R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 948 JC 670 178

CURRICULUM COORDINATION IN MULTICAMPUS JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS--CASE STUDIES IN COMMUNICATION.

BY- COX, JAMES N.

PUB DATE JUN 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.36 57P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, *MULTICAMPUS DISTRICTS, *COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS, ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, ARTICULATION (PROGRAM), PROGRAM COORDINATION, LONG BEACH, SAN DIEGO, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA,

THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE ON COMMUNICATION IS EXAMINED IN A STUDY OF THREE SYSTEMS--(1) IN THE MULTICOLLEGE LOS ANGELES SYSTEM, RAPID GROWTH FROM ONE INSTITUTION TO SEVEN INDEPENDENT COLLEGES NECESSITATED ESTABLISHMENT OF EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION CHANNELS TO PROMOTE COORDINATION AND ARTICULATION, REDUCE COMPETITION, AND ESTABLISH COMMON BASES FOR OPERATION. (2) IN SAN DIEGO, ONE INSTITUTION IS COMPOSED OF TWO DAY CAMPUSES, CALLED "COLLEGES," AND ONE EVENING COLLEGE WHICH SHARES THE FACILITIES OF THE OTHER TWO. CENTRALIZATION AND DIVERSIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS, CLASSIFICATION OF ROLES OF INDIVIDUAL CAMPUSES, AND ALLOCATION OF PROGRAMS ARE EXAMPLES OF PROBLEM AREAS. (3) IN LONG BEACH, THE COLLEGE IS A SYSTEM OF MANY PROGRAMS WITH A CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION WHICH IS ITSELF A PART OF A UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION. THE ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION IN EACH DISTRICT IS DESCRIBED AND PROCESSES FOR IMPROVING COMMUNICATION ARE OUTLINED. (WO)

CURRICULUM COORDINATION IN MULTICAMPUS JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS

CASE STUDIES IN COMMUNICATION

A Seminar Paper

Presented to

Dr. B. Lamar Johnson

Education 264A

University of California

Los Angeles

by

James N. Cox

June 1966

CONTENTS

I. THE MULTIPLE CAMPUS REVOLUTION 1

II. SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATION THEORY 8

III. THE LOS ANGELES SYSTEM 14

IV. THE SAN DIEGO SYSTEM 21

V. THE LONG BEACH SYSTEM 30

VI. REGIONAL SYSTEMS 38

VII. BUREAUCRATIC AND AUTOMATED SYSTEMS 45

APPENDIX: CALIFORNIA MULTICAMPUS SYSTEMS . . . 53

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 54

BIBLIOGRAPHY 55

CHAPTER I

THE MULTIPLE CAMPUS REVOLUTION

Junior College districts are breaking into two or more campuses where two kinds of bigness exist--bigness in area and bigness in numbers served. Both in Los Angeles and Chicago half a dozen new campuses sprang up in as many years, and St. Louis started with three.

But this is not a phenomenon of the megalopolis only. With a pencil and the 1966 Directory of Junior Colleges one can confirm it everywhere. It comes when urban impact and the commitment of governance combine to spawn enrollments that strain the theoretical functions of the institution.

It seems to have been coming for a long time. The historical development of state and university control in a number of commonwealths, broadly interpreted, would suggest that the junior colleges have been in the vanguard of multi-campus organization.

In a narrow sense, there are now twenty districts with two or more campuses, either operating or on the drawing boards, and in five years there may be another fifty. Half of the current operations are in California, and in the near future some thirty campuses will be involved. Already they enroll nearly 200,000 students--forty per cent of those attending the public junior colleges of the state. In the Appendix may be seen a recapitulation

of these campuses, tabled by district, location, date of organization, and enrollment, and this listing is probably incomplete.

Communication and Control

With this kind of growth and complexity come issues in control. "Communication," says the president of a university with five campuses," will be the greatest single problem that will plague the multiple campus institution."[1] And Jensen, who probed ten multicampus junior college districts across the country, says "channels of communication" need further study.[2]

This paper traces these channels in three of the largest districts of typical types--Long Beach, San Diego, and Los Angeles. It follows the downward flow from the mainsprings of control, and the upward flow from the running parts, but mostly it focuses on horizontal interchange so crucial in educational institutions. To provide focus, it bears mostly on communication in the coordination of curriculum. And to provide a theoretical framework, it draws on the new field

---

[1]Peter Samartino, Multiple Campuses (Rutherford, New Jersey, 1964), p. 28.

[2]Arthur Milton Jensen, "An Investigation of the Administration of Junior College Districts with Multicampuses." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1965), p. 166.

of systems and communication theory and on sociological studies of bureaucracy. Communication is taken, not in the narrow sense of media, but in the broader sense of organic function, which is bound up with structure.

Jensen classifies multicampus junior college structure into three groups--multicollege, multibranch, and multiprogram. The multicollege district, like that in Los Angeles, operates individual comprehensive campuses, each with its own president, its own catalog, its own admissions office, its own evening division, its own accreditation, and exclusive use of its own facilities. It so happens that, as of now, Los Angeles also lives with the mixed blessing of offering only graded courses. Here the impulse is toward coordination.

The multibranch system, exemplified by the San Diego Colleges, operates comprehensive campuses but with greater centralized control. They share one president, one catalog, one accreditation, and one central admissions and records office, and the Evening College, administered as a campus, utilizes all available facilities. Here the impulse is centrifugal.

The multiprogram system, one legal entity, operates campuses that are differentiated by the type of educational program they offer. Long Beach City College, for example, has a Liberal Arts Campus, a Business and Technology Campus,

and various adult centers. Here there has been a recoil from decentralization, and the impulse is centripetal.

And yet, all three of these districts have much in common. All are integral parts of, or administered in connection with, a huge unified district, with all the attendant entanglements and frustrations. All are in urban centers, close to other junior college districts. All imply complexity, problems in communication, and a need for close coordination of curriculum, both internally and externally. All have developed channels of communication. They have not developed these channels, really, except in a relative degree. To a great extent they happened, and they are still happening.

Horizontal Communication

Organizational structure conditions the happening of communication. The ideal structure is never really known, and even if it were, the drift of circumstances would undermine it. There are good systems and bad systems, but only the will and purpose of people make any system work.

No structure favors horizontal interchange, and it stirs a special interest. As Redfield says, "Some of the most persistent and acute problems of administration, especially in large or decentralized organizations, stem from deficiencies in horizontal communication--still a

relatively unexplored field."[3]

Interchange throws down various challenges, depending upon structure. One kind of problem is created when there is an imbalance of integral parts, as when subordinate operations are way out of parallel in size and function, as will be seen in Long Beach. Another kind of problem develops when functions are decentralized on a sliding scale, as will be seen in San Diego. Still another kind of problem develops when aggressive subsystems are baffled by the bureaucratic dead weight of parent systems, as will be seen in the relationships of all three of these institutions with giant school systems.

Prevailing opinion favors campus autonomy, and the trend is in this direction. New multicampus districts like those at Foothill, San Mateo, and Orange Coast are following it, and those built on other patterns, as in San Diego, Phoenix, and St. Louis, are finding ways to shift toward it. This reflex will be seen close-up in San Diego.

But all problems in communication are not solved when autonomy is achieved. Those systems that began with it seek ways to get together. Los Angeles has worked out a

---

[3]Charles E. Redfield, Communication in Management (Chicago, 1958), p. 25.

kind of federal system among institutions both autonomous and dispersed. And it is significant that, in terms of recency, the only real innovation found among the systems studied lies not in district-wide coordination so much as in regional cooperation among unrelated junior colleges and with the transfer institutions. Here only common need brings them together.

Unmanifest Destiny

It has been a sly thing in higher education. A college president "who is very active in national academic matters" is reported to have been utterly blind to its magnitude.[4] Practically nothing has been published on the subject, and only three years ago a query to the Office of Education in Washington got back a shrug of ignorance and a plea for help.[5]

But today one out of every four students in colleges of all types go to multiple campus institutions. A pioneer survey, among four-year institutions, by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, ferreted out 69 such institutions. Of these, 56 operated half a dozen or more. "Most of the larger institutions, both public and private," Sammartino says, "have more than one campus...."[6]

---

[4]Samartino, p. ix.
[5]Ibid., p. 106.
[6]Ibid., p. ix.

There are some curious features. Pasadena City College is among the first of junior colleges to give credit for summer courses offered abroad. Little St. John's College at Annapolis, Maryland, has a second campus at Santa Fe, New Mexico, in a different accrediting area. The Middle States Association sends teams junketing across the Atlantic to evaluate campuses of the University of Maryland scattered all over Europe. In fact, one can no longer be sure that an institution will stay put. The floating campus of Chapman College plies the seven seas, and the imagination is fired to anticipate branches in orbit or on the moon. Problems of communication may take on entirely new dimensions.

There is nothing new in the fact that abrupt or radical change precipitates a crisis in communication. It happens in science, in government, in society, and even in the family. Systems and communication theory, like psychology and semantics, can yield insights into some of the forces at play.

CHAPTER II

SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATION THEORY

Communication is the nervous system of any organization. Apply a rubber hammer to the patella tendon, and there should be a reflex action. If there is not, something is wrong, and ultimately it will correct itself or extinction will set it.

Systems and Information Transfer

That word system is one of the most "in" words around. In their search for a fundamental construct, theorists in diverse fields--cybernetics, physical and behavioral science, interpersonal and mass communication--all share it. As one of them says:

> General systems theory is a series of related definitions, assumptions, and postulates about all levels of systems from atomic particles through atoms, molecules, crystals, viruses, cells, organs, individuals, small groups, societies, plants, solar systems, and galaxies.... The predominant emphasis of the biological sciences is energy transfer, whereas that of the social sciences is information transfer. The social sciences deal chiefly with verbal or symbolic behavior. Information theory abets the union of the natural and the social sciences....[7]

Other "in" words, all springing from cybernetics, are input, output, feedback, and coding. In psychology, for example, the organism becomes a system, stimulus becomes input, and response becomes output. Input and output may be either coded or uncoded. Information transfer is always

---

[7]James G. Miller, "Toward a General Theory for the Behavioral Sciences," The American Psychologist, X (1955), p. 514.

coded because one system is inextricable with another as in imprinting, conditioning, learning, and communication.

In communication theory, circles of experience are thought of as systems, and gesture and language as codes for the transfer of information from one circle or system to another. The transmitter encodes information in one circle and the receiver decodes it in another. Schramm says:

> If an African tribesman has never seen or heard an airplane, he can only decode the sight of a plane in terms of whatever experience he has had. The plane may seem to him to be a bird, and the aviator a god borne on wings. If the circles have a large area in common, then communication is easy. If the circles do not meet--if there is no common experience--then communication is impossible.[8]

When one system communicates with another it is trying to find the common ground in information, ideas, and attitudes.

In this concept, campuses, branches, departments, associations, senates, committees, factions, central offices--all these are systems. Each has a structure made up of parts held together by forces of interaction and interdependence, much like an organism or a society. Each has a boundary, however intricate and fluid, and strives to maintain itself and to resist disintegration. Each tends to

---

[8]"How Communication Works," in The Process and Effects of Communication, ed. Wilbur Schramm (Urbana, Illinois, 1960), p. 6.

actualize its potentialities, always toward greater differentiation, specialization, and power. Each functions through coded information. In these, as in all social groups, the ultimate subsystem is the individual.

They all work much like a computer. They scan the field for relevant information, define their problems, assess their resources, calculate their most rewarding course of action, and check feedback to see if they are on the right track. In this same way an individual searches his communication environment like e index of a book, choosing cues of significance to him. In a faculty meeting he may listen at a low level of attention until a word or phrase alerts him as a cue, and he may then throw a meaningful glance at a colleague with whom he shares a circle of experience.

Self-guidance Mechanisms

Hulett has developed a communication model embodying the concept of "covert rehearsal." In this view, an individual gauges the effect of a statement by rehearsing it in his own mind before expressing it, while groups caucus to seek consensus and to plan strategy and negotiation.[9]

How communication theory applies to complex organization is summarized by Smith:

---

[9]J. Edward Hulett, "A Symbolic Interactionist Model of Mass Communication--Part One," AV Communication Review, XIV (1966).

> We could classify the different ways people communicate with each other by simply noting the different types of feedback that are used in communication systems. In the simplest system of organizing lines of communication, there is never more than one way of going from one person to another. There is just one line that connects John and Mary....But as seen as the schema becomes more complicated, closed circuits make their appearance. The presence of such loops in the schema of a servo-mechanism is quite fundamental....[10]

Many concrete examples of non-mechanical self-guidance systems can be given. When the success of an advanced electronics course depends upon the enrollment in a prerequisite, which depends upon the number who pass a mathematics course, which depends upon the success of Electronics in promoting its program, then there is a loop.

"The circulation of money in the market," Smith says, "or the movement of impulses in a neural network is a self-regulatory system. It is a fundamental principle of cybernetics in our time that goal-directed organization requires such a closed circuit. It depends on such feedback."[11]

Self-regulatory systems are of two types. In the first, the goal is clear, and only negative feedback is significant. In the second, the goal is <u>not</u> clear, and positive as well as negative stimulus operates. In the latter type there

---

[10] Alfred G. Smith, <u>Communication and Status</u> (Eugene, Oregon, 1966), p. 34.
[11] Ibid.

lurks a danger, for systems responding to an uninterrupted flow of positive feedback can go beserk like tyrants and cancerous cells.

The Common Ground

Those who object to communication theory as a mere coincidence of terms may be on solid ground. It is an old principle of logic that analogy may illustrate but never prove a point. But it is also true that science uses analogy in the form of constructs to reduce data to a form by which points can be proved. And the results of research based on the premises of systems theory are bearing promising results in a wide variety of fields.

The semanticists have shown that analogy is the only way by which the mind can extend itself in verbal thinking. Seismography and encephalography, for example, extend the concepts of "wave" and "writing." If those who object to systems formulation examine their thought processes they may find that they are actually thinking by other analogies for which the investigators have been able to find no evidence whatsoever. If they believe, for example, that morale depends communication, they believe in something no one has been able to verify. If they believe that social communication enhances business communication, they believe in something about which there are grave doubts. Men may

be friends on the golf course, brothers in their lodge, disputants in politics or religion, and cut-throat competitors in business.

So, for all the jargon, communication theory can give insights to the administrator concerned with control, which <u>does</u> depend on communication. The shrewd communicator knows how to weight his cues, time his "stroking," and read feedback. The <u>sincere</u> communicator goes further. He seeks the common ground so far as it exists. He thus goes out of his own circle of experience, his own semantic trap, and this is the ultimate in recognition. As suggested before, the often-heard idea that morale depends upon communication is only a half-truth. The reverse is equally true: communication depends upon morale. Actually, they both depend upon a sense of working together toward common ends. The words of Edwin Markham come to mind:

> He drew a circle to shut me out--
> Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout.
> But God and I had the wit to win:
> We drew a circle that took him in.

CHAPTER III

THE LOS ANGELES SYSTEM

It is said that the attenuated neuromusculature of the dinosaur evolved a secondary brain at the base of the spine. This was a kind of nervous booster, and it served much the same purpose as the fireman at the back of a ladder wagon; it steered the rear end around corners.

The Value of X

In-migration, the population explosion, and the flood tide of interest in higher education brought about a metamorphosis in the Los Angeles Junior College system. City College had been the largest institution of its kind for sixteen years when, in 1945, a second campus was founded, and five years after that the district had seven autonomous colleges, each an aggressive new system in its own right.

Now the district serves three and a half million people blanketing an area of 882 square miles--twice that of the sprawling city of Los Angeles. It appropriates annual budget funds in the neighborhood of $60 million, it employs some 1300 full-time certificated personnel, and it enrolls some 70,000 students.

With the proliferation of institutions came a proliferation of courses, curricula, requirements, standards, policies, deadlines, and regulations. Residents

of the district could move freely from one campus system to another, and yet they were harassed by inconsistencies. The instructional and administrative staffs were duplicating the efforts of one another and the mistakes of one another. Inter-system, horizontal communication was missing.

The need for coordination was obvious. The problem was how to achieve it without undermining autonomous campus systems in things that really mattered. It was a problem that could be stated as an equation. If X coordination equals the value of uniformity minus the value of autonomy, find X.

By 1955 the deans of instruction were earnestly grappling with this question in the area of curriculum. Two years later they were still working on it, but a great deal had been accomplished by finding the common ground. With the aid of department dhairmen and their subject matter specialists, they had reviewed all the courses offered in the seven colleges. They had classified courses under subject matter headings. They had devised cataloging principles and had assigned uniform numbers, titles, and unit values. Circles of experience had been made to overlap, and the proper place of subsystems had been defined. Trade Technical College, because of its specialized nature, was given the greatest measure of freedom in curriculum.

The same sort of thing had happened in other areas of administration as channels of communication were blazed. Now the presidents meet with the assistant superintendent and other central office personnel every two weeks. In similar fashion, the deans of admissions, students, educational services, and evening division gather periodically with staff and resource personnel to explore common problems and to make common recommendations to the council of presidents.

Department chairmen in the same or interdisciplinary fields come together to find the common ground for course content, new programs, and equipment needs. Plans for new facilities originate with building committees made up of subject matter specialists from the faculties who are concerned, and in the same way the needs of new campus systems are projected. For some time the chairmen of the faculty associations have met regularly with the assistant superintendent and sometimes with the council of presidents, and more recently a district faculty council, a suprasystem of the various academic senates, has developed to formalize the relationship.

In the past, inter-system tension strained among the campuses, and while there are old-timers who still nurse their wounds, vertical and horizontal communication have

resolved the dangerous aspects of these conflicts and the distant sound of old battles now echoes in humor. Now the greatest tension battens between the fat-cat establishment and the newly independent, lean and hungry faculty voice. In any tension situation among systems the disorder may be organic, inherent in structure, and again it may be functional, which implies a lag in volition. The promise in the colleges is that it is functional--merely a nervous tic that will disappear as the system adjusts itself to these newly aggressive but not unaccustomed stimuli.

The same thing cannot be said for relationships with the Los Angeles city school system. Here the tension is inherent in structure. There are two legal entities in this system--the junior college district and the unified district--but they are governed by the same board of education and administered by the same superintendent. In addition to the colleges, this empire embraced 28 adult schools, 126 secondary schools, and 438 elementary schools.

The junior college central office consists of an assistant superintendent and three administrative aides, but both laterally and vertically it is entangled with a bureaucratic superstructure of staggering proportions. So the colleges share many of the same problems that hamper

those which are integral parts of unified and high school districts, and the sheer magnitude and complexity of it all aggravate the underlying problem. The boundaries of systems are confused, and feedback is distorted and distended. Circles of experience do not overlap, and communication is feeble. The agenda of academic senates and the negotiating council for the junior college district reflect the inevitable tensions.

Guidelines and Pipelines

For a decade now, Los Angeles has depended upon the district-wide curriculum coordinating committee made up of deans of instruction and an executive secretary. This committee constitutes the curricular nerve center for the colleges with their respective departments and subject matter specialists. It has been responsive to the thrusts of other systems, including those of students, communities, and faculties. At the same time it has discouraged the duplication of curricula, deterred the proliferation of courses, assured consistency in course content and cataloging, and facilitated articulation with transfer institutions. It has sought the common ground. Still, it has its faults. It is still looking for the absolute value of X.

The College Curriculum Coordinator maintains an office in the Division of Instructional Services of the Los Angeles

Schools, where he formalizes the outcomes of communication both internal and external, vertical and horizontal. He negotiates articulation agreements with the transfer institutions, issues equivalency bulletins, publishes the annual annotated catalog of uniform course numbers and titles, makes annual reports on numbers and revisions of courses and curricula, does studies of current interest, and puts out change notices for operating publications. In this way information flows to campuses, offices, administrators, department chairmen, counselors, and students. And as its current interest lapses, it becomes a historical record.

New courses and curricula go through campus curriculum committees, councils of department chairman, or ad hoc conference groups as conflicts of interest come into play. In the past the curriculum committees have been under administrative control but may now pass to senate control. In any case, all curricular proposals must be approved by the CCCC and the council of presidents. The deans of instruction receive the proposals in structured written form, prepared by one of their number, so that they can caucus with the appropriate faculty personnel. These proposals may originate with instructors, department chairmen, administrators, or representatives of business, industry, or professions.

What are the guidelines for approving a course or curriculum? Investigation should show that a need exists and that there will be no duplication or undue competition with existing offerings. It should also give consideration to the availability of competent staff, to their placement, salary, and promotional opportunities. It should determine the expense of initiating the program, the type of student desired, the amount of equipment required, and to the past experience of the district in these and related matters. In other words, the feedback from all sources must be measured.

CHAPTER IV

THE SAN DIEGO SYSTEM

Systems tend to actualize themselves. In Los Angeles the problem has been to unite them; in San Diego it has been just the reverse.

Systems on Paper

The San Diego Junior Colleges, as their common catalog calls them, are actually organized on a tripartite multibranch basis, and elsewhere the same catalog speaks of them as "operating divisions." Legally a single institution, they include City, Mesa, and the Evening College. The latter is a "paper" college which uses the facilities of the other two branches and local high schools. However, it has its own budget and seems to effect some fiscal advantages that have attracted other districts like San Mateo, Orange Coast, Foothill, and San Jose.

The Evening College, which is responsible for the overlapping adult education program, makes a good vantage point from which to get a perspective of the entire junior college organization. Most of the graded courses in this program are offered on the two campuses of City and Mesa. These two

campuses are each under the jurisdiction of a president who reports to Charles W. Patrick, who is president of all three branches. The evening courses are under a director who is co-equal with the presidents of the two day campuses and who also reports directly to Mr. Patrick.

On paper this organization might raise some eyebrows, but it makes more sense when it is realized that as of Fall 1965 the Evening College offered roughly a third of the degree programs and roughly a third of the certificate programs. And it enrolled, in terms of sheer head count, about twice as many students as either day campus, counting adult education courses. All this can be tabulated as follows:

	Degree Programs	Certificate Programs	Total Enrollment
City	53	41	3400
Mesa	27	16	4900
Evening	30	26	8000
TOTALS	110	83	16,300

These programs respond to a wide variety of student and community needs. They offer courses that range from as little as eight hours of training to preprofessional curricula that take more than two years to complete. San Diego thrives a rapidly growing and changing urban area, still oriented largely toward the harbor, the navy, and public service. And in recent years ungraded classes have been on

the increase--in rocket propulsion, quality control and reliability, ship-building, and structural steel fabrication.

With the growth of urbanization, wealth, and humanitarian values has come a growth in hospital and psychiatric facilities, and MDTA funds have aided in the development of crash programs of specialized training for aides, orderlies, and technicians. Still other adult education is spurred by the flowering of the tourist trade and the boom in real estate.

Systems in Action

At the same time, however, the shift in day majors toward lower division transfer credit is dramatic, and nowhere is this more apparent than in the significant investment represented by the Mesa campus. This new college serves an affluent bedroom of the San Diego economy. As a system, it occupies the most fortuitous and aggressive position, and it threatens to usurp the most status-conscious enrollment.

The inter-personal relations among the personnel of the two day campuses continues warm and cordial. They know each other, they work together on a daily basis, they are only ten minutes apart, and they might switch jobs at any time. They have their own system. But rivalry and tension between the two day campuses as systems--one old and cramped, the other young and expansive--is inevitable. In

each campus can be seen the need to promote its own efficiency, even at the cost of the other.

For a time there was alarm that Mesa would take over the transfer function and that the old campus would be left with the vocational function, destroying the comprehensive nature of the two campuses. But by administrative decree at the highest levels, vocational training programs have been reshuffled in a first step toward equilibrium. In this there is an object lesson for all administration. Systems cannot always be left to work out there own salvation, for each is confined by its own continuum and each is victim to forces peculiar to itself.

Current executive theory defines educational administration as making existing structures function efficiently, and educational leadership as altering existing structures to achieve some broader objective. Communication theory would express the same idea in terms of systems seen in the widest sense.

Communication Problems

Admissions provides another perspective of the San Diego system. Here problems in communication became acute as circles of experience diverged. At first, admissions, registration, and testing were centralized, that is, centered on the old campus. But, more and more, centrifugal force

has thrown these functions out to the individual colleges, and the process was urged on by the criticisms of an accreditation team.

What this really means is that the Mesa campus, which is physically separate, has gained greater autonomy. It now receives its own applications, conducts its own registration, and does its own testing. It now gives the English Cooperative in addition to the SCAT, while City gives the Purdue. Last fall it set its own registration dates for the first time, reducing the time to three weeks, while City clung to a much more extended period.

In theory, the Evening College is following the same course, but in fact, it struggles with only two clerks, and despite its much lighter testing program, it depends to a great extent upon the classified cadre on the City campus.

The strength of this system lies in the truly remarkable extent to which it has kept the channels of informal communication open despite precipitate growth. As a result, there is a high level of morale. But problems in routine, procedural communication remain to plague everyone. Reams of paper work travel between the campuses on an almost daily basis.

The permanent academic records are kept in the central

registrar's office; but transcripts, petitions, and counseling records are in the student's folder on the individual campus. Each campus has its own committee on admission, probation, and dismissal; but permits to enroll are issued by the registrar's office. In Los Angeles, where all records are decentralized, a student disqualified from one campus can sneak into another. This could not happen in San Diego. But there are times when records are available to no one; they are in transit somewhere or being sorted.

Two developments can be predicted. First, everyone not responsible to a campus president will remove to another location at 835 12th Street in San Diego, presently a career, retraining, and MDTA center. Second, the division of responsibilities in the general area of admissions and guidance will be dictated by data processing. Plans anticipate linking a modest computer center with the vast resources of San Diego industry for storage and retrieval, and in time inquiry stations, data display, and remote print-out will replace the truck and the telephone.

Horizontal Communication

Curriculum coordination in San Diego also lays great stress on informal communication, and here, where dependence on detailed records is not urgent, the freedom of horizontal

interchange gives vitality to the vertical communication. Redfield says:

> Great size and specialization cut down the opportunities for cross-talk while they increase the need for it....Wherever there is a need for co-ordinated group effort, there is a concomitant need for horizontal communication.[12]

In San Diego an elaborate structure of committees has been developed to preserve the opportunity for cross-talk, to bring bits of information and experience together from a wide spectrum of sources, and to put curricular proposals into the broadest kind of organizational perspective.

A flew chart diagramming upward movement in this system would show an idea originating with a department in one of the three colleges, often at the suggestion of one of a hundred advisory committees. This idea might involve a new course or curriculum, a revision, a deletion, or merely a change in textbook. It would first be evaluated by one of nine standing committees of coordinators or joint department chairmen. Each of these committees represents all three campuses and its chairmanship rotates every year. Effective in the fall of 1966, there will be campus curriculum committees chaired by the appropriate dean of instruction.

---

[12]Op. cit., p. 243.

Next, the idea would go to the Instructional Review Committee, presented by the dean of the division affected. Here sit the deans of arts and sciences, the deans and the director of vocational education, and the chairmen of the senate committees on academic affairs. The Director of the Evening College is chairman, and the presidents of the colleges and the academic senates are ex-officio members. This committee makes recommendations on study load limits, auditing, credit evaluation, final examinations, college catalogs, and accreditation policies as well as curriculum and instructional materials.

Next, the idea would go to the Junior College Council. In addition to the ranking administrators of the three campuses, this sizable body of over thirty members includes the joint department chairmen and nearly a score of senate leaders. Even so, it alternates biweekly meetings between the City and Mesa campuses. Of course, final approval comes from the Operations Council - composed of associate and assistant superintendants of the San Diego Schools and the superintendent - and ultimately the board of education.

The most striking feature of this system inheres in the heavy faculty representation at every echelon of conference. And this representation does not find its base merely in subject matter specialization only. A score of

the seats in the Junior College Council are held by presidents, immediate past presidents, and presidents-elect of the campus senates for each semester of the college year! The tangible overlap of subsystems, at least for conference and for clearance and review, astonish the casual visitor. He sees a theater in the round, with no curtains, and yet he knows that somewhere all the actors in the piece are subject to feedback from their critics.

Studies have shown that the optimum size for conference groups devoted to the solving of problems does not exceed a dozen members. Hence the common use of committees who make recommendations. But broad participation does yield a sense of working together toward common goals.

CHAPTER V

THE LONG BEACH SYSTEM

Long Beach City College is one of the largest and most versatile community institutions in the world. It enrolls 25,000 students annually, and thousands more attend its many lectures, forums, workshops, and other programs. Its catalog, which lists some 900 course titles, is deceptively compact, for many of these courses convert from one numbering band to another, and many community service classes are not cataloged at all.

A Tiger by the Tail

The clientele fall into many groups: enrolled and non-enrolled, classified and unclassified, day and evening, regular, limited, and special. They pour into the Liberal Arts campus, the Business and Technical campus, and some forty other locations in the unified district, from 7:00 in the morning to 10:00 at night, nearly the year around.

But this is a system of programs rather than campuses, and the trend has been away from local autonomy and toward recentralization. It has moved from a divisional organization to a one-college concept. The adult services so overshadow the graded-course function in volume that the Liberal Arts core has acted like a magnet to prevent disintegration. When the Business and Technical campus tried to

move toward a comprehensive program, it was cut back. Conditions did not make feasible an expansion of its facilities and a broadening of its faculty.

Furthermore, agitation by the regular faculty demanded a check on the number and salaries of administrators. Now one dean of instruction is charged with the entire instructional spectrum. Five assistant deans administer evening subdivisions--those centered at Millikan and West High Schools, Lakewood and Jordan High Schools, the Liberal Arts campus, the Business and Technical campus, and the forums throughout the system. The administrator of engineering and technical education is an associate dean.

One dean of admissions serves the whole system. He directs a centralized registration for matriculated students and classroom enrollment for ungraded courses. Intercampus transfer forms authorize students to move among the day campuses and the West Adult Center and may limit the number of units he can carry and specify the non-resident tuition he must pay. The problems in communication are similar to those in San Diego.

There is more. Administrators move from one campus to another according to the day of the week and the morning or afternoon. A complicated schedule indicates the person in charge at any one campus at any one time. When

they are in their office on one campus, they spend much of their time on the telephone to offices on other campuses. Conferences occur at various locations.

Changes in courses and curricula usually originate with one of nine departments or divisions--Business, Communications, Creative Arts, History and Social Science, Home and Family Living, Mathematics and Science, Nursing, Physical Education, and Technology. If the dean of instruction approves a proposal, he takes it to the college curriculum committee. This group consists of thirty members representing four segments. From the college administration come the dean of instruction, the dean of admissions, and the dean of engineering and vocational education. From the district level come the assistant superintendent for instruction and the director of curriculum. From the lay public come two advisory members nominated by the dean of instruction and approved by the district superintendent. From the faculty come ten department heads, including the chairman of library and audiovisual services, and one instructor appointed by each division, so that 20 out of the 30 members of this committee are faculty.

But course additions and deletions must be approved by the all-district curriculum committee, which has five representatives each from the elementary, junior high,

senior high, and college levels. It meets only four times a year, and the college contingent of two deans, two faculty members, and one lay person constitutes a small minority. The one-college concept is embraced by the one-district concept.

An Elephant's Ears

Every organization has an upper limit of size, and this is mandated by the efficiency of its systems relative to its environment. An animal cannot get so big that its legs are crushed by its own weight, but usually the problems are problems of communication. The largest elephant has ears five feet long and four feet wide, and yet it is nearly deaf. Big unified districts that embrace big junior college systems are, like that elephant, hard of hearing, especially when it comes to the budget.

The success of any system of communication hinges on two limiting factors--the volume of traffic and the efficiency of the coding and decoding processes. As in a telephone network, the first limiting factor has to do with the time it takes to get a message through, and it may fail to get through at all. The second limiting factor has to do with the symbols used. There have to be parties at both ends who speak the same language.

For these reasons, certain organization features are prized by most administrators. A master plan embodying

these would frame an independent district. Its central office would be disassociated from parallel campuses. It would coordinate instruction, business affairs, vocational education, and some aspects of community services and research. But each campus would be autonomous, each would offer a comprehensive program, and its chief administrator would outrank all staff-function personnel. He would report directly to the district superintendent.

If one looks at these criteria, he will see that in every case they assume the principle of self-guidance systems. It is when structural relationships confuse the boundaries of systems and impede the flow of local feedback that the most serious problems in communication and morale develop. But none of the three districts surveyed by this paper conform to the ideal pattern. None have chief administrators who outrank the heads of staff-function personnel. None are independent districts. Two have central offices associated with a particular campus. Only one has autonomous colleges. All are plagued by encumbrances with unified districts. In every case there is dissatisfaction with the organization, and the dissatisfaction is greatest in Long Beach, if faculty activism is any measure.

Systems and People

From this activism came the initial leadership which

organized the California Junior College Faculty Association. Its pamphlet entitled "The Case for Independent Junior College Districts" was edited by two Long Beach City College faculty members and its four-member ad hoc Committee on Publication included two other members of the same faculty.

Says the pamphlet:

> ...the college curriculum in a unified district is not set by college personnel only. Curriculum proposals characteristically must go "downtown" to the central administrator in charge of the district curriculum. Although his background and that of his staff may be--and probably is--in elementary and secondary education, he must make decisions and judgments concerning whether or not the inductive approach to short-story analysis is important enough to authorize the adoption of a supplementary text for English 1B. Inevitably, his decisions are either arbitrary or they are simply ratifications of what has, in effect, been decided by the only people who really understand the problem--members of the college staff. If the decisions of such a central administrator are arbitrary, they are obviously indefensible; if he merely rubber-stamps decisions actually made on the college level, he is, to be sure, doing less damage. But he is certainly rendering inefficient the development of the college curriculum....[14]

Of course, organization charts never tell the whole story. There are personalities, traditions, attitudes, rivalries, physical distances, and all the intangible aspects of informal organization. There are legal and

---

[14]The Case for Independent Junior College Districts (Calif. JC Fac. Assn., P.O. Box 8282, Long Beach, Calif., March, 1965), p. 10.

budgetary considerations, community forces, "bootlegging," and the vested interests of faculty and administrative personnel who "have to be taken care of." Anyone familiar with military organization knows how futile orders are that ignore the local situation. Only the common sense of local commanders make the system work.

In his study of junior college organization, Jensen found a hidden thrust toward greater campus autonomy. This appears to be evolutionary, for the older the district, the greater the degree of actual freedom on the individual campus, regardless of formal structure. It is seen, however, that Long Beach gainsays this model. Forces peculiar to itself have moved it in another direction and yet these forces are not unique. They are inherent in any organization. Writing about universities, Samartino says:

> One might almost say there are as many administrative patterns as there are multiple campuses. The administration really depends upon the men and women who are serving the college. If all is working well, they will divide the problems among themselves under the leadership of the president. Once the pattern is set, everyone has to know how he fits into the general order of things.[15]

Systems theory explains this kind of adaptation in terms of strains among systems and their environment that bring them to a point of equilibrium. So it is in Long

---

[15]Op. Cit., p. 115.

Beach. The faculty is restive and the administration overworked, but the residents of the community continue to enjoy excellent services.

It is ironic that psychology, which began with the study of man, came close to making him a machine with no purpose or will, while cybernetics, which began with the study of machines, goes far toward restoring his dignity as a unique and creative being. Cybernetics does not say that man is a machine. It says that he has and uses a machine. He has and uses many machines.

CHAPTER VI

REGIONAL SYSTEMS

Systems can be fleet in growth and sluggard in refinement.

There is a species of the whale that is eighteen feet long before it cuts its first tooth. Such organic predispositions govern social as well as living organizations.

Regional Cooperation

The San Diego Colleges participate in a complex of secondary and higher education in their own district and in the county. The high schools of the unified district--190 square miles in area, the second largest in California in terms of enrollment--serve more than 20,000 students. And roughly a third of the graduates gravitate toward the local junior colleges.

Articulation with the secondary schools is conventional. But ties with other junior colleges in the county set a pace for regional curriculum coordination and cut the pattern for the kind of group articulation with state colleges being promoted by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

It is feasible that, with this sort of development, loosely knit federations of community colleges could work out articulation somewhat on the formal model evolved by

the half dozen colleges of the Los Angeles district. The detailed paper work could be done either by a division of labor among the participating colleges or by the sharing of a part-time executive secretary.

Two trends mark the need for standardization in course control and description--the quarter system and automation. The future sway of automation is uncertain, but two aspects of it have become relatively clear: it dictates data reduction in all respects and it adds a powerful new thrust to legal and economic forces already impelling organization toward bigness and standardization. It can be expected, therefore, that in the intermediate stages there will be a swing toward regional and segmental uniformity.

In all likelihood these intermediate adjustments will be too laggard to head off the monolithic absorption of all by state-wide coding. It will be like the efforts of the states to amend the federal constitution to control child labor, efforts made an anachronism by the rapid growth of labor unions.

In any case, the individual junior college can profit from regional cooperation in curriculum coordination and articulation. In any given area there should be a rationale for the offering of expensive technical-vocational training. And while the number of students needing better

advisement for transfer to small four-year institutions may be few in any one junior college, the number of such students in a region bulk large.

In San Diego County there are a dozen institutions of higher education, and most of these cluster within a radius of about fifteen miles. They include San Diego State College, California Western University, the University of California, the University of San Diego, and four junior colleges other than those in San Diego proper: Mira Costa, Palomar, Grossmont and Southwestern. Altogether the junior colleges of the county enroll some 30,000 students.

The superintendents or presidents of the seven junior colleges meet on the first Monday of every month to explore their common problems, pool their resources, and coordinate their efforts. As a result of these conferences, Grossmont and Palomar offer Registered Nursing, and Mira Costa joined San Diego in giving Vocational Nursing. Data Processing went to Southwestern and San Diego, and Police Science to Grossmont and San Diego. Inter-district permits make such programs available to all. Only San Diego will maintain an expensive machine shop and radio station. The clientele of the latter exceed that of some commercial operations.

Of course, this inter-district coordination is not

unique. Monterey, Hartnell, and Cabrillo Colleges not only allocate expensive curricula among their campuses; they also cooperate in providing bus transportation.

Articulation Committees

In San Diego there is also a county-wide transfer articulation conference that meets once or twice a semester. The steering committee is made up of the presidents and senate leaders of the participating institutions and the junior college coordinator of San Diego State College, who presides. Department chairmen from the state college meet with subject matter groups. Such is the value of these conferences that a representative from Imperial Valley College, a hundred miles away, also attends.

In the same fashion Long Beach City College participates in a regional conference centered principally in Orange County and hosted by California State at Fullerton. The other junior colleges taking part are Fullerton, Santa Ana, Orange Coast, Mount San Antonio, Rio Hondo, Cerritos, and Citrus. The dean of admissions of the state college is chairman, and minutes distributed to the participatants record and formalize the agreements. Among these are a promise that the state college will do something the Coordinating Council has left to its own discretion--honor the General Education stamp. According to Dr. Sidney

. Brossman, of the Coordinating Council staff similar committees have geen established in "Los Angeles, Fresno, Sacramento, Redding, East Los Angeles-San Bernardino-Riverside Counties, and Humboldt County and have been operating with good success."[13]

Course Control in Los Angeles

Much of what follows extends to 1965 a study made by the author of this paper as an employee of the Los Angeles District in 1963. The data came from reports and publications prepared by William N. Kepley, for many years curriculum coordinator for the junior college district. Among these publications are eight editions of the Uniform Course Numbering Catalog (the UCN), annual reports of changes in courses and curricula, and the munutes of the College Curriculum Coordinating Committee (the CCCC).

It is a startling fact that the current edition of the UCN lists 3000 courses. Half of these, however, are not courses in the usual sense of the word. They are special offerings at Trade Tech College, where the student enrolls in a "block" of subject matter rather than in individually scheduled classes, and the courses on his transcript are only descriptive of the many vocational

---

[13] Minutes of CJCA Spring Conference, April 4 and 5, First Workshop Section, Section 4.

skills in which he receives training.

In the eight editions of the UCN that have appeared since 1957, standard courses have inched from 1274 to 1348--6 per cent. During the same period, day enrollment in the district has swelled from 19,400 to 27,000--44 per cent. It is difficult to arrive at meaningful student-course ratios among districts because of the admixture of graded, ungraded and vocational courses and enrollments. But in the Los Angeles District the ratio of day students to standard courses is 20 to 1. The ratio of day-and-evening enrollment to standard courses is 48 to 1. Similar ratios for other districts will be found to range from 10-to-1 to 30-to-1. It is clear that, because of the many standard offerings that the Los Angeles colleges share, their ratios are favorable with respect to the implications of tele-processing.

The 1966-67 edition of the UCN will drop the appendix listing trade and technical descriptive course titles. It will add a catalog of curricula, showing the campuses at which each is offered.

In large measure, the standard section of the UCN is a differential of offerings that, not only mesh with a wide variety of occupational curricula, but also engage the various patterns of lower-division transfer requirements.

Studies have shown that two-thirds of these courses are acceptable for transfer credit somewhere and that from a third to half of them are acceptable at UCLA or at one of the three state colleges in the metropolitan area. And besides the major articulation agreements, counselors have available equivalency bulletins for such schools as Northrup Institute and Thousand Oaks.

It is interesting that, between 1957 and 1965, the number of standard courses offered exclusively by any one or another of the colleges has declined from 56 per cent to 48 per cent. Meanwhile the number of standard occupational curricula has grown by 20 in the past three years and by 42 in the past six years. They now number 220. The colleges add existing courses to their offerings in far greater numbers than they seek approval for new ones. In the first five years in which the system operated, for example, the district approved 332 new courses while the colleges adopted 687 already authorized by the UCN.

Even so, the Los Angeles colleges have not evolved regional characteristics to the extent the theory of the system implies. Many curricula are, like courses, offered in common, and their proliferation is deterred only when they threaten struggling programs. There is no force working to promote distinctive institutional flavors.

CHAPTER VII

BUREAUCRATIC AND AUTOMATED SYSTEMS

In the coming years the administrator will have to find the common ground among massing and milling forces. Already pressing in on him are prorations among faculty policy making, student and community activism, the popular demand to add two more years of education for all, year-round operation, the streamlining of course offerings, and the miraculous potentials of automation.

Automated Feedback

The latter, almost unnoticed, has already pushed through some state-wide coding and it looks toward the teleprocessing of articulation and transcripts of record. In fact, it may prove to be the unifying system. It may mark out the only common ground on which all these conflicting circles of experience can be made to overlap by a coding meaningful to all.

The classroom example of what data processing can do is the reservation service of the airlines. A salesman makes his wishes known, and while he stands drumming his fingers on the counter, the system advises him that space is not available on the particular flight his boss wanted him to take, but otherwise his needs can be met. A seat will be held for him at a different hour on the same day,

so he can still keep his date with a prospect who makes a fetish of punctuality. Furthermore, a hotel room will be reserved for him at his destination, a rent-a-car will be waiting on his arrival, and special low-calorie and non-salt meals will be served his wife in the air. Automation restricts his freedom less than age-old conflicts.

Such real-time systems are coming to schools. The new Irvine campus is, even now, becoming a model of computerized education. Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, the Chancellor, says, "Those who work with the computer now believe it will have a greater impact on education than the book."[16] Of course, Dr. Aldrich was talking about instructional applications, but much the same thing can be said for high-speed administrative services. The computer may have a greater impact on administration that the telephone.

Computers are only fifteen years old. In 1955 there were a thousand in the United States, rickety, pioneering ones. Now there are 31,000, and by 1970 this figure is expected to double. One authority has predicted that the number will level off at ten for every hundred persons. One large-scale system could link all the institutions of

---

[16]Charles J. Sippl, Computer Dictionary (New York, 1966), p. 251.

higher education in California. The potential is nationwide and will eventually reach into distant space.

Bureaucratic Systems

There are those who fear automation as a willing handmaiden of bureaucracy. Their fears are well founded. But they tend to see bureaucracy as only something imposed from above by administrative hierachies subservient to governing boards subservient to super boards.

In this the way it really works in the world of higher education today? It is eye opening to draw a parallel between this world and the keen insights of Max Weber in his anatomy of bureaucratic organization early in this century. In Weber's view, such organization reflects fixed rules (lockstep education), a hierarchy of authority (academic and administrative rank), expertise (disciplinary specialization), and impersonality (scholarly objectivity and faculty committees). It reflects privilege, tenure, seniority, retirement, and vested interest.

The thrust is always toward greater security and less responsibility for the individual member of the system. Ironically enough, governing boards and administrators in education are either elected or appointed by elected officials. They have their own systems, to be sure, but they man the most sensitive and exposed bulwarks. They

have no shield of tenure. This is as it should be, for they must be responsive to the slings and arrows from outside their own system.

Still, according to Weber's classic definition, self-serving bureaucracy does not thrive only in the echelons of administration. Its roots drive deep into every academic department and every professional organization. And Weber's ideas conform with systems theory.

Faculty Systems

Philosophical questions issue from the workings of the junior college faculty system as regards academic freedom, tenure, policy making, community needs, and student welfare. Traditionally, academic freedom has been associated with university professors who were removed from direct popular control. The principle of such freedom derived from the tradition of research and the ideal of teaching the fruit of that research, however unpopular. The premise was that in the end this freedom and the welfare of society met on common ground. It is a sound premise and one to fight for, but where teaching is concerned, especially in the lower division, it is precariously balanced between the sanctity of truth and the kind of eccentric nonsense that paralyzes administration, provokes student demonstrations, makes headlines, and imperils

the whole tradition of academic freedom.

In this respect, the place of the junior college instructor lies somewhere between that of the university professor and the high school teacher. For while the junior college is an institution of higher education, it is a local creation, and for the most part, it is locally controlled and supported. It belongs to a community whose interests may clash with the ultimate ends of society. And while much of the instruction meets the university level, the junior college is wrapped up in the transmission and application of knowledge rather than its discovery. It draws its most unique characteristic from the two-year occupational function, which is oriented toward the community rather than the broader society.

As to policy formation, those entrusted with this responsibility for public institutions of higher education--legislators, boards of regents or trustees, administrators--have always been responsible to the electoral system, either directly or indirectly, and it is a tenet of democracy that the bad ones will be sent packing in the end. But academic senates and negotiating councils are protected by tenure and answer to organized bodies of their peers. It is hardly likely that in the junior college their desires and those of the community will always

coincide. The faculty system and that of the community must be made to overlap. Only administrative leadership can bring this about.

Of course, the roles that academic senates and negotiating councils will play and how they will relate to each other are not yet clear. They have come into being in response to the failure and abuses of suprasystems. Where corrective mechanisms are concerned, there are always wheels within wheels, and the devil will have his due.

Faculty systems will reflect professional judgment as they relate to various areas of specialization in curriculum and instruction, and they will reflect professional self-interest as they relate to working conditions and the goals of their own subsystems. How they balance these two interests remains to be seen. In faculties there are strong forces of idealism and concern for the student, and it can be expected that these forces will develop feedback loops that will serve as one kind of self-corrective mechanism. Administration should be alert to the need of providing channels for this kind of feedback to follow.

The Ultimate Value of X

Developing truly democratic methods for governing

bigness is one of the crucial problems of our time. It is the old problem of the rights of the individual versus the rights of all. Traditionally, solutions have sought out modes of representative government and modes of decentralizing toward local autonomy. Of course, finding the absolute value of X in local autonomy is not a simple problem, for, as in the case of white supremacy in the south, local autonomy can promote the worst kind of tyranny.

Still, in their own world, educational institutions must persevere in retaining the principles of autonomy so characteristic of the American genius and so essential to the search for, and propagation of, the truth. But even aside from this, and in a very practical sense, they must find ways to prevent alienation and to preserve the impulse to be heard.

For there is a psychological dimension that is dangerous to overlook. Two-way radio, an incredible flow of bias, misinformation, and irrelevancy, owes its popularity to the need to communicate. The telephone lines in Dayton, Ohio, were recently jammed for hours by answers to the question of whether a husband's underpants should be ironed.[17] A computerized culture that answers even trivial complaints by spewing out form letters may be efficient and

---

[17]Jessica Mitford, "Hello, There! You're on the Air," Harper's Magazine, CCXXXII (1966), p. 47.

economical but it is psychologically unsound. It is a ticking time bomb. The miracles of automation should be used to facilitate, not deter, communication. It should be used to meet, not frustrate, the needs of people. Eventually it should make possible a contact ratio between student and teacher, student and counselor, student and test that is beyond belief.

And so, the experiment going on at Irvine may seem, at first glance, to be contradictory to that going on at Santa Cruz, but it is not. The Santa Cruz approach, the Tussman address at Berkeley, the Muscatine Report, the house plan and the small experimental college within a larger system everywhere--all these reflect the need to develop subsystems serving the individual within supersystems serving all. So does the junior college. Crawford H. Greenewalt, President of the Du Pont Company, has put it well when he says:

> The great problem, the great question, is to develop within the framework of the group the creative genius of the individual. It is a problem for management, for public education, for government, for the church, for the press--for everyone. The stake is both the material one of preserving our most productive source of progress and the spiritual one of insuring to each individual the human dignity which is his birthright.[18]

---

[18]"Is the Uncommon Man in Peril?" Management Review, Vol. 45 (June, 1956), p. 466, quoted Redfield, op. cit, p. 277.

MULTICAMPUS JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS IN CALIFORNIA

DISTRICT	CAMPUS OR DIVISION	LOCATION	DATE ORGANIZED	TOTAL ENROLL. - OCT. 1965
Contra Costa	Contra Costa	San Pablo	1948	5,113
"	Diablo Valley	Concord	1948	10,108
Foothill	Foothill	Los Altos Hills	1957	10,475
"	De Anza	----------Projected----------		
Long Beach Unified	Long Beach City	Long Beach	1927	24,815
"	Liberal Arts	"		(15,633 Col. Credit only)
"	Business and Technology Div.	"		
Los Angeles	E. Los Angeles	Los Angeles	1945	9,762
"	LA City	"	1929	17,692
"	LA Harbor	Wilmington	1949	5,077
"	LA Pierce	Woodland Hills	1947	11,049
"	LA Metro*	LA	1950	4,924
"	LA Trade-Tech	LA	1949	10,216
"	LA Valley	Van Nuys	1947	15,250
"	S. Central	LA	------Projected----------	
"	W. LA	Culver City	------Projected----------	
Los Rios	American River	Sacramento	1955	9,394
"	Sacramento City	Sacramento	1916	7,817
Orange Coast	Orange Coast	Costa Mesa	1947	18,089
"	Golden West	----------Projected----------		
Peralta	Laney	Oakland	1953	5,469
"	Merritt	Oakland	1953	8,461
San Diego Unified	SD City	San Diego	1914	3,400
"	SD Evening	"	1939	8,000
"	SD Mesa	"	1964	4,900
San Mateo	San Mateo	San Mateo	1922	15,893
"	Skyline	San Bruno	----------	
"	Canada	Redwood City	----------	
State Center	Fresno City	Fresno	1910	7,860
"	Reedley	Reedley	1926	1,611
Ventura	Ventura	Ventura	1927	8,695
"	----------Projected----------			

*Merged with Trade-Tech effective July 1, 1966.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In preparing this paper the author was helped by many people--fellow students, instructors in various systems, colleagues in the Los Angeles Junior College District--but the line must be drawn somewhere. And a special appreciation is due the following busy persons who gave from an hour to half a day of their time as the author spent three days visiting with them. They were at first hospitable and then genuinely interested, and they knew what they were talking about. All errors in fact, all theory, all interpretations and misinterpretations, are the doing of the author himself.

Thomas A. Comiskey, Evening Dean, Long Beach City College.
Hilbert J. Crosthwaite, Registrar, San Diego Junior Colleges.
Dr. Gerald R. Daniel, Dean of Instruction, Long Beach City College.
Dr. Arthur M. Jensen, Assistant Director, San Diego Evening College.
Mrs. Eleanor E. Kendall, Dean of Students, San Diego Mesa College.
James LaRue, Supervisor of Data Processing, San Diego Colleges.
Paul A. Roman, Acting Dean of Arts and Sciences, San Diego City College.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blau, Peter M., "The Dynamics of Bureaucracy," in American Social Patterns, ed. William Petersen. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, (c) 1956.

Hulett, J. Edward, "A Symbolic Interactionist Model of Human Communication--Part one," AV Communication Review, XIV (1966), 5-30.

Jensen, Arthur Milton, "An Investigation of the Administration of Junior College Districts with Multicampuses." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1965.

Junior College Directory, 1966. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966.

Miller, James G., "Toward a General Theory for the Behavioral Sciences," The American Psychologist, X (1955), 514-519.

Mitford, Jessica, "Hello, There! You're on the Air," Harper's Magazine, CCXXXII (1966), 47-53.

Redfield, Charles E., Communication in Management Revised Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, (c) 1958.

Samartino, Peter, Multiple Campuses. Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1964.

Schramm, Wilbur, ed. The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1960.

Sippl, Charles J., Computer Dictionary. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, (c) 1966.

Smith, Alfred G., Communication and Status: The Dynamics of a Research Center. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, (c) 1966.

Weber, Max, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

The End
6/5/68