June 1974

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Paul Elkin Goldberg entitled "An Approach to Formulating a Basic Program for Community Services in Community Colleges." 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.

John T. Lovell

John T. Lovell, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

AN APPROACH TO FORMULATING A BASIC PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Paul Elkin Goldberg

June 1974

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer expresses his sincere appreciation to his chairman, Dr. John Lovell, for his great patience and guidance. Gratitude is also expressed to the rest of the writer's committee, Dr. William Coffield, Dr. Dewey Stollar and Dr. William Cole, for their constructive criticism and helpful suggestions.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Cuyler Dunbar, President, and Dr. Harold Underwood, Dean of Instruction, of Roane State Community College. It was their belief in the process of staff development that encouraged the writer to develop the study.

Special gratitude goes to the writer's wife, Joy. She has managed to remain helpful, understanding and thoughtful throughout the course of the study.

1146693

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to identify program functions, activity areas and specific activities which could form the nucleus of a basic community services program. The study sought to determine two things: (1) what priorities should be placed on various community service functions and activity areas and (2) which specific activities would be successful when offered. The approach to the study was based on the reasoning that similar communities may have a similar set of needs and that these needs may lead to the development of similar community service programs.

Five community colleges (Group I) from closely related socio-economic communities were compared with five community colleges (Group II) from unrelated communities. Information was gathered through the use of Max Raines' Community Services Inventory, an Activity Questionnaire and a Community Services Information Sheet.

Directors of community service programs from Group I institutions rated 27 program functions and activity areas as important to their total program. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to the 27 ranked mean priorities from Group I and Group II institutions. A significant difference was found to exist between the rankings of the two groups' mean scores. It was also determined that there were 16 specific activities which were successful in a majority of Group I schools. Typing and art courses were the most successful (offered in five of the five schools). Cake decorating, beginning sewing, advanced sewing and slimnastics for women were the next most successful courses (offered in four of the five schools).

The major conclusion of the study was that a basic program for community services could be established by utilizing the important functions, the important activity areas and the successful activities which had developed in community service programs located in similar communities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY The Problem Questions Definitions of Terms Used Methods and Procedures Limitations Organization of the Study Summary	1
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE The Public Community/Junior College Community Services	20
III.	PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA Community Services Inventory Activity Questionnaire Community Services Information Sheet	63
IV.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS Summary Conclusions Recommendations for Further Research and Development	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY		97
APPENDICES Appendix A. Community Information Sheet Appendix B. Activity Questionnaire Appendix C. Expanded Version of Max Raines' Community Services Inventory		105
VITA		112

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Selected Data for the Five Two-Year Community/Junior Colleges and/or Institutes Which Were Located in Counties Which Were within ±15 Percent of the Base County's Population, Education and Income Levels, 1970	14
II.	Selected Data for Five Two-Year Community/Junior Colleges and/or Institutes Which Were Selected Without Regard to Their Population, Education and Income Homogeneity, 1970 . .	15
III.	Selected Mean Scores and K_D Values of Group I and Group II Institutional Responses to the Present Section of the Community Services Inventory, Spring 1973	66
IV.	Selected Mean Scores and K_D Values of Group I and Group II Institutional Responses to the *Should Be* Section of the Community Services Inventory, Spring 1973	68
V.	Successful Community Service Activities Offered by at Least Three of the Five Group I Institutions Prior to the Summer of 1973	76
VI.	Number of Group I Institutions Which Offered Selected Successful Activities Within the First Eight Years of the Opening of Their College	78
VII.	Number of Group I Institutions Which Offered Selected Successful Activities at Least Once a Year Prior to the Summer of 1973	80
VIII.	Number of Surveyed Institutions Responding to Selected Questions Concerning the Chief Administrative Officer and General Operational and Organizational Aspects of the Community Services Program, Spring 1973	84
IX.	Most Important Functions and Activity Areas of Group I Institutions, Spring, 1973	94

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

All public community colleges have been born with the term "community" occupying a central place of status--in the title of the school. Unfortunately, this status has been all too frequently a conceptual rather than an operational objective. Somewhere between the conception of the college and the actual beginning of operation, the community aspect of the community college, specifically community services, has often decreased in importance.

Community colleges have usually been charged with operating three distinct programs: (1) a liberal arts type transfer program, (2) a terminal occupational, vocational or technical program, and (3) a community services program. Historically these programs have not received the same level of support and consequently have failed to develop at the same rate. The policy in a new community college has too often been to develop the transfer aspect first, the occupational opportunities next and then slowly move into the area of community services.

It has not been very difficult to understand why the community services program develops last; its status has been very low. Consequently, community services were often self-supporting. There was no cadre of trained experts for developmental positions. There was a very small body of knowledge dealing with community services. It was perhaps the most difficult area of the community college for traditional educators and administrators to understand.

The lack of status for community service programs has led to a number of discouraging factors. Community service programs have developed without the help of community research, without thorough program planning, without adequate faculty salaries, without trained directors and have operated without meaningful support from other educators.

The tragic part of developing community services activities in a developing community college was the arduous trial-and-error process. Those programs that were successful were retained for as long as they were successful. Those that were not successful were discarded. The colleges were charged with providing needed services for the community, yet it was often a long time before the right activities were matched to the community's needs.

There should be a way to provide some logical, relatively simple, inexpensive way to establish even the most basic of community service programs --to provide programs which would meet the basic needs of the community and allow the community college to start providing in some depth the range of activities which it was supposed to be offering. This was the purpose of the study: to determine a method by which a developing community college could develop a basic community services program.

A. The Problem

Past researchers have been too interested in developing ideological designs for an ideal community services department.

Gundar Myran,[1] Ervin Harlacher,[2] Samuel Pinizzotto,[3] Neal Wimmer[4] and several others have done developmental work in this area. Wimmer's work was a good example of an ideal design for a community services department. He found that the following points should be contained in an ideal community services department:

1. It should contain a strong commitment to serve the community.
2. It should contain a written statement regarding scope and purpose.
3. It should be a major division of the college.
4. It should be headed by a dean or director who reports directly to the president.
5. The college should provide the department with physical and space facilities at a maximum level for service programs.
6. It should provide a variety of services.
7. It should place emphasis on recruiting qualified professional and administrative staff.
8. Financial support must become the "selling" task of the dean.
9. The dean must realize the need for the president and key persons to have a favorable attitude toward community services.

---

[1]Gundar A. Myran, *Community Services in the Community College* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969).

[2]Ervin L. Harlacher, "Critical Requirements for the Establishment of Effective Junior College Programs of Community Services" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1965).

[3]Samuel John Pinizzotto, "A Critical Analysis of the Emerging Programs of Community Colleges of New Jersey" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1971).

[4]Neal Arvin Wimmer, "An Analytical Study for the Development of a Model Community Services Program for Community Colleges" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1971).

10. It needs to use a variety of promotional techniques.
11. The dean must consider research in community services and adult education as well as evaluation as part of his obligation.[5]

Research such as the above was most important for the structural formation of a new department in a new school where the department can be designed as near ideal as possible. The research was also useful as a bench mark to which ongoing colleges constantly strive. Regardless of the structure which developed for the community services division, there still remained the task of establishing a program of community services which would survive.

Researchers, for the most part, have been operating at the theoretical, structural or organizational level rather than at the operational level. There has been no finite statement as to the best operational activities for community services. Harlacher, Wimmer, et al., have suggested what was needed for an ideal community services department, but they have failed to address the question of what was needed for a basic community services program. Herein rests the problem which was investigated in this study. The subproblem was the lack of a basic program which can be used by a developing community college. The major problem was that a basic community services program has been very difficult to establish.

A model operational program has been difficult for researchers to establish because programs which were successful in one college were not necessarily successful in another college. The problem

---

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. v-vi.

that researchers have faced was that community colleges were located in different types of communities. However, there were colleges which were located in similar communities and these communities may have possessed similar needs which have led to the development of similar community service activities in the community colleges. By identifying these similar communities and comparing developed community services programs within these communities, a basic community services program may emerge. If it can be shown that similar populations (communities) beget a similar set of community service activities within developed community colleges, then it should be possible to formulate a basic community services program for a developing community college.

B. Questions

As this researcher delved into the possibility of formulating a basic program of community services in a developing college, the following questions were asked:

1. Are the overall community service programs of the developed community colleges (which are located in similar socio-economic communities) similar?
2. Are there basic community service activities which are common to all the developed community colleges from similar communities?
3. Are certain community service activities always offered as ongoing, one time or irregular activities in developed community colleges in similar communities?
4. Are specific community service activities always co-sponsored

with other college divisions or simply the responsibility of the community services department in similar communities?

5. Are specific community service activities always held in one particular location (off campus or on campus) in developed community colleges in similar communities?
6. Are certain community service activities always started at a similar point in time in developed community colleges in similar communities.
7. What is the average class size of classroom-type community service activities in developed community colleges in similar communities?
8. Do price differentials exist between specific activities in developed community colleges in similar communities?

C. Definitions of Terms Used

Much research has been difficult enough to grasp without the writer adding to the problem by failing to sufficiently define the terms which are basic to his study. The following, therefore, was an attempt to adequately define those terms which were basic to this study:

1. A *class* was defined as "a regularly scheduled meeting of a group formally organized for instruction in a specific topic or area, and extending over an entire session or intersession."[6]

---

[6]Samuel John Pinizzotto, "A Critical Analysis of the Emerging Programs of Community Colleges of New Jersey," p. 4.

2. *Community colleges* were considered to be two-year institutions of higher education which offered transfer-type credit programs, occupational-type credit programs and community service-type programs for the adults of the local community. A more detailed analysis of community colleges can be found in the "Review of Literature" of this study.
3. "The *community service* dimension of the community college includes the educational, cultural, social and recreational services which the college provides for its community beyond the regular credit courses scheduled on campus during the day or evening hours."[7] These services took the form of classes, workshops, institutes, lecture series, seminars, short courses, facility utilization, speaker's bureau, extension programs, community counseling, festivals or many other community-oriented special activities, functions and programs. A more detailed analysis of community services can be found in the "Review of Literature" section of this study.
4. A *community services activity* was the general term used throughout this study for any community happening such as classes, programs, special functions, festivals or lectures.
5. A *conference, workshop* or *institute* was defined as "an organized instructional program which meets for three hours or more in continuous session except for meals and recesses."[8]

---

[7]Malcolm S. Knowles, *The Modern Practice of Adult Education* (New York: Association Press, 1970), p. 64.

[8]*Ibid.*

6. A *developed community college* was one that had been in operation for several years (usually three or more) thereby allowing the trial-and-error process to operate in building a community services program.
7. A *developing community college* was one that was usually within its first three years of operation, was often operating in temporary quarters and had yet to establish a firm precedent for programming.
8. The *importance of an activity area* (or function) was determined by the degree to which it was considered an important part of the total community services program. For the purpose of this study, if the activity area was of moderate or higher priority (as rated by the director of community services on the Community Services Inventory as shown in Appendix C), it was considered an important part of the total community services program.
9. "A *short course* differs from a class (as defined above) only insofar as it extends over a more limited time period and may be terminated at any time."[9]
10. The *success*[10] *of an individual course* was determined by its continuity of existence. If the activity continually succeeded in attracting participants every time it was offered, it was meeting a basic need of the community.

---

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] The success of the activity is not necessarily related to its quality. Quality is often a function of the instructor while success is a measure of the activity's acceptability to the community.

11. The *success of a special activity* was not so easy to measure since it could meet a specific need through a one-time offering. Therefore, a special activity was considered to be successful if it attracted enough participants to be offered and it was deemed a worthwhile activity by the community services director.

D. Methods and Procedures

The overall rationale for this study was the belief that similar communities have a similar set of basic needs. It was, therefore, necessary to establish methods and procedures which would make it possible to determine if some of these basic needs were expressed in the form of a developed community college's community services program.

The Matching Process

The matching process was accomplished in six steps. First, three criteria were selected for matching communities. Second, a base community was established by selecting specific values (to be matched) for the three criteria. Third, all developed public two-year community/junior colleges and/or institutes which met specific restrictions were identified. Fourth, values for the three criteria of each school's community were identified. Fifth, the school's communities were then compared and matched to the base community. Sixth, those schools which were located in communities which most closely matched the base community were identified.

Three socio-economic criteria were chosen as the best potential indicators of a community's similarity. They were county statistics

which were derived from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population 1970* (Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population) and were explained and enumerated as follows: (1) total population--this population variable was important because it gave a rough indication of the population base which was available for community service activities; (2) median years of school completed by males 25 years old and over--the median figure was chosen because of its honest centrality (as compared to average and mode data) while the male component was selected because it consistently related to the lowest education level to which community service activities must be aimed; and (3) yearly income of families and unrelated individuals--this income variable was the best available to indicate abilities to pay for community service activities.

Base data were then established for a hypothetical community, which hereafter was considered the base county or base community to which other communities were later matched. The base values for the three socio-economic criteria were arbitrarily selected by the author as follows: (1) population variable = 39,000; (2) education variable = 9.8 years of school, and (3) income variable = $7,400.

Since it was necessary to match only those communities which housed developed community colleges to the base community, the next step in the matching process was to locate all two-year community/junior colleges and/or institutes which met certain criteria established by the author. The first criterion was that all of the colleges and/or institutes had to be state and/or local supported. Secondly, all had to be located in the South as defined by the Bureau of the Census publication, *Subject Reports: State Economic Areas* (1972).[11] A third criterion was that they all

---

[11]The South includes the following states: Texas, Oklahoma,

had to be listed in the *1972-73 Higher Education Directory* since the *Directory* is the major source of statistical information on institutions of higher education. A fourth criterion was one of two which were used to help insure that a community services program would have had time to develop at an operating community college: the schools either had to be in operation since the fall of 1968 or had to have a community services program which was known to the writer to be in operation for at least three years.

The fifth criterion also dealt with a method to insure that a community services program had developed past the infancy stage. All two-year schools had to have a community services program which was listed in the *1972 Yearbook* of the National Council on Community Services for Community and Junior Colleges (NCCSCJC). The schools also had to be presently committed to at least three of the four areas described by the *Yearbook* and actively presenting at least eight (one-third of the total shown in the *Yearbook*) different types of programs, activities and services. The *Yearbook* listed 23 activities (including programs and functions) which were presently being offered throughout the country. These activities were subdivided into four important areas. Area One indicated activities which had a high interaction between the college and the community. Area Two showed the college's willingness to offer educational opportunities at community-convenient times, in innovative ways and for populations previously by-passed by traditional education.

Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia and the District of Columbia.

Area Three indicated the willingness of the college to share information with the community-at-large or to involve itself in the leisure time of the residents. Area Four indicated the college's willingness to provide a non-traditional form of involvement in the community.

One hundred sixty-five schools were initially identified in 17 states and the District of Columbia. When all five matching criteria were used, the number of schools was narrowed to a maximum of 160. Each of the 160 communities in which the schools were located were then matched to the base county--none were found to be exact matches in every category. Consequently, the base values were expanded to ±15% of their original value. This increased the matching range of each variable: the population value, to the nearest thousand, extended from 33,000 to 45,000; the education value, to the nearest tenth, extended from 8.3 to 11.3; and the income value, to the nearest hundred, extended from $6,300 to $8,500. This expansion made it possible to match seven counties with the base county.

At this point a geographical limitation was placed upon the study by the writer: the two-year schools which met the previous restricting criteria must also lie within 600 round-trip miles of Knoxville, Tennessee. The purpose of this limitation was to make it possible for the writer to visit each school. Two of the seven schools were eliminated because of this 600-mile limitation.

Under the preceding limitation, the following five two-year community/junior colleges and/or institutes were selected:

a. Blue Ridge Technical Institute
   Hendersonville, North Carolina

b. Richmond Technical Institute
   Hamlet, North Carolina

c. Columbia State Community College
Columbia, Tennessee

d. Sandhills Community College
Southern Pines, North Carolina

e. Southwest Virginia Community College
Richlands, Virginia

The pertinent statistical data for each two-year school and the county in which it was located are found in Table I.

Five more two-year institutions of higher learning were picked at random from the 160. These schools met the institutional, program and space limitations of the matched schools but did not meet the criterion of community homogeneity. These schools' community services programs were analyzed in the same way as the matched schools' programs. This procedure was instituted to help the writer determine which community services activities, if any, were truly functions of the community.

The following five two-year community/junior colleges and/or institutes were randomly selected:

a. Kennesaw Junior College
Marietta, Georgia

b. Greenville Technical Education Center
Greenville, South Carolina

c. Cleveland State Community College
Cleveland, Tennessee

d. Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute
Lenoir, North Carolina

e. Wytheville Community College
Wytheville, Virginia

The pertinent data for each school and the county in which it was located are found in Table II.

TABLE I

SELECTED DATA FOR THE FIVE TWO-YEAR COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES AND/OR INSTITUTES WHICH WERE LOCATED IN COUNTIES WHICH WERE WITHIN ±15 PERCENT OF THE BASE COUNTY'S POPULATION, EDUCATION AND INCOME LEVELS, 1970

Schools	County Statistics[a]			
	Year Opened[b]	Population[c]	Education Level[d]	Income Level[e]
Blue Ridge Technical Institute	1970	43,000	10.8	$6,800.00
Richmond Technical Institute	1964	40,000	9.4	7,100.00
Columbia State Community College	1966	43,000	10.0	7,300.00
Sandhills Community College	1963	39,000	10.1	6,800.00
Southwest Virginia Community College	1968	40,000	8.7	6,600.00
Base County		39,000	9.8	7,400.00

[a]Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1970*. Volume 1, Characteristics of the Population (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973).

[b]Source: George E. Delury, ed., *The World Almanac and Book of Facts: 1973 Edition* (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1973).

[c]Rounded to the nearest thousand.

[d]Rounded to the nearest tenth.

[e]Rounded to the nearest hundred.

TABLE II

SELECTED DATA FOR FIVE TWO-YEAR COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES AND/OR INSTITUTES WHICH WERE SELECTED WITHOUT REGARD TO THEIR POPULATION, EDUCATION AND INCOME HOMOGENEITY, 1970

Schools	County Statistics[a]			
	Year Opened[b]	Population[c]	Education Level[d]	Income Level[e]
Kennesaw Junior College	1966	197,000	12.1	$10,400.00
Greenville Technical Education Center	1962	241,000	11.2	8,800.00
Cleveland State Community College	1967	51,000	9.9	7,900.00
Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute	1965	57,000	9.2	8,000.00
Wytheville Community College	1963	22,000	8.7	6,800.00

[a]Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1970.* Volume 1, Characteristics of the Population (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973).

[b]Source: George E. Delury, ed., *The World Almanac and Book of Facts: 1973 Edition* (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1973).

[c]Rounded to the nearest thousand.

[d]Rounded to the nearest tenth.

[e]Rounded to the nearest hundred.

Data Gathering Instruments and Methods

Three instruments were used to gather information about the total community services program, specific community service activities and the director of the community services programs. One instrument which was used was an expanded version of Max Raines' Community Services Inventory (see Appendix C). Each director or the person responsible for community services was asked specific questions in each of the 15 major areas: (1) developmental counseling, (2) educational extension, (3) educational expansion, (4) social outreach, (5) cultural development, (6) leisure-time activity, (7) community analysis, (8) inter-agency cooperation, (9) advisory liaison, (10) civic action, (11) staff consultation, (12) public forum, (13) public information, (14) conference planning, and (15) facility utilization. The director was asked to respond to each question in terms of both what the college is *presently* doing and what the college *should be* doing. The responses were chosen from the following list:

1. One--No priority
2. Two--Low priority
3. Three--Moderate priority
4. Four--High priority
5. Five--Extremely high priority

By using the responses to the Community Services Inventory (CSI), it was possible to compare and contrast the ten community service programs.

Data which concerned specific courses and special activities were gathered through the use of the Activity Questionnaire (see Appendix B). The specific information concerned course enrollment figures, fees,

location, co-sponsoring agencies, initial offering date and continuity of existence. By using the responses from the Activity Questionnaire, it was possible to compare and contrast specific activities.

The third instrument was the Community Services Information Sheet (see Appendix A) which was used to gather specific data about the college, the community services program and the director of community services. The data were supplied by the director of community services (or that person responsible for community services) through personal interviews. The responses were used to determine if there were some specific factor (or factors) which was important in determining differences or similarities between programs.

Analytical Techniques

The responses to the CSI, the Activity Questionnaire and the Community Services Information Sheet were analyzed in terms of Group I and Group II institutions. Frequency of occurrence was the most often used technique to determine differences between the institution's specific activities data and the related community services data. Means were calculated from the responses to the CSI so each function or activity area could be ranked in importance. The responses to the CSI were further analyzed by the use of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Small Samples. The four basic reasons for using this particular technique were as follows: (1) It was the most appropriate non-parametric test for small samples; (2) It was a conservative test; (3) It was very useful in determining differences between small samples; (4) It required

the use of at least ordinal level data; (5) It was 85 to 90 percent as powerful as the t-test.[12]

E. Limitations

The weaknesses of this study were focused in two areas: the geographic limitations and sample-size limitations. Any conclusions which were based on this study will have to be localized to a specific region. The conclusions pertained to only those community colleges which were located within the southern region because of the geographic limits which the writer had placed upon the study. Sample size was also a limiting factor. The small sample size of the study made it difficult to determine trends and significant differences between community services programs.

F. Organization of the Study

The study was presented in four chapters. Chapter I introduced and gave the background for the study. Chapter II presented a review of the related literature. The presentation, analysis and discussion of data was presented in Chapter III. Chapter IV summarized the findings and offered conclusions and recommendations.

G. Summary

This study has presented one possible approach toward the establishment of a basic set of community services in a developing community

---

[12]Dean J. Champion, *Basic Statistics For Social Research* (Scranton, Pennsylvania: Chandler Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 173-75.

college. Information was gathered through responses to the Community Services Inventory, the Activity Questionnaire and the Community Services Information Sheet. The information was analyzed across five schools which were matched by their communities and five schools which were not matched by their communities. It was then possible to identify activities (and priorities) which were more likely to occur in the schools from matched communities than in the schools from nonmatched communities. It was also possible to identify activities (and priorities) which were common to all the schools studied.

The assumption was that a developing community college should be able to match their communities to other communities which have a developed community college and similar socio-economic criteria. It was logically assumed that these developing community colleges could then determine what activities, functions, programs or courses would most likely succeed when formulating their basic program of community services.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The nature of this study dictated a review of literature in two major areas: the public community/junior college and community services. The purpose of this review was to outline the evolution of both these areas. The review has focused on the important relationship between community colleges and community services. This relationship has helped each area evolve to its present stature.

A. The Public Community/Junior College

This section of the review of literature has focused on the historical background, the advent of national support, the present status, current criticisms and trends of the public community/junior college movement. By reviewing the movement's development and its strengths and weaknesses, it has made it possible to understand how community services became a major part of the college.

Developmental History

The earliest type of two-year institutions of higher education was the private junior college. It was privately supported and prepared its students to transfer to the four year colleges and universities.[13] "By 1900 there were about eight junior colleges--all private--with an

---

[13]Samuel John Pinizzotto, "A Critical Analysis of the Emerging Programs of Community Colleges of New Jersey," p. 16.

enrollment of about 100."[14] They had, by all accounts, a small impact on American higher education.

During the late 1800's and early 1900's, the public sector began establishing junior colleges. It was at this time that the two-year colleges began their impact upon American life.

The junior college received early support from noted educators. "Some of its early supporters--such men as Henry Tappan, president of the University of Michigan, and William Rainey Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago--saw the role of the junior college as limited to providing the first two years of a baccalaurate program."[15] These men were vocal in their support. President Tappan, as early as 1850, suggested that lower-division work of colleges and universities should be done elsewhere--perhaps in the stronger high schools and academies."[16] Tappan thus previewed where the real quantity and quality development of the community/junior college would actually occur--in the public sector.

The first public two-year colleges were actually a part of secondary education. Monroe stated that:

> The public community college was born in the image of the public school and thus has its roots in the public school system. The principles and traditions upon which the public schools were built are also the principles and traditions which guide the public community colleges. These traditions are: (1) universal opportunity for a free public education for all persons without distinction based on social class, family income, and ethnic, racial, or religious backgrounds, (2) local control and support of free, non-tuition educational

---

[14]American Association of Junior Colleges, *An Introduction to American Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967), p. 4.

[15]*Ibid.*, p. 3.

[16]Jessee P. Bogue, *American Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956), p. 10.

> systems, and (3) a relevant curriculum designed to meet both the needs of the individual and those of the nation.[17]

Monroe then stated that:

> Certainly most of them [community colleges] developed through the efforts of a few concerned parents and citizens, some sympathetic school board members, and school administrators who had compassion for the less fortunate high school graduates in their communities.[18]

Of course, not all schools which ended up as community/junior colleges started out that way. Of the six agricultural high schools Oklahoma established in 1907, three became community colleges; Mississippi had a system of county vocational high schools which became community colleges and the technical and agricultural institutes of New York State (founded before 1920) became community colleges.[19] As Bogue said, "The greatest significance historically must be attached to the extension of education from the bottom upward rather than from the top downward."[20]

The first public community/junior college still in existence was established in 1902 in Joliet, Illinois. It was established under an agreement with the University of Chicago whereby the University would accept two years of work done by students at the extended high school in Joliet.[21] Very little happened to encourage the formation of community/

---

[17]Charles R. Monroe, *Profile of the Community College* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972), p. 1.

[18]*Ibid.*, p. 11.

[19]*Ibid.*, p. 12.

[20]Jesse P. Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950), p. 85.

[21]B. Lamar Johnson, *State Junior Colleges: How Can They Function Efficiently?* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965), p. 5.

junior colleges until President Harper separated the University of Chicago into junior and senior colleges in 1892. "It was this step which influenced the board of education to add two years on to the high school program."[22]

The early years of the community/junior college were not all smooth. As more and more potential two-year institutions were going to the public for sanctioning and financing, more objections to their formation were surfacing. Some of the more common were the following:

1. No more money should be spent on higher education until the elementary and secondary schools are adequately funded.
2. Too many youths will obtain too much education, which will in turn make them less content with their station in life.
3. There would be enough educational facilities to take care of all who need education if the present facilities were properly used.
4. Vocational training is the modern equivalent to apprenticeship training and as such should not be sponsored publicly.[23]

More Community Orientation

We still hear some of these objections today. But they have become muted by the people who believe as does Wattenberger that "The changing character of the population and the advance of technology makes education

---

[22]James W. Thornton, *The Community Junior College* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 48.

[23]Coleman R. Griffith and Hortense Blackstone, *The Junior College in Illinois* (Urbana: Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Illinois and University of Illinois Press, 1945), pp. 10-13, cited by James L. Wattenbarger, *A State Plan for Public Junior Colleges* (Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1953), p. 9.

beyond the twelfth grade necessary."[24]

As the community/junior college movement developed through the years, it began to extend its functions. Consequently, the definition of the community/junior college began to undergo change. The first official definition of the junior college came in 1922 at the second meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges (A.A.J.C.). The junior college was defined as "An institution offering two years of instruction of strictly college grade."[25] The early community/junior colleges were very much like their definition--limited and narrow in scope and function.

As a response to federal vocational education bills, the A.A.J.C. redefined the junior college at its 1925 annual meeting:

> The junior college is an institution offering two years of strictly collegiate grade. This curriculum may include those courses usually offered in the first two years of the four-year college, in which case the courses must be identical, in scope and thoroughness, with corresponding courses of the standard four year college. The junior college may, and is likely to, develop a different type of curriculum suited to the larger and ever changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs of the entire community in which the college is located. It is understood that in this case also the work offered shall be on a level appropriate for high school graduates.[26]

This 1925 definition forecast the future developmental direction of American junior colleges. The communities in which the colleges were located were beginning to play a stronger role in the programs which they offered. The trend toward more involvement with the local community

---

[24]James L. Wattenbarger, *A State Plan for Public Junior Colleges* (Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1953), p. 6.

[25]B. Lamar Johnson, *State Junior Colleges: How Can They Function Efficiently?*, p. 5.

[26]James W. Thornton, *The Community Junior College*, pp. 52-53.

must have been a good move since the number of two-year colleges grew from a handful in the early 1900's to over 1,100 by 1970 with an enrollment of over 2,000,000.[27] This trend was recognized nationally in 1973 when the Association of American Junior Colleges, at its annual meeting, changed its name to the Association of American Community/Junior Colleges.

Rapid Growth

Thornton generalized about the reasons for this rapid growth. He suggested that there were three major stimuli. First, there was the idea. The penetrating educational statesmanship of a succession of university presidents and deans stimulated discussion and gave the first impetus to the establishment of junior colleges in several areas of the nation. The second factor was the increased economic wealth of the United States. The country could both support more students and needed more workers with the education to control and improve the new technology. The third stimulus was the belief in the American Dream that education is a social and individual good and that society is obligated to provide as much education as any individual desires.[28]

Stages of Development

The community/junior college movement has been broken down into various stages of development. In 1961, Floyd Parker was able to divide the movement into three stages by summarizing the work of 250 dissertations which dealt with the community/junior college:

> Stage 1: The birth, development, and acceptance of the junior college as a separate higher education institution during the years 1850 to 1920.

---

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 46-47.

Stage 2: The acceptance of an emerging trend in providing terminal and semi-professional functions during the years 1920 to 1945.

Stage 3: The acceptance of a community/junior college with a strong emphasis on community adult service since the year 1945. It was in this stage that the college actually developed the "tap root" that promised to keep it in business.[29]

In 1966 Thornton suggested that the community/junior college movement could be summarized by four stages of development:

Stage 1 (1850-1920): This period marked the evolution of the community/junior college as an institution offering the first two years of baccalaurate curriculums.

Stage 2 (1920-1945): This was the era of expanding occupational programs where the concepts of terminal and semi-professional training by community/junior colleges became accepta[illegible] Federal legislation such as the Smith-Hughes Act, the high unemployment of the depression and the increased need for technical skills caused by automation helped the colleges expand into the occupational areas.

Stage 3 (1945-1965): During this stage the community/junior college developed a true service arm for adults in the community. The college redefined itself and started instilling the community as an integral part of that definition.

---

[29]Floyd Parker, "The Community Junior College--Enfant Tarr of American Higher Education. A Bibliography of 225 Doctoral Research Dissertations," *Junior College Journal*, XXXII, No. 4 (December, 1961), 193-94.

The transfer program was re-emphasized because of the increased enrollment.

Stage 4 (1965+): It was in this period that the colleges moved toward full realization of the open-door community college. It was also during this period that minority recruiting began, that occupational education was modernized and that community/junior colleges across the country were systematically being established so as to minimize commuting distance.[30]

Between 1900 and 1970 the American people have witnessed an unusual occurrence in American higher education: the growth of the community/junior college. The college has grown from a narrow parochial institution to an open-door college serving the educational needs of its community through transfer, terminal and community service programs.

National Support

Without the important encouragement from national sources, it would have been much more difficult for the community/junior college movement to grow as rapidly as it did. One of the most important supportive statements came from President Harry S. Truman's Commission on Higher Education (1946-47): "Equal educational opportunities for all persons, to the maximum of their individual abilities and without regard to economic status, race, creed, color, sex, national origin, or ancestry, is a major goal of American democracy."[31]

---

[30]James W. Thornton, *The Community Junior College*, pp. 47-58.

[31]President's Commission on Higher Education, "Establishing the Goals: General Education," *Higher Education for American Democracy* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), p. 3.

The Commission then went on to recommend:

> . . . as an important element in equalization, the establishment of free, public, community colleges which would offer courses in general education both terminal and having transfer value, vocational courses suitably related to local needs, and adult education programs of varied character.[32]

The Commission thus made a strong plea for creating a public system of broad educational designs which would be available to all. "The democratic community cannot tolerate a society based upon education for the well-to-do alone. If college opportunities are restricted to those in the higher income brackets, the way is open to the creation and perpetuation of a class society which has no place in the American way of life."[33]

President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Committee on Education beyond the High School (1955-56) also gave national support to the community/junior college movement by stating that:

> Communities or groups of neighboring communities faced with an impending shortage of higher education capacity will do well to consider new two-year community colleges as part of the solution. Experience in a number of areas has demonstrated that, with carefully planned facilities and programs, community colleges can be highly effective in affording readily available opportunities for excellent education beyond the high school.[34]

The N.E.A. (National Education Association) also made a strong national plea for the public community/junior college through its Educational Policies Commission. ". . . the nation's goal of universal educational opportunity must be expanded to include at least two further

---

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[34] *President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School*, Second Report to the President (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957), p. 12.

years of education, open to any high school graduate and designed to move each student toward intellectual freedom."[35]

In the last ten years, many individuals and national groups have suggested that the public community/junior college be increasingly used to provide educational opportunities past the twelfth grade. The most effective and prolific group has undoubtedly been the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Commission's 1970 publication, *The Open Door Colleges*, suggested many policies for the public community/junior college. Some of the more important recommendations included: (1) low or no tuition, (2) colleges should be located within commuting distance of 95 percent of the American population, and (3) colleges should be comprehensive in nature.[36]

National public support, going into the 1970's, was at an all time high for the community/junior colleges. The most fundamental reason was that these colleges offered the American people the broadest educational opportunities for the least time and money expended.

Present Status

As the community/junior college movement began to move away from the strictly private or church base and toward the public sector, the functions of the college began to change. The two-year transfer program has remained relatively the same. It has usually led to an Associate

---

[35]National Education Association, *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond High School* (Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, 1964), p. 6.

[36]The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *The Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), pp. 1-2.

Degree which verifies that the student is ready to transfer to a four-year college or university.

The occupational sector of the community/junior college has evolved into what is usually called career education or the career program. The career curriculum was prescribed for preparation in such occupation fields as medical technology, electronics technology, secretarial science and nursing.[37] These programs, like transfer programs, have usually led to an Associate Degree which certifies a certain degree of competency in the chosen field.

The newest part of the community/junior college has been the community services function which has grown out of the need for the college to serve the total community. The two basic functions which community services attempts to satisfy were what Max Raines has called the self-development function and the community development function. Self-development activities were those which primarily focus upon the needs, aspirations and potentialities of individuals to help themselves achieve a greater degree of self-realization and fulfillment. The community development activities were those which were focused primarily upon cooperative efforts with community organizations, agencies and institutions to improve the various parts of the community's environment.[38]

The tripart function (transfer programs, career programs and service programs) of the public community/junior college has become

---

[37]Samuel John Pinizzotto, "A Critical Analysis of the Emerging Programs of Community Colleges of New Jersey," p. 18.

[38]Max R. Raines, *A Community Services Inventory for Community Colleges* (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1969), pp. 2-4.

well established--as has the public community/junior college itself. In 1967 the A.A.J.C. noted that 85 percent of all students enrolled in community/junior colleges were in public community/junior colleges.[39]

Most of the community/junior colleges today have become public institutions. Their relatively open admission policies, their close proximity to potential students, their wide variety of course offerings and their low costs have made them especially attractive.[40] However, both church and independent junior colleges have continued to exist. The independent private junior colleges have operated through a combination of tuition, gifts and endowments. Many have provided housing for students which has helped to make the yearly cost of attending one of these institutions rise well over $2,000. The emphasis in instruction has been on the liberal-art courses and transfer-type programs.[41]

The church related junior college has also been traditionally transfer oriented, but a new trend has developed toward offering semi-professional and technical courses at these institutions. The church related junior college, unlike the public community/junior college, has usually offered living arrangements for its students. The cost structure has been relatively high when compared to the public community/junior college but not quite as expensive as the private junior college.[42] The major differences between the three types of junior colleges have been the breadth of program, cost, control and resident facilities.

Because of the attractiveness of the public/community junior

---

[39]American Association of Junior Colleges, *An Introduction to American Junior Colleges*, p. 10.

[40]*Ibid.*, pp. 10-11. [41]*Ibid.*, pp. 8-10. [42]*Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

college, its rapid development and its predicted future growth, a majority of states has passed legislation which would allow for the establishment of state two-year institutions of higher learning. This legislation has taken the form of endorsing state junior colleges, community colleges, technical institutes, technical education centers, a two-year branch system of a state college or university or any combination of these.[43]

Florida was one of the first states to adopt a state plan which dealt with public community/junior colleges. The planning criteria which Florida used were a good example of what other states had to take into account when establishing an orderly state system:

> 1. A public junior college should be established only after a survey by the state department of education. A favorable report and approval of the location by this department should be required.
> 2. A public junior college should be located where it will serve the largest number of prospective students within daily commuting distance. (Specifically, this would mean that the town in which the college is to be located would be the local social and economic center.)
> 3. There should be enough high school students within the area to be served by a proposed junior college to insure an economical and efficient operation of the institution. This should be interpreted in accordance with the school organization. (A working figure of a minimum of 600 pupils in the high schools--grades ten through twelve--of the area would be in harmony with the most recent recommendations.)
> 4. It is essential that a state plan be formed in order to assure every youth in the state an opportunity to continue his education beyond the high school. All junior colleges should be established in accordance with this plan.
> 5. The needs of the community in adult education and the feasibility of the junior college acting as a coordinating agency for these activities should be considered in planning junior colleges.
> 6. The unit of administration for the junior college should be large enough to permit economical and efficient operation of the institution.[44]

---

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[44] James L. Wattenbarger, *A State Plan for Public Junior Colleges*, p. 20.

The development of state planning has helped insure the rapid growth and present success of the community/junior college. The present status of the public community/junior college was not arrived at by just offering three sets of programs. The public community/junior colleges have had much more to offer than that. They have offered developmental learning skills to adults who have dropped out of the regular educational system. The colleges have offered guidance and counseling services on a large scale. Class sizes were usually smaller than state colleges and universities and the instructors were usually more interested in teaching skills than research skills. These factors have helped to make the colleges closely linked to its students and its community. Said another way, "There is nothing artificial about a really functional community/junior college. It is so intertwined with the life and the resources of the community that one cannot define where its campus begins and ends."[45] It has not been difficult, therefore, to understand why "Some form of public two-year college . . . [existed] in all the fifty states of the union except in South Dakota."[46]

Criticism of Public Community/Junior Colleges

Bushnell was one supporter of the public community/junior college movement who realized that all the facts "were not in" concerning how successful the community/junior colleges have been. "As a mainstay of mass higher education, community junior colleges have emerged as a true

---

[45]Jesse P. Bogue, *The Community College*, p. 47.

[46]Charles R. Monroe, *Profile of the Community College*, pp. 3-4.

melting pot for the community. Their unique function has been chronicled by many but critically evaluated by few. The verdict is not yet in on how well they have succeeded in the tougher tasks of higher education."[47]

Duvall, in 1968, accused the community college of trying to be all things to all people and failing completely. He went on to say that "Community colleges, instead of being organizations of the future, are organizations of the past; and it is a false hope to expect them to fill the gaps in higher education in this country."[48]

Other individuals such as Jennings[49] and Lynes[50] feared that since the community college was catering to the masses it was really a second-rate institution.

Jencks and Riesman have expressed the belief that the community/junior colleges have failed to live up to their claims:

> Despite its origins in the antiacademic backlash, then, the community colleges turn out to be an essential pillar of the academic revolution. It is not primarily an alternative model for other colleges or an alternative path to the top for individuals, but rather a safety valve releasing pressures that might otherwise disrupt the dominant system. It contains these pressures and allows the universities to go their own way without facing the full consequences of excluding the dull-witted or uninterested majority. Under these circumstances, we doubt that the community-college movement will lead to significant innovations in academic theory or practice.[51]

---

[47]David S. Bushnell, *Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 7.

[48]W. B. Devall, "Community Colleges: A Dissenting View," *Educational Record*, Spring, 1968, p. 172.

[49]F. B. Jennings, "The Two Year Stretch: Junior Colleges in America," *Change in Higher Education*, March-April, 1970, p. 2.

[50]R. Lynes, "How Good Are the Junior Colleges?" *Harpers*, November, 1966, p. 63.

[51]C. Jencks and D. Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968), pp. 491-92.

Frank Newman has suggested that the community colleges were becoming increasingly ill equipped to handle the great responsibilities which have been given them:

> The public and especially the four-year colleges are shifting more and more of the responsibility onto the two-year colleges for undertaking the toughest tasks of higher education. Simultaneously, the problems we have already identified--the poor match between the students' style of learning and the institutions' style of teaching, the lock step pressure to attend college directly after high school, the over emphasis on credentials--are overtaking the community colleges and rendering them increasingly ill equipped to perform the immense task they have been given.[52]

Troy and Sessions have expressed great pessimism about the actual effectiveness of community colleges. This pessimism was expressed in the following list of pragmatic functions which they contended the community colleges seemed to be fulfilling.

1. Provide more skilled workers for corporations.
2. Provide paraprofessionals for the service industry.
3. Allow corporations to use public funds for job training which was once the accepted risk of private capital.
4. Remold students' aspirations so they understand they are not four-year college material but "terminal students."
5. Socialize obedient, punctual and competitive future workers.
6. Screen students to keep out potential troublemakers.
7. Track women into approved female job areas.[53]

---

[52]Frank Newman, et al., *Report on Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971), p. 71, cited by David S. Bushnell, *Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 9-10.

[53]Bill Troy and Jim Sessions, "Open Door in Appalachia?" *Connexion*, Fall, 1973, pp. 8-9.

Troy and Sessions also stated:

> These functions serve to maintain and reinforce the social, race, sex, and class divisions of American society. These community colleges are intended in part to be custodial, cooling out, screening institutions, regulating size and composition of the labor force by separating students from other workers and from each other. They breed oft-times false hopes of upward social mobility, competitiveness, and antisocial feelings of superiority and inferiority.[54]

In general, Troy and Sessions have argued that the community college has not been living up to expectations.[55]

There have been many critics of the public community/junior college and much of their criticism has been true. Monroe has summed up much of that criticism and has given a very good reply to the critics:

> Enough of the critical voices has been given to suggest that the future of community colleges will not be all roses without thorns. Undoubtedly some community college leaders have promised the public too much for too little cost. This, however, does not negate the fact that the community college remains the best educational institution now available for post high school education for the less privileged youth of the nation. The challenge is there for the community college to be its own self, to form its own identity and image, and not to be the imitation of existing colleges. If all high school graduates and adults in a community are not somehow served by this unique educational institution this most recent development in the history of free and democratic education, then those who are responsible for its direction should have no guilt feelings about failure since probably no educational agency can serve all persons who might want some post high school level education. Guilt feelings are in order only if the community college fails to serve the great majority of persons, young and adult, by offering quality-level education in an extended number of curricula and programs. The critics who warn that the community college cannot be all things to all people are probably speaking the truth.
>
> The most convincing reply to the critics of the community college is the fact that community colleges are now operating in 49 of the 50 states, enrolling some two million students, and expanding at the rate of abut 12 percent per year. The community-college movement is a relatively young and vital aspect of higher education, being recognized and accepted by the public, and enrolling nearly 30 percent of all undergraduate students in the nation. Although the community college faces a bright and hopeful

---

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

> future, growth will be accompanied by difficult problems, the two most difficult ones being what the community college ought to be and how it is to be supported.[56]

Trends and Predictions

Gleazer (1973) has stated that since state colleges and universities were having to limit enrollment, the community colleges will probably experience an increase in growth as a result. He has predicted that community colleges will become more attractive as new campuses, modern facilities and accreditation are added to the low cost and close proximity to home. Gleazer has also predicted that both the community college student and the way he has been served will change. The student will be older and of a more nontraditional nature. The educational services will increase through the advent of more learning centers, more interrelated programs and more individualized learning packages.[57]

The increasing enrollment for community colleges has been echoed by Monroe: "Two-year college enrollments are expected to rise from 29 percent of all undergraduate college enrollment in 1968 to 41 percent by 1980."[58] Monroe has also predicted where most of this growth will occur: "The greatest development of the public community colleges is now in the large metropolitan centers." In the future, "The fertile fields . . . are the Far West, the Midwest and the South."[59]

---

[56]Charles R. Monroe, *Profile of the Community College*, p. 20.

[57]Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., *Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 3-123.

[58]Charles R. Monroe, *Profile of the Community Colleges*, pp. 3-4.

[59]*Ibid.*, p. 4.

Monroe has suggested that of all the functions of the community college, the adult education (community services and continuing education) function has been expected to expand the most. Even by 1980 he has predicted that part-time students will exceed full-time students. He has also suggested that by 1980 the career curriculum may replace the transfer curriculum as the most important curriculum area.[60]

A final statement from Monroe concerning the future of the community college was very fitting. He has stated in the following what many educators have felt but have failed to verbalize:

> Realizing that in the realm of education changes come painfully slow, I would not be surprised when visiting a community college in the future to find that it was most similar to one I worked in in 1960 or 1970. However, I would be depressingly disappointed if this should be the case.[61]

Summary

The public community/junior college has evolved from a basically two-year transfer college to a much more comprehensive institution in less than 100 years. A very important part of this evolution has been the inclusion of community services as part of the institution's purpose. This purpose has not always been successfully accomplished but the institutions have made definite philosophical changes to help meet more needs of more Americans. Consequently, public community/junior colleges have become principal participants in the area of community services.

B. Community Services

The community services section has reviewed the historical background and the present status of community services. Emphasis has been placed on literature relating to community service programs.

---

[60] *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 399.

Definition

The community/junior college has used the term community services to describe not only a wide range of service activities but also much of its philosophy. Unfortunately, the term community services has often been confused with two other terms which have held a traditional role in describing specific types of nontraditional education: adult education and continuing education.

Gunder Myran has done an excellent job of facing the semantics problem in the following way:

> The term used by community colleges should be clearly distinguished from the term used by high school districts in defining their adult education activities. The term "community services" achieves this, whereas the terms "continuing education" and "adult education" are used interchangeably and do not provide this distinction.
>
> Only the term community services really communicates the nature and scope of the programs being described; for example, services to ghetto youth, consultive services by faculty members to community groups, speakers bureaus, art galleries, community use of college facilities, community studies, and summer recreation programs for youth. These services have a broad range of clientele--youth as well as adults, full-time students as well as part-time students and nonstudents, organizations and business enterprises as well as individuals.
>
> Continuing education, on the other hand, implies that only adults who have terminated their role as full-time students and now blend learning activities with other adult responsibilities are to be served. Community services implies no such dichotomy--there is no suggestion in this term that some in the community will be served and others will not. This is the type of term which will be required as the community college assumes its role as an educational and cultural center of the community.[62]

Community Services has become the umbrella term used to describe a multitude of educational services which are community oriented.

Various individuals have offered specific definitions for community

---

[62]Gundar A. Myran, *Community Services in the Community College*, pp. 54-55.

services. In 1960, Reynolds said, "Community service refers to the residue of educational services over and beyond the regular program for full-time students."[63] He further defined the regular program as that which operated within the school day and consisted of regularly scheduled classes on campus. The regular school day operates from the opening of school in the morning to the last class in the afternoon and full-time students were those enrolled in the regular program.[64]

Medsker offered a more general definition by observing that:

> The term "community service" has come to denote generally the various *special* services which an educational institution may provide for its community. Examples of such services are workshops, forums, and institutes; research and advisory assistance to community groups; music and theater groups; and widespread use of the college plant for community activities.[65]

Three additional definitions of community services were those by Johnson, Harlacher and Myran. B. Lamar Johnson considered community services to be those various special "services a junior college performs for its community beyond regularly scheduled day and evening classes."[66] Harlacher stated, "Community services are educational, cultural, and recreational services which an educational institution may provide for its community in addition to its regularly scheduled day and evening classes."[67] Myran further defined community services

---

[63]James W. Reynolds, *An Analysis of Community Service Programs of Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1960), p. 1.

[64]*Ibid.*, p. 7.

[65]Leland L. Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960), p. 78.

[66]B. Lamar Johnson, *Starting a Community Junior College* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964), pp. 60-61.

[67]Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1969), p. 12.

as "those efforts of the community college, often undertaken in cooperation with other community groups or agencies, which are directed toward serving personal and community educational needs not met by formal collegiate degree or certificate programs."[68]

Developmental History

The idea of community services was born in ancient Greece. As Harlacher has pointed out:

> The community service idea dates from ancient Greece--possibly earlier. Socrates first exemplified it by taking his wisdom into the streets and the market place, where he created a student community representative of the people . . . actively concerned with the social and moral issues of the time.[69]

In America the desire for grass-roots education was first reflected by the Lyceum and Chautaugua movements.[70] The Lyceum was established in 1826 by Josiah Holbrook of Derby, Connecticut. Its main objective was to encourage citizens to participate in community development. The Chautaugua, initiated in 1874, carried the spirit of the Lyceum on after the Lyceum movement died out.[71]

---

[68]Gundar A. Myran, *Community Services in the Community College*, p. 12.

[69]Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College*, p. 4.

[70]Robert Nelson Rue, "A Survey and Evaluation of Community Service Programs in Michigan Community Colleges" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 24.

[71]Bertis L. Jones, "The History of Community Development in American Universities With Particular Reference to Four Selected Institutions" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1962), pp. 329-32, cited by Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1969), p. 6.

Higher education began offering community services with development of the land grant colleges. Former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, observed that over 100 years ago the land grant colleges brought a ". . . virtual revolution in higher education through their response to society's demands for a variety of programs and services."[72]

The Morrill Act (1862), the Hatch Act (1887) and the Smith-Lever Act (1914) encouraged rapid growth in the agricultural extension programs of American universities. The growth continued until a network of agricultural extension agents had been established which covered the United States. The impact of such a pervasive service program was by no means a small one.

The land grant universities also started offering general extension courses. The first of many general extension programs was started at the University of Wisconsin in 1906 and by 1913, 28 extension programs were organized in other land grant and private institutions.[73]

Even though the universities developed service programs, "the universities tended to remain selective so that programs of community development reached only certain segments of the population."[74] The agricultural extension programs were primarily to help farmers with technical problems. The general extension programs tended to be limited to on-campus credit and noncredit courses, conferences and workshops,

---

[72]Francis Keppel, "Standards of Excellence," *Junior College Journal*, XXXIV (September, 1963), 6.

[73]Paul H. Sheats, Clarence D. Jayne, and Ralph B. Spence, *Adult Education* (New York: The Dryden Press, 1953), p. 176.

[74]Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College*, p. 7.

and correspondence work.

Other agencies also set up selective programs designed especially for adults. The public evening schools began preparing immigrants for citizenship in 1918.[75] "Correspondence schools, summer schools, . . . residential labor colleges, evening schools, . . . settlement houses, social service agencies, . . . parks and recreation centers and, most prolifically of all, national voluntary associations . . ."[76] were all offering programs for adults before 1920. Down through the years the libraries, churches, television, proprietory schools, museums, labor unions, various businesses and industries, community schools and the community/junior colleges have all become involved at one time or another with adult education.

Unfortunately, the overall area of community service (all adult education and continuing education) has suffered from this "proliferation of overlapping institutional support."[77] "The fragmented support base and the pay-as-you-go approach tend to limit the amount of federal and state funds flowing into this sector of education."[78] Bushnell has also indicated that program development in this area of education has been held up because of the peripheral status that such programs have been given by their institutions.[79]

---

[75]Burton R. Clark, *Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1956), p. 48.

[76]Malcolm S. Knowles, *The Adult Education Movement in the United States* (Chicago, Illinois: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1960), pp. 74-5.

[77]David S. Bushnell, *Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges*, p. 89.

[78]*Ibid.*

[79]*Ibid.*, p. 90.

Community Services and the Community College

The community/junior college has become a different institution from most other community service agencies. First, it has given community services a high status by assigning it a primary function of the institution. Second, the community college has become broad based in its approach to community services by not offering programs which were only tailored to certain limited population groups or were very narrow in scope. Bogue has pointed out the advantages which the community/junior college has had over other community service agencies:

> The community college is in a strategic position from the standpoint of its basic philosophy, its relation to the community, its facilities either actual or potential, and by clear responsibility to provide for adult education on a far more progressive and inclusive scale. . . . it would seem that every college, regardless of its size or method of control, should seek out and encourage adults in the community to improve themselves and their occupational status.[80]

Harlacher has also pointed out the community/junior colleges' unique position. He has stated the following several characteristics which have qualified it to offer these services:

> 1. The community college is a community-centered institution with the primary purpose of providing service to the people of its community. Its offerings and programs are planned to meet the needs of the community and are developed with the active participation of citizens.
> 2. Colleges and universities have traditionally served large geographic areas (e.g., an entire state). In consequence, it has been difficult if not impossible for them to establish a sense of "community" even with people living relatively nearby. The result has been indifference and a strengthening of the concept that they are exclusively compounds for educating young people.
> The school, church, family, business, labor, etc., have tended to go separate ways, developing almost in isolation from each other; American life has become fragmented as well as specialized. There has been no force to draw the basic institutions together,

---

[80]Jesse P. Bogue, *The Community College*, p. 229.

> to give to each other the uniqueness that each possesses. So geographic communities have existed without "community"--without a real concern and commitment within each institution for each other institution, without a sense of community among heterogeneous people.
>
> 2. The community college claims and develops community service to be one of its major functions.
>
> 3. Since the community college is usually a creature of citizens of the local community or area and since it is most frequently governed by a board of local citizens the community college is readily capable of responding to changing community needs.
>
> 4. Most community colleges are operated by a local district that encompasses several separate and distinct communities. . . . The program of community services welds these separate communities and groups together without submerging individual identities.
>
> 5. The community college is an institution of higher education and, as such, can draw upon the advanced resources of its staff to assist in the solution of the problems of an increasingly complex society.
>
> 6. The community college, as a relatively new segment of American education, is unencrusted with tradition, unfettered by a rigid history, eager for adventure. Therefore, without duplicating existing services in the community, it is able to tailor its program to meet local needs and conditions.[81]

The community/junior college has not always been closely connected with community services. In fact there was little apparent interest in the community service function until after World War II.[82] There was some interest at specific community/junior colleges before this time and some general interest at the A.A.J.C. Annual Conventions. In 1935 President Mackay of Eastern New Mexico State Junior College presented "Four Challenges for the Junior Colleges" of which his fourth challenge dealt specifically with the community service function:

> . . . The college must go out from its four walls. It is challenged to assist with adult learning. Extension classes, parent education, trade education, school surveys, improvement of the job, cultural offerings, library facilities to isolated

---

[81]Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College*, pp. 8-9.

[82]Robert Nelson Rue, "A Survey and Evaluation of Community Service Programs in Michigan Community Colleges," p. 26.

> rural people, recreational centers under the guidance of college leaders, forum, program speakers, church leadership, discussion groups, radio programs are just a few of the many forms of adult education with which the college must assist when there is a felt need.[83]

It was after World War II before the community/junior colleges began to realize and accept the responsibility of providing educational programs for those citizens who could not participate in a conventional day school process. This was the point in time when the terms community college and community service became popular.[84]

> The function of community services is the most recently developed of the tasks of the community junior college. Nevertheless, the scope and adequacy of these services determine whether or not the college merits the title of "community" junior college to an important degree, they determine also the extent of community understanding and support of the several functions of the college.[85]

Research

Most of the pertinent research into community service programs has revolved around two themes: what actually exists and what should exist. Some of the most imformative of that research follows.

Classification Studies

James Reynolds, in 1956, looked at community service activities up to that time and summarized them into the following general categories:

1. Mutual aid for meeting college-community needs.
2. Community experience programs where the broad community is the instructional laboratory.

---

[83]Donald William MacKay, "Four Challenges of the Junior College," *Junior College Journal*, V (May, 1935), 345.

[84]Robert Nelson Rue, "A Survey and Evaluation of Community Service Programs in Michigan Community Colleges," p. 28.

[85]James W. Thornton, *The Community Junior College*, p. 67.

3. Community study and research problems.

4. Public affairs education.

5. Specialized community services involving:

   a. Economic conditions

   b. Public education

   c. Health

   d. Cultural and recreational activities

   e. Conservation

6. Community development.

7. Community participation and leadership training.

8. Use of mass-media communication.

9. Public relations programs.

10. Community use of school plant.

11. Adult education.[86]

Medsker reported in 1960 that 219 of the 243 community colleges which he studied were engaged in various community service activities which would fall into the following 11 areas:

1. Widespread use of the college physical plant by community groups.
2. Assistance by college in safety and thrift campaigns, fund drives, and the like.
3. Organization of special events, such as workshops, institutes and forums for business, professional or governmental groups for the purpose of either in-service training of employees or the general improvement of the group.
4. Promotion of cultural and recreational activities, such as the development of community musical groups, sponsoring of little theater groups.
5. Promotion by the college of community events in which public affairs are discussed.
6. Organization projects with other community agencies relating to the improvement of health conditions in the community.

---

[86]James W. Reynolds, *An Analysis of Community Service Programs of Junior Colleges*, pp. 145-56.

7. Use of the college staff and students in making studies of the community (such as occupational surveys, sociological studies).
8. Widespread use of college staff as speakers to community groups.
9. Organization of services using staff or students, or films and lectures from outside, to further the conservation of natural resources.
10. Research by college staff and students for business or professional groups in the community.
11. Organization of child-care programs for demonstration instructional purposes.[87]

Harlacher studied 104 different community services programs across the country and was able to break down community services activities into the following classifications:

I. Community Use of College Facilities and Services
   A. Community Center
   B. Provision of physical facilities and services
   C. Co-sponsorship of community events on campus
   D. Community use of library facilities
   E. Campus tours (especially agricultural and technical)

II. Community Educational Services
   A. Non-credit short courses
   B. College credit extension courses
   C. In-service training
   D. Community counseling
   E. Human resource development training
   F. Campus radio-TV stations

III. Community Development
   A. Advisory and leadership assistance

---

[87]Leland L. Medsker, *The Junior Colleges: Progress and Prospect*, pp. 16-17.

B. Surveys, studies and polls

C. Workshops, conferences and institutes

D. Organization of community councils, coordination councils and other needed community agencies and groups

IV. Cultural and Recreational Activities

A. Arts, lectures and film series

B. Cultural tours and field trips

C. Gallery programs

D. Physical activities

E. Community science services

F. Festivals

G. Community performing groups[88]

Gleazer has viewed the community services program as the community/junior college's catalytic agent in the areas of community development and self-improvement. Through community service, the college can provide leadership, coordination and cooperation to stimulate community action programs. The range of these programs should be limited only by the creativity of the leadership, the community interest, the institutional objectives, the availability of means and the service provisions made by other community organizations and institutions. Gleazer has found that the following were commonly included in the community services program:

1. Education workshops
2. Seminars
3. Institutes

---

[88]Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College*, pp. 19-40.

4. Special lectures
5. Community research and development
6. Community utilization of college facilities
7. Cultural programs of a varied nature
8. Community guidance and counseling
9. Placement services in cooperation with employers and placement agencies
10. Instructional program of the college organized to utilize physical and human resources of the community
11. Public information.[89]

One of the best classification schemes of community services was developed at Michigan State University by Max Raines. One of its primary supporters, Gunder Myran, has stated its virtues as follows:

> Max R. Raines, Michigan State University, has prepared a taxonomy of community services functions which describes the present scope of community services and provides, in reality, a tentative definition of community services--one in which taxons may be added, deleted or changed as the concept of community services in the community college evolves.[90]

The instrument (Community Services Inventory) which Max Raines developed has been used as a survey tool to study community service programs. It was fairly long but the basic three divisions and their functions were as follows:

I. Self-Development Functions

A. Developmental Counseling Function

---

[89]Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., *This Is the Community College* (Boston: Houghlin Mifflin Company, 1968), pp. 85-99.

[90]Gundar A. Myran, *Community Services in the Community College*, p. 14.

B. Educational Extension Function

C. Educational Expansion Function

D. Social Outreach Function

E. Cultural Development Function

F. Leisure Time Activity Function

II. Community Development Functions

A. Community Analysis Function

B. Interagency Cooperation Function

C. Advisory Liaison Function

D. Public Forum Function

E. Civic Action Function

F. Staff Consultation Function

III. Program Development Functions

A. Public Information Function

B. Professional Development Function

C. Program Management Function

D. Conference Planning Function

E. Facility Utilization Function

F. Program Evaluation Function[91]

The Community Services Inventory (CSI) has done an excellent job classifying special activities by their broad function. It has therefore gained wide acceptance as a useful instrument for measuring total programming effort. Unfortunately, the CSI and other such measuring devices have measured only the quantity of a program and not the quality.

---

[91]Max R. Raines, *A Community Services Inventory for Community Colleges.*

Monroe has stated that community service activities should fit into the following four categories: (1) building an open campus, (2) using the community as a classroom, (3) sharing cultural experiences with the community, and (4) using the college's professional staff to assist in the solution of community problems.[92]

Pinizzotto (1971) found that certain community services activities tended to be highly developed at the national community colleges which he surveyed. These activities and their functional headings follow:

I. Self-Development Functions
   - A. Developmental Counseling
     1. Individual counseling
     2. Career information
   - B. Educational Counseling--only evening classes generally were highly developed
   - C. Educational Expansion
     1. Institutes
     2. Seminars
     3. Short courses
   - D. Social Outreach
     1. Unemployed mothers
     2. Unemployed males
     3. Educationally deprived youths
     4. Welfare recipients
   - E. Cultural Development--Artist-in-resident program tended to be highly developed

---

[92]Charles R. Monroe, *Profile of the Community College*, p. 140.

F. Leisure-Time Activity

1. Sports instruction

2. Outdoor education

3. Summer youth programs

II. Community Development Functions

A. Community Analysis

1. Analyzing census tracts

2. Analyzing manpower data

3. Identifying roles and goals of organization

B. Interagency Cooperation

1. Calendar coordination

2. Information exchange

3. Joint committee work

C. Advisory Liaison

1. Community Service's Advisory Council

2. Ad Hoc Advisory Committee

3. Executive Committee

4. Local Government Committee

5. Community Cultural Board

D. Civic Action

1. Community self studies

2. School self studies

3. Urban beautification

4. Air pollution studies

E. Staff Consultation

1. Consulting with small businesses

2. Advising on instructional materials

3. Designing community studies

4. Instructing in group leadership

5. Laboratory testing

III. Program Development Functions

A. Professional Development

1. Professional affiliations

2. Professional conferences

3. Exchange visitations

4. Advance graduate studies

B. Program Management

1. Staff recruitment

2. Job descriptions

3. Budgetary development

C. Conference Planning

1. Registration procedures

2. Program development

3. Conference evaluation

D. Facility Utilization

1. Campus tours

2. Centralized scheduling office

3. Conference rooms

4. Auditorium design

E. Program Evaluation

1. Participation ratings

2. Attendance patterns

3. Behavioral changes
4. Program requests[93]

Prescriptive and Related Studies

Based on his study of national community/junior colleges and local (New Jersey) community colleges, Pinizzotto came to several general conclusions:

1. All community colleges should have a community services division.
2. Community services divisions should develop an operating philosophy.
3. Community colleges should establish job descriptions for community services personnel.
4. There is a wide diversity between local and national community development functions.
5. A national dissemination agency could surely help in developing programs.[94]

Harlacher's comprehensive research on 104 community college campuses in 19 states indicated that seven major trends were emerging in the area of community services. A summary of these trends follows:

1. Community colleges are developing outreach programs such as mobile classrooms and in-plant courses which will extend the campus throughout the entire service area.
2. The community colleges are beginning to bring educational opportunities to *all* groups at all age levels of the community through community services.

---

[93]Samuel John Pinizzotto, "A Critical Analysis of the Emerging Programs of Community Colleges of New Jersey," pp. 92-95.

[94]*Ibid.*, pp. 136-41.

3. In serving the community's needs, the community colleges will diversify its use of media beyond the classroom. Television, self-instructional packets, tours, performing groups and a wide variety of counseling services are all examples of media which can be utilized in community service programs.
4. The community college is using its unique resources to help solve basic social, economic and political problems of the community.
5. The community colleges are becoming more and more concerned about the cultural growth of its community.
6. The community colleges are allowing greater participation by community members in community college projects and programs.
7. The community colleges are increasing their cooperative efforts with other community, regional and state agencies. By cooperating with other agencies which are interested in education, duplication of efforts can be avoided.[95]

Wimmer conducted a study similar in context to that of Pinizzotto's. The following were guidelines which he suggested for community services divisions (in addition to those summarized previously):

1. The community services division should have major decision-making responsibility.
2. Program offerings should be in line with the public's needs and interests.
3. The leadership should be qualified.
4. The faculty should be professional.[96]

James Crossland summarizes two community services studies in his 1971 doctoral dissertation:

Reynolds studied 12 junior colleges in the United States in an attempt to analyze community service programs in terms of their comprehensiveness and analyzation of their administrative machinery used to supervise the programs. Reynolds concluded that (1) the college administrator's personality structure appears to have greatest importance in the development of a community service program and (2) that while in general, community college community service programs are comprehensive, the needs of lower socioeconomic classes are not being met.
Vine's study in 1960 analyzed community service programs in five selected junior colleges to determine the nature, the function, and the effectiveness of community service activities. He concluded

---

[95]Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College*, pp. 70-108.

[96]Neal Arvin Wimmer, "An Analytical Study for the Development of a Model Community Services Program for Community Colleges," pp. 166-74.

from the study that: (1) Community education service demands a complete departure from the traditional ideas of education; (2) The idea of community services does not seem to have been achieved but it is in the process of development; (3) The community service concept does not seem to be fully comprehended by presidents, deans, or faculty members; (4) Community service does not appear to be administered as a major function; (5) There appears to be little coordination between the different college departments in consideration of community service; (6) No common techniques for developing a community service program were found; (7) Some important factors in the development of a community service program in a junior college are continuity of leadership, viewpoint of administrators, ability of administrators to organize resources, type of community, and willingness of the faculty to participate; (8) Some of the techniques used in developing community service programs were use of citizens' advisory committees, surveys of community needs, in-service training for instructors, getting information to the public and a continuous evaluation of the program; (9) A good program of community services must grow; it cannot be set up; and (10) Community service programs are being curtailed because of other educational demands upon the college.[97,98]

Based on his study of community colleges' community services programs, Wimmer (1971) established that objectives for community services programs could be grouped into four categories:

1. To become a center of community life by encouraging the use of college facilities and services by community groups when such use does not interfere with college's regular schedule.
2. To provide for all age groups educational services that utilize the special skills and knowledge of the college staff and other experts. Such services are designed to meet the needs of community groups.
3. To provide the community, including business and industry, with the leadership and coordination capabilities of the college; to assist the community in long range planning and to join with individuals and groups in solving problems.

---

[97]Ronald James Crossland, "Role Expectations for Chief Administrators of Community Services Programs in Selected Community Colleges in the United States" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971), p. 35, citing James W. Reynolds, "Analysis of Community Services Programs of Junior Colleges" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1960), p. 2.

[98]*Ibid.*, citing Eugene F. Vines, "Community Services Programs in Selected Junior Colleges" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960), pp. 241-46.

4. To contribute to and to promote the cultural, intellectual and social life of the college district community and the development of skills for the profitable use of leisure time.[99]

Gunder Myran, as a major member of the Kellogg Community Services Project research team of the late 1960s, was able to research organizational and instructional departures in community services programs. He found that true commitment to community services could only be met by some fundamental, organizational and instructional departures such as:

1. Commitment to concept of education as a life-long process.
2. Movement away from semester-credit base for instruction.
3. Movement away from the campus as a single base for instruction.
4. Experimentation with instructional approaches.
5. Movement toward differentiated administration.
6. Creation of nontraditional positions within the college structure.
7. Movement away from the exclusive use of certified personnel.
8. Movement away from formal admission requirements.
9. Consideration of community services in campus architectural design.
10. Modification in administrative control.
11. Expansion of role of college beyond offering organized classes.
12. Development of community feedback system for curricular change.
13. Increased participation of citizens on the college campus.
14. Development of programs for community groups which have not articulated their needs in the past.
15. Increased responsiveness to community change.[100]

Cummiskey, another Kellogg Project researcher, has made several observations concerning the make-up of successful community services

---

[99]Neal Arvin Wimmer, "An Analytical Study for the Development of a Model Community Services Program for Community Colleges," pp. 144-46.

[100]Gundar A. Myran, *First Definitions and Selected Examples of Community Services: An Emerging Challenge for the Community College* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, n.d.), cited by Robert Nelson Rue, "A Survey and Evaluation of Community Service Programs in Michigan Community Colleges" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970), pp. 39-42.

programs. The following were factors which he felt were very influential in determining the present and future form of a community service program:

1. Pre-existing views of educational traditions and expectations which vary from region to region and state to state
2. Impact of the institution's history prior to becoming a community college
3. Expectations of the people in the college district
4. Background and preconceptions about education held by the administration and faculty of the institution
5. Sociological and economic status of the community
6. Presence of other colleges and service institutions in the area
7. Precedence of neighboring institutions
8. Competence, aggressiveness and creativity of persons responsible for community service programs
9. The financial base and income potential of the college[101]

Cummiskey went on to comment about the community services director who ". . . must be made up of large parts of urban or city planner, social psychologist, community development expert, social worker, peoples' lawyer, public relations expert, and politician."[102]

Bushnell's research indicated that there will be an unprecedented demand in the future for a wide range of adult and continuing education opportunities due to: (1) the desire to raise one's social or economic status, (2) the necessity for redeploying parts of our labor force from one occupation to another, and (3) the anticipated increases in leisure time.[103] He further indicated that adding the forthcoming

---

[101]Kenneth J. Cummiskey, "Community Services for the 1970's," *Community Services Forum*, II, No. 1 (January, 1970), 2, cited by Samuel John Pinizzotto, "A Critical Analysis of the Emerging Programs of Community Colleges of New Jersey" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1971), pp. 43-44.

[102]*Ibid.*, p. 44.

[103]David S. Bushnell, *Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges*, p. 91.

demands for community services to the inadequate present service system will encourage community service departments to develop programs such as the following:

1. Resource Institute--where education would be adapted to persistent and unresolved needs of the community.
2. Community guidance centers--to aid adults in career planning, personal development and educational planning.
3. Satellite learning centers--to provide credit and noncredit educational opportunities at easily accessible locations.
4. Faculty renewal systems--which will provide for faculty to become involved in and of service to their community.
5. Community information system--which would identify, collect, process, analyze and disseminate information about the community.
6. Knowledge linkage systems--which will interpret the needs of local community groups to potential consultants.[104]

Bushnell then added, "These six prototype programs . . . will do much to ensure a close and harmonious relationship between a college and its constituents."[105]

The review of research on community service revealed that the researchers have analyzed community service programs and grouped the special activities into several classifications. They have discovered what presently exists and have come to conclusions as to what ideally should exist. Unfortunately, a gap has occurred in the research because there has been no attempt to ascertain why certain community service activities exist in certain areas and not in others. The research has not evaluated programs in terms of community determinants.

Summary

The review of literature (specifically Vine's study) underscored several points which were important to this study:

1. There was no universally ideal community services program.

---

[104] *Ibid.*, pp. 95-98.

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

2. Community services was not well understood by key administrators.
3. Community services was the least important of the major functions of a community college.
4. No common technique for developing community service programs has been constructed.
5. A good community services program was built through a trial and error process.

With lack of research to the contrary, these points have made it readily understandable why successful community service programs have been difficult to establish. If these programs were not important to a community (and to the community colleges), this lack of research and resulting lack of information would also fail to be important. However, they were important and they were needed.

Harlacher has done an excellent job of summing the need for community services and the equally important need of the community college to provide them:

> Social, political, and economic trends clearly discernible throughout the country lend to the service program an importance that is growing daily. Both the growing recognition of the fact that to be educated, increasingly, means to continue to educate oneself, and the mushrooming demand of all sectors of American society for a meaningful education and a voice in educational policies, represent challenges which the community services operations of the community college are taking up. Unencumbered by a traditional format, concern with academic background and carry-over credits, and unhampered by powerful alumni forces devoted to the status quo, the community college itself has emerged in response to recognized community needs rather than to needs of a select class.
>
> The community services program gives the community college its flexibility, its adaptability, its capability of providing education in whatever form and at whatever site is necessary. By welcoming persons from all strata of the community and from both sides of the generation gap, the skilled and the unskilled, the cultured and the coarse, the educated and the illiterate, the community college chinks the educational panorama and offers enrichment to all citizens of its community.

No aspect of any higher education program shares the ability of the community services program to adapt to the changing milieu in which educational programs will be required to function. Because it represents not only a shift from the past, but a real adaption to the needs of the present and the future, the community services dimension of the community college will grow both in scope and importance in coming years.

Through its program of community services, the community college will insert into the life stream of its people forces that can change, revise, unify, and stimulate the individual, the organization, and ultimately, the tone of mind of the entire community.[106]

---

[106]Ervin L. Harlacher, *The Community Dimension of the Community College*, p. 107.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The questions which were proposed in Chapter I were focused upon the areas of program similarity, activity similarity and activity success. Data pertaining to these areas have been gathered through the use of the Community Services Inventory, the Activity Questionnaire and the Community Services Information Sheet. The findings of the study were based on the analysis of the data gathered through the use of these instruments. After each instrument was completed, the various directors or a member of their staff took the writer on an activity tour of the community services division. Records and files were examined and any information (brochures, fliers, forms, definitions, outlines or evaluations) which pertained to activity planning, program development, records, advertising or community services in general was given to the author. Whenever community service activities were taking place during the writer's visit, he was invited to observe the activity in person. The personal campus visitations allowed the writer the opportunity to see present programs in operation, analyze specific activity files and, in general, made it possible to corroborate the accuracy of the various analytic instruments.

The first section of the findings was focused on an examination of functional and activity characteristics of the 10 community/junior colleges' and/or institutions/ community services programs. The focus of the second section was on the individual aspects of the special activities which were offered in the community colleges. The third section dealt with miscellaneous information about the community services

program, the community services director and the two-year institution. The findings of all three sections were based on the analyzation of the data which were grouped by either (1) the five schools from homogeneous communities, (2) the five schools from non-homogeneous communities, or (3) all ten schools. The five schools which were matched by community characteristics were classified as Group I schools or institutions. The five schools which were not matched by community characteristics were identified as Group II schools or institutions.

A. Community Services Inventory

The Community Services Inventory was conducted at each of the ten schools during the summer of 1973. The purpose of the inventory was explained to each director. Each instrument was then completed under supervision to insure consistency and accuracy of response.

Community Services Inventory responses dealt with both present and future functions of community services. First, the directors were asked to indicate the priority which the school was presently placing upon each community services activity area or function. Secondly, the directors were asked to indicate the priority which the institution *should be* placing upon each activity area or function. The latter should give an indication of the director's philosophy but does not necessarily indicate institutional goals, financial or other resource limitations, political feasibility, or community needs. The former should give a good account of the present level of activity of the community services program. Directors have answered this section in terms of the existing reality. By comparing Group I and Group II programs, it should be possible to determine if there were any differences between the two groups' community service priorities.

Program Similarity

The activity areas and functions which were presented in Table III and IV form the core of the Group I community services program. These were the only activities which averaged a rating of 3 (moderate priority) or more from the results of the Group I responses to the Community Services Inventory. Group I and II were analyzed on the basis of those activities which were part of this core program.

Similarity Between Group I and Group II Activities: Present

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to the ranked mean priorities from Table III. The greatest cumulative frequency difference between the ranked priorities of Group I and Group II schools was computed to be 13. This gave a K_D value of 13 which indicated that there was a significant difference between the rankings of the two group's mean priorities at the .05 level for a one-tailed test. Since the Group I schools were all located in similar socio-economic communities, the significant difference between the two program's ranked priorities could be accounted for by community based determinants.

The Group I schools have consistently placed a higher priority on more community service activities than the Group II schools. There were 27 activity areas of functions which were important to Group I schools and only 14 which were important to Group II schools. Therefore, there were only 14 activities which were rated as important by both groups of schools. These activities have a broader appeal and would most likely be important activities in many southern community colleges' community services programs.

The other activities, the 13 which the Group II schools failed to rate as important, were as follows:

TABLE III

SELECTED MEAN SCORES AND K_D VALUES OF GROUP I AND GROUP II INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO THE PRESENT SECTION OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES INVENTORY, SPRING 1973[a]

Function or Activity Area	Mean Score[b]		K_D Value[c]
	Group I	Group II	
Evening Classes	3.4	4.8	3
Community Extension Centers	3.8	3.2	2
Institutes or Conferences	3.4	3.2	2
Seminars	3.4	3.0	2
Short Courses	4.0	3.8	1
Workshops	3.8	3.0	2
Programs for the Underemployed	3.0	1.8	3
Programs for the Economically Deprived	3.6	1.6	4
Adult Basic Education	3.0	2.0	2
GED Preparation	4.0	2.8	2
Fine Art Series	3.2	1.8	3
Hobby-type Courses	3.4	3.6	1
Community Analysis Function	3.4	2.2	2
Information Exchange Center	3.4	1.4	3
Joint Committee Work	3.4	2.4	2
Advisory Liaison Function	3.0	2.2	1
School Self-Studies	3.4	3.2	1
Community Chest Drives	3.0	2.0	2
Staff Consultation Function	3.2	2.2	3
Newsletters	3.6	2.4	2

TABLE III (continued)

Function or Activity Area	Mean Score[b]		K_D Value[c]
	Group I	Group II	
Radio Programs	4.0	3.0	2
Newspapers	4.0	4.4	2
Registration Procedures	4.5	4.0	1
Program Development	4.3	3.4	1
Conference Evaluation	3.3	2.6	2
Campus Tours	4.0	3.0	2
Conference Rooms for Community Use	4.2	3.4	1

[a]Functions and activities in Table III were rated by at least three reporting Group I directors to be of at least moderate level priority.

[b]The mean score is the average of the scores of the responding directors. A score of one (1) indicated no priority and a score of five (5) indicated extremely high priority.

[c]K_D is defined in the Kolomogorov-Smirnov Test for Small Samples as the largest absolute difference between the cumulative frequency distributions. Critical values for K_D (where P=.05 for a one-tailed test) are four (4) where N=5 and nine (9) where N=27. A K_D value which is equal to or greater than the critical value indicates a significant difference exists between the two distributions from what would be expected by chance.

Source: Community Inventory (Appendix C).

TABLE IV

SELECTED MEAN SCORES AND K_D VALUES OF GROUP I AND GROUP II INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO THE *SHOULD BE* SECTION OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES INVENTORY, SPRING 1973[a]

Function or Activity Area	Mean Score[b]		K_D Value[c]
	Group I	Group II	
Individual Counseling	3.2	2.5	3
Career Information Counseling	3.6	3.0	2
Family Life Counseling	3.2	3.2	2
Evening Classes	4.6	5.0	2
Community Extension Centers	4.6	4.8	1
Institutes or Conferences	3.6	4.2	2
Seminars	3.6	4.2	2
Short Courses	4.2	4.2	1
Workshops	4.0	4.0	1
Programs for the Underemployed	4.2	2.8	4
Programs for the Unemployed	4.2	2.6	3
Programs for the Economically Deprived	4.4	3.0	3
Welfare Programs	3.0	3.0	1
Social Programs for the Elderly	3.6	4.2	2
ABE Programs	3.5	2.0	2
GED Preparation	4.5	3.0	2
Fine Art Series	3.6	3.2	1
Lecture Series	3.6	3.6	0
Special Festivals	3.4	2.2	2
Out-door Education	3.0	1.8	2

TABLE IV (continued)

Function or Activity Area	Mean Score[b] Group I	Group II	K_D Value[c]
Leisure-time Programs for Senior Citizens	3.6	4.2	2
Hobby-type Courses	3.0	3.6	1
Community Analysis Function	4.0	4.0	1
Calendar Coordination	3.6	3.0	2
Information Exchange Center	3.8	2.4	3
Joint Committee Work	4.2	3.0	3
Advisory Liaison Function	4.0	3.4	2
Public Affairs Pamphlets	3.0	3.0	2
School Self-Studies	3.2	3.6	1
Community Chest Drives	3.2	2.2	2
Staff Consultation Function	4.0	2.4	3
Newsletters	4.2	2.8	2
Radio Programs	4.2	3.6	1
Newspapers	4.3	4.6	2
Registration Procedures	3.8	4.0	2
Program Development	4.3	4.2	1
Conference Evaluation	4.0	3.2	2
Campus Tours	4.0	3.6	1
Centralized Scheduling Office	3.2	4.2	2
Conference Rooms for Community Use	4.2	3.8	1

[a]Functions and activities in Table IV were rated by at least three reporting Group I directors to be of at least moderate level priority.

[b]The mean score is the average of the scores of the responding

TABLE IV (continued)

directors. A score of one (1) indicated no priority and a score of five (5) indicated extremely high priority.

[c]K_D is defined in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Small Samples as the largest absolute difference between the cumulative frequency distributions. Critical values for K_D (where P=.05 for a one-tailed test) are four (4) where N=5 and eleven (11) where N=40. A K_D value which is equal to or greater than the critical value indicates a significant difference exists between the two distributions from what would be expected by chance.

Source: Community Services Inventory (Appendix C)

1. Programs for the Underemployed
2. Programs for the Economically Deprived
3. Adult Basic Education Programs
4. GED Preparation
5. Fine Arts Series
6. Community Analysis Function
7. Information Exchange Center
8. Joint Committee Work
9. Advisory Liaison Function
10. Community Chest Drives
11. Staff Consultation Function
12. Newsletters
13. Conference Evaluation

These were the specific activities which *may* have been functions of Group I communities. When the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to individual functions and activity areas, only the ranked priorities from the economically deprived activity areas were significantly different (at the .05 level for a one-tailed test) between Group I and Group II institutions. Since the Group I communities were matched using demographic criteria, it may be community factors which have caused the significantly different priority to be placed on programs for the economically deprived.

In general, the difference in priorities between the Group I and Group II institutions were expressed through program emphasis in two major areas. First, there were the programs which would assist in economic development, basic education and social upgrading. As Table III shows, the educational expansion functions (e.g., seminars), the

social outreach functions (e.g., ABE and GED) and the cultural development functions (e.g., fine art series) were all more important to Group I schools. The second programming area was in the education, public services and civic action fields. As Table III shows, programs dealing with the community analysis function, the advisory liaison function, the civic action function, the staff consultation function as well as the facility utilization function (e.g., campus tours) were more important in Group I schools.

Similarity Between Group I and Group II Activities: Future

The mean priorities of the various functions and activity areas of Group I and Group II schools were ranked and the Kolmagorov-Smirnov test applied. The greatest cumulative frequency difference observed was 10. This gave a K_D value of 10 which indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the two group's ranked mean priorities at the .05 level for a one-tailed test. Even though there was no significant difference between the ranked program priorities, the Group I schools continued to place a higher priority on more activities than the Group II schools.

Table IV indicates that the directors felt that more work needed to be done in upgrading their community service programs. The important activities in Group I schools were increased from 27 to 40. None of the activities which were listed in the present category were decreased in priority to an unimportant level. Thirteen additional activities were listed strictly as a result of the director's desire to expand the role of community services.

All of the 40 items listed in Table IV were viewed by directors

of Group I community service programs to be important activities for their future programs. Ideally, they would like to be involved in all 40 activities in some meaningful way. Thirty of these activities were also viewed as important by directors of Group II schools and as such were perhaps representative of the total population of the study.

Both groups indicated that the utilization of campus facilities by the community should be equally important parts of their community services program. They also rated the community analysis function, the public forum function and the civic action function with very little difference in priority. Developmental work, social outreach function, cultural development, interagency cooperation, advisory liaison function and staff consultation were all relatively more important to Group I directors than to Group II directors. When the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to individual functions and activity areas, only the ranked priorities from the underemployed activity area were significantly different (at the .05 level for a one-tailed test) between Group I and Group II institutions. Since the Group I communities were matched using demographic criteria, it may be community factors which have caused the significantly different priority to be placed on programs for the underemployed.

It was impossible to know if the directors were: (1) judging their future priorities against preconceived ideas of what a good community service program should be like, (2) stating priorities that were needed to meet unsolved community needs, or (3) responding with some other reference. Because of this factor, the future priority section should be used for planning model programs and not basic community service programs.

Summary

The information supplied through the use of the Community Services Inventory has made it possible to answer all or parts of several questions which were proposed in Chapter I. First, the Group I and II community service program priorities were similar in the future priority dimension but significantly different in the present priority dimension. Secondly, a majority of Group I schools rated 27 activities from the Community Services Inventory as presently important and 40 activities as *should be* important to their program. This differed considerably from the 14 *present* and 30 *should be* important activities from Group II schools. The Group I schools exhibited much more homogeneity (especially in their present program) than the Group II schools. They exhibited enough homogeneity to be considered similar as a result of the operation of community based influences.

Third, there was only one activity area in both the present and future section of the Community Services Inventory which was operating at a significantly different level between the two groups of institutions. Programs for the economically deprived were presently operating at a significantly higher priority in Group I institutions than in Group II institutions. Programs for the underemployed were planned at a significantly higher level in Group I schools than in Group II schools.

Fourth, the director of community services in a developing community college could utilize the Community Services Inventory to help him establish priorities for his total program. Tables III and IV, pages 66 and 68, contained a list of program functions and activity areas which were important to a majority of community related institutions. Some were more community related than others, but all were

important. By placing program priorities judiciously, a director could greatly increase the chances that the community services program would be successful.

B. Activity Questionnaire

The Activity Questionnaire was conducted at each of the ten schools during the summer of 1973. After each director finished answering the Community Services Inventory, he was asked to help locate the data for the Activity Questionnaire. This was usually accomplished by the divisional secretary searching past records for the needed data. The author reviewed each completed Questionnaire with the director to insure consistency and accuracy of the data.

Successful Activities

The 10 schools had a combined list of 96 activities which were considered to have been successful throughout the years. Of these 96, only 16 were offered by at least three of the Group I schools. Table V indicates that there were only three courses which were successful throughout both groups of schools. Beginning and advanced sewing were found in eight of the ten schools. The 4/4 split between groups indicated broad appeal for the courses. Four schools in Group I and three schools in Group II offered successful programs in cake decorating. An investment course was on the fringe as being classified as a course which had a broad appeal. Five of the schools have this course as a successful program (three in Group I and Two in Group II schools). Since this course was not listed by a majority of the Group II schools, it is rather doubtful that it would be a course which

TABLE V

SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES OFFERED BY AT LEAST THREE OF THE FIVE GROUP I INSTITUTIONS PRIOR TO THE SUMMER OF 1973

Activity	Group Frequency I	II
Emergency Medical Training	3	0
Conditioning for Men	3	0
Bridge	3	1
Slimnastics for Women	4	1
Beginning Sewing	4	4
Advanced Sewing	4	4
Cake Decorating	4	3
Upholstering	3	0
Oil Painting	3	0
Shorthand	3	0
Typing	5	0
Art	5	2
Wood Carving	3	0
Investment, Money and Banking	3	2
Interior Decorating	3	1
Flower Arranging	3	1

Source: Activity Questionnaire (Appendix B).

could be classified as having broad regional appeal.

The rest of the activities listed in Table V would be considered as Group I community determined. They fall into three frequency categories. The highest category would include typing and art classes. All Group I schools offered a class in both these areas. The second level would contain the slimnastics course for women. Four of the five schools offered this program successfully. The third level would contain the rest of the activities listed in Table V.

A developing community college located in a Group I area should also be able to offer the same successful program which four to five of the Group I schools were offering. The cake decorating class which six of the schools offered would also be a good possibility. The 11 other activities should be offered with little hesitancy as time, space and instructional resources permit.

Program Maturity

A director of community services in a developing community college could tell by looking at Table VI that total program maturity was not a key factor in finding and offering successful activities. The 16 courses listed in Table VI were offered by at least three of the Group I schools and 75 percent of the time they were first offered within the first two years of the schools' existence. This pointed up the fact that activities which were a reflection of community needs would stand a good chance of being successful at any time when they were offered.

Course Frequency

The only other information which was gained from the Activity

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF GROUP I INSTITUTIONS WHICH OFFERED SELECTED SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE FIRST EIGHT YEARS OF THE OPENING OF THEIR COLLEGE

Activity	Years							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Emergency Medical Training	1			1	1			
Conditioning for Men	3							
Bridge	1	1	1					
Slimnastics for Women	2	2						
Beginning Sewing	3				1			
Advanced Sewing	3				1			
Cake Decorating	2				1			1
Upholstering	1		1			1		
Oil Painting	1	2						
Shorthand	2	1						
Typing	4	1						
Art	2	2			1			
Wood Carving	2				1			
Investment, Money and Banking	2					1		
Interior Decorating	2				1			
Flower Arranging	1	1			1			

Source: Activity Questionnaire (Appendix B).

Questionnaire that established any pattern dealt with the number of times the activity was offered yearly. As Table VII indicates, 8 of the 16 courses were offered at least three times a year by at least three of the Group I schools. They were beginning and advanced sewing, cake decorating, upholstering, oil painting, typing, art and wood carving. With the exception of the emergency medical training (EMT) course, the other eight activities did not form any patterns across the five schools. The EMT course was offered once a year at three schools. A possible reason was that it was conducted for a specialized audience and one course a year met the need of that audience.

Class Size

Class size for similar activities varied considerably among Group I schools. Activities varied in pupil size from less than 10 to greater than 200, but within similar categories the range was considerably less. The most common class size for Group I school activities fell within the range of from 15 to 20 students. It was not uncommon, however, for indivivual classes to run over 30 students or more. The fact that the classes were successful was important; the actual class size was not. The instructor, the class site, advertisement, administrative policy or a number of other factors could have been at work to inflate or deflate the size of individual classes.

Cost of Special Activities

The price of various activities was not standard in all Group I schools. State pricing policies, administrative policies and the difficulty of obtaining instruction caused the cost of a similar activity to

TABLE VII

NUMBER OF GROUP I INSTITUTIONS WHICH OFFERED SELECTED SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITIES AT LEAST ONCE A YEAR PRIOR TO THE SUMMER OF 1973

Activity	Yearly Frequency		
	1	2	3+
Emergency Medical Training	3		
Conditioning for Men	2		1
Bridge	2		1
Slimnastics for Women	2	1	1
Beginning Sewing			4
Advanced Sewing			4
Cake Decorating		1	3
Upholstering			3
Oil Painting			3
Shorthand	1		2
Typing	1	1	3
Art			5
Wood Carving			3
Investment, Money and Banking	2		1
Interior Decorating	1		2
Flower Arranging	1	1	1

Source: Activity Questionnaire (Appendix B).

fluctuate among schools. Some schools had a policy of not charging anything for a community services course. Others charged a nominal fee of less than $5. Other schools charged as much as $20.00 for an individual course. Even when all 10 schools' fees were reviewed, only three successful activities had fees in excess of $20.

Location of Special Activities

All of the Group I schools taught classes both off campus and on campus. Some off-campus classes were taught at official centers which were actually a permanent arm of the institution. Other off-campus classes were taught at isolated or nonpermanent places. But by far the largest number of activities conducted by Group I schools was on the primary campus of the respective institution.

Sponsorship

The workshops (seminars or institutes) were almost always co-sponsored with an outside agency such as the public schools, an arm of the local government, churches, a regional university, a department of the federal government or a local civic or social agency. Classes, on the other hand, were usually not co-sponsored. Less than 10 of all the successful classes operated by the 10 institutions were co-sponsored.

Summary

The information supplied through the use of the Activities Questionnaire has made it possible to answer all or parts of several of the questions which were proposed in Chapter I. First, there were three activities which were successful at a majority of all institutions. They were beginning sewing, advanced sewing and cake decorating. There were 13 other activities which were successful at a majority of Group I

institutions, but not at a majority of Group II institutions. There were, then, 16 successful activities which Group I schools had in common.

Second, there were 16 successful activities which occurred with at least yearly frequency in a majority of Group I schools. Eight of the 16 were offered at least three times a year by a majority of Group I schools.

Third, there were no successful community service activities which were always co-sponsored by any special agency. All activities were the responsibility of the community services division.

Fourth, specific community service activities might be held in any location. The most common location was on campus.

Fifth, there was no relationship between a successful community services activity and the date it was first offered. The successful programs proved successful whenever they were started.

Sixth, the average successful community services activity had a small enrollment. The number of students enrolled was usually between 15 and 20.

Seventh, the fees for these successful activities varied widely. However, the most common fee for a successful activity was less than $20.

Eighth, there were 13 activities which were successful in a majority of the Group I schools but not in a majority of the Group II schools. Six of the 13 were successfully offered in four of the five Group I schools, while 7 of the 13 were not offered successfully in a single Group II school. The success of several of the 13 activities may have

resulted from community factors since all Group I schools were from similar communities.

C. Community Services Information Sheet

The information for the Community Services Information Sheet was collected during the summer of 1973. The purpose of the information sheet was to see if there were any miscellaneous factors which were held in common by community service programs. The writer explained the purpose to the directors and then personally interviewed each one so as to insure consistency and accuracy of response.

The operational dimension of the various Community Service Divisions differed widely as can be seen in Table VIII. Nine of the 10 directors had worked in their new position for less than six years. This indicated that either the positions were relatively new or that the turnover rate was high. Interviews indicated the former.

Eight of the 10 directors held degrees above the bachelor's. However, only two of the directors had received formal college training in a field related to their present job. Also, there was no relationship between 8 of the 10 directors' last job and their present job.

Lack of specific training in community services and much trial-and-error on-the-job training predominated in most of the 10 schools. Six of the directors had other responsibilities which restricted the available time each could spend developing and operating community service activities.

Based on the information gained from the Community Services Information Sheets (Appendix A), there were no glaring differences between Group I and Group II schools. There did not seem to be any

TABLE VIII

NUMBER OF SURVEYED INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING TO SELECTED QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND GENERAL OPERATIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAM, SPRING 1973

Selected Information	Institutions I	II	All
Title of Chief Administrative Officer			
Director of Community Services		2	2
Director of Adult Education	1	1	2
Director of Continuing Education	3	2	5
Director of Extension Programs	1		1
Length of Time in Position			
0-1 Years	1	2	3
2-3 Years	2	1	3
4-5 Years	1	2	3
6+ Years	1		1
Age of Chief Administrator			
Less than 30 Years	1		1
30-39 Years	1	2	3
40-49 Years	2	2	4
50+ Years	1	1	2
Last Degree Earned			
B.S. or B.A.		2	2
M.S.	4	2	6
Ed.S.		1	1
Ed.D.	1		1
Educational Training			
Vocational and Industrial	2		2
Administration	3	3	6
Other		2	2
Preceding Work Experience			
Coach	2		2
Teacher, College Level	2	1	3
Administration, High School Level		2	2
Administration, College Level	1	1	2
Other		1	1
Other Responsibilities			
Yes	3	3	6
No	2	2	4

TABLE VIII (continued)

Selected Information	Institutions I	II	All
Report to			
President	3	1	4
Dean	2	3	5
Other		1	1
Advisory Councils			
Yes	2	2	4
No	3	3	6
Community Services Budget			
Less than $25,000	1	2	3
$25,000-$50,000	1	2	3
$51,000-$100,000	2		2
Greater than $100,000	1	1	2
Total Community Services Staff			
2-3	1	3	4
4-5	2	2	4
6+	2		2
Type of Faculty Most Often Used			
Community (rather than college)	5	5	10
Major Factor Which Limits Community Services			
Money		2	2
State Regulation	1		1
Isolation of Students	2		2
Lack of Full-Time Director	1	1	2
Lack of Community Interest		1	1
None	1	1	2
Faculty Salary			
$0-$5 Per Contact Hour	2		2
$6-$10 Per Contact Hour	1	1	2
$11-$20 Per Contact Hour	1	1	2
Varies with the Course and the Instructor	1	3	4

Source: Community Services Information Sheet (Appendix A).

community-oriented determinants which caused certain operational and organizational factors to exist. There was nothing developed by the Community Services Information Sheet which would be useful in helping to build a basic program for community services in a developing community college.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a rapid, logical, inexpensive way for a developing community college to arrive at a basic set of community services which, when offered, would be successfully supported. To achieve this objective, the study sought to determine what priorities should be placed on various community service functions, activity areas and successful activities. The methods used involved certain techniques and procedures which analyzed ten developed community service programs that were located in public community/junior colleges and/or institutes. The schools were divided into two groups. Group I schools were located in matched communities and Group II schools were selected at random from nonmatched communities.

Directors of community services in Group I schools rated 27 present program functions and activity areas important to the total program. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to the 27 ranked mean priorities from Group I and Group II institutions. A significant difference was found to exist between the rankings of the two groups' mean scores. It was, therefore, possible for a developing community college to rate, through the analysis of other programs, which functions and activity areas should receive the highest priority in the newly developing community services program. It was also determined that there were 16 specific activities which were successful in a majority of Group I schools. If the overall program priorities and the specific

successful activities were observed, the chances of having a successful basic program of community services would be greatly increased.

Summary of Findings

Several questions were proposed in Chapter I to act as guides to research. It was necessary to find the answers to the questions before any definite statement as to the possibility of formulating a basic community services program could be made. It is important then to go back to those questions and review the findings.

First, are the overall community service programs of the developed community colleges (which are located in similar socio-economic communities) similar? Program priorities indicated that there were 27 functions and activity areas which were similarly important to a majority of the Group I institutions. When the mean priorities of the 27 functions and activity areas of Group I and Group II schools were ranked and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test applied, the difference between the two programs was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance for a one-tailed test. The five Group I community service programs were not duplicates of each other, but they were enough alike to be considered similar.

Second, are there basic community service activities which are common to all the developed community colleges from similar communities? There were 16 separate course type activities which have been continually successful in a majority of Group I schools. Of these 16 activities, 6 were offered in 8 of the 10 community service programs. There was a group of specific activities which were common to Group I schools.

Third, are certain community service activities always offered as ongoing, one-time or irregular activities in developed community colleges in similar communities? Certain conferences, institutes, workshops and short courses, because of their nature, tended to be offered for one time only. Although there were several such successful activities, no specific one was offered in a majority of Group I institutions. There were, however, 16 specific courses which occurred regularly on at least a yearly basis in a majority of schools. Six of these occurred with at least yearly frequency in eight of the Group I schools.

Fourth, are specific community service activities always co-sponsored with a community agency, co-sponsored within a college or simply the responsibility of the community services department in similar communities? Special workshops, conferences, seminars, institutes, and courses were usually co-sponsored with an outside agency. For example, a program for the health industry may have been sponsored by the local hospital. Various social outreach activities (e.g., programs for the elderly) were often co-sponsored with agencies that dealt directly with the specific target group. The interagency cooperation function was another obvious area of joint cooperation between college and community agencies. Of the 16 successful community service course-type activities that were offered at a majority of the Group I institutions, none were co-sponsored. They were all the responsibility of the community services division.

Fifth, are specific community service activities always held in one particular location (off campus or on campus) in developed community colleges in similar communities? Community service activities were held

in various locations. The most common facility was the home campus, but extension centers existed in almost every conceivable location throughout each service area.

Sixth, are certain community service activities always started at a similar point in time in developed community colleges in similar communities? Total program maturity was not found to be a key factor as to when specific courses should be offered. Successful activities were successful because they satisfied a need, not because they were offered at a specific point in time.

Seventh, what is the average class size of classroom-type community service activities in developed community colleges in similar communities? The average class tended to be in the 15 to 20 student range. However, classes ranged considerably above and below this figure.

Eighth, do price differentials exist between specific activities in developed community colleges in similar communities? Prices did vary widely. The price of a course at one location showed no relation to the cost of the course at another location except when both locations (schools) were governed by the same state pricing policy.

B. Conclusions

The findings of this study have made it possible for a director of community services at a Group I developing institution to formulate a basic community services program. By using the Community Services Inventory findings, he would be able to decide which activity areas (e.g., hobby-type courses) were the most useful for meeting the functional objectives (e.g., leisure-time activity function) of the

community services program. By using the findings from the Activity Questionnaire he would be able to identify specific activities (e.g., typing) within activity areas (e.g., hobby-type courses) which would be successful when offered. The program would have both a sound operational base of successful activities and a sound philosophical base of important activity areas. The community services division would begin operation by offering only those courses which were most likely to succeed and thereby avoid major program setbacks. The areas of program growth would be determined by a ranked set of important activity areas within their major functional area. These were the activity areas which were proven most needed in similar communities and, therefore, offered the greatest chance of community acceptance and support.

Successful Activity Selection

The findings have indicated that there were 16 activities which were successful in a majority of Group I schools. These successful activities which were presented in the study could be categorized into four frequency levels. Course development could then be planned in stages which utilized these categories. The highest level would be Level One. At this level would be the "sure successes" because they had proven success records across a high majority (8) of all 10 schools. These were the courses that would most likely be successful at any public community/junior college and/or institute in the southeastern region. Only two courses fell within this category: beginning and advanced sewing. Level Two would include any other courses which were successful at a majority of both Group I and Group II schools. Courses in Level

Two would also stand a good chance of being successful when offered at institutions throughout the region. Only one course, cake decorating, fell within this level. Level Three would be composed of the Group I "sure success" courses. These activities were proven successful in at least eight of the Group I schools. This level would include beginning sewing, advanced sewing, cake decoration, slimnastics for women, typing and art. The final level (4) would include the rest of the activities which were successful in a majority of Group I institutions. Included in Level Four would be emergency medical training, conditioning for men, bridge, upholstering, oil painting, shorthand, wood carving, an investment course, interior decorating, and flower arranging.

The director of a community services program in a developing community college would have a basic set of courses, with proven ability to succeed, to use. He could start the program on a small scale by using the six courses from Level Three. Then, by finding good instructors, consolidating advertising on these activities and offering them at various locations throughout his community, he should be able to establish a successful foundation for future development of community service activities. The foundation would have been arrived at rapidly and inexpensively. The director would have created a good rapport with the community by offering what was desired. An aura of success should envelop the whole program thereby making future programs, projects and activities for more marginal target populations more likely to succeed.

Priority Placement

The results of the priority section of the study should prove

valuable to a director of community services at a Group I developing institution. He could use the results from the present priority section to develop the priorities for his initial program. By observing the rankings of the inventoried items on the Community Services Inventory which had at least a minimum rating of moderate priority, a new director could avoid placing high priorities on areas that may prove at first counter-productive for a new college. By observing the 27 functions and activity areas from highest to lowest priority, within their major functional area, a relatively useful chart could be developed for the director to use. The 27 most important functions and activity areas of Group I institutions are seen in Table IX.

Not all of these activity areas would be given the same relative ranking or necessarily the same priority by a director at a developing institution, but these have been practically determined by field operations in communities very similar to the developing community college's. By utilizing the priority rankings of the various activity areas the chances of a more successful and smoother developing total community services program would be greatly increased.

C. Recommendations For Further Research and Development

This study has created as many questions as it has answered. Hopefully, other researchers in the future will be first, interested, and second, able to answer some of these questions. Since the need for further research was evident, the statement of a few areas of concern may prove valuable.

This study focused on the southeastern region. Would similar results be found if the region were enlarged to include several regions or even the whole United States?

TABLE IX

MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITY AREAS OF GROUP I INSTITUTIONS, SPRING, 1973

Functions and Activity Areas	Mean Priority
Self-Development Function	
1. Short Courses	4.0
2. GED Preparation Program	4.0
3. Workshops	3.8
4. Community Extension Centers	3.8
5. Programs for Economically Deprived	3.6
6. Evening Classes	3.4
7. Institutes or Conferences	3.4
8. Seminars	3.4
9. Hobby-type Classes	3.4
10. Fine Art Programs	3.2
11. Programs for the Underemployed	3.0
12. Adult Basic Education Programs	3.0
Community Development Function	
1. Information Exchange Center	3.4
2. Joint Committee Work	3.4
3. School Self-Studies	3.4
4. Community Analysis Function	3.4
5. Staff Consultation Function	3.2
6. Community Chest Programs	3.0
7. Advisory Liaison Function	3.0
Program Development Function	
1. Registration Procedures	4.5
2. Program Development	4.3
3. Conference Rooms for Community Use	4.2
4. Campus Tours	4.0
5. Newspapers	4.0
6. Radio	4.0
7. Newsletters	3.6
8. Conference Evaluation	3.3

Source: Community Services Inventory (Appendix C).

The present study dealt with low income, low education, small population communities. What results would emerge when communities of different income, education and population were compared?

The Group I schools were relatively rural in location. Would trends similar to those found in this study develop if "rural" was the only common variable?

The present study has not attempted to measure the influences of the states, board of governors, presidents, directors or deans on program development. How much effect did these factors have as compared to the true community determinants? Also, the communities themselves were not analyzed to any great degree. Could the existence of other educational institutions, several major social service agencies or some other major component have been instrumental in influencing priorities and course development?

One final recommendation was that a scheme be developed so that all community/junior colleges and/or institutes could be grouped by a set of socio-economic criteria. The present study indicated far greater similarity than dissimilarity between Group I schools. If schools were combined into fairly broad but similar groups, this could be the impetus for great advancement in several areas. Schools with specific problems or proposals could team up with similar institutions. Programs that were successful could be realistically shared since the chances of success would be greatly improved. Proposals could be written to cover vast numbers of similar communities, offering time and money savings and greater service to more people. Administrators and faculty would have a network of sister institutions with whom they could share

successes, failures or just ideas. It would be an excellent and effective way to share what was happening with those who could really utilize the information.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Junior Colleges. *An Introduction to American Junior Colleges*. Reprinted from *American Junior Colleges*. Seventh Edition, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

American Association of Junior Colleges. *Community Services Forum*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. Vol. 1, No. 1, January, 1967.

Balster, Robert Eden. "An Exploratory Study of Strategies and Tactics Used to Introduce Planned Innovations in Selected Community Services Programs." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Baskin, Samuel. *University Without Walls*. Interim report to the Union of Experimenting Colleges and Universities, Yellowsprings, Ohio, 1972. Yellowsprings, Ohio: Union of Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1972.

Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H., and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. *The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Bogue, Jesse P. *American Junior Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

Bradley, B. W. "The Junior College Provisions for Adult Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1942.

Brubacher, John S. and Willis, Rudy. *Higher Education in Transition*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Bushnell, David S. *Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Carey, James T. *The Development of the University Evening College: As Observed in Ten Urban Universities*. Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University, 1961.

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

Chamberlain, A. H., ed. *The Lange Book: Collected Writings of a Great Educational Philosopher*. San Francisco, California: Tray Publishing, 1927.

Champion, Dean J. *Basic Statistics for Social Research*. Scranton, Pennsylvania: Chandler Publishing Company, 1970.

Clark, Burton R. *Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1956.

A Compilation of Federal Education Laws. Carl D. Perkins, Chairman. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Crossland, Ronald James. "Role Expectations for Chief Administrators of Community Services Programs in Selected Community Colleges in the United States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Cummiskey, J. Kenneth. "Community Services for the 1970's," *Community Services Forum*, II, No. 1 (January, 1970), 1-5.

Delury, George E., ed. *The World Almanac and Book of Facts.* 1973 edition. New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1972.

Devall, W. B. "Community Colleges: A Dissenting View," *Educational Record*, Spring, 1968, pp. 168-172.

Empire State College. *Interim Report: 1971-72.* Saratoga Springs, New York: Empire State College--SUNY, 1972.

Fields, Ralph C. *The Community College Movement.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Fightmaster, Walter J. *Effective Organization and Administration Practices. Establishing and Expanding a Community Services Program.* Community Services Working Paper, No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Association of Junior Colleges, September, 1969.

Finch, Robert. American Society of Newspaper Editors' luncheon, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1969.

Gier, James Tale. "An Analysis of Community Services Administrative Practices Among Washington Community Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 1971.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. *A New Social Invention, the Community College.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, n.d.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. *Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. *This Is the Community College.* Boston: Houghlin Mifflin Company, 1968.

Gordon, Morton. *Daytime School for Adults: A New Program Dimension at University of California Berkeley.* Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University, 1967.

Graham, R. William. *Instant College*. Boston: Branden Press, 1971.

Griffith, Coleman R. and Blackstone, Hortense. *The Junior College in Illinois*. Urbana: Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Illinois and University of Illinois Press, 1945.

Hankin, Joseph N. "The Door That Never Closes," *Junior College Journal*, XXXXIV (August, 1973), 8-9.

Harlacher, Ervin L. "California Community Renaissance," *Junior College Journal*, XXXVI, No. 25 (October, 1965), 17.

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

Harlacher, Ervin L. "Critical Requirements for the Establishment of Effective Junior College Programs of Community Services." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1965.

Harlacher, Ervin L. "New Directions in Community Services," *Junior College Journal*, XXXVIII (March, 1968), 12-17.

Haygood, Kenneth, ed. *A Live Option: The Future of the Evening College*. Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University, 1965.

Houle, Cyril O., Blackwell, Gordon W., Kallen, Horace M., and Whipple, James B. *The Continuing Task: Reflection on Purpose of Higher Continuing Education*. Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University, 1967.

Jencks, C. and Reisman, D. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Jennings, F. G. "The Two-Year Stretch: Junior Colleges in America," *Change in Higher Education*, March-April, 1970, p. 2.

Johnson, B. Lamar. "Needed: Experimental Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, XXXVI, No. 25 (October, 1965), 17.

Johnson, B. Lamar. *Starting a Community Junior College*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964.

Johnson, B. Lamar. *State Junior Colleges: How Can They Function Efficiently?* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965.

Jones, Bertis L. "The History of Community Development in American Universities With Particular Reference to Four Selected Institutions." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1962.

Kellogg Community College. *Impact Through Community Services.* Battle Creek, Michigan: Kellogg Community Services, 1970.

Kemp, Florence B. and Weldon, J. Eugene. *Noncredit Activities in Institutions of Higher Education, 1967-1968: Professional and Technical Refresher Courses.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Keppel, Francis. "Standards of Excellence," *Junior College Journal,* XXXIV (September, 1963), 8-10.

Knowles, Malcolm S. *The Adult Education Movement in the United States.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Knowles, Malcolm S. *Handbook of Adult Education in the United States.* Chicago, Illinois: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1960.

Knowles, Malcolm S. *The Modern Practice of Adult Education.* New York: Association Press, 1970.

Koos, Leonard V. *The Junior College.* Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, Education Series No. 5, 1924.

Koos, Leonard V. *The Junior College Movement.* Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925.

Lanser, Roland L. "The Community Services of Selected Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1959.

Lynes, R. "How Good Are the Junior Colleges?" *Harpers,* November, 1966, p. 63.

MacKay, Donald William. "Four Challenges of the Junior College," *Junior College Journal,* V (May, 1935), 345.

McDowell, F. M. "The Junior College." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1918.

Medsker, Leland L. *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

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

Moseo, Stanley. *Notes on the Future of Education.* Policy Research Center Report, Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University. Vol. I, Issue 2, January, 1970.

Myran, Gundar A. *Community Services in the Community College.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Myran, Gundar A. *Community Services Perceptions of the National Council on Community Service.* East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1971.

Myran, Gundar A. *First Definitions and Selected Examples of Community Services: An Emerging Challenge for the Community College.* Community Services Working Paper, No. 1, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, n.d.

Myran, Gundar A. "The Structure and Development of Community Service Programs in Selected Community Colleges in the United States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

National Center for Educational Statistics. *Education Directory, 1972-73, Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December, 1972.

National Education Association. *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond High School.* Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, 1964.

National Society for the Study of Education. *The Public Junior College.* The Fifty-fifth Yearbook of National Society for the Study of Education, Part K, Chicago, 1956.

Newman, Frank, et al. *Report on Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971.

Parker, Floyd. "The Community Junior College--Eufant Tarr of American Higher Education. A Bibliography of 225 Doctoral Research Dissertations," *Junior College Journal*, XXXII, No. 4 (December, 1961), 193-204.

Pinizzotto, Samuel John. "A Critical Analysis of the Emerging Programs of Community Colleges of New Jersey." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1971.

President's Commission on Higher Education. "Establishing the Goals: General Education," *Higher Education for American Democracy*, II. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

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

Raines, Max R. *A Community Services Inventory for Community Colleges.* Kellogg Community Services Leadership Program, East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1969.

Reynolds, James W. *An Analysis of Community Service Programs of Junior Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1960.

Reynolds, James W. "Analysis of Community Service Programs of Junior Colleges." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1960.

Reynolds, James W. "Community Services," *The Public Junior College.* Ed., Nelson B. Henry. National Society for the Study of Education, 55th Yearbook, Part II, Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Rue, Robert Nelson. "A Survey and Evaluation of Community Service Programs in Michigan Community Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.

Sheats, Paul H., Jayne, Clarence D. and Spence, Ralph B. *Adult Education.* New York: The Dryden Press, 1953.

Stern, Milton R. *People, Programs, and Persuasions: Some Remarks About Promoting University Adult Education.* Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University, 1961.

Thornton, James W. *The Community Junior College.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Traicoff, George, ed. *1972 Yearbook of the National Council on Community Services: Directory and Program Guide of Community Services in Community and Junior Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: National Council on Community Services, 1972.

Troy, Bill and Sessions, Jim. "Open Door in Appalachia?" *Connexion,* Fall, 1973, pp. 8-9.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1970.* Vol. I, Characteristics of the Population, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1970 General Social and Economic Characteristics.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Vines, Eugene F. "Community Services Programs in Selected Junior Colleges." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960.

Wattenbarger, James L. *A State Plan for Public Junior Colleges.* Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1953.

Willingham, Warren W. *Free Access to Higher Education.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Wimmer, Neal Arvin. "An Analytical Study for the Development of a Model Community Services Program for Community Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1971.

Winston, Chester. "The Self-Perceived and Self-Reported Scope, Quality, and Staffing Patterns of Community Service Programs in 100 Community Colleges in the United States." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1971.

Woodman, Everett M. "Our Message and Our Mandate," *Junior College Journal*, XL (September, 1969), 7.

Ziegler, Jerome M. "Continuing Education in the University," *Daedalus*, XCIII (Fall, 1964), 1166-70.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY SERVICES INFORMATION SHEET

1. Name of college _____
2. Full-time equated enrollment _____
3. Population: County _____ Total service area _____
4. Information concerning Community Services Director:
   a. Age _____
   b. Degrees _____
   c. Previous professional experience _____
   d. Other responsibilities: Yes ___ No ___
      _____
   e. Report to _____
   f. Professional and civic membership:
      _____
      _____
5. Does a community service advisory committee exist? Yes ___ No ___
   _____
   _____
6. What community groups are cooperating with the college in initiating community services programs:
   _____
   _____
7. Total college budget _____
8. Total community services budget _____
9. Total community services personnel _____
   _____
10. Media used in advertising programs _____
    _____
11. How are programs evaluated _____
12. Type of faculty usually employed _____
13. Limiting factors to community services programs _____

APPENDIX B

ACTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Program Name	Date First Offered	Ongoing Yearly Regularity	Average Class Size	Price	Usual Location*	Sponsorship#
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						
16.						
17.						
18.						

*On = on-campus and Of = off-campus.

#1 = with community agency, 2 = with college department, 3 = no cosponsorship

APPENDIX C

EXPANDED VERSION OF MAX RAINES' COMMUNITY SERVICES INVENTORY

Instructions

For each function record in the first column what priority you feel your institution *now* assigns that function and in the second column record what priority you feel your institution *should* assign to that function.

Use a 5 point scale:
1 No priority
2 Low priority
3 Medium priority
4 High priority
5 Extremely high priority

Respondent _____

Expanded Version of Max Raines' Community Services Inventory

I. SELF-DEVELOPMENT FUNCTIONS: THOSE FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE COLLEGE PRIMARILY FOCUSED UPON THE NEEDS, ASPIRATIONS, AND POTENTIALITIES OF INDIVIDUALS TO HELP THEM ACHIEVE A GREATER DEGREE OF PERSONAL SELF-REALIZATION AND FULFILLMENT.

	IS NOW	SHOULD BE
A. Developmental Counseling Function		
1. Aptitude-interest testing		
2. Individual counseling		
3. Career information		
4. Job placement		
5. Family life		
6. Other		
B. Educational Extension Function		
1. Evening classes		
2. TV courses		
3. Weekend college		
4. Community extension centers		
5. Traveling extension centers		
6. Correspondence courses		
7. Other		
C. Educational Expansion Function		
1. Institutes or conferences		
2. Seminars		
3. Short courses		
4. Workshops		
5. Tours		
6. Other		
D. Social Outreach Function		
1. Underemployed		
2. Unemployed		
3. Economically deprived		
4. Welfare recipients		
5. Elderly		
6. Adult Basic Education (ABE)		
7. Other		

	IS NOW	SHOULD BE
E. Cultural Development Function		
1. Performing arts series (music, theater, dance)		
2. Fine art series		
3. Lecture series		
4. Cultural film series		
5. Special festivals		
6. Other		
F. Leisure-Time Activity Function		
1. Sports instruction		
2. Out-door education		
3. Summer youth program		
4. Senior citizen activities		
5. Hobby-type courses		
6. Other		

II. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNCTIONS: THOSE FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE COLLEGE PRIMARILY FOCUSED UPON COOPERATIVE EFFORTS WITH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, AGENCIES, AND INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE THE PHYSICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE COMMUNITY (e.g., housing, transportation, air pollution, human relations, public safety, etc.)

A. Community Analysis Function		
B. Inter-Agency Cooperation Function		
1. Calendar coordination		
2. Information exchange center		
3. Joint committee work		
4. Other		
C. Advisory Liaison Function		
D. Public Forum Function		
1. Public affairs pamphlets		
2. Town meetings		
3. Other		
E. Civic Action Function		
1. Community self-studies		
2. School self-studies		
3. Urban beautification		
4. Community chest drives		
5. Air pollution studies		
6. Open space development activities		

	IS NOW	SHOULD BE
F. Staff Consultation Function		

III. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUNCTIONS: THOSE FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES STAFF DESIGNED TO PROCURE AND ALLOCATE RESOURCES, COORDINATE ACTIVITIES, ESTABLISH OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATE OUTCOMES.

	IS NOW	SHOULD BE
A. Public Information Function		
1. Newsletters		
2. Radio programs		
3. TV programs		
4. Newspapers		
5. Other		
B. Conference Planning Function		
1. Registration procedures		
2. Program development		
3. Conference evaluation		
4. Other		
C. Facility Utilization Function		
1. Campus tours		
2. Centralized scheduling office		
3. Conference rooms		
4. Other		

VITA

Paul Elkin Goldberg was born in Huntsville, Texas, on April 11, 1945. He was educated in the public schools of Nashville, Tennessee, and was graduated from Isaac Litton High School in 1963. The following September he entered Vanderbilt University where he completed his freshman year before transferring to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. He received his B.S. in economics from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, on August 22, 1967. He worked for a year with Owens-Corning Fiberglas in Toledo, Ohio; Memphis, Tennessee; and New Orleans, Louisiana, before returning to U.T. in September of 1968. While working toward an advanced degree he was employed as a graduate teaching assistant, a counselor, and an economist with the Bureau of Mines. He was also secretary of Gamma Theta Upsilon and president of UT Usher Corps. In August, 1971, he received his Master of Science degree in geography.

In September of 1971 he entered the graduate program of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville's College of Education. While in graduate school he was employed as a teaching assistant and research assistant at U.T. and a part-time instructor of geography and Acting Director of Community Services at Roane State Community College. On September 2, 1972, he was married in Monroe, Wisconsin, to the former Joy Lynn Trumpy. On May 1, 1973, he was named Director of Community Services at Roane State Community College. In June, 1974, he received his Doctor of Education degree in Educational Administration and Supervision.