have true community education.

2. Community education directors and coordinators, executive directors of planning agencies and development districts, and community school principals perceived the "ideal" situation of interagency collaboration to be significantly higher than the "real" situation at an alpha level of .05 on four of the six variables. These four variables were: (1) community involvement, (2) feasibility analysis, (3) community school director and (4) implementation. When the F ratios were found to be significant, the researcher was required to test the assumption of equal variances. Then, the researcher applied Scheffe's multiple comparison test in order to determine which of the group means were significantly different from the others as can be seen in Table VIII on page 101. The results included in this table were as follows:

(A). The group mean for the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts concerning the community involvement variable were significantly lower than those of community education directors and coordinators and community school principals.

(B). The perceptions of all three groups were significantly different from each other on the feasibility analysis variable with community education directors and coordinators having the highest mean and community school principals placing second highest.

(C). The perceptions of all three groups were significantly different from each other on the community school director variable. Community education directors and coordinators had the highest mean and community school principals followed with the second highest mean.

(D). The group mean of the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts concerning the implementation variable were significantly lower than those of the other two groups.

Based on these findings it was concluded that agency-school collaboration prompted uncertain feelings among the respondent groups. Perhaps, fears were aroused that the autonomy of the organizations would be watered down or destroyed, or that the identity of the sponsoring agencies and institutions would be lost in the masses. Regrettably, these fears often persuade many institutions to operate quite unilaterally because they do not feel secure enough to complement one another, to cost-share at times, or to share facilities and resources.

The community education directors and coordinators and the community school principals perceived the variables of community

involvement and implementation in a similar fashion, and significantly higher than the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts. Based on this finding it was concluded that those respondents affiliated with education consider involving community members a part of their job description. Whereas, executive directors of planning agencies and development districts perceive themselves as meeting service needs for community members without as much input from the clientele they serve.

Each group perceived the feasibility analysis and community school director variables significantly different. Community education directors and coordinators had the highest group mean and community school principals were the next highest. Based on this finding it was concluded that the usage of the facilities, funds, and leadership among the three groups would be done differently. At the local level, some organizations, like the public schools, are divided into sub-units, while others are still single units. As the number of units in any organization increases, so does the complexity of collaboration of services with other agencies. Organizations of larger magnitude enjoy more status in the eyes of the public, as do institutions with larger budgets. Positions which seem analagous on organizational charts may not be so in reality. The problem of approaching the proper level of administrator in each institution to effect collaboration may cause territorialism struggles and refusals from larger organizations to share with smaller ones.

3. The second hypothesis stated that there was no difference between the "ideal" and "real" situation of agency-school collaboration

among the respondents from the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee. Analysis of the data was conclusive that there was no significant difference between the three states and the null hypothesis was accepted.

From this finding it was concluded that the University of Alabama, Birmingham Regional Community Education Center provides coordination among its three member states and promotes a philosophy which is accepted by them. The community school principals responded in a similar manner because they are trained by educational institutions which foster basic administrative skills, methods, and tasks. The executive directors of planning agencies and development districts perceived in a likewise manner because they manage similar programs under the auspices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

4. The largest percentage (94 percent) of the respondents were in agreement that evaluation is a vital key element in improving and changing interagency collaboration and community education.

As a result of this finding it was concluded that the respondents perceived evaluation of the "real" situation of community education as a means of attaining the "ideal" situation. Only through constant evaluation can problems be found and addressed properly.

5. Community involvement was perceived as an important key element of interagency collaboration. Executive directors of planning agencies and development districts perceived this variable significantly lower than the two school-oriented groups. Examination of the total responses shows that 93 percent were in agreement to its relative importance allowing the researcher to conclude that community

involvement is a dynamic process through which growth occurs in individuals, groups, and within communities at large.

6. The community school director element was perceived significantly different by each group. The group mean for community education directors and coordinators was the highest and the group mean for the executive directors of planning agencies and development districts was the lowest. Based upon this finding it was concluded that the role of the leader or catalyst for change in developing community education programs may create territorial hostilities and constraints of operations for respondents from each of the three groups. Since 90 percent of the total respondents were in agreement concerning the importance of this variable, it was concluded that the role of the community school director occupies a central position in agency-school collaborative ventures.

7. All three groups had significantly different perceptions concerning the feasibility analysis element. Again, the community education directors and coordinators had the highest group mean with the community school principals following second. Based upon this finding it was concluded that the three groups view communicating their operational procedures in an effort to innovate programs as a threat to their future progress. Since 88 percent of the total respondents confirm the importance of this element in agency-school collaboration, it was concluded that modes of communication among the three groups needs improvement.

8. The executive directors of planning agencies and development districts perceived the implementation element significantly lower

than the other two school-oriented groups. Based upon this finding it was concluded that the merger of agencies with schools change the role for both groups and could be viewed as a destruction of organizational autonomy, especially for the agencies. Since 82 percent of the respondents perceived this element as important, it was concluded that immense and lucid communication is essential for maximum collaboration.

9. Formal structure of the collaborative venture between agencies and schools was perceived by all three groups in a similar manner. Based upon this finding it was concluded that differences among the organizational structures of participating agencies and schools had been well thought out early in the collaborative process. A comparative analysis of the organizational patterns of community institutions is a valuable tool toward understanding the roles and constraints of operating in advancing interagency collaboration. Since 77 percent were affirmative on the need for formal structure, the researcher concluded that established guidelines and procedures are a realized necessity by informed people.

10. On the basis of all the information in the study, it was concluded that community education, as a collaborative venture, serves as a viable base from which to plan the delivery of human services. When carried out on a continuous and collaborative basis the following outcomes were reasonably expected:

(A). The community would develop commitment to the program of the schools through its participation.

(B). The citizens and professionals alike would develop planning skills essential to democratic action.

(C). The local community would become the object of study and service projects would be a part of the school curriculum.

(D). The citizens involved would define areas for collaborative planning and therefore contribute to change and improvement in the community-at-large.

(E). There would be a process in use which would allow for collaborative action as a way of life for the school and the community.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The results and implications of this study prompt four recommendations. First, explore ways in which this research can be used as a model for a diagnostic and prescriptive tool for schools to assess: (1) interagency collaboration and (2) other components of community education such as pre-school programs, adult education, health services, and recreation.

Based on the findings it is recommended that the advocates of interagency collaboration seek to encourage the following factors in order to insure its development:

1. Emerging community education concepts;
2. Lifelong learning concepts;
3. Adult performance level concepts;
4. Information agency concepts;
5. Assessing human services and resources;
6. Utilization of full-time specialists; and
7. Promotion of interest in professional associations.

Second, considerations should be made by communities interested in the integrating of agency-school services. Every community is different in its educational goals and programs, agency services, organization, structure, and so on. Therefore, adequate study of the community, needs, services, problems, available resources, and other special circumstances should be undertaken prior to the development of interagency collaborative ventures.

Third, endeavor to provide for increased involvement of citizens in their local schools through community school advisory councils; seek to assure maximum use of public school facilities by the citizens of each community; and encourage community educational programs on a county-wide or multicounty-wide basis in an effort to have the best possible programs for the least cost without duplication. This recommendation is based on the rationale that systematic involvement is the key to the successful development and implementation of community education. Regrettably, as found in this study by analysis of the community involvement variable, the major community resource, namely, people, are not being used to any considerable degree and until they are involved, community education will not exist in true form.

Fourth, this research suggests the following areas for further study:

1. Utilize the study design to examine one of the six key elements of interagency collaboration in depth.

2. Replicate the study at another Regional Center of Community Education which forms a cooperative with two or more states.

3. Replicate the study but with a selected population or sample from community education across the nation.

4. Replicate the study involving two or more states with the respondents being state school board members, state department of education community education specialists, and city and/or county superintendents.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Peter J. Cwik, Marilyn J. King, and Curtis Van Voorhees, Community Education Research Monograph, Vol. 2, No. 3 (1976), p. 7.

2. Curtis Van Voorhees, Eleventh National Community Education Clinic Address (Flint, Michigan: March 2, 1971).

3. James Dorland and Donald G. Butcher, "Editorial," Community Education Journal, Vol. V, No. 5 (September-October, 1975), p. 6.

4. Public Law 93-380 Title IV, Section 405, Community Schools, August 21, 1974, 88 stat 549 (c).

5. Maurice F. Seay, et al., Community Education: A Developing Concept, (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1974), p. 11.

6. George W. Eyster, "Interagency Collaboration: The Keystone to Community Education," Community Education Journal, Vol. V., No. 5 (September-October, 1975), p. 24.

7. Maurice F. Seay, "Thread Running Through the Community School Movement," Community Education Journal, Vol. II, No. 1 (February, 1972), p. 19.

8. James Kenney, "The Community School as a Base for the Coordination of Human Service Delivery," Community Education Journal, Vol. III, No. 3 (May, 1973), p. 9.

9. Merle R. Sumption and Yvonne Engstrom, School Community Relations: A New Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 46.

10. Van Voorhees, Address, March 2, 1971.

11. Larry E. Decker, People Helping People (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1976), p. 9.

12. Forbis Jordan, School Business Administration (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1969), p. 29.

13. Decker, op. cit., p. 11.

14. Louis J. Tassee, "A Study of the Key Elements of Agency-School Cooperation and Their Relationship to Community Education," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972), pp. 97-98.

15. Roland, G. Frank, Planning for Community Education: A Lay Citizen's Guide (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1975), p. 9.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Link: For and About Community Education, Tennessee Community Education Association, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Dec. 20, 1977), p. 14.

19. Roger Hiemstra, The Educative Community: Linking the Community, Schools, and Family (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972), pp. 34-35.

20. Deobold B. Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 324-325.

21. Hiemstra, op. cit., p. 94.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., p. 31.

24. Ibid.

25. Eyster, loc. cit.

26. Hiemstra, loc. cit.

27. Frank Goble, The Third Force -- The Psychology of Abraham Maslow (New York: Grossman Publishers, Inc., 1970), p. 42.

28. Ibid.

29. Tennessee Education PRGRAM, Tennessee Education Association Publication, Vol. V, No. 15, (March 13, 1978), p. 6.

30. Van Dalen, loc. cit.

31. Ibid.

32. Claire Selltiz, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967), pp. 237-41.

33. Asher, J. William, Educational Research and Evaluation Methods (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976), p. 92.

34. Ibid.

35. F. M. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959), p. 491.

36. Tassee, op. cit., p. 103.

37. Peter F. Drucker, The Age of Discontinuity (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968), p. 190.

38. Kerlinger, op. cit., p. 397.

39. Schuyler W. Huck, William H. Cormier, and William G. Bounds, Jr., Reading Statistics and Research (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974), p. 66.

40. Roger Hiemstra, op. cit., p. 7.

41. Joseph Ringers, Jr., Community/Schools and Interagency Programs: A Guide (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1976), p. 22.

42. James D. Logsdon and V.M. Kerensky, "The Principal's Responsibilities in Community Education," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 59, No. 394 (November, 1975), p. 1.

43. Hiemstra, loc. cit.

44. Larry W. Hughes, Informal and Formal Community Forces: External Influences on Schools and Teachers (Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1976), p. 3.

45. Roland L. Warren, The Community in America (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973), p. 9.

46. Larry E. Decker, "Community Education: The Need for Conceptual Framework," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 59, No. 394 (November, 1975), p. 5.

47. Hiemstra, op. cit., p. 53.

48. Hughes, op. cit., p. 8.

49. Hiemstra, op. cit., p. 12.

50. V. M. Kerensky and E. O. Melby, op. cit., p. 10.

51. Hughes, op. cit., p. 2.

52. C. Wright Mills, "Are We Losing Our Sense of Belonging?" Paper delivered at Couchiching Conference, August 10, 1954, pp. 8-9.

53. Peter J. Cwik, Marilyn J. King, and Curtis Van Voorhees, op. cit., p. 7.

54. Ibid.

55. A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1954), p. 80.

56. Frank Goble, op. cit., p. 108.

57. A. W. Combs and D. Snygg, Individual Behavior, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1959), p. 240.

58. Herbert A. Carroll, Mental Hygiene: The Dynamics of Adjustment, 4th ed. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 291.

59. A. W. Combs, "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality," Paper delivered to Mott Interns (Flint, Michigan: November, 1972).

60. William A. Poppen and C. L. Thompson, School Counseling Theories and Concepts (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1974), pp. 47-48.

61. Cwik, King and Van Voorhees, loc. cit.

62. H. G. Wells, The Outline of History (Garden City, New York: Garden City Publishing Co., 1929), p. 1089.

63. John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963), pp. 5-6.

64. Peter F. Drucker, op. cit., p. 320.

65. E. O. Melby, Addresses to the Faculty of the University College of Michigan State University (Michigan: September 14, 1972).

66. W. Fred Totten and Frank J. Manley, The Community School: Basic Concepts, Function and Organization (Galien, Michigan: Allied Education Council, 1969), p. xx.

67. American Association of School Administrators, Schools for a New World (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1947), p. 67.

68. John M. Gaus, "A Theory of Organizations in Public Administration," The Frontiers of Public Administration (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 66.

69. Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1958), p. 73.

70. Ibid.

71. Talcott Parsons, "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to Theory of Organizations," A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations, ed. by Amitai Etzioni (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), p. 36.

72. Ibid.

73. Ibid.

74. Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, (New York: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 12-14.

75. Ibid.

76. Ibid.

77. Ibid.

78. Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958), p. 90.

79. Ibid.

80. Ibid.

81. Arthur E. Fink, C. Wilson Anderson, and Merrill B. Conover, The Field of Social Work, 5th ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 19.

82. Ibid., p. 36.

83. Ibid., pp. 40-43.

84. Arthur Dunham, Community Welfare Organization: Principles and Practice (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1962), p. 75.

85. Jack D. Minzey and Clyde E. LeTarte, "Community Education--Where to Now?" Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (July-August, 1977), p. 30.

86. Ibid.

87. Willard Wirtz, "Task Force III: Jobs, Income, and Human Services: Recommendations," Appalachia, Vol. II, No. 2 (October-November, 1977), p. 40.

88. Ibid.

89. Eyster, op. cit., p. 25.

90. Phillip A. Clark, "Community Education and Its Major Components," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (July-August, 1977), p. 6.

91. Ibid.

92. Maurice F. Seay, et al., Community Education: A Developing Concept (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1974), p. 19.

93. V. M. Kerensky, "The Lights of Community Education--Let's Turn Them On," Community Education Today (March, 1976), p. 5.

94. David Migocki, Community Education at the State Education Agency Level, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1976.

95. Ibid.

96. People Helping People Help Themselves, brochure published by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation Building (Flint, Michigan).

97. Jack Minzey, "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1972), p. 150.

98. Ringers, op. cit., p. 92.

99. Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 21.

100. Joseph K. Hart, The Discovery of Intelligence (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1924), p. 383.

101. Kenneth Hansen, Public Education in American Society (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 260.

102. Warren G. Bennis, "Theory and Method in Applying Behavioral Science to Planned Organizational Change," The Planning of Change, 2nd ed., ed. by Warren Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), pp. 77-78.

103. Ibid.

104. Ibid.

105. E. O. Melby, "Epilogue: Broad Challenge," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (July-August, 1977), p. 43.

106. Paul Misner, The School and Community Reader, ed. by Edward G. Olsen (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), pp. 220-221.

107. Donald C. Weaver, "Strategies for Training Community Education Leaders," Community Education Journal, Vol. V, No. 3 (May-June, 1975), p. 26.

108. Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), pp. 468-469.

109. Susan Kraus and Kenneth Northwick, "The Evening Portion of the Community School," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 59, No. 394 (November, 1975), p. 40.

110. Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 186.

111. Ibid.

112. W. Fred Totten, The Community Services Director, No. 532, Mott Program, (Flint, Michigan), p. 3.

113. Jack D. Minzey and Clyde LeTarte, Community Education: From Program to Process (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1976), p. 169.

114. Ibid., p. 5.

115. Ibid.

116. Everette E. Nance, The Community Council: Its Organization and Function (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1976), p. 7.

117. Ringers, op. cit., p. 69.

118. Phillip Clark and Robert Shoop, "Community Advisory Councils: Composition and Selection Procedures," Community Education Journal, Vol. IV, No. 3 (May-June, 1974), p. 43.

119. Ibid.

120. Nance, op. cit., p. 10.

121. George Woons, "The Community School Council," Community Education Journal, Vol. III, No. 5 (September, 1973), p. 10.

122. Nance, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

123. Edward G. Olsen and Phillip A. Clark, Life-Centering Education (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1977), p. 98.

124. Decker, "Community Education: The Need for Conceptual Framework," p. 11.

125. Dwight W. Allen and Mark H. Rossman, "A Perspective on Lifelong Learning," Community Education Journal, Vol. 1, No. 5 (September-October, 1975), p. 32.

126. Norman D. Kurland, A National Strategy for Lifelong Learning (Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1976), p. 3.

127. Ibid.

128. Ibid.

129. Ibid.

130. Curtis Van Voorhees, "A Report on Community Education: The Imperative of Leadership," National Association of State Boards of Education, Vol. 11, No. 5 (November, 1976), p. 3.

131. Sylvia Porter, Your Money's Worth, Field Newspaper Syndicate, December, 1974.

132. Totten and Manley, op. cit., p. 210.

133. Harold E. Moore, "Organizational and Administrative Problems and Practices," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 3 (November, 1972), p. 170.

134. Minzey and LeTarte, Community Education: From Program to Process, p. 234.

135. Porter, loc. cit.

136. Ringers, op. cit., p. 126.

137. Sumpton and Engstrom, op. cit., p. 147.

138. Kerensky and Melby, op. cit., p. 173.

139. Olsen and Clark, op. cit., pp. 88-90.

140. Ibid.

141. Ringers, op. cit., p. 55.

142. Clark, op. cit., p. 7.

143. Ringers, op. cit., p. 23.

144. Bennis and et al., op. cit., p. 147.

145. John L. G. Palmer, "A Study of the Community Education Programs as a Deterrent to Violence and Vandalism in the Alma Community," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1975), pp. 80-120.

146. Ibid.

147. Gerald T. Horton, Victoria M. E. Carr and G. J. Corcoran, Human Services Monograph: Illustrating Services Integration from Categorical Bases (Rockville, Maryland: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976), pp. 43-47.

148. Horton, op. cit., p. 3.

149. Ibid.

150. Bennis and et al., op. cit., p. 152.

151. Clifford Earle, "Overpopulation: New Threat to Survival," Educational Issues in a Changing Society, ed. by August Kerber and W. R. Smith (Detroit: Wayne State University, 1968), pp. 35-39.

152. Robert L. Shinn, "Human Responsibility in the Emerging Society," Designing Education for the Future, No. 1, ed. by Edgar Morphet and Charles Ryan (New York: Citation Press, 1967), pp. 243-246.

153. Alvin Toffler, Future Shock, Chapter 18 (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 395-398.

154. Ibid., p. 357.

155. Kevin Ryan, "Where Are We Going and How Can We Get There?" Criticism, Conflict, and Change, ed. by Emanuel Hurwitz, Jr. and Robert Maidment (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1972), p. 442.

156. Ibid.

157. Hiemstra, op. cit., pp. 85-86.

158. David H. Dean, Community Schools in Rural Areas (New Mexico: The National Institute of Education affiliated with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, January, 1974), p. 2.

159. Ibid., p. 10.

160. James H. Cowhig, "School Dropout Rates Among Farm and Non-Farm Youth: 1950-1960," Agricultural Economic Report Number 42 (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agricultural Economic Research Services, 1963), p. 34.

161. John P. Mahlstede and Robert W. Thomas, "Research and Development in Vocational and Technical Education: Non-Metropolitan Areas," Research Reports, Final Reports, Appendix One (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, June, 1968), p. 157.

162. M. L. Cushman, "The Status of Education and the Training of Rural Youth--The Impact of Socioeconomic Change," Paper presented at The National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 13.

163. Eugene B. Griesman and Kenneth G. Densley, "Vocational Education in Rural Areas: Review and Synthesis of Research," Vocational Technical Research Series Number 50 (New Mexico: ERIC/CRESS, 1969), p. 35.

164. Tennessee Education PRGRAM, loc. cit., p. 6.

165. Elsie Clapp, Community Schools in Action (New York: The Viking Press, 1939), p. 66.

166. Everett M. Rogers and Lyne Svenning, "Change in Small Schools," (Washington, D.C.: Monograph presented at the National Working Conference on Solving Problems in Sparsely Populated Areas, May, 1969), p. 13.

167. Minzey and LeTarte, Community Education: From Program to Process, p. 273.

168. Shinn, op. cit., pp. 243-246.

169. John Goodlad, "The Educational Program to 1980 and Beyond," Designing Education for the Future, No. 2, ed. by Edgar Morphet and Charles Ryan (New York: Citation Press, 1967), pp. 47-60.

170. Walt Whitman, Leaves of Grass, ed. by Harold W. Blodgett and Sculley Bradley (New York: New York University Press, 1965), pp. 364-366.

171. Jack D. Minzey, "Community Education--Another Perception," Community Education Journal, Vol. 3, No. 3 (May-June, 1973), p. 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Asher, J. William. Educational Research and Evaluation Methods. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Massachuettes: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Bennis, Warren, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, eds. The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Blodgett, Harold W., ed. Leaves of Grass. New York: New York University Press, 1965.

Carroll, Herbert A. Mental Hygiene: The Dynamics of Adjustment. Fourth Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1964.

Clapp, Elsie. Community Schools in Action. New York: The Viking Press, 1939.

Combs, A. W. and Donald Snygg. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1959.

Cwik, Peter J., Marilyn J. King, and Curtis Van Voorhees. Community Education Research Monograph. Vol. 2, No. 3, 1976.

Decker, Larry E. People Helping People. Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1976.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.

Directory of Local Planning Agencies in the Southeastern United States. Tampa, Florida: Metropolitan Development Agency, 1976.

Dunham, Arthur. Community Welfare Organization: Principles and Practice. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1962.

Drucker, Peter F. The Age of Discontinuity. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969.

Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Etzioni, Amitai., ed. A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Fink, Arthur E., C. Wilson Anderson, and Merrill B. Conover. The Field of Social Work. Fifth Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1968.

Gaus, John M. The Frontiers of Public Administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Goble, Frank. The Third Force--The Psychology of Abraham Maslow. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1970.

Hansen, Kenneth. Public Education in American Society. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Hart, Joseph K. The Discovery of Intelligence. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1924.

Hiemstra, Roger. The Educative Community. Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, 1972.

Horton, Gerald T., Victoria M. E. Carr, and G. J. Corcoran. Human Services Monograph: Illustrating Service Integration from Categorical Bases. No. 3. Maryland: Project Share and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976.

Huck, Schuyler W., William H. Cormier, and William G. Bounds, Jr. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.

Hughes, Larry W. Informal and Formal Community Forces: External Influences on Schools and Teachers. New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1976.

Hurwitz, Emanuel, Jr. and Robert Maidment., eds. Criticism, Conflict and Change. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1972.

Jacobson, Paul B., James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman. The Principalship: New Perspectives. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Jordan, Forbis. School Business Administration. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1969.

Kerber, August and W. R. Smith., eds. Educational Issues in a Changing Society. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1968.

Kerlinger, F. M. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Kerensky, V. M. and E. O. Melby. Education II Revisited: A Social Imperative. Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1975.

Kurland, Norman D. A National Strategy for Lifelong Learning. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1976.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1954.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.

Migocki, David. Community Education at the State Education Agency Level. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1976.

Minzey, Jack D. and Clyde LeTarte. Community Education: From Program to Process. Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1976.

Morphet, Edgar and Charles Ryan. eds. Designing Education for the Future. No. 1. New York: Citation Press, 1967.

Morphet, Edgar and Charles Ryan. eds. Designing Education for the Future. No. 2. New York: Citation Press, 1967.

Nance, Everett E. The Community Council: Its Organization and Function. Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1976.

Olsen, Edward G. and Phillip A. Clark. Life-Centering Education. Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1977.

Olsen, Edward G., ed. The School and Community Reader. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.

Poppen, William A. and C. L. Thompson. School Counseling Theories and Concepts. Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1974.

Ringers, Joseph, Jr. Community/Schools and Interagency Programs: A Guide. Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1976.

Roland, Frank G. Planning for Community Education: A Lay Citizens Guide. Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1975.

Seay, Maurice F., et al. Community Education: A Developing Concept. Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1974.

Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Sumption, Merle R. and Yvonne Engstrom. School-Community Relations--A New Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Toffer, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.

Totten, W. Fred and Frank J. Manley. The Community School: Basic Concepts, Function, and Organization. Michigan: Allied Education Council, 1969.

Totten. W. Fred. The Community Services Director. No. 532, Mott Program, Flint, Michigan.

Van Dalen, Deobold. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.

Warren, Roland L. The Community in America. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973.

Wells, H. G. The Outline of History. New York: Garden City Publishing Co., 1929.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Allen, Dwight W. and Mark H. Rossman. "A Perspective on Lifelong Learning." Community Education Journal. Vol. 1, No. 5 (September-October, 1975), p. 32.

American Association of School Administrators. Schools for a New World. Washington, D.C.: The Association Press, 1947.

Clark, Phillip A. "Community Education and Its Major Components." Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (July-August, 1977), p. 6.

Clark, Phillip A. and Robert Shoop. "Community Advisory Councils." Community Education Journal. Vol. IV, No. 3 (May-June, 1974), p. 43.

Decker, Larry E. "Community Education: The Need for Conceptual Framework." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 59, No. 394 (November, 1975), p. 5.

Dorland, James and Donald G. Butcher. "Editoral." Community Education Journal, Vol. V, No. 5 (September-October, 1975), p. 6.

Eyster, George W. "Interagency Collaboration: The Keystone to Community Education." Community Education Journal. Vol. V, No. 5 (September-October, 1975), p. 25.

Kenney, James. "The Community Schools as a Base for the Coordination of Human Service Delivery." Community Education Journal. Vol. III, No. 3 (May, 1973), p. 9.

Kerensky, V. M. "The Lights of Community Education--Let's Turn Them On." Community Education Today. (March, 1976), p. 5.

Kraus, Susan and Kenneth Nortwick. "The Evening Portion of the Community School." NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 59, No. 394 (November, 1975), p. 40.

Link: For and About Community Education. Tennessee Community Education Association. Vol. 2, No. 1 (December 20, 1977), p. 14.

Logsdon, James D. and V. M. Kerensky. "The Principal's Responsibilities in Community Education." NASSP Bulletin, Vol 59, No. 394 (November, 1975), p. 1.

Melby, E. O. "Epilogue: Broad Challenge." Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (July-August, 1977), p. 43.

Minzey, Jack D. and Clyde LeTarte. "Community Education--Where to Now?" Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (July-August, 1977), p. 30.

Minzey, Jack D. "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views." Phi Delta Kappen (November, 1972), p. 150.

Minzey, Jack D. "Community Education--Another Perception." Community Education Journal. Vol. 3, No. 3 (May-June, 1973), p. 7.

Moore, Harold E. "Organizational and Administrative Problems and Practices." Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. LIV, No. 3 (November, 1972), p. 170.

Porter, Sylvia. Your Money's Worth. Field Newspaper Syndicate. December, 1974.

Seay, Maurice F. "Thread Running Through the Community School Movement." Community Education Journal. Vol. 11, No. 1 (February, 1972), p. 19.

Tennessee Education PRGRAM. Tennessee Education Association. Vol. V, No. 15 (March 13, 1978), p. 6.

Van Voorhees, Curtis. "A Report on Community Education: The Imperative of Leadership." National Association of State Boards of Education. Vol. 11, No. 5 (November, 1976), p. 3.

Weaver, Donald C. "Strategies for Training Community Education Leaders." Community Education Journal. Vol. V, No. 3 (May-June, 1975), p. 26.

Wirtz, Willard. "Task Force III: Jobs, Income, and Human Services: Recommendations." Appalachia. Vol. II, No. 2 (October-November, 1977), p. 40.

Woons, George. "The Community School Council." Community Education Journal. Vol. III, No. 5 (September, 1973), p. 10.

DISSERTATIONS

Palmer, John L. G. "A Study of the Community Education Programs as a Deterrent to Violence and Vandalism in the Alma Community." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1975).

Tassee, Louis J. "A Study of the Key Elements of Agency-School Cooperation and Their Relationship to Community Education." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972).

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL AND REPORTS

Cowhig, James H. "School Dropout Rates Among Farm and Non-Farm Youth: 1950-1960." Agricultural Economic Report Number 42. United States Department of Agricultural Economic Research Services, 1963.

Dean, David H. "Community Schools in Rural Areas." Study by the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, New Mexico, 1974.

Griessman, Eugene B. and Kenneth G. Densley. "Vocational Education in Rural Areas: Review and Synthesis of Research." Vocational Technical Research Series Number 50. New Mexico, 1969.

Mahlstede, John P. and Robert W. Thomas. "Research and Development in Vocational and Technical Education: Non-Metropolitan Areas." Research Report, Final Reports, Appendix One. Iowa State University, Iowa, 1968.

People Helping People Help Themselves. Brochure by the Charles S. Mott Foundation Building, Flint, Michigan.

Public Law 93-380 Title IV Section 405 Community Schools, August 21, 1974, 88 stat 549 (c).

SPEECHES AND PAPERS DELIVERED

Combs, A. W. "A Perceptual View of the Adequate Personality." Paper delivered to Mott Interns, 1972.

Cushman, M. L. "The Status of Education and the Training of Rural Youth--The Impact of Socioeconomic Change." Paper delivered at The National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth. Washington, D.C., 1967.

Melby, E. O. Addresses to the Faculty of the University College of Michigan State University. Michigan, 1972.

Mills, C. Wright. "Are We Losing Our Sense of Belonging?" Paper delivered at Couchiching Conference, 1954.

Van Voorhees, Curtis. Eleventh National Community Education Clinic Address. Flint, Michigan, March 2, 1971.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR A

STUDY OF AGENCY-SCHOOL COLLABORATION

WITHIN THE MOTT REGION

General Information:

1. Your responses will be held in strict confidence.
2. You are encouraged to make any comments that will help in interpreting your data.
3. After completing the questionnaire, simply put it in the stamped, self-addressed return envelope and mail it to Joyce S. Hopson, R.R. 2, Box 52, Tazewell, Tennessee, 37879.

Marking Instructions:

1. PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS.
2. CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.
3. GIVE THE ANSWER WHICH BEST EXPRESSES YOUR PERCEPTION OF THE REAL (OR ACTUAL) SITUATION.

Key: SA - Strongly Agree; A - Agree; N - Neutral; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly Disagree

I. Community Involvement

1. Community Education is developing and encouraging community involvement.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. Community Education is providing opportunity for many self-generating activities.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3. Community Education is establishing representative citizen's advisory groups in each school area.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. Community Councils are involved in the business of priority setting.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5. Community Councils do recommend changes in agency policies or procedures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6. Community Councils do include agency representatives.	SA	A	N	D	SD

7. Agency-school projects are allowing community groups to have a greater responsibility in meeting their own needs. SA A N D SD

8. Agency-school collaboration is providing for community involvement in the setting of priorities for service. SA A N D SD

9. Agency-school collaboration is producing projects which allow for community persons to participate in various action projects in their school area. SA A N D SD

II. Feasibility Analysis

1. Community Education is developing a sense of pride in the community. SA A N D SD

2. Community Education is serving as a direct line of communication with all of the people. SA A N D SD

3. Community Education is identifying community wants and needs. SA A N D SD

4. Community Education is reducing juvenile delinquency in the community by working with agencies. SA A N D SD

5. Community Education is making maximum use of existing human and physical resources. SA A N D SD

6. Community Education is reducing problems such as drug abuse, vandalism, truancy, etc. by working collaboratively with other agencies. SA A N D SD

7. Community Education is developing a climate for innovation and change. SA A N D SD

8. Community Education is offering opportunities for agencies to collaborate in a non-threatening atmosphere. SA A N D SD

9. Agencies do recommend changes in school programs. SA A N D SD

10. Agency-school collaboration is producing greater support for agencies. SA A N D SD

11. Agency-school collaboration is making the goals of agencies and schools more fully realized. SA A N D SD

12. Agency-school programs are providing a better system of communications between schools and agencies. SA A N D SD

III. Community School Director

1. The community school director is responsible for working with agencies, organizations and groups in each school area. SA A N D SD

2. Community Education directors provide leadership in collaborating joint-projects so that each participating agency can be responsible for achieving a part of the overall goal. SA A N D SD

3. A system of reporting on projects involving the school and other agencies is collaborated and coordinated by the community school director. SA A N D SD

4. The community school director is knowledgeable in the politics of change. SA A N D SD

5. The community school director is a leader in the community. SA A N D SD

6. The community school director is a "change agent." SA A N D SD

7. The community school director is spending most of his time in community activities and organizations. SA A N D SD

8. The community school director has broad knowledge of the educational problems outside of community and adult education. SA A N D SD

9. The community school director attends conferences and workshops relevant to agency-school operations. SA A N D SD

10. The community school director is essentially a "bridge" between agency, school, and community. SA A N D SD

11. The community school director keeps his office open to all members of the community. SA A N D SD

IV. Structure

1. Formal agreements between agencies and schools have been developed. SA A N D SD

2. A definite set of procedures for working with agencies has been established. SA A N D SD

3. Specific guidelines showing steps to be followed in inter-agency projects has been developed. SA A N D SD

4. A general set of guidelines are established for inter-agency collaboration. SA A N D SD

5. Agency-school collaboration is allowing the fuller utilization of facilities. SA A N D SD

6. Agency-school collaboration is avoiding unnecessary duplication of facilities. SA A N D SD

7. Agency-school collaboration is improving joint planning of school and community facilities. SA A N D SD

8. Agency-school collaboration is allowing for sharing of staff. SA A N D SD

9. Agency-school collaboration is allowing for joint inservice programs. SA A N D SD

10. Agency-school collaboration is increasing the efficient use of public and private funds. SA A N D SD

11. Agency-school collaboration is improving the expenditure of funds by both schools and agencies. SA A N D SD

V. Implementation

1. Community Education is serving as a catalyst in the initiation of change in the community. SA A N D SD

2. Community Education is used to decentralize community services. SA A N D SD

3. Community Education is serving to minimize bureaucracy. SA A N D SD

4. Community Education is the vehicle for establishing collaborative procedures with governmental service agencies. SA A N D SD

5. Community Education is providing for maximum free use of the facilities. SA A N D SD

6. Community Education is allowing community agencies to be housed in school facilities. SA A N D SD

7. Community Education is attempting to collaborate school and agency staffs. SA A N D SD

8. Agency-school projects are initially relatively simple, short-term activities to develop communications and understanding. SA A N D SD

9. Agency-school collaboration is effecting changes within agencies. SA A N D SD

10. Agency-school collaboration is effecting changes within the community. SA A N D SD

11. Agency-school collaboration is effecting changes within the schools. SA A N D SD

VI. Evaluation

1. Community Education is working collaboratively with volunteer and civic organizations. SA A N D SD

2. Community Education is working collaboratively with business and industry. SA A N D SD

3. Measurement of progress on joint-projects is including assessment by the agencies, schools, and community. SA A N D SD

4. Agency-school collaboration is noticeably improving services. SA A N D SD

5. Agency-school collaboration is providing services not ordinarily provided by the school. SA A N D SD

6. Agency-school collaboration is making agency services more accessible to residents. SA A N D SD

7. Agency-school projects are providing for an equal sharing of the recognition for joint efforts. SA A N D SD

8. Agency-school collaboration is making the public more aware of services provided by non-school agencies. SA A N D SD

9. Agency-school collaboration is allowing for continuous reassessment of community needs and goals. SA A N D SD

COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR A STUDY OF AGENCY-SCHOOL COLLABORATION WITHIN THE MOTT REGION

General Information:

1. Your response will be held in strict confidence.
2. You are encouraged to make any comments that will help in interpreting your data.
3. After completing the questionnaire, simply put it in the stamped, self-addressed return envelope and mail it to Joyce S. Hopson, R.R. 2, Box 52, Tazewell, Tennessee, 37879.

Marking Instructions:

1. PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS.
2. CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.
3. GIVE THE ANSWER WHICH BEST EXPRESSES YOUR PERCEPTION OF AN IDEAL SITUATION.

Key: SA - Strongly Agree; A - Agree; N - Neutral; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly Disagree

I. Community Involvement

1. Community Education should develop and encourage community involvement.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. Community Education should provide opportunity for many self-generating activities.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3. Community Education should establish representative citizens' advisory groups in each school area.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. Community councils should be involved in the business of priority setting.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5. Community councils should recommend changes in agency polities or procedures.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6. Community councils should include agency representatives.	SA	A	N	D	SD

7. Agency-school projects ought to allow community groups to have a greater responsibility in meeting their own needs. SA A N D SD

8. Agency-school collaboration should provide for community involvement in the setting of priorities for service. SA A N D SD

9. Agency-school collaboration should produce projects which allow for community persons to participate in various action projects in their school area. SA A N D SD

II. Feasibility Analysis

1. Community Education should develop a sense of pride in the community. SA A N D SD

2. Community Education should serve as a direct line of communication with all of the people. SA A N D SD

3. Community Education should identify community wants and needs. SA A N D SD

4. Community Education should be able to reduce juvenile delinquency in the community by working with agencies. SA A N D SD

5. Community Education should make maximum use of existing human and physical resources. SA A N D SD

6. Community Education should be able to reduce problems such as drug abuse, vandalism, truancy, etc. by working collaboratively with other agencies. SA A N D SD

7. Community Education should develop a climate for innovation and change. SA A N D SD

8. Community Education should offer opportunities for agencies to collaborate in a non-threatening atmosphere. SA A N D SD

9. Agencies should recommend changes in school programs. SA A N D SD

10. Agency-school collaboration should produce greater support for agencies. SA A N D SD

11. Agency-school collaboration should make the goals of agencies and schools more fully realized. SA A N D SD

12. Agency-school programs should provide a better system of communications between schools and agencies. SA A N D SD

III. Community School Director

1. The Community school director should have responsibility for working with agencies, organizations and groups in each school area. SA A N D SD

2. Community education directors should provide leadership in collaborating joint-projects so that each participating agency can be responsible for achieving a part of the overall goal. SA A N D SD

3. A system of reporting on projects involving the school and other agencies should be collaborated and coordinated by the community school director. SA A N D SD

4. The community school director should be knowledgeable in the politics of change. SA A N D SD

5. The community school director should be a leader in the community. SA A N D SD

6. The community school director should be a "change agent." SA A N D SD

7. The community school director should spend most of his time in community activities and organizations. SA A N D SD

8. The community school director ought to have broad knowledge of the educational problems outside of community and adult education. SA A N D SD

9. The community school director should attend conferences and workshops relevant to agency-school operations. SA A N D SD

10. The community school director should be essentially a "bridge" between agency, school, and community. SA A N D SD

11. The community school director ought to keep his office open to all members of the community. SA A N D SD

IV. Structure

1. Formal agreements between agencies and schools should be developed. SA A N D SD

2. A definite set of procedures for working with agencies should be established. SA A N D SD

3. Specific guidelines showing steps to be followed in inter-agency projects should be developed. SA A N D SD

4. A general set of guidelines should be established for inter-agency collaboration. SA A N D SD

5. Agency-school collaboration should allow the fuller utilization of facilities. SA A N D SD

6. Agency-school collaboration should avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities. SA A N D SD

7. Agency-school collaboration should improve joint planning of school and community facilities. SA A N D SD

8. Agency-school collaboration ought to allow for sharing of staff. SA A N D SD

9. Agency-school collaboration ought to allow for joint inservice programs. SA A N D SD

10. Agency-school collaboration should increase the efficient use of public and private funds. SA A N D SD

11. Agency-school collaboration should improve the expenditure of funds by both schools and agencies. SA A N D SD

V. Implementation

1. Community Education should serve as a catalyst in the initiation of change in the community. SA A N D SD

2. Community Education should be used to decentralize community services. SA A N D SD

3. Community Education should serve to minimize bureaucracy. SA A N D SD

4. Community Education should be the vehicle for establishing collaborative procedures with governmental service agencies. SA A N D SD

5. Community Education should provide for maximum free use of facilities. SA A N D SD

6. Community Education should allow community agencies to be housed in school facilities. SA A N D SD

7. Community Education should attempt to collaborate school and agency staffs. SA A N D SD

8. Agency-school projects should be initially relatively simple, short-term activities to develop communications and understanding. SA A N D SD

9. Agency-school collaboration ought to effect changes within agencies. SA A N D SD

10. Agency-school collaboration ought to effect changes within the community. SA A N D SD

11. Agency-school collaboration ought to effect changes within the schools. SA A N D SD

VI. Evaluation

1. Community Education should work collaboratively with volunteer and civic organizations. SA A N D SD

2. Community Education should work collaboratively with business and industry. SA A N D SD

3. Measurement of programs on joint-projects should include assessment by the agencies, schools, and community. SA A N D SD

4. Agency-school collaboration should noticeably improve services. SA A N D SD

5. Agency-school collaboration should make agency services not ordinarily provided by the school. SA A N D SD

6. Agency-school collaboration should make agency services more accessible to residents. SA A N D SD

7. Agency-school projects should provide for an equal sharing of the recognition for joint efforts. SA A N D SD

8. Agency-school collaboration should make the public more aware of services provided by non-school agencies. SA A N D SD

9. Agency-school collaboration should allow continuous reassessment of community needs and goals. SA A N D SD

APPENDIX B

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

AND/OR PLANNING AGENCIES IN ALABAMA,

MISSISSIPPI, AND TENNESSEE

Alabama

Region 1
Muscle Shoals Council of Local Government
P.O. Box 2603
Muscle Shoals, Alabama 35660
Executive Director - Henry L. Turner

Region 2
West Alabama Planning and Development Council
P.O. Drawer 28
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35401
Executive Director - Lewis E. McCray

Region 3
Birmingham Regional Planning Commission
21 Office Plaza South, Suite 220
2112 11th Avenue, South
Birmingham, Alabama 35205
Executive Director - William Bondarenko

Region 4
East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission
700 Quintard Avenue
P.O. Box 2186
Anniston, Alabama 36201
Executive Director - Sam F. Reynolds

Region 5
South Central Alabama Development Commission
2825 E. South Blvd.
Governors Square Shopping Center
Montgomery, Alabama 36111
Executive Director - Lewis F. Duckworth

Region 6
Alabama-Tombigbee Rivers Regional Planning and Development Commission
P.O. Box 269
Camden, Alabama 36726
Executive Director - Joseph L. Knight

Region 7
Southeast Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission
207 Plaza 2
U.S. Highway 231 at Ross Clark Circle
P.O. Box 1406
Dothan, Alabama 36301
Director - William T. Cathell

Region 8
South Alabama Regional Planning Commission
International Trade Center
250 North Water Street
P.O. Box 1665
Mobile, Alabama 33601
Executive Director - Richard Pruitt

Region 9
Central Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission
303 Washington Avenue
P.O. Box 4034
Montgomery, Alabama 36101
Executive Director - Robert E. Grasser

Region 10
Lee County Area Council of Government
P.O. Box 1072
Room 203, First National Bank Building
Auburn, Alabama 36830
Director - Luther Holt

Region 11
North Central Alabama Regional Council of Government
P.O. Box 1069
Fifth Floor - City Hall Tower
Decatur, Alabama 35601
Executive Director - Gary Voketz

Region 12
Top of Alabama Regional Council of Government
Central Bank Building, Suite 350
Huntsville, Alabama 35801
Executive Director - Dean Y. Matthews

Mississippi

Region 1
North Delta Planning and Development District
#7 Sunflower Avenue
P.O. Box 1244
Clarksdale, Mississippi 38614
Executive Director - Edwin P. Thomas

Region 2
Northeast Mississippi Planning and Development District
Northeast Mississippi Jr. College Campus
Industrial Education Building
P.O. Box 6-D
Booneville, Mississippi 38829
Executive Director - Charlie Spearman

Region 3
Three River Planning and Development District
Pontotoc County Community Facilities Building
99 Center Ridge Drive
Pontotoc, Mississippi 38863
Executive Director - Vernon R. Kelly, III

Region 4
South Delta Planning and Development District
Building 340, Old Greenville Air Base
Route 1, Box AB52
Greenville, Mississippi 38701
Executive Director - Walter M. Merritt

Region 5
North Central Planning and Development District
321 Summit Street, Room 107
Winona Times Building
P.O. Box 668
Winona, Mississippi 38967
Executive Director - Bob Williamson

Region 6
Golden Triangle Planning
215 Memorial Hall
P.O. Drawer DN.
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762
Executive Director - John D. Albrittion

Region 7
Central Mississippi Planning and Development District
2675 River Road
Jackson, Mississippi 39216
Executive Director - F. Clark Holmes

Region 8
East Central Planning and Development District
410 Decatur Street
Newton, Mississippi 39345
Executive Director - Colbert Crowe

Region 9
Southwest Mississippi Development District
Main Street
P.O. Box 636
Meadville, Mississippi
Executive Director - Robert E. Whiddon

Region 10
Southern Mississippi Planning and Development District
1020 32nd Avenue
Gulfport, Mississippi 39501
Executive Director - Leslie Newcomb

Region 11
Gulf Region Planning Commission
P.O. Box 4216
Gulfport, Mississippi 39501
Executive Director - Ned J. Boudreaux

Region 12
Lee County Council of Governments
P.O. Drawer A
Tupelo, Mississippi 38801
Executive Director - Harry A. Martin

Tennessee

Region 1
Northwest Tennessee Development District
P.O. Box 63
Martin, Tennessee 38237
Executive Director - Robert W. Brandon

Region 2
Mid-Cumberland Council of Government and Development District
501 Union Street, Suite 600
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
Executive Director - Marshall S. Stuart

Region 3
Upper Cumberland Development District
Burgess Falls Road
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501
Executive Director - Dr. Donald S. Wakefield

Region 4
East Tennessee Development District
P.O. Box 15000
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Executive Director - John W. Anderson

Region 5
First Tennessee-Virginia Development District
207 N. Boone Street
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
Executive Director - B. Thomas Moore

Region 6
Mississippi-Arkansas-Tennessee Council of Governments/
Memphis Delta Development District
125 North Main Street
Room 518
Memphis, Tennessee 38103
Executive Director - George M. Livers

Region 7
Southwest Tennessee Development District
P.O. Box 2385
Jackson, Tennessee 38301
Executive Director - George E. Boyd

Region 8
South Central Tennessee Development District
805 Nashville Highway
Columbia, Tennessee 38401
Executive Director - Don Darden

Region 9
Chattanooga Area Regional Council of Governments/ Southeast
Tennessee Development District
413 James Building
735 Broad Street
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402
Executive Director - Charles L. Thrailkill

VITA

Joyce Sue Hopson was born in Middlesboro, Kentucky on May 14, 1950. She attended elementary schools in Tazewell, Tennessee and was graduated from Claiborne County High School im May 1967. She enrolled in Lincoln Memorial University in June 1967 and received a Bachelor of Arts degree in secondary education with majors in English and History in June 1970. In the fall of 1970, she accepted a teaching position in Claiborne County. She began work on the Master's degree at Union College in Barbourville, Kentucky in the fall of 1971. She received that degree in June 1973.

She entered Graduate School at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville in January 1974 and became certified in special education and guidance. She was admitted in the doctoral program in the department of Educational Administration and Supervision in March 1977. While in residence at The University of Tennessee, she worked as a research assistant with the Bureau of Educational Research and Services. She was involved in the Tennessee State-wide Facilitator Project which set up exemplary United States Office of Education programs throughout that state. She received the Doctor of Education degree with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision in August 1978.

The author is a member of Phi Delta Kappan, National Education Association, and the Tennessee Education Association. Miss Hopson will be employed by the Claiborne County Board of Education after graduation. She will also be serving as president of the Claiborne County Education Association in 1978-79.