ABSTRACT
        This collection of essays focuses on contemporary
issues for two-year college education related to instruction,
students, and faculty. The following essays are included: (1)
"Entrance Testing at Community Colleges," by Patricia McElroy; (2)
"Academic Advising in the Community College," by Ann Houpt; (3) "New
Jersey Community College General Education Regulations," by William
H. Engler; (4) "Honors Programs in the Community College: Reality and
Promise," by Larry L. Cohen; (5) "Requiring Microcomputers in
Community Colleges," by George Popel; (6) "Attrition at Community
Colleges," by James Marinaccio; (7) "Community Colleges and Industry:
Rationale for a Relationship," by Joseph Santora; (8) "Faculty
Evaluation at the Community College," by Joseph C. Kudless; and (9)
"The Complex Challenge of Professional Development: Current Trends
and Future Opportunities," by Henry D. Ryder and George W. Perabo.
(LAL)

NOTE: Copies of this collection of essays, bound in a looseleaf binder, are available from:

> The Mid-Career Fellowship Program
> Theodore K. Rabb, Director
> History Department
> Princeton University
> Princeton, NJ 08544
>
> at cost -- $10.00

CURRENT ISSUES FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

ESSAYS BY FELLOWS

IN THE MID-CAREER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

September 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.

ENTRANCE TESTING AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Patricia McElroy
Business and Social Sciences Department
Northern Virginia Community College

Historically, a certain number of college freshmen have
always been unprepared for the college level curriculum.
Colonial colleges, founded before there was any network of
grammar schools, enrolled students with less than college level
skills. Rudolph (1977:60) notes that "college authorities
learned to restrain their expectations in deference to the
preparation of the students who came their way." Special
programs designed to help these students emerged in the nine-
teenth century. (Cross, 1976) By the late 1970s attention had
again been drawn to the number of students ill-prepared for
college. With minimal reading, writing and/or computational
skills, an estimated 13% of high school seniors have been
labeled functionally illiterate. (National Commission, 1983)
As some of these students become matriculants in the nation's
community colleges they do so with skills below "traditional"
standards. Institutions, more and more frequently, are
turning to academic skills assessment of entering students to
place them in courses where they can be helped.

A transition to or increased emphasis on skills assess-
ment for open-door systems is rarely fluid or uncontrover-
sial. Those concerned with academic standards argue that
under-prepared students need to be identified and directed
toward developmental courses. Students, they hold, can
expect academic success only when they bring to the class-

room proficiencies in basic skills that facilitate mastery of college level material.

Others counter that such student screening will become analogous to the 1960s remedial catch-all programs that eroded self concepts, tracked students and "cooled them out." (Clark, 1960:1980) The suspicion of literacy testing centers on the perpetuation of inequality. The open door philosophy implies that students should not be denied access to courses they wish to take.

For some, the controversy is resolved by recognizing that the academic mission of the community college requires educational intervention. This means that testing students permits us to arm them with the best possible academic plan. As the chair of the Association of American Community and Junior Colleges Board of Directors summarizes:

> "We have an obligation to differentiate based on ability. It is not totally unlikely that our important commitment to access can be appropriately mediated by academic standards designed for increasing the likelihood of student success. We are not necessarily eliminating access through educational intervention. This intervention can take the form of open admission to our colleges and data-based entry to individual courses and programs. But there is a tendency to view this as a tainted activity at variance with community college social responsibility. It is time to sanction this effort." (Eaton,1984:55)

Other researchers have also argued that students must be screened to determine whether they possess the necessary skills for collegiate study. (Roueche,1981; Herrscher, 1977)

Most community colleges today are involved in some type of skills measurement. Thus, to test or not has become a moot issue. More pertinent queries for educators reverberate around the kinds of decisions made from test data. Does student placement, based on test performance, create a "revolving door"? Are the tests used to equip students with the skills they have missed in earlier educational experiences but will need for college success? I will review the reading skills assessment programs at three institutions, Southern, Western and County, in trying to answer these questions. A statistically comparative analysis is inhibited by the absence of long term data and the embryonic state of the reading skills program at Southern.

Southern

Southern, a community college located in Virginia, created the Committee to Study Reading Skills during the 1983-84 academic year. Representatives from the three academic divisions, counseling, admissions and records, the learning resources center and continuing education developed recommendations for a testing and reading program that was implemented in the fall of 1984.

The recommendations considered the potential impact of the program on personnel, facilities and dollars. The institution's concern about its access function led to a proposal that recommended rather than required skills assessment for

students.

The committee evaluated test data on 683 students in the 1983-84 academic year. Students reading levels were compared to their grade point averages.

The results demonstrated serious reading deficiencies among the students sampled. Students reading abilities ranged from below 7th to above 14th grade level. The reading test data revealed a 10th grade mode. Forty percent of the subjects read at 9th grade and below.

Academic success was observed to increase as the reading level of the student increased. Academic success was defined as a 50 percent chance of a GPA at 2.5 or above. Students reading at or above the 12th grade level demonstrated the best chance at academic success. The committee determined that students reading below 12th grade level would have difficulty with college work. This cut-level paralleled the 48th percentile and below on the Nelson-Denny Reading Tests.

Some caution was used in interpreting the data due to questions about the representativeness of the sample (Ss included developmental English students). The Nelson-Denny Reading Test is used as a preliminary diagnostic. Additional diagnostic steps are pursued by faculty after placement into either the remedial reading improvement course or the for-credit critical reading and study skills course.

The Reading Test is administered and scored by testing personnel. Students are referred to an English faculty member

or a counselor for placement advice.

The Reading Test is currently recommended for students registering for any 100 level English course and for all students on probation. Those students scoring below the 9th grade level are strongly encouraged to register for remedial English 008. Students may concurrently register for college level credit courses (except English and Math, where a placement test is also required).

Reading Test policies are available in print from Admissions and Records, faculty advisors, counselors, division administrators and the Dean of Students.

Western

Western, a county college in New Jersey, began its remediation program in the fall of 1978. Initially the cut scores reflected practical considerations in staffing capacity to handle the students in need of skills assessment and of how the students actually fare in the classroom. Recently the state and Western mutually agreed upon a standard cut-score in keeping with the Basic Skills Council recommendation.

Testing scores are used to identify students in need of reading remediation. Students needing extensive remediation (six hours required) are differentiated from those needing slight remediation (three hours required). Students are unrestricted in the first level college courses that they may take while gaining reading proficiency. However, Western

advises those needing remediation to take no more than twelve credit hours while developing their basic skills.

All students are tested before registering for courses. Western uses the New Jersey Basic Skills Placement Test (NJBSPT). Students are notified within a week if no remediation is needed. Those needing to take all or part of the bi-level reading program are notified somewhat later while the appropriate tier assignment is considered.

Full-time students must satisfy reading requirements within 24 semester hours. At the 24th credit students are not permitted to enroll in subsequent semesters for college level courses until remediation is completed. Part-time students are given four semesters to complete their remediation requirements.

County

County, a New Jersey community college, finds that approximately 40% of all entering students need to improve reading skills. Testing is done prior to registration. Roughly 99% of all students are tested at entry and 93% of those needing remediation are actually placed in the two-tiered reading program.

The Degrees of Reading Power Test is used in conjunction with the Reading Comprehension section of the NJCBSPT to determine reading placement. Students are assigned to either a lower level remedial (lacks proficiency) group or

an upper level developmental (lacks proficiency in certain areas) group. The remedial group contains students with below 9th grade equivalency cut scores. The developmental group is comprised of students with cut score equivalencies between 9th and 11th grade reading level. The reading placement cut-scores are based on skills required for entry level college courses. These skills have been specified for each course at County.

Students may take a limited number of college level courses while they attain reading proficiency. These courses include typing, contemporary society, foreign languages, concepts of physical education, math (by placement), drafting, principles of construction, visual arts and performing arts.

County students must begin required remediation in their first semester. Full-time students are given a year to satisfy skills course obligations. Part-time students must meet their obligation within the first 30 credit hours of enrollment. Insufficient progress in the first semester limits a student to 13 credits in the next semester. Inadequate performance in the second semester results in a nine credit ceiling on enrollment in the subsequent semester. Insufficient progress in the third semester results in academic dismissal. Both full and part-time students are subject to these requirements regradless of their curriculum or remedial status.

County's educational intervention strategy combines pre-testing with post-testing. Pre-tests are used to establish entry level abilities and determine placement. Post-tests serve to supplement evaluation data and ensure consistency of application to exit standards.

Students may proceed to the next level or to college level courses by satisfying course requirements and demonstrating proficiency on the exit examination. Exit from lower level reading requires 9th grade proficiency. Exit from upper level reading requires an 11th grade equivalency as measured by the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills and Informal Reading Inventory. Once exit criteria are met students are provisionally accepted into college level courses. However, the number of credit hours a student takes is very closely monitored by County.

An on-line master tracking tape stores NJCBSPT scores, placement results and indices of academic performance. This permits enforcement of testing, placement and enrollment policies and longitudinal tracking and evaluation of the assessment-placement program.

Conclusions

Reading Skills assessments at Southern are recommended. For students who accept diagnostic/placement recommendations skills upgrading may be achieved. Funding concerns, at this

time reduce the support of a more comprehensive assessment
program. The institution does indicate an interest in entry
level evaluation of all students. When this is possible
Southern may wish to explore a bi-level placement program,
exit controls to aid in validating placement decisions, com-
pletion rates, retention-data by placement decision, and
the effects of concurrent enrollment in college level courses
on students needing remediation. For the moment, the limited
policy of placement testing may indeed be, as the committee
has expressed, "more responsible than a policy of benign
neglect." (SCCRR, 1984)

The two New Jersey colleges, in comparison to Southern
reflect a more comprehensive use of assessment instruments.
County, in particular, maximizes its use of placement testing
to facilitate student success. Both County and Western lend
support to Eaton's (1984) comment--colleges continue to pro-
vide open access to higher education while improving student
skills.

The New Jersey Basic Skills Council's recently released
report of its study of New Jersey Colleges and Community
Colleges seems buoyed by the retention and academic success
resulting from skills assessment and placement programs.
They report high retention rates, credit ratios, GPAs and
survival success when Western and County's remediation-com-

pleted groups are compared to their remediation-not completed groups. The Council report (1985) notes, for instance, that all County students passing the remedial course in reading (73%) also attain minimum competency on the reading post test (100%). Too, students who complete remediation survive in the college at a higher rate than those not needing remediation and at a much higher rate than those who did not complete remediation.

Admittedly the report finds some unexpected phenomena that complicates an understanding of the relationship between assessment, skills programs and student success. At Western, one-half of the remediation-not-completed group attained a GPA of 2.0 or better. Too, low percentages of the remediation completed reading group reached minimum competency but performed as well as the non-remediated group. At County, need completing reading groups and the need-not-completing reading groups are not strikingly different in GPA and credits earned to credits attempted. (NJBSC,1985) While such results pose questions for assessment based placement programs, the data at least assuage concerns over testing as the death knell to the community college's open door.

The overall patterns at County and Western give support to the argument that skills assessment is necessary and purposeful in catapulting the open door philosophy into student survival and success. Toward this end, assessment programs should consider the following in their design:

o   a specification of the skills required in college
    level courses;

o   testing instruments that will accurately and incre-
    mentally measure these skills;

o   a remedial curriculum staffed by faculty committed to
    developing these skills;

o   clearly stipulated performance goals and completion
    time frames set and monitored for the students;

o   post-evaluations to determine when exit proficiency
    has been achieved;

o   close and regular interaction between students iden-
    tified as being in need of remediation and their
    faculty, advisors and counselors;

o   financial support for administrative/faculty personnel,
    facilities and monitoring systems for the program.

REFERENCES

Clark, Burton, R. "The Cooling Out Function Revisited" in G.B. Vaughan (editor). New Directions for Community Colleges: Questioning the Community College Role. San Francisco:Jossey Bass, 1980.

_____ "The Cooling Out Function in Higher Education." American Journal of Sociology. 1960:65:6:569-576.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. The American Community College. San Francisco:Jossey Bass. 1976.

Cross, K.P. Accent on Learning: Improving Instruction and Re-Shaping the Curriculum. San Francisco:Jossey Bass, 1976.

Eaton, Judith S. "Community College Culture." Community and Junior College Journal. 1984:55:1:552-555.

Herrscher, B.R. "Designing Instruction" in J.E. Roueche (editor) New Directions for Higher Education:Increasing Basic Skills by Developmental Studies. San Francisco:Jossey Bass. 1983.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office. 1983.

New Jersey Basic Skills Council. Effectiveness of Remedial Programs. Trenton:Department of Higher Education. 1985.

Roueche, John. "Between a Rock and A Hard Place." Community and Junior College Journal. 1984:54:7:21-24.

Rudolph, F. Curriculum:A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. 1977.

Southern Community College's Committee on Reading Recommendations. Virginia:Southern Community College. 1984.

Vaughan, George B. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. 1983.

II.

ACADEMIC ADVISING IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Ann Houpt
Counseling Department
Middlesex County College

The definition of academic advising as set forth by the
American College Testing Program's National Center for the
Advancement of Educational Practices is as follows:

> "Academic advising is a developmental process
> which assists students in the clarification of
> their life/career goals and in the development
> of educational plans for the realization of
> these goals. It is a decision-making process
> by which students realize their maximum educa-
> tional potential through communication and
> information exchanges with an advisor; it is
> ongoing, multifaceted, and the responsibility
> of both student and advisor. The advisor
> serves as a facilitator of communication, a
> coordinator of learning experiences through
> course and career planning and academic pro-
> gress review, and an agent of referral to other
> campus agencies as necessary." (ACT 1984)

This definition is derived from the mission statement in the
Standards for Academic Advising published by the National
Academic Advising Association. (ACT 1983)

When this comprehensive, idealistic definition of what
advising could be is compared with actual situations (a study
done at one community college (MCC 1979) revealed that 14%
of students surveyed did not know the identity or location of
their advisor, 31% had never met with their assigned advisor,
and 50% who did know and had met with their advisors did not
find it helpful) there appears to be a rather large gap
between theory and practice, between the ideal and the real.

The purpose of this paper is to reiterate the importance of
good advising, to describe briefly the situation in fifteen
community colleges, to highlight the more salient issues and
to suggest some ways to improve the situation.

There seems to be little doubt that when academic advising is
done well it benefits both the student and the college.
Thomas Grites of Stockton State College has done a great deal
of research and writing about advising and he concludes that
good advising programs result in better attitudes, enhanced
self-concept, and both intellectual and interpersonal
development on the part of the student. Increases in academic
performance also result. (ACT 1984) The connection of
advising with retention efforts has been continually
emphasized in the literature and in retention studies done on
individual campuses. Teague and Grites (1980) concluded in
one study that, "It may be through a more clearly defined and
better supported process of academic advising that some
institutions are able to minimize severe student deficits in
the 1980's". Academic advising is crucial in the student's
progress through college; from the first days of course
selection and scheduling, through adjustment to the college
experience, into career planning and goal setting for the

future. The relationship between a student and her/his advisor can be the link which makes the college experience meaningful.

Fifteen community colleges (all but one from the state of New Jersey) were surveyed as to their current advising practices. In most cases the questionnaires were completed by a member of the counseling staff. The pertinent results are listed below:

-The goal of advising which was best met was the providing of accurate information about institutional policies and procedures.

-The goal least well met was assisting students in developing decision-making skills.

-There was unanimous agreement that the most important factors in the advising process are that advisors are available to students, that they provide specific and accurate information and that they exhibit a personal and caring attitude toward their advisees.

-The most important needs were seen to be greater administrative recognition of the importance of advising, expanded advisor training and better advisee awareness of the expectations of the advising process.

-Two-thirds of the colleges have a written statement which contains the goals of advising and the responsibilities of advisors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Page 3 20

-At none of the colleges do students see advisors more than once or twice a term.

-At half of the colleges advisors are responsible for more than 40 students.

-One-third of the colleges have no training for advisors, one-third have some in-service training and the remaining one-third have some sort of orientation.

-Virtually none of the surveyed colleges have evaluation processes.

-At two-thirds of the colleges advising is done by the teaching faculty, at the remaining third it is done by counselors. Where it is done by faculty, counselors usually add some sort of support.

-At four-fifths of the colleges there is no formal reward or recognition for advising.

-At all but four of the colleges, advisors spend less than 10% or no specified time at advising tasks.

The final questions on the survey asked respondents to list the strengths and weaknesses of the advising programs at their colleges. It appeared to be difficult to answer questions about strengths. Several counselors who returned questionnaires and some who added comments were apologetic about the system at their schools. When strengths were listed they usually reflected dedication, experience and caring on the part of those doing the advising. Weaknesses which were mentioned repeatedly were: not enough advisors for too many students, students were not required to meet with

advisors. inadequate training, the part-time student is neglected and information is not always current.

When the results of this survey were compared with results of a national survey using the same questionnaire, the outcomes were nearly identical for the two-year college sample. The major difference was that in the national survey the ratios of faculty and counselor advising were reversed; nationally, two-thirds of the advising was done by counselors and one-third by faculty. (ACT 1983) This appears to be an expected result; the trend is for advising to be a counselor function in two-year institutions.

Another comparison is also worth noting. In studies of student perceptions of the advising process factors cited as being of primary importance to students are accessibility of advisors, specific and accurate information, advice and counsel and a personal relationship with the advisor. (ACT 1984) These factors are remarkably similar to those voiced by the survey respondents.

From an analysis of the surveys, both local and national, and the current literature, it appears that there are four basic issues in advising:

-What are the goals of advising?

-Who does the advising and what are its rewards ?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

-What kind of training needs exist?

-How is the program evaluated?

The developmental approach to advising which is stressed in
the definition we are using is the most recent emphasis for
this function. The problem is that those who are responsible
for implementing the function still regard it as a primarily
informational one. In order for a program to have any
coherence at all is is obvious that agreement must exist as
to the goals of the program. At colleges where written plans
do exist they need to be reviewed by administrators, advisors
and students and revised as necessary. Everyone on campus
needs to be aware that a plan exists and be familiar with its
objectives. Where written plans do not exist, they need to
be written and implemented. According to Bostaph and Moore
(1980) the most important advising function is providing the
opportunity and encouragement for long-range program planning
congruent with the students' interests and abilities. Other
functions then are the provision of information on courses,
policies, and resources and some guidance in the rationale
for the requirements and the objectives of education.
Students expect more than competent advice; they want to feel
that the advisor is concerned about their welfare and
progress. To reflect the new thrust in developmental
advising then, a college's plan for advising should implement
processes to assist students in planning coherent programs
and in synthesizing their academic pursuits with their life

goals and vocational aspirations. (Welsh 1979)

The question of who does the advising appears to be less
important that what occurs in the process and the actual
delivery model may vary considerably depending on constraints
of particular campuses. Proponents of faculty advising argue
that faculty have a unique opportunity for personal and
instructional contact with students and are therefore more
accessible. (Wilder 1981) Astin agrees that student-faculty
interaction has a stronger relationship to student
satisfaction with the college experience than any other
variable and should therefore be the cornerstone for the
advising function. (Astin 1977) Williamson, on the other
hand, contends that advising should not be done by faculty
who may be experts in their own fields because "some
psychological understanding of the complexities of human
relations and aspirations is needed, especially because we
are now bringing into the colleges many individuals who a few
decades ago would not have been enrolled". (ACT 1984) There
is no question that the implementation of the developmental
advising model involves more skills than a straight
informational model. One approach which seems to have
promise involves team efforts between faculty and student
personnel staffs. Robbins (O'Banion and Thurston 1972)
contends that in the strong community college there is a team
effort in which teachers and student personnel workers engage
in continuous dialogue and cooperative activity to plan

innovative programs including the academic advising program.

Whether advisors are teaching faculty, counselors or both functioning on a team, the program will not be successful unless their efforts are recognized and rewarded. This means that advising must be valued as an activity which is vital to the mission of the college in educating students and may even be crucial to its survival. The rewards for excellence in academic advising can take many forms: financial rewards through bonuses, conference registration, travel allotment or considerations for promotion and tenure; or recognition type rewards such as mention in publications, appreciation dinners, press releases, citations or notices to parents. In order to make the advising function a sought-after assignment in which professionals take pride, it must be valued and rewarded by administrators.

The lack of respect for advising is reflected in its neglect in faculty contracts. Teague and Grites (1980) surveyed faculty contracts at 114 two-year colleges and found that only four gave detailed descriptions of the advising function. Seventy colleges made no mention of advising at all. We know from our own surveys that advising was being done by faculty under contract at some of those colleges, so we must assume that it was not valued enough to rate mention in the contracts.   **BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

The training of advisors is not nearly as controversial an issue but the promotion of such activities to make them seem valued and needed may be problematic. Beginning with an overview of the advising process and its importance in education, training should proceed to help advisors develop the necessary advising skills which are informing, communicating, listening and helping. (ACT 1984) More specifically, according to Wilder (1981), an advisor should be a specialist in the advisee's discipline and be familiar with its requirements and career opportunities, should know the college's regulations, should be familiar with college resources and know when to refer, should have a basic understanding of human behavior and communication processes. Training of advisors can focus on those skills which advisors see as needs. With adequate training interested advisors, faculty or student personnel workers, can become effective in advising.

The final issue in advising is evaluation. Is the system meeting the goals and objectives as stated in the advising plan? The people who are best able to answer the questions are those involved in it. Consequently students should be regularly surveyed as to their perceptions of the advising process. At Penn State, Fayette Campus, (Kapraum and Coldren 1980) sudents are asked to rate advisors on a scale from 0 to 4 in each of the following dimensions:

-Is consistently available, on time, for appointments.

-Keeps regular office hours.

-Is aware of and has access to information you need.

-Takes time to become acquainted with you personally.

-Discusses your academic goals and progress toward these
 goals with you.

-Refers you, when necessary, to the proper college
 representative, administrative staff member, or
 counselor.

-Is one with whom you have a congenial relationship.

-Has a positive constructive attitude toward advising in
 general.

-Keeps you up to date on changes in your course of
 study.

The results of this evaluation are used by advisors for self
improvement and by administrators who award points for
advising in the general evaluation. The process serves also
to reinforce the importance of advising and makes students
aware of what should be accomplished in advising.

Advisors and prospective advisors can also evaluate their
own attitudes toward advising by asking themselves questions.
Walter (1982) has devised such a list of questions among
which are:

-Am I willing to take the time to help students discover
 their interests and explore those interests in terms of
 their strength and significance?

-Am I creative in putting students in touch with people,

27

books, experiences, and resources which will stimulate
their curiosity and feed their interests?

-Do I really help students to integrate their learning
experiences in such a way so that they emerge from
their college careers equipped to function effectively
and creatively?

These are not easy questions but just asking them again helps
the advisor to focus on the developmental aspects of
advising.

From my perspective as a counselor who regularly sees
students who are either unaware of the advising system or
have ignored it, there are several factors which are of
primary importance in the implementation of a successful
advising system.

First, both the advisors and the students need to be aware
that a system is in place, what the system is designed to
accomplish, and how it can be accessed. This means that a
written plan, which I think should be devised by students,
faculty and student personnel staff, is not only agreed upon
but is publicized; to the advisors during their training
sessions and to the students during their orientation to the
college.

Ideally, students should have the opportunity to meet ...th
their assigned advisors (who should have expertise in the

28

student's proposed area of interest) before their first class registration. Since this is not always possible, advisors could at least meet with groups of advisees during orientation or during the first week of classes. Early contact with their advisors gives students a more solid beginning in college.

Secondly, advisors must be available when students need them.. On some campuses this may mean that advising centers which are staffed continously and accessible by phone, may be the answer for times of peak need. It is always preferable for students to talk with their own advisors, but answers to specific questions must always be available. Information on non-advisor contacts should be fed to the advisor; a plan for this information flow should be incorporated into the advising system.

Finally, and most important, the college must value the advising process. In order for a workable plan to be devised, the administration must provide for training, time and encouragement for those devoting their energies to the effort. Good advising must have its rewards, whether they are economic or by some form of recognition. And the administration must advertise its committment to the importance of advising in printed materials; the catalogue, viewbooks, recruitment materials and letters to prospective students and their families. The existence of a strong

29

advising system is proof that a college cares about its
students and the caring attitude is the one which will
attract and retain students.

Accurate and current information can be supplied to students
through written materials or by computers. As Welsh (1979)
puts it, "Advisement must either discover a more significant
function for itself or face gradual and eventual phasing
out." This significant function would appear to be the
developmental one. As colleges evaluate existing advising
systems and begin to design new ones they will need to
consider the advising needs of the students, the
organizational structure of the institution, the desired
outcomes, the available resources, faculty contract
agreements and adviso load. (ACT 1984) The best system at
one college may not work at another. As Crockett (ACT 1984)
puts it, "In the final analysis, although the ways
institutions choose to deliver advising services to students
is important, more important are the institution's commitment
to the process and the ability of individual advisors,
whoever they may be, to build quality and meaningful
relationships with their advisees."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices. Advising Skills, Techniques, and Resources. 1984

The ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices. A National Survey of Academic Advising: Final Report, July, 1983.

Astin, A.W. Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Bostaph, Charles and Marti Moore. Training Academic Advisors: A Developmental Strategy. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1980. 21. 45-49.

Hazelton, Vincent and George E. Tuttle. Performance Appraisal: A New Model for Academic Advisement. Journal Of College Student Personnel, 1981. 22, 213-217.

Kapraum, E. Daniel and Doris W. Coldren. An Approach to the Evaluation of Academic Advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1980. 21. 85-86.

Middlesex County College Office of Institutional Research. A Study to Evaluate the Academic Advisement System in the College - Summary and Conclusions. 1979.

O'Banion, Terry and Alice Thurston, editors. Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Teague, Gerald and Thomas Grites. Faculty Contracts and Academic Advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1980. 21, 40-44.

Vaughn, George B. and Associates. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Walsh, E. Michael. Revitalizing Academic Advisement. Personnel and Guidance Journal, May, 1979.

Walter, Lowell M. Lifeline to the Underprepared: Successful Academic Advising. Improving College and University Teaching, 1982. V.30, No.4.

Wilder, Gerry R. A Successful Academic Advising Program: Essential Ingredients. Journal of College Student Personnel. 1981, 22. 488-492.

III.

NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

GENERAL EDUCATION REGULATIONS

William H. Engler
Humanities Department
Mercer County Community College

Considering the volume of discourse on the plight of general education at institutions of higher learning, participation by the public community colleges has been relatively thin and irresponsibly tardy. In 1978, general education in this sector had been thought to have "been on the defensive, if not on the decline"(Cantor 51). Similarly, a study completed in 1979 revealed that 54% of the community colleges surveyed indicated that no change in general education was likely to occur on their campuses, and that 15% predicted decreased emphasis (Hammons). In 1982, Patricia Cross declared that "General Education in the community college is neither more secure nor less than it was thirty years ago, neither more clarified nor more blurred, neither more -nportant or less"(14). That same year, O'Banion and Shaw declared that"despite their well-deserved reputation for innovation, community colleges generally have been unsuccessful in designing programs of general education d'fferent from those of the senior institutions"(63). Somehow the ferment, the plethora of conferences, the episodes of public self-accusations as well as the fervent proclamations of new commitment to broader educational experiences have had limited impact upon the community college. A perusal of the literature produced by the Project on General Education Models corroborates this relative inactivity. There have been, to be sure, spectacular exceptions, most notably the highly publicized effort at Miami-Dade (Lukenbill and McCabe). Even the celebrated DOORS Program adopted by some community colleges (and subsequently dropped by New Jersey's Essex County Community College) was initially developed at Illinois Central College (Forum 8).

33

For a variety of reasons, including anxiety about having been left behind, the community college sector is beginning to deal with the issues more directly, albeit pessimistically. Despite calls for a committment to reform and self-study noted at a national workshop on general education in March, 1984 (Rabb), the participants were all too keenly aware of the obstacles and pitfalls in the path of reform. They were familiar with the issues, eg. the lack of clear focus, the need for integration, the creep of specialization, etc., but it is as if the pull and tug of the battle- zone has made their good intentions both wary and tentative.

The question asked by Rose Channing, President of Middlesex Community College, at this same workshop, as to whether the public or students appreciated the value of general education, betrayed an ever growing hyper-sensitivity toward the marketplace among New Jersey colleges. Snakebitten by rapidly falling enrollment and ever tighter budgetary restictions, the community colleges in the state of New Jersey are inclined, at best, to stand pat on general education, and continue to use their energies to penetrate the special interests market. All of these colleges have enlarged their community and continuing education services often at the expense of competing with more traditional general education offerings. It is, then, fair to say that a fresh effort to regenerate general education has not been in the offing. In this light it was not suprising that the Department of Higher Education would seek to fill the vacuum as yet another way to expand its influence over the community college sector. Rushing in where angels feared to tread, the Board of Higher Education, in April

1983, adopted a revised set of General Education Regulations.

The Regulations

The stated purposes of these regulations are threefold: First, that students cease taking advantage of the existing regulations by taking a disproportionate number of courses in a specific discipline. Further, certificate programs had to require general education courses, and finally, that articulation between the county colleges and the state colleges had not bene facilitated by tighter regulations. Of the firs one may only assume that the DHE had observed excesses and sought to eliminate them by ensuring broader educational experiences. The second and third purposes are in line with the DHE's policy to promote vertical articulation through standardization. The assumption underlying this effort is that each level is to a large extent, preparation f the next. The community college is viewed in this manner as a layer in a hierarchy, rather than a distinct entity with its own unique identity. The fact that ever decreasing numbers of students matriculate in transfer programs makes this treatment highly questionable. The "stronger articulation" line is therefore, a cover for the DHE's extension of authority.

The main body of the document focuses the distribution of courses within distinct categories or areas of general education. The existing number of general education credits required for degrees still pertain, but now they must be "spent" within four areas: communications, mathematics and science (including computer science), social sciences, and humanities. These categories had been proceeded by a statement that the distribution might be

satisfied by "such other courses as may be specified in the college catalog which emphasize the acquisition of knowledge, comprehension and evaluation of ideas ..,"   the gist of which suggests opportunities for interdisciplinary courses housed outside the grouping. No such inference is, however, supported by the rest of the document. General education courses had to be placed among the four "portions". In addition, students are expected to take an "array" of courses under each heading, thereby ensuring both breadth and depth.

Two other requirments are of interest. First, certificate programs would have to include six to nine general education credits, in keeping with the policy of vertical articulation, and finally the stipulation that "a general education course shall be taught only by faculty qualified in the discipline." Here the DHE reaches into the hiring and coverage practices of the colleges, but more significantly provides legal support for an orderly Reduction In Force. This regulation would prevent "switching" into disciplines, as had been encouraged in the years when the community colleges ate at the horn of plenty.

On the whole there are no suprises in this document. The distribution list matches that already in place for the state colleges. Further, the categories represent an inoffensive, consensus approach to distribution. This point of view does, however, reinforce debatable assumptions about the efficacy of the distribution method. It assumes that general education experiences are best encouraged within descrete disciplines, and that every educated person knows what they are. By enforcing distribution, the new regulations will discourage new arrangements including

cross-disciplinary offerings, and different ways to provide the
sense of connectedness not addressed in the stated directives.
The limitations of the distribution system have been amply
identified and assessed in any number of publications and forums.
As Gaff notes "distribution requirements have spawned the very
problems that current reform efforts are seeking to
overcome" (51). The promising approaches designed to deal with the
fragmentation of the traditional distribution method, noted in the
Princeton workshop would not find fertile soil in the dank tarn of
the Jersey Meadowlands.

Even more disturbing than the DHE's imposition of a specific
curricular pattern, is its insatiable appetite for control. In
order to complete its effort of making eveything symmetrical
within a neatly organized hierarchy, all the DHE had to do was to
find a way measuring the effects of the curriculum. That is
exactly what the Department recommended when T. Edward Hollander
dropped the other shoe in December, 1984. In a memorandum to the
Board of Higher Education concerning the recent NIE Report on
Higher Education, Hollander continued his bold foray into the
business of all the colleges in the state. Although most of the
publicity surrounding the NIE Report emphasized the NIE's concern
over the plight of the teaching and study of the humanities,
Hollander used the Report as a springboard for his own pet
concerns. Only one brief comment about the humanities is buried
in the bowels of this scattershot document and even that ended up
as a recommendation "that the Fund for the Improvement of
Collegiate Educatioin expand its objectives to encompass the
development of comprehensive undergraduate core curricula" (9). The

heart of this memorandum, however, rests in a series of recommendations for assessing student achievment including a request that the colleges and universities report back to the Board "on the feasibility of instituting a statewide sophomore testing program" (16). Hollander is seeking closure on this last measure, so the county colleges will soon have to gear up for the inevitable. In a way, the regulations for general education, and the regulations for expanded testing are part of the same pattern of state inteference. The county colleges will have to find ways to compromise the state examination, or end up having their curricula fit the test rather than the other way around.

Mercer's Reaction

The presidents of Mercer County Community College have often handled major changes in policy at the DHE, by incorporating them into college policy well before the state has taken final action. By promulgating subtle, self-serving versions of the anticipated changes, Mercer then assumes the leadership role among the community colleges, while also establishing a cooperative relationship with the DHE. Mercer's handling of the General Education Regulations was no exception to this strategy. Fully a year prior to the formulation of the DHE's regulations, Mercer's Dean for Academic Affairs recommended slight alterations of the college's general education distribution requirements based upon a definition endorsed by the Academic Officers Association of New Jersey which he himself had written. Mercer's Curriculum Committee adopted some of the recommendations, including the splitting of the liberal arts category into two: social sciences and

38

humanities. When the DHE's regulations landed on the county colleges, Mercer was in the unique position of having to make only minimal adjustments in some of its programs. A humanities or a social science course had to be added to seven degree programs while an English course had to be added to six certificate programs. As a result of these additional credits, some programs technically exceeded the maximum number of credits permitted by Mercer, and consequently, the college is seeking a waiver from the DHE which would permit the <u>reduction</u> of general education credits in a few technological programs. All in all, Mercer's distribution approach was not only inviolate, but also validated by Hollander's official stamp of approval.

A review of trends in Mercer's educational programs shows feverish curricular activity in both occupational and techn logical courses of study. This has tended to increase the pressure toward specialization by those who coordinate discipline activities. To its credit, the college has sought to temper this development by establishing minimum literacy requirements in all courses, by supporting efforts to promote writing across the disciplines and by adding an additional three credits of English for all AAS students. In addition, the Curriculum Committee reviewed the the general education course list and removed offerings which were clearly occupational. Apart from these activities, however, no person or forum has ever raised serious questions about the function or format of general education. Occasionally, an irate member of the faculty in technology will rail against the need for students to take a social science course, but no one has ever raised the need for coherence, fusion,

or diminished fragmentation.

The distribution system is general education at Mercer, and any other arrangement unimaginable. The trick for most faculty is to find a way to make the system work for them, that is to say, to buttress enrollment in their own courses. The faculty only become interested in general education when they want to place new courses on the general education course list, or when the Curriculum Committee threatens to excise someone's course. The distribution system and the approved courses are the result of a complicated skein of political accomodations, common sense, traditional practices and finally arrangements brought about by an ever changing academic management structure. As a result of all the above, proponents of courses in areas which have been traditionally underrepresented in general education, eg. visual and performing arts are finding it almost impossible to gain acceptance. Requests on the part of these groups usually lead to a demand that the Curriculum Committee provide a definition of general education which would cover the existing list, and that is, of course, impossible. The committee usually avoids confrontation by referring to the distribution list as its definition. Furthermore, no one has ever developed an interdisciplinary offering for fear that it will fail to be placed on the general education course list because there isn't a category for it and therefore will wind up underenrolled. Mercer has the best of all possible worlds: it has a system which is carved in stone, approved by the state, and successfully resistant to most creative encroachments.

The Future at Mercer

Some positive steps may be taken to improve the general
education program despite the permanence of the distribution
system. Although the content of courses is regularly reviewed,
there is little or no discussion about the potential for
connections between the disciplines. Further, the wider goals of
the college having to do with thinking and valuing are lo,t among
the lists of facts the students are expected to master. A number
of approaches might be encouraged to foster interrelatedness among
the disciplines as well as techniques designed to develop the
higher level cognitive skills a sound general education should
address. Given the concern for falling enrollment and the
potential for RIF, these approaches must be non-threatening, and
if possible initiated by the faculty.

1. Writing Across the Curriculum activities should be continued.
In addition, workshops along the lines of Thinking Across the
Curriculum should be initiated. Bard College is currently
sponsoring weekend workshops to encourage inquiry and questioning
techniques in the classroom. Faculty might also share ways to
stimulate logic and synthesis in class, in readings and on tests.

2. Pilot interdisciplinary offerings might be funded by the
college's Instructional Development Committee. Courses in the
Humanities (art, literature, history, philosophy) might be fused
without disrupting the distribution system. Discussions and
planning might be undertaken by faculty who might arrange to have
their courses scheduled concurrently, eg. History of Western

Civilization and World Literature.

3. Forums and presentations by speakers focusing attention upon the connection between technology and general societal issues (eg. nursing and ethics, social effects of the computer) might be offered on a regular basis.

4. Workshops for the college's Curriculum Committee re general education should be undertaken without delay.

While none of the above is new or earthshaking, the combination might encourage thoughtfulness about the ways in which technique, content and organization might fulfil our goals for general education. If not, the Department of Higher Education will gladly do our thinking for us.

Works Cited

Cantor, Harold. "Integrated Humanities." Humanities in Two-
    Year Colleges: Trends in Curriculum. Los Angeles:
    Center for the Study of Community Colleges and Eric
    Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Summer, 1978.

Cross, Patricia. "Thirty Years Have Passed: Trends in
    General Education." General Education in Two-Year
    Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Forum for Liberal Education. November 1978.

Gaff, Jerry G. "Avoiding the Potholes: Strategies for
    Reforming General Education." Educational Record.
    Fall 1980.

GEM Newsletter. Project on General Education Models.
    July 1979.

Hollander, T. Edward. "Adoption of Proposed Revision of
    County College General Education Regulations." New
    Jersey Department of Higher Education. April 6, 1983.

---. "Analysis of NIE Report on Higher Education."
    New Jersey Department of Higher Education.
    December 1985.

Lukenbill, Jeffrey D., McCabe, Robert H. General Education
    in a Changing Society. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt,
    1978.

Rabb, Theodore, ed. Mid-Career Fellowship Program Bulletin
    No. 5. Winter 1985.

IV.

HONORS PROGRAMS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

REALITY AND PROMISE

Larry L. Cohen
English Department
Middlesex County College

If they are seen in the context of realistic expectations, honors programs offer one of the few opportunities for mid-career community college faculty desiring growth within a traditional institutional framework. However, in order to assess this opportunity fairly, it is necessary to become familiar with both the limitations and the variety of options that characterize such programs.

Initial exposure to honors efforts at community colleges through implicit findings in the literature and explicit "war stories" of program coordinators can be discouraging. Until recently, honors programs at many community colleges seem to have borne many of the hallmarks of newly arrived immigrant groups-- barely tolerated by the mainstream culture, poor, misunderstood, a threat to other groups' meager share of an inadequate pie. The perversion of the comprehensive mission of the community college into a narrow obsession with career training and serving the least able has hardly provided a healthy environment for honors program implementation. With a few exceptions such as Miami-Dade's and Maricopa's comprehensive honors projects, most efforts at two-year colleges have been tiny, woefully underfunded, and of minimal impact on students or faculty. A recent article on the honors student in the AACJC Journal unconsciouly underscores the alienation between honors programs

and the larger two-year college community in its very title:
"The Honors Program Student: Atypical Profile."

It is perhaps significant that this article is only
one of a handful dealing with programs for the academically
gifted student in the Journal, which serves as the two-year
colleges' primary professional forum. Among these, most
helpful in its comprehensiveness is Jack Friedlander's
"Honors Programs in Community Colleges, in the Journal's
February, 1983 issue. Friedlander, a staff associate at
the Center for the Study of Community Colleges in Los
Angeles, has delineated the beginnings and modes of operation
of several exemplary two-year honors programs in his study of
 six districts (Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Maricopa,
Miami-Dade, and St. Louis.) Friedlander found that the
honors program is nearly always a recent phenomenon, and
that his respondents were "remarkably similar" in their
observations that their honors program came out of a
realization that "until recently, their college had concen-
trated its efforts on helping the whole range of students
with special needs except for one group-- the academically
advanced student."

The specific reasons cited for starting honors programs
were striking in their contrast to the "academic populist"
rhetoric fashionable in the 1960's and 1970's:

1. An increasing number of students who are attending community colleges can benefit from honors courses and programs

2. Honors programs are part of collegewide efforts to strengthen the quality of their academic programs, particularly in the area of general education

3. Honors programs can assist community college educators in their efforts to attract and retain outstanding students and faculty

4. These programs can enhance the public image of the institution as a place where superior scholarship is honored and encouraged

The rhetoric is salutary-- quality, outstanding, superior, scholarship-- but what of the reality? How have these and other institutions translated such ambitious goals into successful programs?

Unfortunately, there appears to be little empirical data that documents the positive effects of honors program implementation on recruitment, retention, or public image. Even the most detailed study of honors programs, Honors in the Two-Year College, published by the National Collegiate Honors Council, the National Council of Instructional Administrators, and the Community College Humanities (1983)

remains silent on questions concerning the effectiveness of honors in these areas. Perhaps observers are reluctant to subject so new a phenomenon to close scrutiny, or perhaps they have found it difficult to measure the efficacy of honors programs as institutional adrenalin, but it appears that some sort of detailed, dispassionate evaluation of representative honors programs is needed.

There is data, however, on the practice if not the outcome of honors program operation, much of which suggests a genuine attempt to live up to the rhetoric of Friedlander's respondents. In a departure from common two-year college practice, these programs have flexible but genuine academic entrance criteria. Typically, according to Friedlander, admission into honors requires an ACT score of 25 or a combined SAT score of 1100, a cumulative grade point average in high school or college of about 3.5 on a 4-point scale, demonstration of special talents and abilities, and interviews with members of the college's honors committee. These criteria are, parenthetically, more or less congruent with those incorporated into Ocean County College's and Gloucester County College's honors programs. The compilers of Honors in the Two-Year College report a similar pattern of admission criteria nationally.

Once admitted. students will find a number of options

under the rubric honors, depending on the commitment,
philosophy, or politics of the individual institution.
These include, according to Honors in the Two-Year College,
the following modes:

-- the course-centered program

-- the single-track or prescribed curriculum
  program

-- the core-oriented program

-- the individualized honors program

-- the comprehensive program

In the course-centered program, honors sections of
selected courses are the major-- and sometimes only-- program
component. This option permits the participation of students
whose talents are unevenly distributed, and may be especially
useful in facilitating involvement on the part of foreign-
background students with some vestigial language difficulty.
Most course-centered programs seem to focus on either
enriched traditional liberal arts courses or on interdisci-
--inary courses. While this helps to obtain the minimum
enrollment needed to run certain humanities courses, such
an approach tends to exclude the vocational-technical
student.

Course-centered programs are inexpensive and administra-
tively easy to initiate, but may also result in a fragmented
effort in which non-participating departments resent the

attraction of students away from already thinly-subscribed
courses. In examining institutional models, one might in
fact suspect that the presence of a course-centered program
after several years of honors operation suggests a weak
commitment on the part of the institution.

The single-track or prescribed curriculum program
(such as offered at the County College of Morris) offers
a university-parallel-oriented package that is highly
structured, yet permits a variety of options within its
structure. At Morris, for example, the program is given a
special dimension through a second-year 12-credit Honors
Seminars sequence which focuses on the history of ideas
and on literary masterpieces, and is designed to provide a
holistic vision of the development of Western consciousness.
Obviously, a single-track program, even if it enrolls only
a small number of students, will require more administrative
and advisement energy than will a course-centered appr ach.

An even greater institutional commitment is usually
required by the core-oriented program, which emphasizes
the need for interaction among honors students within a
required group of courses that share a common theme and an
an interdisciplinary approach. These programs are charac-
terized by close cooperative relationships among partici-
pating faculty, and by a strong focus on a particular

unifying theme, such as the Community College of Philadel-
phia's concern with Western intellectual history. The core-
oriented program also lends itself to differing pedagogical
approaches, of which Philadelphia offers an excellent
example. According to the program's directors, Dennis
McGrath and Marty Spear, many community college faculty
use the opportunity to design individual honors courses as
an outlet for their idiosyncratic notions of the ideal
curriculum, which leads to fragmentation and neglects the
relationship between honors and the general education
curriculum. McGrath and Spear have circumvented this
tendency by making their core-oriented honors curriculum
emphasize the cognitive and attitudinal skills that students
will need for success in academic and professional life.
By focusing on students' cognitive styles and de-emphasizing
content, they have removed subject matter from center stage.
This, in turn, has helped remove content from the arena of
faculty conflict over _what_ is to be taught, and from being
so dominant that concerns over what they term 'low-level
information transfer" become paramount.

The Philadelphia program, taught by a team of 6 or 7
faculty, emphasizes writing across the curriculum, and
includes weekly 2-hour seminars as well as conventional
lectures during its operating year.

Attractive as core-oriented programs may seem, however, they may create a problem for some students, who might dislike the unifying theme or may not want a strong history or humanities background, as McGrath and Spear recently admitted in discussing their program at an NCHC conference. For example, the imposition of Western intellectual history at a heavily minority-oriented campus may be politically unwise, worthy as its educational objectives might be.

At the opposite end of the spectrum is the individualized honors program such as is found at Corning Community College, in which independent study under a faculty mentor is coupled with an interdisciplinary forum so that students can share their interests and insights. This model seems particularly adaptable to colleges interested in making only a limited initial commitment to honors without compromising quality, and to those at which "contract grading" is already in place as a methodology. Even those campuses with only an established practice of offering independent study courses, such as Middlesex, could easily adapt to individualized honors. Another advantage is this mode's easy adaptability to the needs of older, part-time evening students who are locked out of full-time honors options, or vocational-technical students who face the same problem.

For those colleges large enough to have multi-campus facilities, the comprehensive program, utilizing two or

more of the above options, may be appropriate. Maricopa
Community College in Phoenix, with 9 campuses and 9 program
variations, may be the ultimate example of this approach.
However, given the smaller size and historical development
of New Jersey's community colleges, a comprehensive approach
seems too ambitious for the state at this time.

Once enrolled, students in the programs outlined above
generally must meet maintenance criteria. For example,
Frederick Community College (Frederick, Texas) requires a
3.5 major GPA and a 3.2 overall GPA for the honors degree;
typical of most programs appears to be at least a cumula-
tive GPA of from 3.25 to 3.5. At least one college has
given additional grade points for honors courses to compensate
for students' fears that participating in an honors program
will lower their cumulative average.

At this juncture it should be noted that the admission
and maintenance standards outlined above, given the average
community college environment and its minimal resource
allocation to forstering academic excellence, will usually
result in small numbers of honor enrollees. For example,
a study by Piland and Gould (1981) found that enrollment
in honors programs ranged from 10 to 100. These numbers
are significant on t ' counts for those contemplating honors
implementation. First, it is unlikely that honors courses
will "drain" students away from any large number of regular
courses. Second, it is equally unlikely that honors offerings
will, in themselves, act as a major stimulant to enrollment.

A second factor limiting the size of honors programs is the unwillingness of most two-year schools to commit the administrative and faculty resources necessary for effective operation of larger programs. Many four-, ar honors programs are staffed by a full-time director (Rutgers is one local example) but few two-year colleges will do so. Instead, a dedicated faculty member is give one or two courses' released time and, together with a faculty committee, operates the program on an _ad ho._ basis, with little money for first-rate guest lecturers or recruitment advertising. The supplemental enrichment activities that round out any honors programs, such as special colloquia, field trips, films, or social events, are a particular challenge under such circumstances. Indeed, if administrative support is sufficiently absent, the program may simply wither away, as has reportedly occurred at Mercer.

However, if at least minimal administrative support is present, some sort of honors program can be established in most two-year colleges, petty details, petty jealousies, and the absence of petty cash notwithstanding. But why, then, should a mid-career faculty member take on the very demanding exertions most such enterprises will require? Not to save the institution, for the research has not demonstrated that this will work as a "quick fix." Perhaps to save oneself. Most mid-career faculty are increasingly

immobilized by a vanished job market, a dearth of administrative or lateral promotion opportunities at the home campus, and limited room for curricular adventures. Involvement in an honors program offers a rare opportunity for keeping intellectually fresh and avoiding "stale-out." The rewards for faculty initiative in this area are self-evident but worth repeating:

1. Honors programs can, if necessary, be conducted at a minimal level-- a course or two-- at so little cost to the institution that little objection can be made to implementation on purely economic grounds. One's "expensive" mid-career salary does not act as an impediment.

2. Because honors programs are small and rely heavily on faculty initiative for their success, the individual can still make a difference-- and the results of leadership are highly visible, yea, even unto the quantifiable.

3. The rewards of success are further sweetened by contact with students and ideas at a level approximating the secret fantasies of most community college faculty.

4. No one has yet adequately evaluated the success of honors programs in terms of their institutional

impacts on enrollment, image, and the like.
Therefore, one's claims for the value of honors
to the institution's well-being are unlikely
to be challenged by research-minded administra-
tive types for years to come.

5. One can have the satisfaction of knowing that
   one has inched the community college back to the
   initial promise of educational opportunity
   for all embraced by the concept of the
   comprehensive institution.

Given the apparently sustained swing toward the traditional
and conservative in American life, with its withdrawal of
commitment to strongly egalitarian postures, the time may
be especially ripe for an expansion of honors programming
at two-year schools. If one accepts the limitations of
a two-year college setting, involvement in an honors
program can, in providing the benefits outlined above,
revitalize one's non-honors teaching and related activities.
If enough faculty commit themselves to strengthening honors
activities on their campuses, the day may come when an honors
seminar will rival the latest in high-technology laboratories
as a "showpiece" for visitors.

V.

REQUIRING MICROCOMPUTERS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

.

George Popel
Mathematics Department
Middlesex County College

Computers are generally known for their usefullness to engineering
and the sciences. The computer has natural ties to scientific ac-
tivity-the activity of model building, model testing and model sim-
ulating. But in the marriage of "arts and sciences" cam computers
be useful for the "arts" or, more importantly, can computers help
any student of arts or sciences or of the professions, regardless
of specialization? Can computers help students learn? Can they
encourage creativity? Can they stimulate curiosity? If the ans-
wers to the above questions are yes, should colleges and univer-
sities require computer literacy of each student? If computer lit-
eracy, then why not computer fluency? And again, if the answer is
yes, then what about the community college? Are there risks?

Requiring microcomputers in community colleges is the topic of this
paper. I will argue that "somehow" computers must be mandatory in
community colleges. I wish to present this argument in several parts.

First, I will claim that computers will help students learn and that
it is inevitable that all college and university students will soon
be required to be computer fluent. Next, I wish to discuss some
myths about computers and learning. Then I wish to discuss some
problems in requiring computer fluency-problems unique to commun-
ity colleges. Last, I wish to suggest how some of these problems
might be resolved.

Many colleges and universities are already extensively making com-
puting resources available to their students or are requiring stu-
dents to own their own computer. Some of these are Massachusetts
Institute of Technology, Carnegie-Mellon University, Clarkson Uni-
versity, Stevens Institute of Technology, Vassar College, Grinnell
College, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rensselaer Polytechnic
Institute, Case Western Reserve, Stanford University, University
of Michigan, Evergreen State College, Drexel University, Brown
University, Dartmouth College, Reed College, Dallas Baptist College,

58

Drew College of Liberal Arts etc. The list is not complete, only intended to demonstrate the variety, and the list is growing. Why?

There are many reasons why micro computers are beginning to flood college campuses, and not just the desks of scientists and graduate students. One reason is economic-microcomputers are becoming relatively "inexpensive." Another reason is "userfriendliness" - which means that students and faculty members no longer require elaborate training to use them. Another and the most important reason, is the recognition that computers are as relevant to the humanities and the social sciences as they are to the physical sciences and to engineering. Computers manipulate symbols and there is no device more proficient at manipulating symbols than a computer. But numbers are symbols, words are symbols, concepts are made up of symbols. Education, regardless of specialty, is the manipulation of symbols. When used in a meaningful way, computers will help students learn.

Clarkson School of Management professor Ralph Janaro: "What we're trying to teach students is how to think, not how to plug-in numbers. The mechanics of getting a solution won't be as important as what the students do once they arrive at that solution." He predicts that the only limitation on the computer will be a lack of imagination on the users part.

In the drama department at CarnegieMellon University, for example, students are using computers to learn st age lighting and are writing plays on computer terminals." They used to use scotch tape and throw paper on the floor, says Akram Midani, the dean of fine arts. "But the act of constructing a dramatic text is beautifully suited to a computer's word-processing ability."

The potential of using computers to enhance learning is great. Microcomputers can change the way students learn, they can show how complex processes work. John Kemeny, Dartmouth's former president, says computerization allows students to work on "more substantial problems" and learn by discovery rather than note-

taking. "Suppose you are talking about pay discrimination against women in a sociology course," he hypothesizes. "You can take actual current statistics on age, sex, education, pay and so forth, and let students run the correlations and decide for themselves whether it is a problem."

Nicholas Armington, a senior at Dartmouth College, has used computers to study philosophy, create random geometric patterns in a course on art and technology and brush up on his French. While studying statistics he used computers to verify the probabilities of such large-scale events as flipping coins thousands of times. "The computer lets you run through a large sample you could never generate yourself," he says. And, of course, there's the advantage of word processing. Armington says he has "never written a paper onto a piece of paper."

The advantages of word processing go beyond convenience, speed and accuracy and neatness. Kenneth C. Rodgers, the president of Stevens Institute of Technology, believes that computers will help students to become better writers. "The idea has not been tested, but I have a strong feeling that the mechanics of good writing-paragraphing, punctuation and spelling can be taught more readily using a computer," he said. "One of the interesting things about computers is that they are totally unforgiving." He explained that a minor difference is punctuation in programming, such as a period used for a comma, can change meaning. He feels that the discipline the student learns in mastering a computer can also help to improve sensitivity to the written word.

"The computer," says Richard M. Cyert, president of Carnegie-Mellon, "is the most significant addition of capital to students since the printing press." He thinks that wide spread use of computers will stimualte analytical thinking. "When you use a computer, y .J have to be more specific."

60

So, is every educator in favor of requiring students to be computer-fluent? The answer is no. Then why? There are doubtless many reasons-some valid and some perhaps invalid. Some of the invalid reasons are lack of knowledge about what a computer can do (and the reluctance to learn), resistance to change, and myths. What kind of myths?

Computers will undermine the art of the written word and the personal interaction between student and teacher. The computer is an impersonal and mindless machine which will preclude creativity. A computer will only tell you what you tell it to say.

Two thousand years ago, Plato chronicled the shift from an oral tradition to a written one. In one of the diaglogues, he records the objections of Socrates, who argued that words on paper undermine the "art of dialectic," the personal interaction between student and tutor that constitutes words "go on telling you just the same thing forever," Socrates declared in the diaglogue "Phaedus." "If men learn this, it will implant forgetfulness in their soul."

The printed word represented a threat to the authority of scholars, putting an alternative source of knowledge into the hands of students. It was denounced as impersonal and mindlessly repetitious, precluding the creativity that took place when scribes amended and commented on the manuscripts they were copying. According to Patrick Suppes, professor of philosophy at Standord University, it was not until the end of the 18th century that books were extensively used for teaching in schools.

Another myth about microcomputers is that they will only become a means of repetitious (traditional) drill-and-practice memorizing. Worse than that, some feel that they will merely become sophisticated and expensive toys for students and faculty. This does not need to be the case, and in fact, is not in many schools. The success will depend on integrating the systems into the schools' curriculum. The best way for faculty to ensure the systems "applicability" is for the faculty to participate in development.

Another myth about the use of microcomputers is the vision of the computer user glued to a monitor screen and isolated from human contact. All evidence indicates that this is just not true. On the contrary, on many campuses, the computer has brought together students who would not other wise have anything in common. More importantly, the computer has brought faculty together across departments and divisions, who prior to computers had very little in common. It may turn out to be that computers may be the best thing that ever happened to "interdisciplinary studies." Different disciplines, which hardly knew the other existed, are now talking to each other about their now common problems on the microcomputer.

There would be, of course, problems and risks in requiring microcomputers in colleges and universities. These problems have been discussed and written about at length, and they are being resolved. But are there any problems that are unique to community colleges? I think there are, and I think they fall into two general groups.

The first problem is that there are many students in a community college that plan to take only a handful (or even one) of courses. Requiring a student to purchase a microcomputer in order to take one or two courses would be not only unreasonable, but doubtlessly unacceptable.

The second problem is the "high" attrition rate of a typical community college. The philosophy of giving every student an opportunity to attend college has as a negative consequence the fact that many of them do not complete their intended goals and programs. Requiring student sthat will not continue to the second or third semester to buy a microcomputer for such a brief period of time would also be unreasonable and unacceptable.

A third problem the problem of finances, although a major problem, is not unique to community colleges. I feel that it is inevitable that all college students will have to become computer fluent - and as a consequence the financial problems will be resolved. I feel that it is inevitable that every college and university student will be required to own a microcomputer.

But if college and university students are becoming computer fluent what about community college students? I think the conclusion is inescapable. We, the community colleges, would be doing our students a great disservice if we were not to make our students computer literate. The community college student, in order not to be at a disadvantage, will also have to own a microcomputer. But when? What about part time students and those who do not complete their programs? I suggest the following compromise.

The schools will have to provide access to microcomputers to all part-time and freshman students. Sophomore students will have to own their own computers.

Is the solution so simple? No. Can the problems be resolved? Yes. Can the money be generated? Yes. Will faculty be reluctant? Yes. Can they be convinced? Maybe. Are microcomputers inevitable in community colleges? Yes.

REQUIRING MICROCOMPUTERS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by George Popel

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Computer on Every Desk" by Donna Osgood
BYTE magazine, June 1984

"Computers in the Groves of Academe" by Edward B. Fiske
The New York Times magazine, May 13, 1984

"Stevens Focuses on Computers" by Elizabeth M. Fowler in
the Careers column, Business Day Section
The New York Times, October 31, 1984

"Micros Flood Campuses" by Margie Plcch
High Technology magazine March, 1984

"College Students Learn to Live with Computers" by Barbara
Wierzbicki in the Using Micros column
Popular Computing, January 16,1984

"The Microcomputer Environment at Stevens Institute of Tech-
nology" - a paper presented by Joseph J. Moeller Jr. (of
Stevens) at the 1984 ASEE Annual Conference Proceedings

"Making the Grade" by Carol Thorsten-Stein
Digital Review, September 1984

EDUCOM Computer Literacy Newsletter
Steven W. Gilbert, Director
Vol. 1, No. 3, Spring 1984

VI.

ATTRITION AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

James Marinaccio
Natural Science Department
Somerset County College

Introduction

Student attrition and retention have been familiar terms in higher education for a long time. Until recently, most of us have been content to acknowledge that attrition existed and to accept it. Elite institutions have tended to assume that attrition is a consequence of maintaining the competitive conditions upon which their reputation depends (Pantages and Creedon 1978). Willner (1982) notes that for different reasons, community colleges with their open-door policies have come to accept attrition as an inevitable consequence of their admission policy. In most cases, retention rates have not been a concern unless drastic attrition occurred in a particular department or program, thus signaling that some type of problem existed (Cope 1975).

Today, however, there is an increased awareness of the cost of attrition, both to students and to community colleges. Students who drop out have wasted time, energy, and money; furthermore, the negative college experience may discourage them from trying again elsewhere. (of course, for some students, dropping out is a disirable and needed action, especially if they achieved their intended goals during the time they were at the community college Willner 1982). From the stand point of the institution's perspective, improving refention-reducing attrition- is one way to combat declining enrollments and the accompanying decreases in

66

funding that now threaten so many community colleges. In addition,
Lee (1982) states that improved retention and effective recruiting
enhance one another. Recruiting that attracts students who will not
be happy or successful at the particular community college will
adversely affect retention (Keyser 1982). Conversely, students who
drop out because they are unh ppy with their experience or feel the
community college misled them, or both, will communicate their
dissatisfaction to other students; this may hurt future recruiting.

Is Retention Good and Attrition Bad?

To assume that retention equates with success and attrition with
failure poses hazards f r any attrition study (Pantages and Creedon
1978). Today, when community colleges struggle to maintain
enrollments and funding levels, it is no suprise to find that this
misconception persists. But for any attrition or retention study to
be worthwhile, this notion should be replaced with a more objective
understanding of what enrollment, graduation, and other kinds of
statistics really indicate, along with a commitment to develop
programs that can help students reach the best decision about
leaving or staying in school.(Noel 1978). Another fallacy imbedded
in some attrition and retention studies is an unrealistic
expectation for retention (Noel 1978). The epitome of retention
perhaps, is the case of Edward Levi, who began as a kindergartner
at the University of Chicago Laboratory School, progressed there

through high school, went on to complete his bachelor's and law degrees a the same campus, and eventually became the University's president. But Edward Levi's career notwithstanding, dropping out of college does not necessarily impede or preclude high achievement. William Faulkner dropped out of the University of Mississippi at the end of his freshman year; John Steinbeck attended college only briefly, and Ernest Hemingway never attended college at all. Yet each won a Nobel prize for literature. (I know of no similar examples from science and mathematics).

Factors Relating to Retention and Attrition

Although research has not provided any solutions to the complex problem of attrition, studies (Pantages and Creedon 1978; Noel 1978) have identified some basic characteristics that appear to be linked with attrition and retention at the community college.

A. Student Characteristics

1. Willner (1982) states that academic factors represent the strongest predicators of retention. The main factors predicting retention may be the level of student's previous academic attainment, and their education aspirations.

2. Cope (1975) notes that demographic factors also have a relationship to attrition. However, Cope (1975) says that this relationship to attrition is not clear for a number of these factors.

3. Pantages and Creedon (1978) mention aspiration and motivation factors as important but difficult to determine.

In their review of the literature, Pantages and Creedon (1978)

concluded that research has "failed to establish
relationships among levels of motivation, commitment to
the college, the strength and content of educational goals,
and attrition".

4. Astin (1975) lists finacncial factors as a reason why some
   students drop out. Student concern about finances, finanial
   aid and employment are all interwoven into this equation.

B. Institutional Characteristics

According to Pantages and Creedon (1978), only in the last
15 years has research focused on the college environment
and its influence on retention and attrition. The college
environment is now considered a major factor in the
retention or attrition of students. Institutional influences
on retention and attrition can be divided into three
categories: environment, student involvement, and policies
and procedures of the institution (Noel 1978).

1. The environment would include image, size of the college
   and services.

2. According to Noel (1978) involvement is a key factor in
   retention.

3. Pantages and Creedon (1978) note that research is lacking
   on the influence of administrative policies and procedures
   on student attrition. In one study, students were found to
   persist to a greater extent when policies did not impose

punitive measures for e.rly withdrawal.

Interactions

The dominant theme in retention research is that retention and
attrition result from the interactions that take place between
students and the institution. The term fit is used to describe
the interaction for those who stay and lack of fit the interaction
for those who leave. Fit can involve many things, but it does include
meaningful contact between the student and the faculty, development
of relationships between students and those who care about them, and
the responsiveness of the institution to the need student feel.
(Marketing the college to prospective students must involve more
than merely attracting them to come and enroll, as is now being done
at some schools.) Integral to the fit is the degree of discrepancy
between student expectations and opportunities for realization of
those expectations. According to Pantages and Creedon (1978), social
interaction with the faculty is related to retention, expecially
if the interaction focuses upon intellectual or course-related
matters. Cope (1978) states that "the research on integrating the
individual with the academic and social milieu suggests that this
is where programs for retention will be most successful".
Pantages and Creedon (1978) note: "The extent to which students
can meet the demands of the college and derive satisfaction from
doing so is the degree to which the student may be expected to

persist at the community college". The factors discussed here can enhance persistence or contribute to the dropout rationale, which eventually culminates in withdrawal from the college.

Recommendations

Much is known about the retention and attrition of students in community colleges. From the standpoint of the college, the next step after determining the factors associated with retention-attrition is to ask the question, " What can we do about it?" Despite both the multivaried factors that contribute to retention and attrition and the highly complex interrelationships among them, solutions may be less difficult to find than would first appear. The task is not to eliminate attrition, a task that is impossible and probably not desirable. Instead, the task is to assist a relatively small percentage of students to stay in college. A shift of even a few percentage points in retention statistics could benefit individual students and have a major impact on the college. According to Pantages and Creedon (1978), "colleges must design and implement effective intervention programs if they hope to minimize the attrition potential of their students". As mentioned previously, the emphasis should be on prevention rather than on prediction. Noel (1978) states that, "the goal of increased student retention can best be realized if two essential conditions are met, First, a genuine concern about student retention and a commitment to

develop and implement retention strategies must be visible at all levels of the institution-from the Board of Trustees to part-time support staff. The second essential condition is equally comprehensive: To be effective, a retention strategy must affect all points where students interact with the college."

According to Noel (1978), giving attention to student retention will force an institution to examine itself closely, even though it may not like what it sees. Change may be necessary. "The students will persist if the institution is delivering lively, substantive learning and growth experiences". Although institutions vary, there are steps and procedures for increasing retention that can apply to virtually every type of institution. Noel (1978) lists the following:

a. Establish an institutionwide retention steering committee.

b. Determine dropout rate.

c. Conduct a dropout study to determine why students are leaving.

d. Conduct an institutional self-study to determine where the institution is successful and where it needs improvement.

e. Establish retention task committees within each of the units or departments to determine appropriate student-oriented action programs.

f. Make concerted efforts to increase faculty and staff awareness of factors related to retaining students; encourage a campuswide attitude of serving students.

g. Build a sound marketing approach into the recruiting program; recruit for retention.

h. Develop a good orientation program for entering freshman.

i. Build a student couseling and advising program from admissions through job placement.

j. Provide a special career-planning program for students who are undecided about educational major or vocational choice.

k. Provide a range of academic-support services for students with marginal academic credentials.

l. Build a so-called early warning system to identify students who are likely to drop out.

m. Set up a simple but sensitive exit-interview process.

n. Institute a tangible reward system for good teaching and faculty advising.

In addition to the specific action areas mentioned in the Noel summary above, Cope and Hannah (1975), Astin (1975c), and Pantages and Creedon (1978) offer specific recommendations, many of which overlap.

Conclusions

For those of us concerned about attrition and retention at the community college, the future can be a bright one. There are many community colleges throughout the country that have dealt effectively with this reality. It is important that at each level within the hierarchy of the community college, that each of us maximize our concern and abilities with respect to students.

Bibliography

Astin, Alexander W. <u>Preventing Students from Dropping Out</u>.
    San Francisco. Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Cope, Robert G., and Hannah, William. <u>Revolving College Doors:
    The Causes and Consequences of Dropping Out, Stopping Out,
    and Transferring.</u> New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Keyser, John S. "Mobilizing To Improve Retention."
    Community and Junior College Journal, 1982. p.24-26.

Lee, Ralph H. "Shared Retention Data: The Barrier of Fear."
    Community and Junior College Journal, Dec/Jan. 1981-1982.
    6-8.

Noel, Lee. ed. <u>Reducing The Dropout Rate</u>. New Directions for
    Student Services, no.3 SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Pantages, Timothy J., and Creedon, Carol F. "Studies of College
    Attrition: 1950-1975." Review of Educational Research
    48 (Winter 1978):49-101.

Willner, Eric. "Characteristics Related to Students Withdrawing
    from College". Community College Review. Vol 10 Winter
    1982-1983.

VII.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND INDUSTRY:

RATIONALE FOR A RELATIONSHIP

Joseph Santora
Humanities Department
Essex County College

Introduction

In recent times, there has been a growing debate among educators regarding the role of the community and junior colleges. One group of educators perceives the community college as having a somewhat narrow focus, i.e., as the mechanism to prepare those entering its doors to make the necessary adjustment and transition between high school and/or the work environment to transfer to four year institutions. On the other hand, a second group of educators sees the community college fulfilling the need of the transfer student while at the same time serving as a vehicle to address the needs of the terminal student, business and industry, adult populations and a host of other special interest groups. A discussion of the two schools of thought previously described has undoubtedly been the subject of debate for some time now and any attempt to address such issues would be overwhelming. Instead, the intention of this brief paper is to select and explore one topic, the need for a relationship between the community college and business/industry.

Economic Issues

In the last decade or so, many American companies have been losing their competitive edge and their ability to dominate world-wide markets. Companies like International

Harvester and Western Electric are forced to terminate
employees, thereby contributing to unemployment and generally
weakening the economy at large. We are all aware of the
litany of reasons attributed to this overall condition. As
well we are also aware of the number of economic issues are
confronting the American economy today. Unemployment the
federal deficit, factory and plant closings, inflation,
business failures, personal bankruptcies, and bank failures
top the list. Coupled with these economic ills are the ever-
present problems of the lack of skilled workers, adult
literacy, dislocated workers and a graying/aging population.

In addition, the economy on both a domestic and
international level is undergoing rapid structural changes
that Americans are only now beginning to understand.
Smokestack industries, once the heart of national and
international trade are dying are being replaced by a very
visible service economy which stresses high technology and
robotics. Such activities and changes confirm the fact that
3
we are entering a post-industrial society.

While these activities are transforming industries
throughout the nation at an rapid rate, a corresponding
rate of employment has not occurred; the existing work force
is not equipped to handle new and innovative machinery nor

3

does it possess the technical expertise needed to function

both effectively and efficiently in what Toffler calls The
      4
Third Wave.

Community Colleges and Industry: Reasons for Joint Efforts

Community colleges have the ability to work

cooperatively with American business. In order to address

itself to the needs of industry and to improve productivity

levels one of the first actions to be taken is improving the
                                                         5
workforce's skills "through training and education." If this

is to occur however community colleges must be willing to

accept the challenge. In accepting this challenge, community

colleges and their faculty need to "be more flexible and
                                                    6
responsive to a rapidly changing environment."

Historically, community colleges have worked" effectively

with local business. Cooperative relationships of these

kinds are manifestations of the college's philosophy—

providing high quality educational services and programs in
                                  7
respons to community needs."

H.   ..r, from business and industry's point of view,

there seems to be a problem present in such an arrangement.

The educational community can not be counted on to" deliver

                                  8
the desired product on time. " Community colleges are

encumbered by numerous self-imposed restrictions. For

example, some community college faculty, in a sense, are
part of the problem: many are not available to participate
in such business/college projects because of teaching
schedule/conflicts; because they are not technically prepared
to teach in specialized programs; because they lack the
necessary expertise; and finally because they express a fear
of change and tend to promote academic snobbery.[9] But all of
the problems facing business-college relationship can not be
blamed solely on faculty. Institutional barriers such as
legal, philosophical, and contractual obligations deter such
arangements. "As publically supported institutions many
community colleges have faced legal and philosophical
problems in providing contract training programs for
individual companies."[10]

However, all is not bleak. A number of community
colleges throughout the United States have begun to develop
a variety of working relationships with industries. In part
such a cooperative relationship is a direct result of the
community college's role and philosophy. This direction is
often contained within community colleges' mission and goals
statements. Those colleges responding to the needs of
business must provide "high quality educational services and
programs".[11] If they don't make some real attempt to meet the

needs of industry, then industry will begin to run its own

college. A recent study conducted by the Carnegie Foundation

for the Advancement of Teaching entitled "Corporate

Classrooms: The Learning Business" indicated that

approximately "$60 billion is spent on corporate-run

education". [12]

Creating Mutual Benefits

Community colleges can gain a number of distinct

benefits by working cooperatively with the private/business

sector. Recent tax revolts such as Proposition 13 (CA.) and

Proposition $2\frac{1}{2}$ (Mass.) as well as federal, state, and local

cutbacks have proved almost beyond a shadow of a doubt that

public financing for community colleges and four year

institutions becomes increasing "difficult to obtain". [13] In

addition to providing funding,

> the private sector has valuable resources
> that can be used to replace and supplement
> dwindling public dollars. Moreover, by
> working well with the private sector, the
> importance of public higher education to
> business can be demonstrated. These power-
> ful allies, in turn, can persuade state
> legislatures and governors that greater
> support is needed and deserved by public
> institutions. [14]

In other words, such arrangements lend support to the

political process by allowing for added political lobbying

muscle.

6

Community colleges can seek to gain additional students, especially significant in today's dwindling post-secondary college bound population. These new populations can replace and to some degree bolster falling FTE levels and thereby allow colleges to continue to operate.

Perhaps the final and most important reason for the community college to engage in a meaningful educational dialogue with industry is the onslaught of proprietary schools. These non-profit and for-profit schools have literally sprung up throughout the country over the past decade. Such schools are approved to offer students financial aid, assure job placement and are nc wedded to conventional instructional hours and schedules. There viability, at the expense of the community college, is based on the inability of community colleges and other post-secondary schools to provide competent educational services to industry.

In addition to fiscal benefits, community colleges are fortunate in the sense that they are

> tied internally to local businesses through
> their administrative structure. The members
> of the local colleges' Board of Trustees are
> usually drawn from the business community, an
> arrangement that provides the private sector
> a direct hand in college policy-making and gives
> them insights into the services that the colleges
> can provide. 15

Other benefit also accrue to college, industry, and the
community-at-large. For instance, the college receives
revenue, fulfills its mission, develops and forges linkages,
gains access to modern equipment, enables faculty to up-grade
hands-on skills, enhances job opportunities for students as
well as hands-on experiences, and is able to tap industrial
resources such as personnel to teach in an adjunct capacity.[16]

Industry, on the other hand, also enjoys certain
gains. Training is able to be provided at a realistic cost.
In most cases, community college training costs are lower
than industry costs. Monies saved from such training can be
diverted into R & D efforts, thereby helping the company.(It
is estimated that ATT spends approximately $1 Billion on its
world-wide training and development efforts.) Moreover,
industry is able to hire additional, better qualified entry-
level persons; receive tax advantages--able to write-off
equipment donated to colleges; participates in the actual
training by using the skills of in-house personnel, thereby
reducing the actual on-the-job training; develops a pool of
trained manpower; and stabilizes labor-union management.[17]
Furthermore, advisory board membership often a prerequsite of
many programs are filled with capable and knowledgeable
industrial representatives willing to undertake college-

related assignments to develop curriculum and to improve instruction.

The community-at-large attracts its share of benefits too Community residents are provided with the necessary skills to become gainfully employed. With skilled employees, industries are more likely to remain in the community rather than move to areas where employees are more plentiful. Not only do local industries remain in these areas but new industries are attracted to such communities. As a result, new monies flow into the community; tax bases remain secure and in some cases expand; and public services continue to be provided to the community at reduced costs.[18]

Conclusion

The community college has a distinct role in working cooperatively with the business community. Since the community college for the most part serves as a training ground for entry level employees it is a unique position to work with industry. The relationship between these two entities, colleges and industry, are mutually complementary and serve to forge a common bond. Benefits derived from from such an arrangement enable both to develop and prosper.

9

Endnotes

1
Putting America Back to Work: The Kellogg Leadership
Initiative: A Report and Guidebook (Washington, D.C.:
AACJC, 1984), pp. 5-9.

2
Ibid., pp. 11-12.

3
Daniel Bell, Coming of a Post-Industrial Society
(New York: Basic, 1976).

4
Alvin Toffler, The Third Wave (New York: Morrow, 1980).

5
Mary Jane Jackman and James R. Mahoney, Shoulders to
the Wheel, (Washington, D.C.: AACJC, 1982), p. vii.

6
M. Ross Boyle, "Sensible Response to Hard Times,"
Community and Junior College Journal, (November 1983), p. 15.

7
Jackman and Mahoney, p. vii.

8
Boyle, p. 16.

9
James R. Mahoney, Community College Centers for Con-
tracted Programs: A Sequel to Shoulders to the Wheel
(Washington, D. C.: AACJC, 1984), p.10.

10
Boyle, p. 17.

11
Jackman and Mahoney, p. viii.

12

Edward B. Fiske, "Booming Corporate Education Efforts Rival College Programs, Study Says," New York <u>Times,</u> 28 January 1985, p. A.10.

13

Richard E. Wilson, "Collaboration with the Private Sector," <u>Community and Junior College Journal</u> (September 1981), p. 2.

14

Wilson, p. 2.

15

Jackman and Mahoney, p. 9.

16

Jackman and Mahoney, pp. 42-43.

17

Jackman and Mahoney, p. 43.

18

Jackman and Mahoney, p. 43.

Bibliography

Bell, Daniel. <u>Coming of a Post-Industrial Society</u>.
    New York, Basic, 1976.

Boyle, M. Ross. "Sensible Response to Hard Times."
    <u>Community & Junor College Journal</u>.   November
    1983,

Fiske, Edward B. "Booming Corporate Education Efforts
    Rival College Programs, Study Says."   New York
    <u>Times</u>, 28 January 1985, p. A 10.

Jackman, Mary Jane and James R. Mahoney.   <u>Shoulders to the
    Wheel</u>.   Washington, D. C.:   AACJC, 1982.

Mahoney, James R.   <u>Community College Centers for Contracted
    Programs: A Sequel to Shoulders to the Wheel</u>.
    Washington, D. C.: AACJC,   1984.

<u>Putting America Back to Work: The Kellogg Leadership
    Initiative: A Report and Guidebook</u>.   Washington, D. C.:
    AACJC, 1984.

Toffler, Alvin. <u>The Third Wave</u>.   New York: Morrow, 1980.

Wilson, Richard E.   "Collaboration with the Private Sector."
    <u>Community & Junior College Journal</u>.   September 1981,
    p. 2.

VIII.

FACULTY EVALUATION

AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Joseph C. Kudless
Humanities Department
Somerset County College

FACULTY EVALUATION AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

> ". . . the most critical problem confronted in
> the social organization of any college or
> university is the proper evaluation of faculty
> services and giving due recognition through
> impartial assignment of status."

One might attribute the above statement to a recent observer
of the higher education scene. Actually Logan Wilson's Comments
were made in 1942 in a work entitled The Academic Man. Yet there
is a certain timelessness about his thoughts. Who, for example,
would want to argue that the specifics of what is expected of
them in a college classroom should be kept from them? But how
many instructors working on college campuses today have even a
vague awareness of what constitutes exemplary or even satisfactory
performance in the classroom?

It is the contention of this author that whatever the
substantive answer to the latter question, it must have within
it the twin characteristics of flexibility and individualization.
Evaluating teaching effectiveness in an environment that proclaims
to be the one place in higher education where teaching is more
important than publications for advancement (the community college)
is not an easy matter. Some would agree that any assessment
of a teacher's clarity, effectiveness of presentation, or his
or her short-term impact on students might be made through use
of a student evaluation instrument. Arguments begin over how
and when to measure effectiveness and how to use the evaluation
data. Both of these are troublesome issues across the disciplines.

As Joseph Lowman has pointed out:

> Social science faculties are generally most sympathetic to rating-scale questionnaires because this evaluation method is common to their disciplines. Interestingly, rating scales commonly draw fire both from humanities faculty, who feel that they reduce teachers to numbers, and from a natural science faculty, who view the application of measurement theory to people as a bastardization of scientific methodology.[1]

Obviously, parochial concerns of those who feel threatened among the faculty coincide with the administrative "heartburn" over the leveling of enrollments, increased instructional costs and the multiplication of litigation cases. Both faculty and administrators see importance in coping with the issue of faculty evaluation since they more or less participate in managing the faculty reward structure which has grown to become a time-consuming process by the nineteen eighties.

This is not a point to be passed over too quickly. Changing conditions in higher education have changed the attitudes of many participants in the academic evaluation process as well as the process itself. Kenneth Eble calls the overall result a "trade-off". There are some plusses: more useful data-gathering, more informed discussion by the participants, some diffusion of the decision-making power. But on the minus side, he worries over the loss of "some of the ease that goes with more casual procedures carried out by someone we could trust."[2] Both faculty and administrators have the experience to ask t day: How much time can we invest in

---

1 Joseph Lowman, <u>Mastering the Techniques of Teaching</u>. San Francisco Jossey-Bass, 1984, p. 217

2 Peter Seldin, <u>Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation</u>, San Francisco. Jossey-Bass, 1984, pp. 98-99.

evaluating faculty without it becoming counter-productive?

There are certain minimum standards of performance that
one can quickly agree upon. The. somewhat illing presence
of court intervention on campus in recent years has also con-
tributed to more formal agreements for due process in faculty
evaluation practices. Typical safeguards that are more visible
now than in the earlier growth years for community colleges include:

a. written and publicized criteria for retention, promotion,
and tenure decisions,

b. a well-defined appeal procedure for dissatisfied faculty,

c. an understanding, accepted by faculty and administration,
of the circumstances under which the institution's leaders
will overturn peer committee recommendations on retention,
promotion and tenure.

d. strict reliance on the rules of evidence in reaching these
key personnel decisions

e. a written statement of reasons provided to the faculty
member for a negative decision on retention, promotion and
tenure.[3]

One cannot deny that these five factors primarily relate to
procedural issues. One is still stuck on the flypaper of defining
and measuring "performance". As a practical matter, seeking
such an algebra of faculty evaluation can be a troublesome
adventure. When a new faculty member is brought on board, she
or he is usually given a copy of the faculty handbook and/or
faculty contract. By so doing, the responsible college authority
becomes the dispenser of the factual i formation on that institu-

_____

3 Peter Seldin, p. 30   90

tution's hiring, promotion and tenure practices. The handbook or
contract is rare that offers specific "   " of teaching,
college and community service and publications. Should a brand
new faculty member ask for an explanation, the response will
depend mainly on who is asking the question. If it is an
administrator, the response will most likely be that promotion
and tenure are awarded to those who achieve excellence in the
specific categories found in the handbook or contract. If one
asks a faculty member, she or he will most likely be told teaching
is what is most rewarded at this community college. The new
instructor, if possessed of both opinions, has a right to wonder
who to believe, and, to play it safe, will probably believe both
views and plan accordingly.

The impact of recent changes in the workplace have now helped
to place some veteran faculty in the same dilemma as was tradionally
felt by the untenured new colleague on campus. With student enroll-
ments shifting, some institutions are trying to reassign and retrain
tenured faculty who find themselves in a shrinking enrollment
situation. For example, faculty evaluation data may become one
way for a dean or department chair to discover at least an interest
in business or data processing subjects by underutilized historians.
If such is the case, proven faculty members can be retained by
being re-trained.

One can see that the scope of the problem of defining and measuring performance has not improved in recent years and has in fact widened to include faculty members both new and old. In view of this increased faculty concern, would it not seem useful to try and make each professor's evaluation tailored to the needs of the college and the specific strengths of that faculty member?

The rationale that each faculty member contributes differently to the needs of a department is not a new one, but the necessity to be specific and systematic about measuring that contribution is a new catalyst. The time to establish goals would seem to be best done after an annual self-evaluation has been completed by the faculty member and student evaluation data has been received from the prior term. An opportunity to consult with one's peers in a frank and unthreatening atmosphere for assistance in establishing a few key goals for that year would seem a sensible next step. The fashioning of an agreement between the faculty member and his peers would be the goal of such a conference and awareness of the need for individualization and flexibility in weighing the criteria for evaluation must be commonly felt.

Four guidelines that might assist in such a conference are:
a. Our agreement should be consonant with the department's and the institution's needs as perceived at the start of the academic year.

b. Our agreement will spell out in specific terms how my
   performance will be measured during the academic year
   and by whom.

c. The department chair (or his or her authorized representa-
   tive if a large department) agrees to take the initiative
   to have frank, factual and candid discussions with me
   if it is the perception of the chair that I am not
   measuring up to the agreed upon standards.

d. The department chair agrees to provide assistance and
   encouragement to all faculty who wish to participate
   in faculty development activities that will allow the
   faculty member to grow in ways mutually acceptable to
   the individual and the institution.

In using guidelines such as these, one critical assumption
is that a faculty member freely chooses to participate in such
a growth contract arrangement. Ideally, no one should be forced
to use such a system against their will. Those who prefer more
traditional methods because they value them and use them con-
structively should be allowed to continue. Unfortunately, the
consequences of completely voluntary participation might be
that the college teachers most in need of improvement choose
not to take part. In addition, voluntary participation in the
use of student evaluation rating forms has produced distorted
norms because only the better teachers may be included.[4]

---

4 G.S. Howard and J.H. Bray. "Use of Norm Groups to Adjust Student
   Ratings of Instruction: A Warning." Journal of Educational
   Psychology, 1979, vol. 71, 58-73.

There is also the question of whether or not such growth contracts are mainly used by the faculty member and the department chair for the purpose of instructional improvements. If so, things could be relatively smooth. If faculty are involved from the beginning in the decision to encourage growth contracts as an experiment and this is all that is done, there is likely to be little objection. Use of such growth contracts might be required of new faculty since the college has a special responsibility to ensure that the performance of new faculty is satisfactory. Here also recently hired members of the staff should be involved as much as possible in deciding their goals for that academic year. Individualization and flexibility will be achieved with improved morale among the junior faculty if the primary emphasis is given in the process to self-improvement. However, it would be difficult to be convincing on this latter point if the department chair admits that he or she has an obligation to share all growth contracts at re-hiring time with the upper levels of the college administration. When little is known about how the college administration weighs such information about faculty, the possibility that data from faculty growth contracts might be misused or ignored is a real one. One solution that has been used in the past with student evaluation material would be to allow the department chair to prepare summaries of what faculty growth contracts contain without getting into the specifics for each faculty member. Self-improvement language rather than hire and fire recommedations

would form the narrative of such summaries. Assuming that the above has been worked out, the issue of feedback follows.

The task of the peer providing feedback is to alert the colleague to what effect her or his performance is having within the particular framework that was mutually established at the start of the semester. Feedback which is specific and concrete is helpful because the faculty member can handle it. That is, she or he can place the information in a time and place context and examine it there. This situation is not nearly as threatening to the teacher as a negative generalization made by you conveying the message of a trend over time which may appear to be irreversible. If you create an atmosphere of sharing, that you wish to offer what you have to the teacher for mutual consideration, then you create a non-threatening situation. If the feedback is shared information, then the teacher is free to use it as she or he sees fit in light of your overall conference comments. Since the purpose of the peer providing feedback is on what the teacher-colleague needs rather than what you need to get off your chest, your first consideration must be the meaningfulness of the feedback to the teacher. If you must get a few things off your chest, perhaps a separate conference or a casual meeting would be better so as to differentiate the feedback session from your tension release session.[5]

---

5 Ronald T. Hyman. School Administrators' Handbook of Teacher
   Supervision and Evaluation Methods. Englewood Cliffs, N.J..
   Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1975, pp. 75-78

If the use of growth contracts has a high level of risk, it also possesses the potential of diminishing the vagueness over "satisfactory performance". If t' ise of growth contracts were built on the twin concepts of flexibility and individualization, one more piece in the puzzle of faculty evaluation might be discovered.

Teachers have traditionally set goals for their students at the start of the term. Growth contracts encourage teachers to set goals for teachers. If made in an atmosphere of mutual respect and sensitivity, such instruments could positively affect instructional motivation and performance.

In the final analysis, as each instructor grows, so grows his/her community college. The converse is probably also painfully self-evident to those inhabiting our classrooms as the "greying of the faculty"continues. The latter phenomena should be enough by itself to look a bit closer at the usefulness of faculty growth contracts. As one worthwhile approach for those community colleges who remain serious about pursuing the relationship between instruction and learning,now may be the right time for such an idea to be tried.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The willingness of the faculty is essential.

2. The creation of a now-threatening atmosphere by the college administration is essential.

3. Further inquiries and follow-up through a survey to a representative sample of community colleges seems to be the natural next step.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bess, James L. (Editor) "Motivating Professors to Teach Effectively", New Directions for Teaching and Learning, #10, March 1982.

Centra, John A. Determining Faculty Effectiveness. -Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1979.

Cohen, A.M. and Brawer, F.B. Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Cohen, A.A. and Brawer, F.B. The Two Year College Instructor Today, New York, Praeger, 1977.

Cross, K. Patricia. Accent on Learning. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1976.

Eble, Kenneth E. The Craft of Teaching. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1976.

Gaff, Sally Shake, Conrad Festa and Jerry G. Gaff. Professional Development: A Guide to Resources. CHANGE Magazine Press, New Rochelle, New York, 1978.

Hyman, Ronald T. School Administrators Handbook of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Methods. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

The Group for Human Development in Higher Education. Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment. CHANGE Magazine Press, New Rochelle, New York, 1974.

Lowman, Joseph. Mastering the Techniques of Teaching. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco, 1984.

Meeth, L.R. "The Stateless Art of Teaching Evaluation." CHANGE Magazine, July 1976, pp 3-5.

Seldin, Peter. Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1984.

Smith, Al. (Editor) "Evaluating Faculty and Staff", New Directions for Community Colleges, #41, March, 1983.

IX.

THE COMPLEX CHALLENGE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES

Henry D. Ryder
Business Studies Division
Gloucester County College

and

George W. Perabo
Humanities Department
Ocean County College

Acknowledgements

The rapid expansion of knowledge in the last half of the twentieth century has made it increasingly difficult for any professional to stay abreast of developments in his area of expertise. Yet the need to acquire new knowledge is essential for most professionals, and it is no less important for an academic than for an architect or a surgeon. Professional development for a college teacher, however, is different from the development of other professionals: rather than being self-employed or working in a small profit-making firm, college teachers work for non-profit institutions and work in much greater concentrations, often numbering in the hundreds on the same campus.

Two year colleges are different still. Because they emphasize. teaching rather than research or publication, professional development at these colleges generally has one aim: to improve the effectiveness of teaching. Although this goal may seem simple, the subjective nature of personal and professional growth, the realities of time constraints at two year colleges, and the difficulty in knowing precisely how to improve teaching effectiveness complicate the issue of professional development and make it a difficult and multifaceted challenge.

Our goal in this study is to begin to address that challenge. Our concern, particularly with regard to New Jersey's nineteen community colleges, is to raise significant questions about

professional development, to present our research findings, to evaluate those findings, to dispel some commonly held misconceptions, and to offer some suggestions on how the effectiveness of faculty professional development in New Jersey's community colleges can be increased.

Our initial concern developed because we both sensed a "graying" faculty at these colleges--a faculty growing older and so caught up in the burdens of exhaustive teaching schedules that they had little time to step back and reflect on their goals, little time to study the latest research in their fields, and little time to revitalize themselves intellectually. Because of these initial concerns, we were interested in finding some creative ways to allow community college teachers to maintain their heavy loads and at the same time have regular opportunities for professional development, study, and reflection.

These concerns led us to formulate several questions: What kinds of professional development activities will be most beneficial for community college teachers? What are the best ways of encouraging these kinds of professional development? What motivates faculty to undertake these activities? Who is responsible for developing a college's faculty?

Before any of these subjective questions could be answered, it was necessary to seek answers to more quantifiable questions: What are the current policies regarding professional development at New Jersey's county colleges? What are the current activities and opportunities? How effective are they? How do they vary from campus to campus? How do they vary among different disciplines, ranks, and age groups? What kinds of incentives do colleges provide to encourage

pursuit of these activities? Are there professional development activities that are both inexpensive and effective?

Research Methodology

To answer these questions, in December 1984 we sent a questionnaire requesting information about faculty to the academic deans of New Jersey's 19 community colleges (see Appendix 1). During the ensuing three months, all but two were returned. These questionnaires provided basic information concerning a college's size, growth and faculty turnover, as well as information about its approach to professional development.

In February 1985 faculty questionnaires were distributed to the faculty at eight community colleges--those eight who had representatives in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University (see Appendix 2). One fellow from each of the colleges distributed and then collected the completed forms. Of the 1094 questionnaires distributed, 401, or 36.7%, were returned, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 - Summary of Returned Questionnaires

College	Distributed	Returned	Percent Returned
Gloucester	73	58	79%
Ocean	95	51	54%
Somerset	82	41	50%
Morris	184	89	48%
Middlesex	211	71	34%
Mercer	132	31	23%
Essex	149	33	22%
Brookdale	168	27	16%
	1094	401	36.7%

The results were tabulated on an Apple IIc computer using a program written for that purpose. Results were first tabulated for the entire response group. Then cross tabulations were completed for the following sub-groups: age, rank, discipline, college, and years

4.

taught at that college.   Total responses for each group and the re-
spective percentages are in parentheses.   (All data is included in
Appendix 3.)

Age:
    Under 30 (4 - 1%)
    Thirty to forty-five (225 - 56%)
    Forty-six to sixty (156 - 39%)
    Over 60 (14 - 4%)
    No response (2 - 0%)

Years taught at that college:
    Two or less (21 - 5%)
    Three to five (42 - 10%)
    Six to 10 (80 - 20%)
    More than 10 (255 - 64%)
    No response (3 - 1%)

Rank:
    Instructor (54 - 14%)
    Assistant professor (117 - 29%)
    Associate professor (160 - 40%)
    Full professor (61 - 15%)
    No response (9 - 2%)

Discipline:
    English (51)
    Humanities (51)
    Social Science (54)
    Mathematics (58)
    Science (40)
    Business and computers (64)
    Nursing (39)
    Health and physical education (17)
    Counseling (11)
    Librarians (8)
    No response (8)

Research Results

Effect of Pursued Activities

    Faculty members were first asked to consider the professional
development activities they had pursued while employed at their
respective colleges and to rank those activities according to which
ones they felt had made them better teachers (1 = no effect on
teaching, 2 = some effect, 3 = great effect).   The second column in
Table 2 shows a weighted average of those responses; thus, of those

who pursued doctoral work, the average response (2.40) falls about half way between having "some effect" on teaching (2.00) and having a "great effect (3.00).

Table 2 - Activities Pursued by All Respondents

Activity	Perceived Effectiveness (Weighted average)	Percent who Pursued
Industry experience	2.41	46%
Doctoral	2.40	42%
Conferences	2.24	93%
Other graduate work	2.21	69%
Publication	1.85	26%

Among those who had pursued activities listed on the question-naire, industry experience and doctoral programs had the greatest positive impact on teaching, while publication had the least. Attending professional conferences was by far the most popular but was seen as having less effect than doctoral studies or industry experience.

When the various population groups are cross-tabulated, trends become apparent that are not apparent when tabulated by rank or length of employment. First, as faculty members grow older, the perception of the effectiveness of doctoral studies diminishes. That is, as one gets older, the pursuit of a doctorate is perceived as having less and less effect on teaching. There is, however, a corresponding increase in the perceived effectiveness of other graduate work and industry experience (see Table 3).

Doctoral work is perceived to have the greatest effect on teaching by physical education (2.75 weighted average), English (2.53), and social science faculty (2.64), and the least effect by business (2.27), science (2.23) and math (2.07) faculty. Perceptions of industry experience are nearly reversed, with the greatest effect

perceived by physical education (2.71), math (2.63), and business (2.56) faculty, and the least effect by social science (1.94) and English (2.07) faculty. Publication was generally not seen as helpful although the weighted average of English faculty (2.11) was higher than the others.

Table 3 - Weighted Averages of Activities Pursued
by Faculty in Various Age Groups

Activity	30-45	46-60	over 60
Doctoral	2.49	2.36	2.00
Publication	1.87	1.85	1.75
Industry experience	2.40	2.43	2.58
Other graduate work	2.16	2.21	2.72

The fact that the the weighted average for industry experience is so high is significant. It indicates that this relatively non-traditional approach to professional development should be given increased attention by two-year colleges. The data also show that the approach must be designed for specific populations, because different approaches have different impacts on various ages and disciplines.

Professional Activities Pursued and Planned

Among activities pursued, one group of statistics is significant: while only 26% of responding faculty members who had been employed five years or less had pursued a doctorate since their employment, nearly half (46%) of those who had been employed over six years HAD pursued a doctorate. Moreover, 47% of the responding associate professors and 70% of all responding full professors had pursued a doctorate since beginning their employment. Since doctoral work was perceived by those who had pursued it as having a great effect on their teaching (2.40 weighted average for all 401 respon-

dents), this statistic becomes significant when compared to the activities which other faculty members plan to pursue.

Table 4 - Percentages of Faculty Who Pursued Doctoral Work

Age		Rank		Length of Employment	
30-45	45%	Instructor	22%	Less than 2 years	19%
46-60	39%	Assistant prof.	33%	3 - 5 years	33%
Over 60	36%	Associate prof.	47%	6 - 10 years	47%
		Full professor	70%	Over 10 years	45%

Responding faculty who plan to pursue professional development activities ranked their plans in the order shown in Table 5. These percentages are significant because with the exception of conferences, the order of the plans is in reverse order compared to what faculty believe has the greatest effect on their teaching. Industry experience and doctoral studies, for instance, the two activities which faculty members plan to pursue least, rank highest by those who have pursued them in terms of how helpful they are in improving their teaching.

Table 5 - Planned Activities

Activity	Percent Who Plan to Pursue	Perceived Effectiveness by Those Who Have Pursued
Conferences	86%	2.24
Publication	52%	1.85
Other graduate work	38%	2.21
Industry experience	35%	2.41
Doctoral program	20%	2.40

This suggests that there is apparently poor communication between those faculty who have pursued these activities and those who have not. The advice of Paul Lacey supports this conclusion. In a 1983 essay on revitalizing teaching, Lacey finds that "helping junior faculty find their place in the profession should be a major

focus of any faculty development program. This entails encouraging the junior person to make connections with the appropriate senior colleagues, role models, and mentors" (100). If, as this data suggests, those who have pursued doctoral studies and industry experience have found that these activities have had the greatest impact on improving their effectiveness as teachers, then they are not helping the junior faculty to know this; they are not helping the less experienced faculty to know what professional development activities are the most helpful for improving teaching. The result is that faculty plans are apparently not aimed at maximizing their impact on teaching.

When planned activities are cross-tabulated with the various disciplines, plans for working in industry are significantly higher among math and business faculty than among English or social science faculty. Table 6 shows that these plans correspond closely to the effectiveness perceived by those who have pursued industry experience. That is, plans are greatest in disciplines where effectiveness is highest. While this result is as it should be, it demonstrates again that not all activities are suited for faculty in all disciplines.

Table 6 - Plans to Pursue and Effect of Industry Experience

Discipline	Plan to Pursue Industry Experience	Perceived Impact by Those Who Pursued
Math	57%	2.63
Business	52%	2.56
Science	30%	2.39
English	22%	2.07
Social Science	15%	1.94

Job Challenge and Satisfaction

107

What challenges faculty? What satisfies them? Based on the

survey results, the three most consistent factors that would increase job challenge and satisfaction are recognition ("More recognition for a job well done," which was checked on 69% of all questionnaires returned), "more pay" (59%), and "better prepared students in class" (57%). These three factors are generally first across all measured populations: age, rank, discipline, and length of employment. Pay and advancement are, as would be expected, more important to faculty in lower ranks and decrease in importance as rank increases. However, recognition and desire for better prepared students increase as rank increases, thus becoming an increasingly important factor (see Table 7).

Table 7 - Perceptions of Selected Challenge Factors by Rank

Factor	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor
Pay	61%	72%	53%	49%
Promotion	59%	56%	33%	18%
Students	44%	58%	61%	61%
Recognition	63%	68%	68%	77%

The factors having least effect on challenge and satisfaction are "a better maintained campus" (22%), "more control over course content and/or materials" (15%), and "having a more understanding supervisor"(10%). Supervision, in fact, was rated last in nearly every population group. The low rating of the intrinsic factor of more control over course content was puzzling; its relative insignificance, however, may result from the fact that control over course content may be perceived as being already high by the respondents.

At least two conclusions can be reached from this data. First, with the exception of pay, job challenge is increased by intrinsic

factors such as recognition, students, and advancement. Extrinsic factors, such as supervision, college policies, and working conditions, have little effect on job challenge or satisfaction. (Had the questionnaire asked for factors that increase just challenge, rather than challenge OR satisfaction, the importance of pay would probably have been less.) Other research supports this finding. Meledez and Guzman (1983) find that faculty are rarely motivated by external factors. Paraphrasing a conclusion from Wilbert and McKeachie, they argue that "extrinsic rewards alone—an increase in salary and promotion—do not motivate professors to improve the quality of their teaching. Intrinsic rewards are the factors that motivate effective teaching"(59). Thus, to increase motivation, emphasis should be placed on intrinsic factors such as better prepared students and recognition. (The responses did not make clear how this should be accomplished.)

Second, administrative approaches to motivation should change as the age of the faculty increases. Since perceptions change as faculty become older, administrative policies must also change. Policies such as increasing pay and promotions, which may have been effective ten years ago, will not necessarily be effective in the future. Other methods of motivation will become necessary.

Some of the most startling conclusions about professional development in general came from the faculty responses about current job challenge—especially when faculty responses were contrasted with responses from academic deans. For most faculty, job challenge comes from student interaction, from keeping current in the field, or from teaching itself. Table 8 summarizes faculty responses to the question "If you do [find your job challenging], what makes it

challenging?

Table 8 - Sources of Current Job Challenge

Response	Percent responding
Student interaction/ helping them learn	34%
Keeping current in the field	11%
Student interaction and keeping current	14%
Teaching/ finding new and better ways	9%
Variety and solving problem,	6%
Personal challenge	5%
The subject itself	1%
Course and program development	2%
Other	1%
No response	19%

The fact that only 19% failed to respond to this open-ended question is significant. In addition, in response to the question "Do you find your job challenging?" 62% of all respondents rated their job as "mostly" challenging, and 26% rated it "always" challenging. Only 11% find their job infrequently challenging. On a scale of 1 (never) to 4 (always), the weighted average of all responses was 3.14. These responses certainly seem to dispell the myth about widespread burnout among community college faculty. (It should be noted here, however, that faculty were given only four choices with no midway choice between "mostly" challenging and "infrequently" challenging. It could also be argued that the 64% who did not answer the survey include a large number of burnouts. Thus the very high and positive rating for job challenge may be somewhat misleading.)

Conclusions that can be drawn from these responses are encouraging. The extent of job challenge is pervasive. Job challenge did not significantly vary from the average as rank and length of employment increased, although it did increase with age as shown by Table 9. A similar result was uncovered by Cohen and Brawer in a

1977 survey of nearly 2000 instructors from 156 two-year colleges (81). Job challenge and satisfaction apparently increase with age. Even more significant, the data show that over two-thirds of responding faculty find challenge in the areas that one would hope would be true for community college faculty: student interaction, keeping current in one's field, and improvement of teaching.

Table 9 - Perceptions of Job Challenge

ʌank	Weighted Average	Years Teaching	Weighted Average	Age	Weighted Average
Instructor	3.22	under 2	3.19	30-45	3.06
Assistant prof.	3.12	3 to 5	3.21	46-60	3.23
Assoc. prof.	3.16	6 to 10	3.15	over 60	3.46
Full prof.	3.13	over 10	3.13		

But when these faculty responses are placed alongside those from the responding academic deans, the conclusions are not quite so heartening. Eleven of the deans ranked their own faculty as only "somewhat" challenged. Perhaps more significant is the fact that only five deans mentioned any plans to increase job challenge. Two of the deans mentioned the improvement of teaching as the goal of their faculty development program. ("Primary goal is improvement of teaching," and "Essentially, our focus is improving teaching and learning. Our program of professional development revolves around this.") Perhaps most si_nificant of all is that these were the only two deans who mentioned improving teaching and learning, and none mentioned enhancing faculty-student relationships--yet these are the very factors that faculty members find provide the most challenge.

When deans were asked what types of professional development were encouraged at their colleges, dean after dean mentioned activities such mini-grants for research, membership in professional

organizations, participation in workshops and conferences, travel, and publication. Yet none of these is directly related to teaching and student interaction, the activities in which faculty find the most challenge.

Discussion of Results

Is it possible to help faculty recognize those activities which are worth pursuing, those activities which will improve their effectiveness as teachers? Is it possible to help administrators recognize those activities which will provide the most challenge and satisfaction for faculty? Is it possible, ultimately, to create a better alignment between what faculty see as important and challenging in their jobs and what administrators see as worth encouraging? And if these goals are possible, how might they best be accomplished?

We believe these goals are achievable, but reaching them will require major realignments in the thinking and policies at community colleges. As we see it, four modes of thinking need to be addressed.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, as New Jersey's community colleges began and grew, there was a nationwide tendency in higher education to emphasize programs that would revitalize entire institutions: on-campus speakers, on-campus workshops, and on-campus seminars. According to a survey of professional development research done in the late 1970s be Sally Shake Gaff and others, this tendency increased as the administrative awareness of the need for professional development increased (69). Policies frequently developed at young community colleges whereby professional development activities (1) were administered and directed from the president down, (2) were aimed at correcting deficiencies or weaknesses in individual faculty

members, (3) were generally campus-wide activities in which all were encouraged to participate, and (4) were rewarded by administrators who "counted" participation in such activities on faculty performance evaluations. Evaluations that included active participation invariably led to more tangible rewards such as promotion and salary increases. Policies incorporating these concepts were generally regarded as healthy and constructive, and such policies, or vesitges of them, are apparently still in effect at most New Jersey county colleges.

The conclusions we've inferred from the results of our survey, along with results from recent research on professional development, have led us to realize that all four of these concepts, although well intentioned, are now outdated. While these modes of thinking and their consequent policies may have provided benefits for a new college with a generally young faculty, county colleges are no longer in their infancy and their faculties are now more mature. Accordingly, all four of these policies need to be reviewed in light of the current faculty.

First, faculty development, instead of being directed and administered from the top down, must be initiated by the individual. The more sophisticated the faculty, the more that pressure from above becomes ineffective. Steven Phillips, writing in the bulletin of the Association of Departments of English, insists that faculty development "is and must be a strictly voluntary activity" (12). That is, the desire for change, growth, and development must come naturally from within the faculty member. While an institution may publicize opportunities and provide funding and released time for appropriate activities, the initial impetus for growth must be a

private, personal, and natural desire for growth. Pressure from above for faculty development will encourage faculty to pursue activities for the wrong reasons, for "good" evaluations by superiors rather than for real personal growth and improvement of teaching.

The concept of self-initiated professional .development is especially important for those faculty who have reached middle age and beyond. According to Harold Hodgkinson's study of academics in middle age--what he calls "middlescence"--the nature of adult learners is such that external pressures to change will be resisted and ultimately resented. He sees middle-aged faculty, like middle-aged students, as "unfinished products [still] capable of learning new skills and strategies and growing and changing". And while this condition "paves the way" for professional development, it does so only when the individual wants to change and grow (68). The impetus for personal and professional growth must willingly come from within.

Table 10
Perceptions of College-Provided Inventives
for Professional Development

Incentive	Weighted average
Promotion	2.15
Sabbatical	2.12
Tuition reimbursement	2.10
Salary increase	2.08
Released time	1.95

Our survey results support this conclusion since none of the external incentives for development stand out as being either particularly effective or particularly ineffective for the faculty as a whole, as shown by Table 10. All the weighted averages (3.0 = great incentive, 2.0 = some incentive, 1.0 = no incentive) are clustered

around 2.0, or "some" incentive. Thus, since none of the college-provided incentives stands out as providing great incentive, the real incentive must come from some other, non-external source.

A second mode of thinking that has also been translated into policy at many schools is that faculty development should be aimed at correcting deficiencies in faculty members. The atmosphere created by such thinking cannot be anything but negative. Certainly faculty members have areas in which they can improve, but we would agree with Lacey's view, expressed in his "Politics of Vitalizing Teaching" that successful faculty development occurs only when the activities are not considered remedial:

> A politically astute program acknowledges, respects, and plays to faculty strengths and should not be perceived as looking for weaknesses to overcome or errors to get rid of. It assumes that faculty see themselves as con- cerned, effective teachers and seeks to build support groups based on that foundation. (99)

The kind of positive support that is needed depends very heav-ily on the department chair. Many writers on the subject of profes-sional development mention how vital the chair's role is in avoiding any suggestion that faculty development is remedial. The department chair must cultivate the kind of positive atmosphere which encoura-ges faculty growth. To nurture such an environment, a department chair can do many things: advertise opportunities for renewal and change, encourage faculty to take risks and try new activities both in and out of the classroom, and foster discussion among all ranks and all ages as to the kinds of faculty development activities that are most useful and most rewarding. W. Todd Furniss suggests that "the key...to faculty careers that serve the institution, the stu-dent, and the faculty member is the psychological and intellectual milieu within which the faculty member works, and the key to that

milieu is the department chairman particularly, and his or her senior staff" (35). The department chair sets the tone for faculty development, and that tone will be positive if he or she "plays to the faculty strengths."

A third mode of thinking that needs review is the concept of a comprehensive, college-wide program aimed at all faculty members. This kind of thinking addresses all faculty members as if they were all the same and all needed the same kind of opportunities. Our survey results, however, indicate that some activities, such as industry experience, become more worthwhile as age increases; others, such as pursuing doctoral studies, decrease in importance and perceived effectiveness. Consequently, if policies maintain that any particular activity is good for ALL faculty members, those policies miss the point of faculty development; it must be multi-faceted, self-initiated, and individualized.

Gaff and others see a greater need for faculty to work "independently to revitalize themselves" (70). Instead of a limited list of activities available to everyone, what is needed according to our data is a wide array of individualized opportunities that will satisfy faculty in different disciplines, in different ranks, and at different stages in their lives.

These individualized opportunities need not be major or expensive undertakings. One possibility, for instance, is creative scheduling: a faculty member who regularly teaches a five-day week could be offered a four- or even three-day schedule. While this is already standard practice in some departments of some community colleges, it could be implemented with little effort and no expense. Such a schedule might be offered to a faculty member every second or

third year, not as a reward, but simply as an opportunity for pursu-
ing professional development. While each professor's class load,
student load, and pay would remain the same, he would have an extra
day or two each week of that term for study, reflection or instruc-
tional improvement.

In an article entitled "Pragmatics of Faculty Self-Develop-
ment," David G. Brown and William S. Hanger offer an excellent var-
iety of self-development opportunities--142 of them in all--that are
largely free. For instance, within a college "a sociologist and a
historian switch jobs for a term." Such short-term exchanges would
provide a fresh challenge to each of the faculty members involved
and, ultimately, would broaden their interdisciplinary perspective.

Brown and Hanger also suggest a short-term faculty exchange
with a foundation, government agency, or business firm: "a professor
of finance with a corporation's trust officer," for example. They
suggest that faculty "Experiment with the lecture method of instruc-
tion if you are using the discussion approach--and vice versa."
Faculty often resist such seemingly simple suggestions and prefer to
continue working with their old methods. But faculty members who
commit themselves to such a change have the opportunity to organize
and use old materials in new ways. ·The challenge is obvious and the
cost to the college could be zero.

Faculty members can also develop themselves by making contact
with practitioners in their fields. Brown and Hanger suggest monthly
meetings; for instance, "the faculty of accountancy to visit with
the personnel at a pub'ic accounting firm, the faculty of marketing
to lunch regularly with the marketing department of department
stores." The cost of such contact would be slight, and participating

faculty would form a network of coatacts with practitioners in their fields--contacts which could lead to a more formal business experience, a type of experience our survey found to be most helpful to faculty in some departments. Furthermore, the contacting faculty would become informed of current practices while practitioners would become updated on current theories.

Other suggestions by Brown and Hanger would be low in cost but equally rewarding: for instance, "Invite a media specialist to sit in on your class and offer constructive criticism," or "Videotape your instruction and have a group of peers evaluate it." While such suggestions may involve some minimal expense, the costs would be far outweighed by the benefits. Faculty, at very little or no expense to their college, would essentially be developing themselves. In sum, numerous professional development activities are already available to faculty that are not expensive.

A fourth and final mode of thinking--unfortunately entrenched in most college's policies--is the idea of evaluating and rewarding professional development. This, too, needs review. Deans at New Jersey's county colleges were asked if their schools rewarded those faculty who participated in professional development activities. Of the seventeen respondents, four answered "No" or "Not directly" or "Not particularly." Paradoxically, these responses could be positive and encouraging: they may show an awareness that the college reward structure is not, and should not be the primary reason for pursuing professional development. The motivation to pursue must come from within; external rewards, while they offer some incentive, should clearly be secondary.

Furthermore, we believe that faculty development should not be

evaluated because it cannot be accurately measured. By faculty
development we are referring to anything from a year-long sabbatical
to simply reading a book. The change and growth which occurs from
such activities is personal, intellectual, and subjective. By its
very nature it is not quantifiable. The purpose of such activities
is to enrich the individual faculty member; that enrichment will
naturally enrich his or her students, the ultimate beneficiaries of
a faculty member's growth.

Professional development, therefore, should not be part of the
faculty evaluation process, and faculty should not pursue such
activities with the idea that they will be measured or rewarded by
the college. Hammons, Wallace, and Watts argue that, unless there
is a mutually acceptable contractual agreement, faculty development
and faculty evaluation must be kept separate:

> It is a fatal mistake to mix the two.   Given the nature
> of adult learners and the neo-sophistication of community
> college performance appraisal systems, any attempt to
> relate them will result in attendance, not involvement,
> and the application of objective measures (How many staff
> development sessions did you attend last year?) to a very
> subjective and internal activity. .   (54)

Recommendations

1. Professional development activities must be matched to specific disciplines and specific age groups. Teachers in different disciplines find different kinds of activities effective. No activity, as helpful as it may be to a particular group of faculty, should be universally encouraged.

2. For appropriate faculty (generally in higher ranks or in math, science, or business), industry experience should be pursued as a low-cost, effective method of professional development. One of the authors has been involved in such an industry-education partnership for two years. If a faculty member can be released from one or more courses per semester and the employing firm can compensate the college for the cost of a replacement adjunct, the program could be effected at no cost to the college and at a minimial cost to the participating firm.

3. Faculty who have pursued professional development activities should advise those who have not about which activities are the most rewarding. Such advice and counsel should be encouraged because, significantly, the activities which faculty plan to pursue (such as attending conferences and publishing) are not those that the more experienced faculty have found to have the greatest effect on teaching.

4. The faculty, although "graying" in terms of service to their college, are still relatively young and are not "graying" in terms of job challenge. The vast majority of respondents to our survey (88%) found their jobs either mostly or always challen-

ging. Faculty members mentioned keeping current in their fields, improving their teaching, and relationships with their students as the factors providing the most challenge in their jobs. Yet the majority of deans (11 out of 16) ranked their faculty as "somewhat" challenged. Few deans had specific plans. to enhance job challenge; few mentioned improving teaching; none mentioned fostering faculty-student relationships. Clearly, policies at county colleges should nurture that existing challenge.

5. Factors related to teaching, such as recognition and well-prepared students, provide much greater challenge for faculty than do external factors such as working conditions and college policies. And factors related to teaching become increasingly important as faculty members grow older. The exact nature of "recognition" should be investigated fully in a future study because it remains unclear whether faculty seek this recognition from students, peers, administrators, the community, or from some combination of these. Still, the concept of recognition is such a highly valued challenge factor that its importance to faculty should be recognized by administrators in any future policy decisions regarding professional development.

It is particularly important that community colleges recognize these findings now while their faculties are still relatively young and while they still feel challenged. Of the faculty who responded to our survey, only 4% were over sixty years old; only 1% were under thirty; the majority (56%) were between the ages of thirty and forty-five.

This majority, however, will not be "relatively young" forever. The statewide, voluntary turnover rate for faculty, as reported by the deans, has averaged less than 2% per year for the last five years. If this rate continues, and there is no reason to believe it will not, few new faculty will be hired because few current faculty will leave. The majority of the faculty in ten years will be in the forty-five to sixty age group and will have taught at their colleges for twenty years. Among this group there will be a much greater potential for "burnout."

There are benefits from increasing age, such as added experience and more developed teaching methodologies, but there is also a potential cost in stagnation that Peter Drucker calls "featherbedding." Drucker believes that unless the potential for burnout is addressed, colleges can become what he calls "the railroads of the knowledge industry" (133). Unless attitudes and policies toward professional development are altered, the possibilities for stagnation will increase dramatically over the next decade. This is especially true in New Jersey's county colleges where the majority of faculty is moving into middle age and beyond, where faculty turnover is very low and where opportunities for professional growth have been limited and often misdirected.

Now, while the faculty is still relatively young, is the time for county colleges to prepare for the future, to cultivate faculty development opportunities, and to build on that job challenge that currently exists.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire sent to the Academic Deans

of New Jersey's County Colleges

1. FACULTY
    a. Number of full time faculty as of January 1, 1985. _____
    b. Approximately what percent of current full time faculty
        were hired: (1) before 1973   _____
                                        (2) 1974 - 1980   _____
                                        (3) since 1980   _____
    c. Number of full time faculty in 1975 (approximate) _____

2. FACULTY TURNOVER
    Since 1980, approximately how many faculty have:
    a. left voluntarily to teach at another college?   _____
    b. left voluntarily for a job in industry or government? _____
    c. left voluntarily to pursue further studies?   _____
    d. left for all other reasons?   _____

3. FACULTY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
    Does your college:
    a. have a professional development committee?   _____
    b. have a budget for professional development activities? _____
            Dollar amount of budget (if not confidential)   _____
    c. support faculty sabbatical leaves?   _____
    d. allow faculty unpaid leaves for further study or
        related employment?   _____

    List below the types of professional development that your college
    encourages.

    Approximately what percent of your faculty uses those activities?

    Does your school reward those that participate in these
    activities? If so, how?

4. FACULTY ATTITUDES
    a. To what extent do you believe your faculty are bored?
        significantly   somewhat   not at all
    b. If you see this as a problem, what are you doing about it?

5. Your college _____ _____
6. Your name and title _____

7. Would you like a copy of the results of this study? _____

Appendix 2

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

I. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
 a. Considering the professional development activities that you have pursued during your employment at your college:
  Place a "3" next to those activities that have had the greatest effect in making you a better teacher;
  Place a "2" next to those activities that have had some effect;
  Place a "1" next to those activities that have had little or no effect;
  Place a "0" next to those activities you have not pursued.

  (1)___ doctoral program
  (2)___ other graduate work
  (3)___ industry experience
  (4)___ professional conferences
  (5)___ publication
  (6)___ other _____

  (7) If you have not pursued such activities, why have you not done so?

 b. Which of the following do you plan to pursue in the future? (Check all that apply.)

  (8) ___ doctoral program
  (9) ___ other graduate work
  (10) ___ industry experience
  (11) ___ professional conferences
  (12) ___ publication
  (13) ___ other _____

 c. Of the rewards or incentives that your college provides to encourage you to pursue these activities,
  Place a "3" next to those that provide the greatest incentive;
  Place a "2" next to those that provide some incentive;
  Place a "1" next to those that provide no incentive;
  Place a "0" next to those that your college does not provide.

  (14) ___ increased promotional opportunity
  (15) ___ increased salary
  (16) ___ released time
  (17) ___ tuition reimbursement   BEST COPY AVAILABLE
  (18) ___ sabbatical leave
  (19) ___ other _____

 d. How would you describe your college's attitude toward professional development?

  (20) ___strongly encourages ___mildly encourages ___neutral ___discourages

 e. Would a change in your college's attitude toward professional development affect your desire to pursue such activities?

 (21) ___yes   ___no   ___don't know   124

II. JOB SATISFACTION
   a. Do you find your job challenging?

     (22) ___always   ___most of the time   ___infrequently   __ never

   b. If you do, what makes it challenging?
     (23)

   c. Which of the following would increase the challenge of your job or your satisfaction with it? (Check all that apply)
     (24) ___ more pay .
     (25) ___ more control over course content and/or materials
     (26) ___ more recognition for a job well done
     (27) ___ a better maintained campus
     (28) ___ better chances for advancement
     (29) ___ a more understanding supervisor
     (30) ___ better prepared students in class
     (31) ___ more realistic college policies
     (32) ___ increased interaction with other faculty .
     (33) ___ increased departmental responsibility in decision making

III. PERSONAL INFORMATION

   a. Your department or discipline (34)_____

   b. Your rank (35)_____

   c. Number of years you have taught at your college:

     (36) ___2 or less   ___3-5   ___6-10   ___more than 10

   d. Your age:

     (37) ___under 30   ___30-45   ___46-60   ___over 60

Appendix 3

Tally of All 401 Respondents

Cross Tabulations by Rank

TALLY OF ALL 401 RESPONDENTS

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	97	24%	45	11%	27	7%	231	58%	2.4
OTHER GRAD. WORK	104	26%	122	36%	50	12%	124	31%	2.21
INDUSTRY EXPER.	101	25%	59	15%	24	6%	216	54%	2.41
CONFERENCES	140	35%	179	45%	53	13%	28	7%	2.24
PUBLICATION	34	8%	96	24%	60	15%	210	52%	1.85
OTHER	81	20%	19	5%	4	1%	297	74%	2.73

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	82	20%	316	79%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	152	38%	247	62%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	140	35%	259	65%
CONFERENCES	345	86%	52	13%
PUBLICATION	209	52%	191	48%
OTHER	74	18%	323	81%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	311	78%
NO INTEREST	9	2%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	12	3%
NOT NECESSARY	5	1%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	15	4%
NO TIME	28	7%
NO INCENTIVE	8	2%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	4	1%
TIME AND MONEY	3	1%
OTHER	11	3%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	111	28%	153	38%	63	16%	73	18%	2.15
SALARY INCREASE	95	24%	124	31%	74	18%	107	27%	2.08
RELEASED TIME	68	17%	86	21%	80	20%	166	41%	1.95
TUITION REIMB.	93	23%	170	42%	68	17%	69	17%	2.07
SABBATICAL	113	28%	124	31%	69	17%	94	23%	2.14
OTHER	23	6%	4	1%	1	0%	372	93%	2.86

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
90	207	69	34	2.88
22%	52%	17%	8%	

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
190	132	78
47%	33%	19%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
105	248	46	1	3.14
26%	62%	11%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	75	19%
STUDENT INTERACTION	124	31%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	25	6%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	43	11%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	57	14%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	13	3%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	5	1%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	7	2%
THE JOB ITSELF - TEACHING	35	9%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	20	5%
OTHER	4	1%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	238	59%
ACHIEVEMENT	61	15%
RECOGNITION	276	69%
WORKING CONDITIONS	87	22%
ADVANCEMENT	166	41%
SUPERVISION	42	10%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	229	57%
COLLEGE POLICIES	119	30%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	154	38%
RESPONSIBILITY	117	29%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF	FULL PROF.
54	117	160	61
13%	29%	40%	15%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
21	42	80	255
5%	10%	20%	64%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 63	OVER 60
4	225	156	14
1%	56%	39%	3%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 401

TALLY OF ALL ALL INSTRUCTORS

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	8	15%	1	2%	3	6%	42	78%	2.39
OTHER GRAD. WORK	10	19%	13	24%	9	17%	22	41%	2.03
INDUSTRY EXPER.	11	20%	11	20%	2	4%	30	56%	2.36
CONFERENCES	16	30%	23	43%	9	17%	6	11%	2.14
PUBLICATION	2	4%	12	22%	6	11%	34	63%	1.81
OTHER	12	22%	2	4%	1	2%	39	72%	2.71

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	22	41%	32	59%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	26	48%	28	52%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	18	33%	36	67%
CONFERENCES	40	74%	14	26%
PUBLICATION	26	48%	28	52%
OTHER	6	11%	48	89%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	39	72%
NO INTEREST	1	2%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	2	4%
NOT NECESSARY	0	0%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	3	6%
NO TIME	5	9%
NO INCENTIVE	1	2%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	1	2%
TIME & MONEY	1	2%
OTHER	1	2%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	23	43%	20	37%	6	11%	5	9%	2.35
SALARY INCREASE	17	31%	17	31%	9	17%	11	20%	2.18
RELEASED TIME	11	20%	10	19%	15	28%	18	33%	1.88
TUITION REIMB.	19	35%	20	37%	9	17%	6	11%	2.2
SABBATICAL	9	17%	20	37%	9	17%	16	30%	2
OTHER	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	50	93%	3

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
14	25	12	3	2.93
26%	46%	22%	6%	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE?

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
26	17	11
48%	31%	20%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
17	32	5	0	3.22
31%	59%	9%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	9	17%
STUDENT INTERACTION	21	39%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	2	4%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	9	17%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	10	19%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	0	0%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	0	0%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	0	0%
TEACHING; FINDING BETTER METHODS	3	6%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	0	0%
OTHER	0	0%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	33	61%
ACHIEVEMENT	11	20%
RECOGNITION	34	63%
WORKING CONDITIONS	5	9%
ADVANCEMENT	32	59%
SUPERVISION	4	7%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	24	44%
COLLEGE POLICIES	13	24%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	22	41%
RESPONSIBILITY	11	20%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF.	FULL PROF.
54	0	0	0
100%	0%	0%	0%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
13	20	14	7
24%	37%	26%	13%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
4	37	13	0
7%	69%	24%	0%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 54

TALLY OF ALL ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTOPAL	24	21%	9	8%	5	4%	~8	67%	2.52
OTHER GRAD. WORK	26	22%	39	33%	15	13%	36	31%	2.13
INDUSTRY EXPER.	31	26%	16	14%	8	7%	61	52%	2.4
CONFERENCES	44	38%	51	44%	14	12%	7	6%	2.28
PUBLICATION	10	9%	27	23%	19	16%	60	51%	1.85
OTHER	23	20%	6	5%	1	1%	87	74%	2.73

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	29	25%	86	74%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	54	46%	62	53%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	42	36%	74	63%
CONFERENCES	104	89%	11	9%
PUBLICATION	72	62%	44	38%
OTHER	20	17%	96	82%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	81	69%
NO INTEREST	6	5%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	3	3%
NOT NECESSARY	2	2%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	5	4%
NO TIME	11	9%
NO INCENTIVE	2	2%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	2	2%
TIME & MONEY	2	2%
OTHER	3	3%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	28	24%	52	44%	15	13%	22	19%	2.14
SALARY INCREASE	35	30%	36	31%	20	17%	26	22%	2.17
RELEASED TIME	20	17%	29	25%	21	18%	47	40%	1.98
TUITION REIMB.	30	26%	53	45%	17	15%	17	15%	2.13
SABBATICAL	26	22%	39	33%	24	21%	28	24%	2.01
OTHER	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	116	99%	3

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
32	60	15	10	2.97
27%	51%	13%	9%	

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE?

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
62	33	22
53%	28%	19%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
27	77	13	0	3.12
23%	66%	11%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	22	19%
STUDENT INTERACTION	35	30%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	7	6%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	8	7%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	19	16%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	6	5%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	1	1%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	1	1%
TEACHING; FINDING BETTER METHODS	13	11%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	2	2%
OTHER	3	3%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	84	72%
ACHIEVEMENT	22	19%
RECOGNITION	80	68%
WORKING CONDITIONS	22	19%
ADVANCEMENT	65	56%
SUPERVISION	14	12%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	68	58%
COLLEGE POLICIES	36	31%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	51	44%
RESPONSIBILITY	41	35%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	AST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF.	FULL PROF.
0	117	0	0
0%	100%	0%	0%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
7	18	36	56
6%	15%	31%	48%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
0	87	27	3
0%	74%	23%	3%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 117

TALLY OF ALL ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

E.ID OF DATA

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

BREAK IN 130

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	38	24%	24	15%	13	8%	85	53%	2.34
OTHER GRAD. WORK	43	27%	49	31%	21	13%	47	29%	2.2
INDUSTRY EXPER.	43	27%	23	14%	8	5%	86	54%	2.48
CONFERENCES	55	34%	71	44%	21	13%	13	8%	2.23
PUBLICATION	12	8%	35	22%	25	16%	88	55%	1.83
OTHER	33	21%	6	4%	2	1%	119	74%	2.77

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	29	18%	130	81%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	53	33%	106	66%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	60	38%	99	62%
CONFERENCES	139	87%	20	13%
PUBLICATION	70	44%	90	56%
OTHER	33	21%	125	78%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	130	81%
NO INTEREST	1	1%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	6	4%
NOT NECESSARY	2	1%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	7	4%
NO TIME	8	5%
NO INCENTIVE	4	3%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	0	0%
TIME & MONEY	0	0%
OTHER	2	1%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	46	29%	57	36%	31	19%	26	16%	2.12
SALARY INCREASE	31	19%	46	29%	35	22%	48	30%	1.96
RELEASED TIME	21	13%	30	19%	34	21%	75	47%	1.85
TUITION REIMB.	27	17%	67	42%	33	21%	33	21%	1.95
SABBATICAL	47	29%	46	29%	30	19%	37	23%	2.13
OTHER	15	9%	3	2%	1	1%	141	88%	2.67

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
25	83	36	16	2.73
16%	52%	23%	10%	.

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE?

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
74	53	33
46%	33%	21%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
43	100	17	0	3.16
27%	63%	11%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	29	18%
STUDENT INTERACTION	49	31%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	9	6%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	18	11%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	25	16%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	6	4%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	3	2%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	4	3%
TEACHING; FINDING BETTER METHODS	9	6%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	7	4%
OTHER	1	1%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	85	53%
ACHIEVEMENT	21	13%
RECOGNITION	109	68%
WORKING CONDITIONS	38	24%
ADVANCEMENT	52	33%
SUPERVISION	14	9%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	97	61%
COLLEGE POLICIES	49	31%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	57	36%
RESPONSIBILITY	48	30%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF.	FULL PROF.
0	0	160	0
0%	0%	100%	0%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
1	2	29	128
1%	1%	18%	80%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
0	76	77	6
0%	48%	48%	4%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 160

TALLY OF ALL FULL PROFESSORS

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED

	GREAT EFFECT		SOME EFFECT		NO EFFECT		NOT PURSUED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
DOCTORAL	27	44%	11	18%	5	8%	18	30%	2.51
OTHER GRAD. WORK	22	36%	20	33%	3	5%	16	26%	2.42
INDUSTRY EXPER.	14	23%	8	13%	6	10%	33	54%	2.28
CONFERENCES	21	34%	31	51%	8	13%	1	2%	2.21
PUBLICATION	9	15%	20	33%	7	11%	25	41%	2.07
OTHER	11	18%	4	7%	0	0%	46	75%	2.72

PLANNED ACTIVITIES

	PLANNED		NOT PLANNED	
DOCTORAL	2	3%	59	97%
OTHER GRAD. WORK	18	30%	43	70%
INDUSTRY EXPER.	17	28%	44	72%
CONFERENCES	55	90%	5	8%
PUBLICATION	38	62%	23	38%
OTHER	14	23%	47	77%

REASONS FOR NOT PURSUING SUCH ACTIVITIES

NO RESPONSE	54	89%
NO INTEREST	1	2%
COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS	0	0%
NOT NECESSARY	0	0%
COULDN'T FIND RELEVANT PROGRAM	0	0%
NO TIME	4	7%
NO INCENTIVE	1	2%
JUST BEGAN TEACHING	1	2%
TIME & MONEY	0	0%
OTHER	0	0%

PERCEPTIONS OF INCENTIVES

	GREATEST		SOME		NONE		NOT PROVIDED		WEIGHTED AVERAGE
PROMOTION	13	21%	22	36%	10	16%	16	26%	2.07
SALARY INCREASE	12	20%	23	38%	7	11%	19	31%	2.13
RELEASED TIME	14	23%	16	26%	8	13%	23	38%	2.16
TUITION REIMB.	15	25%	26	43%	8	13%	12	20%	2.15
SABBATICAL	31	51%	14	23%	5	8%	11	18%	2.52
OTHER	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	57	93%	2.71

COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PROF. DEVELOPMENT

STRONGLY ENCOURAGES	MILDLY ENCOURAGES	NEUTRAL	DISCOURAGES	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
18	36	4	3	3.13
30%	59%	7%	5%	

WOULD A CHANGE IN YOUR COLLEGE'S ATTITUDE AFFECT YOUR DESIRE?

YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
26	26	9
43%	43%	15%

DO YOU FIND YOUR JOB CHALLENGING?

ALWAYS	MOSTLY	SELDOM	NEVER	WEIGHTED AVER.
17	35	9	0	3.13
28%	57%	15%	0%	

WHAT MAKES THE JOB CHALLENGING?

NO RESPONSE	11	18%
STUDENT INTERACTION	19	31%
MANY DUTIES; SOLVING PROBLEMS; VARIETY	5	8%
KEEPING SELF AND CONTENT CURRENT	7	11%
STUDENT INTERACTION & KEEPING CURRENT	3	5%
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN	1	2%
THE SUBJECT ITSELF	1	2%
NEW COURSE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	2	3%
TEACHING; FINDING BETTER METHODS	10	16%
PERSONAL CHALLENGE; INTERNAL DRIVE	2	3%
OTHER	0	0%

ANSWERS TO MOTIVATION QUESTIONS

PAY	30	49%
ACHIEVEMENT	6	10%
RECOGNITION	47	77%
WORKING CONDITIONS	19	31%
ADVANCEMENT	11	18%
SUPERVISION	9	15%
BETTER PREPARED STUDENTS	37	61%
COLLEGE POLICIES	19	31%
INTERPERS. REL'SHIPS	21	34%
RESPONSIBILITY	15	25%

RANK

INSTRUCTOR	ASST.PROF.	ASSO.PROF.	FULL PROF.
0	0	0	61
0%	0%	0%	100%

YEARS TAUGHT AT COLLEGE

2 OR LESS	3 TO 5	6 TO 10	MORE THAN 10
0	0	1	60
0%	0%	2%	98%

AGE

UNDER 30	30 TO 45	46 TO 60	OVER 60
0	19	38	4
0%	31%	62%	7%

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TABULATED: 61

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

List of References

Brown, David G. and William S. Hanger. "Pragmatics of Faculty Self-
Development." EDUCATIONAL RECORD 56 (1975): pp. 201-206.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY
COLLEGE. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Drucker, Peter F. "The Professor as Featherbedder."

Furniss, W. Todd. RESHAPING FACULTY CAREERS. Washington, D.C.:
American Council on Education, 1981.

Gaff, Sally Shake, Concord Festa, and Jerry G. Gaff. PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT: A GUIDE TO RESOURCES. NP: Change Magazine Press,
1978.

Hammons, Jim, Terry H. Smith Wallace, and Gordon Watts. STAFF DEVEL-
OPMENT IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: A HANDBOOK. Los Angeles: ERIC,
1978.

Lacey, Paul A. "The Politics of Vitalizing Teaching." in REVITALIZ-
ING TEACHING THROUGH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT. ed. Paul A. Lacey.
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Melendez, Winfred Albizu, and Rafael M. de Guzman. BURNOUT: THE NEW
ACADEMIC DISEASE. Washington D.C.: ASHE, 1983.

Phillips, Steven R. "What, Then, IS Faculty Development?" ADE (Asso-
ciation of Departments of English) Bulletin, May 1976, pp. 11-
17.