

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 291

HE 013 799

AUTHOR Bender, Louis W.  
 TITLE A Third Version of the Community College: The Contract College--An Analysis for State Planners.  
 INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.  
 SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.  
 REPORT NO IEP-903-1  
 PUB DATE Feb 77  
 NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education (Orlando, FL, February 1977).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; College Role; \*Community Colleges; Contracts; \*Delivery Systems; Higher Education; \*Intercollegiate Cooperation; Noncampus Colleges; Nontraditional Education; \*Shared Services; Student Needs; Two Year Colleges  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Contract Schools; \*Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO)

## ABSTRACT

The evolution and role of the community college and three community college prototypes are considered, with emphasis directed to the contract community college. It is suggested that through their open door philosophy, community colleges respond to the public demand for access to postsecondary education and accommodate the lifelong learning needs of a pluralistic society. Three community college prototypes are described: the traditional campus-oriented institution, the without walls community college, and the most recent contract community college. The contract community college delivers its services through contracting with existent postsecondary institutions or organizations that either accommodate the students of the community college by having them occupy empty spaces in regular classes or design special courses of study and programs to serve the educational goals and needs of the community college student. Four contract community colleges are briefly described: the Union County Coordinating Agency in New Jersey is nonaccredited and nondegree-granting, while the Hudson Community College Commission in the same state is accredited and degree-granting. The Hudson group contracts with three senior institutions and a vocational/technical school and also employs part-time faculty to teach in its evening credit and noncredit programs. The John Wood Community College in Illinois operates on a common market approach very much like the Hudson model, and the Watsco Area Educational District in Oregon also provides services by contracting with community colleges. Advantages of the contract college for students served, for the local sponsor, and for the existent postsecondary education institutions are examined, along with concerns pertaining to authorization, accreditation, and the contract. (SW)

# Inservice Education Program (IEP)

ED202291

## Paper Presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education

A THIRD VERSION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE:  
THE CONTRACT COLLEGE -- AN ANALYSIS FOR STATE PLANNERS

LOUIS W. BENDER

Director  
State and Regional Higher Education Center  
Florida State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ECS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Orlando, Florida  
February 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)  
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.  
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.  
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

IEP Reprint No. 903-1

HE 013 799



Inservice Education Program (IEP)  
Education Commission of the States  
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300  
Denver, Colorado 80295



The IEP Program has been supported primarily by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with additional funds from the Education Commission of the States, the Frost Foundation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers



"A Third Version of the Community College:  
The Contract College--An Analysis for State Planners"

by

Louis W. Bender  
Director, State and Regional Higher Education Center  
Florida State University

The postsecondary education institutional form developed by and indigenous to the United States known as the community college evolved in cadence with the emergence of the middle manpower spectrum of contemporary society. Prior to World War II, there were only two primary manpower levels, made up of the blue collar worker associated with a high school diploma and the white collar worker associated with management and the professions characterized by the baccalaureate and professional degrees awarded by college and universities. Following World War II, however, a new middle manpower level emerged to accommodate the complexities of a technological society employing automated approaches to industry and business. Positions for mid-management, para-professionals, and technicians requiring more than a high school education but less than a baccalaureate training have become the focus of community colleges as they provide certificate and associate degree programs which prepare individuals for entry at the middle manpower level. While some baccalaureate institutions have added this level to their mission and have developed two-year associate degree programs accordingly, the community college can claim uniqueness in

having responded specifically to contemporary societal demands for a postsecondary institution which would accommodate the egalitarian press for access while also tailoring educational and training programs to the specific requirements of local business and industry needs.

Three prototypes of community colleges now exist. The most common and numerous type is the community college with a main campus which closely resembles any other collegiate campus and boasts of its library as the "heart of the college," its classroom and laboratory buildings, its student center dedicated to the "socialization function" of higher education and related buildings and grounds which have typically been symbolic of "college" in the American mind. This pattern of campus-based community colleges is testimony of the perceptions and ambitions of the early fledgling institutions to be recognized and accepted as "institutions of higher education." During the early history, baccalaureate institutions looked down upon the two-year colleges as mere extensions of high school; therefore deliberate efforts to establish visible evidence of a collegiate institution occurred. State regulations were adopted during the early and mid-1960s to guarantee that local community college sponsors and boards of trustees would not attempt to make temporary and makeshift facilities become permanent arrangements. Regulations in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Florida, Illinois, and many other states required the newly approved colleges to submit campus and facilities development plans which would guarantee some kind of permanent campus

being created within a specified period of time; as brief as three years in several states.

The second prototype of community college, the "without walls" community college, began to emerge at the end of the 1960s when it became apparent that the financial requirements from public funds at the local and state level for capital and operating costs were far greater than many had imagined. The early disciples and the missionaries who "preached the gospel of the community college" had established a mind set of low cost education to the student and to the public sponsors as well. Many legislators mistakenly interpreted that message to mean that the costs of facilities and programs would be minimal as visions of "cheap" but "quality" education were created. Resistance to sponsorship and establishment of new community colleges on the basis of cost became a subtle motivating factor in the establishment of "without walls" community colleges such as the Community College of Vermont, Whatcom Community College in Washington, Austin Community College in Texas, and Wor-Wic Technical Community College in Maryland. It is essential to recognize the positive underlying philosophical motives for these institutions which also led to their beginnings. Each of the institutions just named were deliberately designed to take education to the people through an outreach commitment. This philosophy was a product of a society which had come to accept the community college as having its own integrity and thus excellence was measured by how well a given institution carried out the community college mission rather than how well it mirrored or compared with

a given baccalaureate institution. It had become respectable, even admirable, for an institution to champion excellence in occupational programs or in remedial or developmental education services. As a result, community college leaders began to realize that an institution would be judged by the public on its programs and services more than upon the beauty or size of its campus.

The "without walls" community college is very much like the typical community college except that it has no main campus and permanent facilities. By design, the college administration and faculty utilize a variety of existing facilities located throughout the service area such as churches, fire halls, granges, school buildings after regular hours, store fronts, and other available space that can be used for class meetings. These institutions typically develop cooperative arrangements whereby laboratory experiences can take place either in academic facilities or real-life settings within business or industry. The faculty and staff of the community college identify with the institution and view it as an entity having vitality and an institutional substance or "being." While the outreach philosophy may be different, the "without walls" community college is comparable to the first prototype with the exception that there is no permanent campus or facilities.

The third prototype and most recent to emerge, is the "contract" community college. This institution is a legal entity in the same manner as the other two prototypes. It is legally recognized by the state, and has the power to sue and be sued as any other

institution. The distinguishing characteristic of this prototype is the fact that it contracts with other existing institutions to provide the educational programs and services it wishes to offer within its service area. As conceptualized, the "contract" community college would not have a permanent campus and facilities or its own permanent faculty. Personnel directly employed by the college would be a small administrative complement which would carry out the functions of community needs assessment, student recruitment and admission, determination of educational programs and services required for the student clientele, identification and contracting with appropriate institutions or organizations to provide the desired programs and services, and functions associated with budgeting, accounting, and evaluation of overall operations.

#### Historical Perspective

The historical diversity and individuality of the 50 states can be found in the development of community college education in America. Even the term community college is not universally used among the states to describe the public two-year comprehensive institution being examined although most of you will have no difficulty in applying the term for the institutions in your state. Whether called a community college, a junior college, a technical institute, or simply called a college, it is the public less-than-baccalaureate level institution committed to postsecondary education access and preparing people for the middle manpower spectrum of jobs. As the states enacted laws providing for the establishment of such institutions, local initiative and local

support became a strategic determinant of whether or not a new institution would be established. Many states sought to develop a statewide service-area boundary plan for community colleges which would insure that all citizens of the state would be eligible for services. In many states, a requirement that local financial support for a specified percent of the community college was written into the state law. This meant that authorization for establishment of an institution could only come about through a referendum from the electorate or by vote of a legally recognized taxing entity such as a governmental unit or a school district. Consequently, not all service areas opted to establish a community college and thus twenty-six states now have a "patchwork-like" configuration with some areas of the state encompassed by a community college and others not. It might be argued that the second and third prototype of community college came as a consequence of the failure of local initiative to provide for a community college universally in each state.

Shoemaker studied the factors which inhibited the establishment of community colleges in one state and found that problems of an inadequate tax base, sparse population, distance and topography as well as provincial attitudes mitigated against establishment of the community college in many parts of the state. He also found that opposition by existing institutions such as public or private colleges, vocational-technical schools, and branch campuses often resulted in blocking establishment of a proposed institution (1971, pp. 206-207). It might be deduced that the "without walls"

community college has responded to certain of those problems or obstacles while the "contract" community college has responded to others.

#### Case-Study Descriptions

Four different contract community colleges which will be briefly described include: The Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education, The Hudson County Community College Commission (both in New Jersey), The John Wood Community College in Illinois, and The Wasco Area Educational District in Oregon. Following a description of each of these institutions, an analysis of various aspects of the contract college will be given.

The Union County Coordinating Agency: Special state legislation was necessary to create the Union County Coordinating Agency. The New Jersey Public Law of 1964, Chapter 18A, providing for the establishment of public county (community) colleges was amended in New Jersey Public Law 1968, Chapter 180 which provided the basis for establishment of the Union County Coordinating Agency in 1969. The intent of the amended law was to allow a county board of freeholders to create a public higher education agency which could contract for educational programs from existing colleges as an alternative to creating a new county (community) college. The Union County Coordinating Agency Board has the same powers as a county college board of trustees with the exception of the right of eminent domain.

The Union County Coordinating Agency contracts for educational programs and services with Union College, a two-year independent

college founded in 1933 which provides academic programs in the arts and sciences. The second contracting institution is the Union County Technical Institute, a public institution founded in 1959 providing secondary and postsecondary vocational and technical training. Financial support of the institution is derived from the Union County Board of Freeholders, the local sponsor; the state; and student tuition. The funding formula is the same as with the county community colleges of the state.

Literature used with the public has employed the title of "Union County's Community College System". A very small central staff assumes responsibility for public information, advisement of prospective students and contractual agreements with the two co-operating institutions. Degree granting authority resides only with Union College rather than with the Union County Coordinating Agency. Students seeking a degree in an occupational area can only do so in special programs where the Technical Institute and Union College have established cooperative arrangements. There are no provisions in the law allowing for contracts outside of Union County. The policy body for the Agency is made up of nine members who statutorily are representative of the participating contractual institutions and the general public. They are charged with coordination of the use of facilities associated with the educational services to qualified county residents and for reimbursing the participating institutions in accordance with state legislation and contractual agreements.

The Hudson Community College Commission: This legal entity was created in response to further legislative action in New Jersey

Public Law 1974, Chapter 89 which authorized the New Jersey State Board of Higher Education to approve a "community college agency" which was defined as an educational institution established by one or more sponsoring counties to offer instruction similar to that authorized under Public Law 1968, Chapter 180 providing for the Union County Agency. Several distinguishable differences were provided, however, including authority of the new community college agency to award degrees and enter into contracts with as many and as different institutions or organizations as desired to provide community college education services.

The Hudson Community College Commission is a public agency which contracts with three senior institutions -- Jersey City State College, St. Peter's College, Steven's Institute of Technology -- and other educational institutions including the Hudson County Vocational Technical School. The agency "matches student needs with available educational opportunities at any college or postsecondary institution in New Jersey" and has no full-time faculty or permanent facilities of its own. It is purported that this contractual approach reduces competition among the institutions while saving the taxpayers the financial burden of duplicating physical facilities and competing public programs.

The Hudson Community College Commission development was stimulated by an Exxon Educational Foundation Grant in 1972 which supported a feasibility study which was carried out under the direction of Joseph P. O'Neill and which was published in March, 1973. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) awarded a \$225,000

*D* 11

grant to a consortium called the Hudson Higher Education Consortium and was composed of the three baccalaureate colleges which are now contracting institutions. This arrangement was in existence when the state legislature took action on the 1974 Law and contributed to the design of that legislation. In this case, a voluntary consortium sought legislation which would create a legal entity under the county or community college legislation of the state and which would empower that entity with all duties, jurisdiction and authority vested in a traditional county or community college with the exception of the power of eminent domain.

The Hudson Community College Commission describes its operating philosophy as an "educational brokering approach." Four centers in different parts of the country which provide interviewing, career counseling, testing, program planning, and related services to accommodate the interests and needs of potential students. A center staff attempts to tailor a planned program of courses and activities in any combination of the participating contracting institutions which meet each student's goals. Certificates of competence or associate degrees may be awarded by the Commission or, in some cases, by the contracting institution depending upon the specific plan developed between the student and the Commission, acting as the "broker".

The Hudson Community College Commission has also established its own evening program of credit courses applicable to a two-year associate degree and non-credit courses and services available for interested adults and community groups. Thus another difference

between Hudson and Union can be found in the fact that part-time faculty, at least, are being employed by the Hudson County Community College Commission.

John Wood Community College: This college was established in 1974 and is a part of the Illinois Community College System serving District #539. It serves a five-county area in Illinois as well as portions of the adjoining state of Missouri. It was established pursuant to the Public Community College Act of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, Chapter 122, and is empowered under Section 3-40 of that law to enter into contracts for educational services with any person, organization, association, or governmental agency. It has degree-granting authority as well as powers and jurisdiction provided to all other community colleges in Illinois.

The operating philosophy of the John Wood Community College has been developed around "a 'common market' approach to education." Five postsecondary institutions presently are under contract with three private colleges -- Quincy College, Culver-Stockton College, and Hannibal-LaGrange College -- and two proprietary vocational-technical oriented institutions -- Gem City College and Quincy Technical School. John Wood Community College confers three associate degrees including the Associate of Arts, the Associate of Science, and the Associate of Applied Science degrees. It has no instructional facilities or full-time faculty although it, like the Hudson Community College Commission, has hired "part-time teacher coordinators" in agriculture to serve its remote communities and areas. The common market concept is intended to provide qualified

students with programs and services without duplicating facilities or personnel. The administrative complement of the institution assumes a responsibility for promoting educational programs and services among the citizenry and for finding ways to facilitate admission, counseling, program planning, and evaluation of courses which meet the needs and goals of individuals turning to the community college. While existing institutions in New Jersey seem to have been instrumental in the original concept and founding of the "contract" community colleges in New Jersey, the impetus in Illinois seemed to be from the state and local governmental levels. The boundary plan promulgated by the Illinois Community College Board represented a state pressure. Locally, it was felt that the sparseness of the geographic area encompassed in District #539 and the relatively low tax base necessitated a different approach from the typical community college. The "common market" concept and the subsequent contracting design of John Wood Community College was the result.

Wasco Area Educational District: The Wasco Area Educational District was formed in Oregon in 1976 and will not commence offering actual services until July of 1977. Located at The Dalles, the institution will provide its courses and services through contracts with Mt. Hood Community College and Blue Mountain Community College. At the present time, there are no other institutions identified for future contracting.

The Wasco Area Educational District was authorized by a vote of the electorate and has taxing authority, a distinguishing

characteristic different from the three previously described institutions. It will not have degree-granting authority, however, until it is accredited by its regional accrediting body. Thus, the initial classes of students may need to receive their degrees from the contracting institutions rather than from the Wasco Area Educational District. Plans call for the contracting arrangements to be comparable with those previously described in this paper. Similarly, the concept of providing recruitment, student admission/counseling and advising services as well as testing, placement, and program planning are envisioned for this new institution.

#### Contract Colleges Analyzed

There are a number of obvious advantages to the contract college approach. For the students, the contract college provides immediate programs and services which are generally accepted qualitatively because they have been offered by recognized institutions. The credibility and positive reputation of the existing institutions offer instant legitimization, something which a fledgling new community college would need to earn over several years of operation. In some cases, students who would not otherwise be able to attend a local private institution because of academic or financial barriers are able to sit side-by-side with regularly matriculated students. More importantly, however, is the fact contract college admissions procedures almost guarantee that personal and individual program planning will be carried out, something which is not done for incoming freshmen students at most

institutions.

Advantages for the local sponsor are primarily economic. The Union County taxpayers have been saved more than \$20 million according to descriptive literature for that institution. The John Wood Community College claims that its per student operating costs have been lower than would be the operating costs if it had employed its own faculty and support staff for comparable programs.

Existent postsecondary institutions within the contract community college service area benefit in a number of ways. First, competition of a low tuition public community college is avoided. Secondly, some of the contracting institutions have found that the financial income covers empty spaces, which otherwise would have added to the overall costs of operation, but now become income gathering. Another benefit which has been identified has been the subtle but positive influence upon faculty attitudes toward the "new student clientele" which is emerging as the lifelong education concept becomes a reality.

State planners need to examine a number of other factors associated with the contract community colleges. Before the concept can be embraced, serious study and consideration should be given to the following areas:

Authorization: At least 28 states\* have conditions or

*Alabama	Illinois	Missouri	Ohio
Alaska	Iowa	Montana	Oklahoma
Arizona	Kentucky	New Jersey	Oregon
Arkansas	Louisiana	New Mexico	Pennsylvania
California	Maryland	New York	South Carolina
Colorado	Michigan	Nevada	Texas
Florida	Mississippi	North Carolina	Wyoming

circumstances which would be conducive to the contract community college approach. They generally require local initiative since the institutions are not perceived as part of a state system; and/or there is some local support required in addition to state and student support; and/or there are areas of the state presently not encompassed by a community college service area. In order to utilize this approach, however, community college legislation would need to be amended or new legislation enacted. Strategic provisions in such legislation include consideration of whether the proposed entity should have degree-granting authority. In the case of Union County it would appear that the absence of such authority has placed the coordinating agency in a subservient role to its contracting college. The evidence would suggest that the architects of the legislation deliberately sought to place considerable power with Union College; however, in the process, the function of the coordinating agency became limited to a "funneling-type" of activity. Dependency of the agency upon degree-granting authority of the contracting college clearly weakens the agency and its ability to use the postsecondary education market place in tailoring programs for its student clientele. The Hudson County and John Wood institutions clearly gained stature and power from the degree-granting authority vested with them in the legislation.

Accreditation: An immediate question confronting institutional accrediting agencies is whether the contract community college itself should be evaluated or whether the accreditation of the

individual contracting institutions should be the focus. The Hudson and John Wood institutions have sought and successfully been accredited by their respective regional accrediting associations. Since Union County does not have degree-granting authority, it is not eligible for accreditation. The visitation report for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities reveals strong sentiment on the part of visiting team members that the John Wood Community College should ultimately secure its own faculty and develop its own program much like the "without walls" community colleges such as Watcom, Vermont, and Wor-Wic. Some of the internal problems of contracting institutions are identified through the accreditation process. For example, the question of price differentials exists, particularly for private contracting institutions, when students from the contract community college pay a low tuition and regularly matriculated students of the same private institution pay a traditional tuition. Another problem area requiring consideration is the question of the faculty and their supervision. Are the faculty of the contracting colleges under the jurisdiction of the community college...if not, how can the community college assure appropriate and qualitative programs...if so, what kind of friction develops between administrators of the separate colleges and the community college? How is faculty evaluation carried out and by whose standards and criteria? Another difficult area relates to the impact of the community college on registration procedures, grading policies, admissions standards and so forth. Does the

contract community college necessarily force uniformity and commonality of procedures, forms, and standards upon the contracting institutions?

It becomes clear that the present format and standards of regional accrediting associations do not lend themselves to evaluation of the contract community college. It has been done, nevertheless, and successfully. Yet, the evidence is clear that the visiting teams favor the contracting approach to be a transitional rather than a permanent approach. In the case of John Wood and Hudson, at least, accreditation has represented a force or pressure upon the contract community college to move toward becoming an outreach institution with its own faculty, its own program, and thus ultimately abandon the dependence upon contracting with existing institutions like the without walls model.

The Contract: When state planners consider the contract community college as a possible approach for meeting the lifelong education needs and middle manpower spectrum requirements of their state, serious consideration should be given to the contract itself used by the contract community college. A number of important considerations must have been decided before entering into the contract. The term or length of the contract is one consideration. Some favor a year-to-year contract. From the perspective of the contract community college, such short-term obligation fosters flexibility in seeking out other possible institutions or organizations which could provide desired services. Yet there are those who would argue that the community college could be weakened should some of the cooperating institutions suddenly decide not to provide

spaces or continue contracting. From the point of view of the cooperating institutions, one-year contracts are seen by some as desirable in order to guarantee that pricing of contracted services will reflect inflationary and other unanticipated increased costs while another group would argue that an institution is victimized if it does not have assurance of long-term continuity, particularly where additional resources are secured to offer new or expanded programs to accommodate the new clientele of the community college.

Another contract provision which often become politicized is the question of student services and activities and the institutional identity of the community college students. Should such students pay the student fee of the contracting college and participate as any other registered student at the institution or should the contract community college attempt to develop its own identity through student activities, institutional insignias on T-shirts, jackets, and so forth?

A third important provision in the contract relates to accounting aspects of the community college students and billing procedures. How much does the contract community college pay for a student who withdraws after one or two weeks? How does the contracting college relate its grading and probation policies to community college students? How does the community college make sure its students are not "channeled" into the classes of less effective or popular faculty? Who has responsibility for judging the quality of the courses and programs involved?

It is readily apparent that the contract community college must be more thorough and meticulous in drawing up a contract for

services than many institutions have been in developing or codifying institutional policies. A considerable amount of visionary planning must go into the development of the contract if the interests of all parties -- students, cooperating institutions, and the contract community college -- are to appropriately accommodate.

Meeting Community Needs: The contract community college which aspires to fulfill the mission of the community-based institution will soon find that the services of existing post-secondary institutions do not lend themselves to that area known as community services. Of the four institutions studied, Wasco Area Educational District may be the exception since it will be contracting with two community colleges only, although it is doubtful whether those institutions will provide community services in the area of the Dalles. Both the John Wood and Hudson institutions have already employed part-time community education faculty in order to meet the community service goals of their institution. Apparently, some subtle difficulties have occurred for both institutions because of this commitment. There is evidence of criticism on the part of some that such part-time staffing does not assure high standards consistent with the full-time programs of the contracting institutions and inadequate provisions exist for appropriate supervision and management of such activities. Advocates, on the other hand, argue that the contract community colleges should broaden and expand such part-time staffing and programming to meet additional educational needs, even those full-time credit and degree programs not available from existing

institutions in the area. The situation is ripe, therefore, for possible disagreements and strained relations between and among the various institutions.

The counseling/advisement function of the contract community college can be viewed as a community service function where the institution attempts to serve any of the citizenry seeking help. This area has also become politicized with some criticism directed at the costs involved and other criticism directed at the outreach nature of such services. There is some evidence to suggest that the contract community college is perceived as being available much as a campus-based admissions and counseling office. But the staff of the four contract community colleges studied seem oriented toward and motivated to provide outreach throughout the service area and to become effective human-resource centers very much like the brokering process or approach being described in Fran Macy's module.

### Summary

State planners charged with designing postsecondary education opportunities which accommodate the lifelong learning needs of a pluralistic society must examine the community college as one of the significant delivery approaches. A truly American institution, the community college emerged in response to the beginning and subsequent evolution of the middle manpower spectrum of our contemporary technological society. Furthermore, the community college, through its open-door philosophy, responds to the public demand for access to postsecondary educational opportunity.

Three community college prototypes have been described including the traditional campus-oriented institution, the "without walls" community college, and the most recent type to emerge, the "contract" community college. Illustration of the without walls community college can be seen in Austin Community College in Texas, the Community College of Vermont, Whatcom Community College in Washington, and Wor-Wic Technical Community College in Maryland. Each of these institutions have their own faculty and staff but do not have any central or permanent campus. Their outreach philosophy is accommodated by utilizing a variety of existing facilities located throughout their service area which typically are borrowed, rented, or leased on a short-term basis.

The third version of the community college, the "contract" community college delivers its services through contracting with existing postsecondary institutions or organizations which either accommodate the students of the community college by having them occupy empty spaces in regular classes or design special courses of study and programs to serve the educational goals and needs of the community college student.

The latest two versions of the community college developed as consequence of historical factors which mitigated against the establishment of the traditional campus-type institution. Sparsity of population, low or limited tax base and topography often represented obstacles which could not be overcome without some kind of special design. In other areas, private and/or public postsecondary

institutions already in existence represented a resource even though their individual programs did not totally serve the community college education needs of the local citizenry. The contract community college became a mechanism for increasing services and programs available to the local service area while capitalizing upon already existent institutional resources.

Four contract community colleges have been described briefly. The Union County Coordinating Agency, the oldest of the four, was established under community college legislation in New Jersey but does not have degree-granting authority and thus has not been separately accredited by the Middle States Association. The Hudson Community College Commission in the same state, on the other hand, does have degree-granting authority and has been accredited. It presently contracts with three senior institutions and a vocational-technical school. In an effort to provide additional programs not available through the contracting institutions and at different times of the day or evening, the Hudson Community College Commission has employed part-time faculty to teach in its evening credit and non-credit programs. Operating on an "educational broker" philosophy of approach, this institution has been more autonomous than its Union counterpart.

The John Wood Community College in Illinois operates on a "common market" approach and is very much like the Hudson model. It contracts with three private colleges and two proprietary vocational-technical institutions offering services not only in the state of Illinois but in adjacent Missouri as well. In carrying

out its "common market" philosophy, the institution has also employed a part-time faculty to offer programs and provide counseling/ advisement services in remote parts of its service area.

The fourth contract community college described is the Wasco Area Educational District which was formed in 1976 in Oregon. It will provide its services through contracting with Mt. Hood Community College and Blue Mountain Community College when it commences offering actual services in July of 1977.

State planners need to analyze the contract college approach in order to examine the many strengths and some weaknesses which are involved. Students served by contract community colleges probably would have not enjoyed postsecondary educational services through a locally sponsored institution if the state were to insist upon traditional standards and criteria promulgated in the statutes and regulations of most states. In fact, it would be necessary for most states to amend existing community college legislation or adopt new regulations in order to permit establishment of a contract community college. Before doing so, however, state planners should study the kind of authorization which would best achieve a vital and responsive contract institution and which would qualify for regional accreditation. Analysis of contractual provisions and strategies for meeting community needs should also occupy serious study by the state planner before taking action.

Thank you.

## References

- "A Descriptive History of the Hudson Community College Commission" (including 23 pages on Educational Brokerage applications). Mimeographed. 35 pages.
- Commission on Colleges "Status Team Report on Hudson Community College Commission." Middle States Association on Colleges and Schools. April, 1975. Mimeographed. 3 pages.
- Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, "Report of a Visit to John Wood Community College, Quincy, Illinois." North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. December, 1975. Mimeographed. 18 pages.
- The Hudson County Community College, "Evening College Centers." August, 1975. Mimeographed. 11 pages.
- Hudson County Community College Commission. Miscellaneous papers and documents including contract agreements, handbooks, position descriptions, news clippings, etc.
- John Wood Community College. Miscellaneous papers and documents including contract agreements, handbooks, position descriptions, news clippings, etc.
- MacKay, Kenneth C. Annual Report of the Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education. 1972; 1974; and 1975.
- "Serving Community Needs Through Inter-institutional Cooperation." Undated. Mimeographed. 13 pages.
- New Jersey Public Law 1964, Chapter 18.
- New Jersey Public Law 1968, Chapter 180.
- New Jersey Public Law 1974, Chapter 89.
- Shoemaker, Elwood A. A Study of the Factors Inhibiting Establishment of Community Colleges in Pennsylvania. An unpublished dissertation. Temple University, 1971.
- Union County Coordinating Agency for Higher Education, "Twoard Unification, A Timetable." October 7, 1974. Mimeographed. 12 pages.

Union County Coordinating Agency. Miscellaneous papers and documents including contract agreements, handbooks, position descriptions, news clippings, etc.

Wasco Area Educational District. Miscellaneous papers and documents including contract agreements, handbooks, position descriptions, news clippings, etc.