

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 742

JC 910 259

TITLE Community College Involvement in Contracted Training and Other Economic Development Activities. A Report of a National Survey.

INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 91

NOTE 48p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Economic Development; *Employment Programs; *Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Financial Support; *Job Training; National Surveys; Performance Contracts; Questionnaires; *School Business Relationship; Tables (Data); Technical Institutes; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS *Customized Training

ABSTRACT

In 1989, a national survey sponsored by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education was conducted of a random sample of 246 public community, technical, and junior colleges to ascertain the extent of the colleges' economic development activities outside of the regular curriculum, such as customized training, short-term vocational classes and workshops, and consultations with small businesses. In addition, the study sought to examine those college services receiving federal funds from the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and the Vocational Education Act (VEA). Major findings, based on a 72% response rate, included the following: (1) 93% of the responding colleges offered at least one contract training course to public or private employers, although a large percentage of the total number of courses offered and students served was derived from a minority of institutions; (2) over 90% of the colleges offered job-specific skills courses, while 60% provided basic academic skills courses as part of contract education; (3) on average, 67% of the job-related courses offered were customized, while only 29% of the apprenticeship, basic skills, and "other" courses were tailored to meet employer needs; (4) 31% of the contracted courses offered per college allowed students to earn credit; (5) 72% of the colleges' contract-training clients were private firms, and 20% were public agencies; (6) in addition to contract education, approximately 33% of the colleges provided special services to small businesses, 18% helped businesses obtain loans or financing, and 13% provided assistance in procuring contracts; and (7) during 1988-89, 80% of the colleges received funds provided by the VEA, while 50% were direct recipients of JTPA funds. The survey instrument is attached. (JMC)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED332742

Community College Involvement in Contracted Training and
Other Economic Development Activities

A Report of a National Survey Conducted by
The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Gollattscheck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it
 Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Washington, D.C.

Jc 910 259

Community College Involvement in Contracted Training and Other Economic Development Activities

A Report of a National Survey Conducted by
The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

Introduction

Economic development has become a much heralded framework for community college vocational education. Encouraged by state and federal legislation providing subsidies for labor force training and promoted by professional organizations such as the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), contract education for business and occupational training and counseling for special populations (such as displaced workers or homemakers) now complement the standard courses and curricula that have traditionally linked community college education with the world of work. By helping industries add or retain jobs and by retraining workers with insufficient or outdated skills, community colleges seek to become primary players in state and national efforts to remain economically competitive.

While these new roles have been promoted by policy makers and community college leaders, little is known about the extent of community college economic development activities undertaken outside of the training provided through the regular curriculum. Many of these activities, such as customized training for business clients or short-

term vocational classes and workshops are offered in the form of noncredit community services and are therefore not always subject to state reporting requirements. Other activities, such as one-on-one counseling for operators of small businesses do not entail formal instruction and cannot be gauged in terms of enrollment or other standard measures of the collegiate enterprise. It is hard to derive a composite picture of the nontraditional economic development services offered by community colleges, because little information is available beyond the anecdotal evidence proffered in case studies or descriptions of individual college programs.

In order to develop an empirical picture of these services, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education contracted with AACJC to conduct a national survey of public community, technical, and junior colleges. The questionnaire, distributed to a random sample of institutions in the fall of 1989, sought information on two broad areas: (1) training offered to public and private employers on a contracted basis and (2) college services that are subsidized by federal funds made available through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and the Vocational Education Act. In addition, the questionnaire asked responding colleges to list other economic development efforts, such as business incubators or contract procurement assistance. The following pages review survey methodology and highlight key findings.

Methodology

AACJC faced the task of balancing the desire for in-depth information with the need for a brief survey instrument that could be easily filled out by responding colleges. Because staff time for data entry was limited, it was also necessary to utilize a sample of colleges rather than surveying the entire population. Thus, planning for the survey involved (1) pretesting and refining the questionnaire and (2) drawing a representative, random sample of institutions.

The Survey Instrument

When the project began in the spring of 1989, little was known about the availability of information on contracted programs or other economic development activities. The initial survey instrument, developed in consultation with the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, was therefore pretested by 10 community colleges. The questionnaire (presented in Appendix A) was ambitious, aimed at gathering detailed information on the subject areas covered by work force training programs and the staffing and funding used to support those services. Among other items, the questionnaire asked for a listing of the courses offered to public and private employers on a contracted basis during 1988-89, as well as for data on the funding sources for each

class and on the number of instructional hours devoted to each course.

The results of the pretest were dismal, however, indicating that such detailed information is not readily available. Interviews with staff at the ten colleges indicated that while the requisite data existed, they were inconveniently stored (often in file cabinets) and accessed only with great difficulty. Only four of the ten colleges were able to complete the questionnaire, and the number of man-hours required for the task ranged from six to 43. As a result, the questionnaire was simplified. The revised version asked for data in broad categories, rather than on a course-by-course basis. In addition, respondents were asked to provide estimates if hard data were not at hand. Pilot tests of the downsized questionnaire revealed an average response time of only 2.1 hours. But this reduction in the burden placed on the responding colleges, though necessary, was made at the cost of considerable detail in the survey findings. (See the Appendix B for a copy of the final questionnaire.)

Sample Selection and Response Rate

Using AACJC's institutional data base, a 25 percent random sample of public community, technical, and junior colleges that were members of AACJC (N = 982) was selected for inclusion in the survey. The sample, which included 246

colleges, was stratified by enrollment (under 3,000; 3,000 to 7,000; over 7,000) and by location (rural, suburban, and urban). This resulted in a matrix of nine institutional categories:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Fall 1988 Enrollment</u>		
	Under 3,000	3,000-7,000	Over 7,000
Urban	A	B	C
Suburban	D	E	F
Rural	G	H	I

In September, 1989, the survey instrument was sent to the chief academic officers (CAOs) of each of the 246 institutions with a cover letter signed by AACJC president Dale Parnell. The CAOs were asked to forward the questionnaire to those on the college staff who were most knowledgeable about the issues addressed in the survey. Colleges were requested to return the questionnaire by the end of October.

In early November, follow-up letters were mailed to institutions that had not yet returned the survey. But by the end of November the response rate was only 54 percent. In order to increase returns, the 112 colleges who had not responded (or who indicated that they would not respond) were matched with randomly selected colleges having the same enrollment size and location characteristics. (That is, a

non-responding college in cell A of the size/location matrix would be matched with another randomly selected college from cell A.) Questionnaires were sent to these newly-selected institutions in December, and by mid-February, 64 (57 percent) had returned the survey instrument, bringing the total number of responding colleges to 176. Because the second sample was matched with the first, the total response rate for the survey was 72 percent (176 of 246 colleges).

Table One details the distribution of responding and non-responding colleges within the cells of the size and location matrix. The data indicate that while smaller colleges (under 3,000 students) were somewhat underrepresented and medium-sized colleges (3,000-7,000 students) were somewhat overrepresented, the distribution of the 176 responding colleges is similar to the distribution of the population of colleges. This speaks well for the representativeness of the responding institutions, but no formal study of non-respondent bias was undertaken.¹

Findings

The survey data present a broad, national picture of the types of economic development activities undertaken by

¹We were concerned that colleges that did not provide contracted education for employers, or that did not have strong economic development programs, would be less likely to respond. The result would be an overstatement in the degree to which community colleges engage in these activities. Phone calls to a selection of non-respondents, however, indicated that this was not the case.

Table One
Size and Location of Responding Institutions
Compared to Population of Public Community, Technical
and Junior Colleges

Fall 1988 enrollment				
Location	Under 3,000	3,000-7,000	over 7,000	Total
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Urban				
All colleges	6%	9%	10%	25%
Responding colleges	2%	12%	10%	24%
Suburban				
All colleges	8%	11%	12%	31%
Responding colleges	8%	14%	12%	34%
Rural				
All colleges	34%	9%	1%	44%
Responding colleges	30%	11%	1%	42%
All locations				
All colleges	48%	29%	23%	100%
Responding colleges	40%	37%	23%	100%

community colleges and the extent to which colleges involve themselves in these activities. Major findings are summarized below.

Contracted Training

One purpose of the survey was to develop an aggregate picture of the volume and nature of instructional services provided by community colleges to public or private employers on a contracted basis. For the purposes of the study, these services were defined loosely as those classes offered to employees of a business, industry, or public agency (or to the members of a labor union) and which were therefore not open to the general student body. Colleges were asked to indicate the number of such courses offered during academic year 1988-89, the number of students in those courses, and the number of businesses, public agencies, or unions with which arrangements for instruction had been made. The survey also gathered data on the types of instructional services provided, on the types of agencies that received this training, on the ways in which those services were funded, and on the extent to which colleges collaborate with their corporate clients to design and deliver courses.

Volume of Training Provided

How large an enterprise is contracted training? The survey findings provide a mixed answer. Almost all of the responding colleges (93 percent) indicated that they offered at least one course to a public or private employer during the 1988-89 academic year (see Table Two). In this sense, contracted training is widespread. But at most colleges, the number of clients and students served is relatively small. In terms of the total number of courses offered and students served, most contracted training is concentrated at a minority of institutions.²

Data in Table Three illustrate the skewed distribution of contracted services. The ranges of courses offered, clients served, and students enrolled at individual colleges are quite large. But the medians are extremely low, indicating that most colleges cluster at the lower ends of the range. For example, the number of job-specific courses offered per college in 1988-89 ranged from one to 550. The median, however, was only 39. Clearly, the college offering

²Further tests of the data are needed to determine if this skewed variance is accounted for by the large number of small, rural community colleges that serve districts with small industrial bases. A useful follow-up of this study would be a comparison of those colleges that report large contracted education programs with those colleges that report little or no activity in this area. Here we would examine the extent to which college leadership determines institutional involvement as opposed to external factors such as the size and health of the local economy or the type of industry that forms the base of that economy.

550 courses is an anomaly; at most institutions, contracted training is a relatively small enterprise. Table Four provides further evidence, indicating that almost half (49 percent) of the responding colleges offered fewer than 50 contracted courses during 1988-89; 79 percent offered fewer than 100.

Table Two
Proportion of Colleges Offering Contracted Training
During 1988-89

Type of contracted training	Percent of colleges providing training
Job-specific skills training designed to provide the skills or knowledge needed to perform a job, improve current performance, or prepare for advancement;	93%
The academic or general education portion of apprenticeship programs;	35%
Courses in basic reading, writing or math skills; and	60%
Other courses that do not fit into any of the above categories (examples include academic courses that are not part of apprenticeship programs as well as recreational, health, or other personal interest classes).	46%

Table Three

Volume of Contracted Training Provided During 1988-89

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Range</u>
Number of courses provided			
Job-specific skills	80	39	1 - 550
Formal apprenticeship	21	9	1 - 144
Basic academic skills	12	6	1 - 134
All other courses	38	10	1 - 761
Total, unduplicated	107	50	1 -1,065
Number of clients/employers			
Job-specific skills	43	19	1 -1,000
Formal apprenticeships	27	5	1 - 433
Basic academic skills	5	3	1 - 38
All other courses	11	4	1 - 171
Total, unduplicated	56	24	1 -1,023
Number of students enrolled			
Job-specific skills	1149	600	10-20,700
Formal apprenticeships	260	71	6 -1,979
Basic academic skills	253	93	3 -6,500
All other courses	621	195	10 -8,863
Total, unduplicated	1867	919	10- 27,000

Table Four

Number of Contracted Courses Provided During 1988-89

Percent of colleges providing:

Type of course	At least One course	Less than 25 courses	25-50 courses	51-100 courses	100 or more courses
Job-specific skills	93%	44%	16%	16%	24%
Apprenticeships	35%	93%	2%	3%	2%
Basic academic skills	60%	93%	4%	2%	1%
Other contract courses	46%	90%	5%	2%	3%
SUMMARY	94%	30%	19%	20%	31%

The same pattern emerges when one contrasts enrollment in contracted courses with enrollment in regular, credit curricula that are open to the general student body. Table Five makes this contrast, showing the distribution of responding colleges by "contract-to-credit" ratios, defined as the number of students enrolled in contracted courses during 1988-98 divided by the number of students enrolled in credit courses in the fall of 1988. The mean ratio is .455, giving the impression that contract enrollment approaches 50 percent of credit enrollment. But the median ratio is .221, indicating that at half of the colleges, there are one or fewer contract students for every five students enrolled in regular, credit courses. The relatively high mean appears to be an artifact of the few anomalous colleges that have unusually large contract education programs. At most colleges, credit enrollment outstrips contract enrollment by a wide margin. (It should also be noted that the ratios would most likely have been smaller had annual credit enrollment been used instead of fall semester enrollment.)

Types of Training Provided

Besides examining the volume of contracted courses provided, the survey also asked the responding colleges for information on (1) the broad subject areas covered by the classes; (2) the degree to which the courses were customized

Table Five

Ratio of Contracted Enrollment During 1988-89
To Regular Credit Enrollment in Fall 1988
(Contract/Credit = .xx)

	Contract/credit ratio						
	.00	.01-.09	.10-.19	.20-.29	.30-.50	.50+	
	(% of responding colleges)						
Job-related training	10%	24%	24%	10%	16%	16%	100%
All contract training	10%	19%	18%	11%	17%	25%	100%

Notes: The percentages in the table refer to percentages of responding colleges. For example, 10 percent of the responding colleges reported that they had no enrollments in contracted job-related training during 1988-89. Therefore the contract/credit ratio is zero. Twenty-four percent of the responding colleges had contract/credit enrollment ratios of .01 through .09, and so on.

The mean contract/credit ratio for job-related courses was .336. The median was .153.

The mean contract/credit ratio for all contracted courses was .455. The median was .221.

to fit the needs of the employer clients; (3) the extent to which assessment was incorporated in the training and (4) the degree to which college credit was awarded for completion of the courses. Findings reveal that while courses were often tailored to meet job-specific training needs, academic, credit courses have a significant presence.

Course Subject Areas. The responding colleges were asked to indicate the proportion of courses that fell into each of four broad categories:

- 1) Job-specific skills training designed to provide the skills or knowledge needed to perform a job, improve current performance, or prepare for advancement;
- 2) The academic or general education portion of apprenticeship programs;
- 3) Courses in basic reading, writing or math skills; and
- 4) Other courses that do not fit into any of the above categories (examples include academic courses that are not part of apprenticeship programs as well as recreational, health, or other personal interest classes).

Findings (detailed in Table Two on page 10) reveal that while most contracted training focuses on job-specific skills, colleges often offer their employer clients other types of instruction. Over 90 percent of the responding colleges included job-specific classes in their contract education classes; basic academic skills classes was the next largest category (60 percent), followed by "other" courses (46 percent) and the academic courses that are part of

apprenticeship programs (35 percent). A slightly different pattern emerges when one examines mean and median enrollments. Classes focusing on job-specific skills attract the largest number of students, but "other courses" are the second largest category.

Customization. Overall, the colleges reported that 48 percent of the contracted courses they offered in 1988-89 were customized to meet specific employer needs; the remaining 52 percent were "off-the-shelf" courses from the regular curriculum. The degree to which courses were customized depended largely on the subject area covered. While the majority (67 percent, on average) of job-related courses were customized, only a minority (29 percent, on average) of the apprenticeship, basic skills and "other" classes were tailored to meet employer needs (see Table Six). When it comes to academic skills, personal interest courses, or other nonvocational areas, employers seem more willing to rely on standard courses from the regular curriculum.

Assessment. The survey provides no information on the ways students are screened into the contracted courses. In many cases, screening may be a function of the hiring process; entrance assessment may therefore not be necessary, because courses are designed for a predetermined group of employees whose jobs require them to learn specific skills. Nonetheless, the responding colleges were asked to indicate

Table Six
Customization of Contracted Courses

	Type of contracted training	
	Job-related courses	All other courses
Percent of courses that are customized		
Mean response of responding colleges	67%	29%
Median response of responding colleges	80%	10%
Range of responses	0-100%	0-100%

the percent of courses in which students' basic skills were assessed at the outset. Most colleges (77 percent) replied that such assessment occurred in at least some contracted classes. But these classes are in the minority. On average, the colleges reported that only 31 percent of the contracted courses had a basic skills assessment component; the median was 20 percent (see Table Seven).

College Credit. Most of the colleges (62 percent) indicated that college credit was available for at least some of the contracted courses offered in 1988-89. But on average, 31 percent of the contracted courses offered per college allowed students to earn credit. It appears that in the majority of cases students do not earn college credit for the courses they complete (see Table Seven).

Organizations That Contract With Colleges

During 1988-89, the responding colleges provided instruction for a variety of organizations, including private companies or firms, public agencies, and other, non-profit groups (see Table Eight). It appears, however, that the private sector enjoys the largest share of college services. On average, 72 percent of all clients with whom colleges contracted to provide training were private enterprises.

It is interesting to note that in many cases these

Table Seven

Assessment of Students and Availability of College Credit

	Mean response of colleges	Median response of colleges	Range
Percent of contracted courses starting with some form of assessment of students' basic academic skills or ability to learn	31%	20%	0-100%
Percent of contracted courses for which college credit (not CEU's) was available	30%	63%	0-100%

Table Eight

**Types of Companies/Organizations/Clients
Receiving Contracted Training**

	% of colleges providing training to	Average % of clients in each category
Private companies or firms	96%	72%
Local/state/federal agencies	84%	20%
Other (e.g., non-profit)	60%	8%

organizations are partners in the training effort and not passive consumers of educational services. Almost all (96 percent) of the colleges reported that at least some of the classes were offered at company work sites. (Most classes, though, were offered at the college. When asked to indicate the percent of contracted courses offered at the work place, the mean response was 59 percent, and the median response was ten percent). A sizable minority of the colleges (39 percent) noted that employers donated equipment during 1988-89 for the training. When asked to indicate the value of these equipment donations, the mean response per college was \$96,000, while the median response was \$20,000; responses ranged from \$100 to \$1,000,000. In addition, many of the customized courses--especially those dealing with job-specific skills--were developed jointly by the college and the employer (see Table Nine).

The high degree of cooperation in the development of courses is encouraging. While colleges strive to meet the needs of their employer clients, it appears unlikely that they abandon, as some critics claim, control of course content and instruction. For their part, employers appear willing to work with the colleges, respecting their expertise in instructional matters. Further research should examine the respective roles played by colleges and employers and the ways in which interaction between the two organizations affects the content and delivery of contracted courses.

Table Nine
Development of Customized Courses

	Type of contracted training	
	Job-related courses	All other courses
What % of customized courses were developed by college staff only?		
Mean response of responding colleges	26%	44%
Median response of responding colleges	10%	46%
Range of responses	0-100%	0-100%
What % of customized courses were developed jointly by college staff and employer/clients?		
Mean response of responding colleges	61%	46%
Median response of responding colleges	70%	40%
Range of responses	0-100%	0-100%
What % of customized courses were developed by employer clients?		
Mean response of responding colleges	12%	8%
Median response of responding colleges	2%	1%
Range of responses	0-100%	0-100%

Funding

Eighty-five percent of the responding colleges provided information on the revenues that supported contracted education during 1988-89. The average total revenues received per college ranged from \$430 to \$3,500,000. The median, however, was only \$100,000, and the mean was \$267,072. The distribution of annual revenues per college is therefore skewed, with most clustering at the lower end. This matches the pattern revealed in the distribution of courses offered and students served. Contracted training does not appear to be a large money maker at most colleges.

Overall, employer funds accounted for 42 percent of the total revenues received by the responding colleges and state/local funds accounted for 25 percent. Data in Table Ten reveal that at 42 percent of colleges employers contribute more than 50 percent of the revenues needed to fund the classes. In contrast, only 23 percent said that state and local governments provided more than 50 percent of the revenues, eight percent cited students as the primary revenue source, and five percent cited the federal government. Given the large share of revenues contributed by employers, it appears that contracted training does not often constitute a public subsidy of private benefits.

Table Ten
Sources of Revenue

Source	Percent of revenue					
	0%	1-10%	11-33%	34-50%	Over 50%	
	(percent of responding colleges)					
Employers	23%	12%	19%	4%	42%	100%
Students	58%	16%	20%	1%	8%	100%
Federal	67%	17%	10%	1%	5%	100%
State/local	43%	9%	16%	8%	23%	100%
Other	91%	4%	4%	1%	0%	100%

Other Services to the Business Community

Besides contracted education, the responding colleges were asked to list any other activities they undertook during 1988-89 to support the business community. The findings, detailed in Table Eleven, reveal that while colleges offer a number of services, the provision of these services is not as widespread as contracted training. Approximately one-third of the colleges offered services to small businesses, 18 percent helped businesses obtain loans or financing and 13 percent provided assistance in procuring contracts. Almost a third of the colleges (31 percent) cited a variety of "other" services, outlined in Table Twelve.

Federal and State Initiatives

Another objective of the survey was to determine the extent to which community colleges use federal or state monies earmarked for vocational education or economic development. Findings indicate that while most receive funding through the Vocational Education Act ("Perkins Act"), fewer have participated in programs sponsored by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Survey responses also indicate that colleges receive funding from numerous state and federal agencies that support programs for special populations.

Table Eleven
Other Business Assistance Activities

Activity	% of colleges providing the activity	Number of employers served per college by activity:		
		mean	median	range
Small business development center	33%	199	110	3-1,575
Business incubators	8%	14	5	1-100
Small Business Administration training workshops	33%	216	78	2-1,947
Advanced technology centers	7%	84	16	1-663
Minority business development centers	6%	25	10	1-100
Assisting businesses obtain funding/loans	18%	22	15	1-88
Assisting businesses in contract procurement	13%	59	13	1-409
Other activities	31%	90	20	1-600

Table Twelve

Other Economic Development Activities
Listed by Responding Colleges

Industrial retention, expansion, attraction
Regional economic development seminars
Sunshine State Skills Program
California State Chancellor's Office Economic Development
Network
Expanding new businesses
Cape Cod Labor Conference
Resource for locating employees
Industrial start-ups
S.C.O.R.E.
Regional and State Advising Council
Grant development to support training
Regional Public/Private Coalition
Involved with PIC re: displaced workers
Redevelopment Agency
Chamber of Commerce Business Exposition
Chamber of Commerce training workshops
High Impact Training Services
Miscellaneous business services
Technical assistance
Technology Transfer Program
Workshop on Women and Minority Business Development
Virginia State Department of Industrial Training
Industrial training program
Job skills program
Export-import training
Chamber of Commerce business development week
Training for displaced workers
CustomFit
Seminars for economic development corps and women/minority
entrepreneurs
Entrepreneur survival skills training
Part of regional/county economic development team
Regional consortium for economic development
Professional development center for training
Opened a SBDC
Local manufacturing grants to open a training center
Assistance to inventors
Work force development
SBDC training sessions
Small Business Assistance Center
Teleconference on economic development

Perkins Act and JTPA Funds

Tables Thirteen, Fourteen, and Fifteen summarize data pertaining to Perkins Act and JTPA funds. Eight out of ten responding colleges received Perkins Act monies in 1988-89 and one out of two colleges received JTPA funds. In addition, 20 percent of the responding colleges indicated that they served as regional administrative agencies for JTPA. Tables Thirteen and Fourteen summarize additional findings related to the amount of money received per college and the number of clients served. In all cases, the ranges of funding received were great, but the means and medians were relatively low. Thus, the familiar skewed distribution appears, with a few institutions receiving relatively high awards and most institutions receiving awards that are considerably lower.

In addition to the amount of money awarded and clients served, the colleges were asked to indicate how the Perkins Act and JTPA funds were used. Responses indicate that most Perkin's Act monies were used for credit instruction, though a significant proportion was allocated for non-credit programs and other activities. (See Table 13.) JTPA funds were also used for credit and non-credit instruction, but these monies were more often allocated for non-instructional services such as assessment, placement, and job-placement services (see Table Fifteen).

Table Thirteen
Findings Concerning Perkins Act Funding

	Mean	Median	Range
Award (\$ amount) per college during 1988-89	\$207,233	\$166,417	\$958-1,110,877
Percent of funds allocated per college to			
Credit programs	65%	68%	9%-100%
Non-credit programs	17%	13%	1%-100%
Other activities	16%	15%	1%-41%

Table Fourteen
Findings Concerning JTPA Funding

	Mean	Median	Range
Colleges serving as JTPA administrative entities (21% of responding colleges)			
Total funds administered per college in 1988-89	\$631,289	\$109,234	\$2,411-\$5,108,645
Total no. of clients served per college	311	72	5 - 2,680
Colleges that are direct recipients of JTPA funds (53 of responding colleges)			
JTPA allocation per college	\$184,676	\$99,500	\$4,000-\$1,114,652
Total no. of clients served per college	179	83	15 - 1,248

Table Fifteen
Activities Funded Through JTPA Monies

Service	Percent of clients receiving service
Assessment	66%
Counseling	65%
Job search skills	53%
Placed in jobs	41%
Remedial/Basic skills	44%
Credit vocational courses	44%
Non-credit vocational courses	26%

Note: Percentages total to more than 100 percent, because clients usually receive more than one type of service.

Other Government Programs and Initiatives

Over half (56 percent) of the responding colleges indicated that they received monies through other state, federal, or local initiatives designed to assist business with its training needs or to provide special populations (such as displaced homemakers or workers) with job training or upgrading. Table Sixteen details the funding received per college through these initiatives, as well as the number of students served through programs funded by these initiatives. Table Seventeen lists the disparate funding sources that were cited. Though it is hard to interpret this listing (open-ended questions are usually plagued by vague responses), it can be easily seen that community colleges rely on a myriad of agencies for funding that supports job training and economic development.

Summary

The insights gained by the survey must be viewed within the constraints of at least three limitations. First, responding colleges were encouraged to provide estimates if requested data were not easily obtainable. No follow-up was conducted to determine the extent to which survey responses were estimated or to determine the accuracy of those estimates. Second, those responding to the survey were

rarely guided by operational definitions. For example, when asked to indicate the number of courses taught on a

Table Sixteen

Other Local, State, and Federal Funding Received to Help Businesses or Assist Special Populations Obtain Job Training of Upgrading

	Mean	Median	Range
Per-college funding from these other sources	\$136,577	\$26,214	\$1,800-\$1,715,131
Students served per college with these funds	769	241	3 - 9,634
Businesses served per college with these funds	136	14	1 - 5,200

Note: These funds include any government monies earmarked for either assistance to business enterprises or assistance to special populations (such as displaced homemakers or workers) who need job training or retraining.

Table Seventeen
Activities and Programs Funded Through Other
Federal, State, or Local Initiatives

State Department of Commerce & Community Affairs -
 industrial attraction
Displaced Homemakers - N.J. Division on Women
State apprenticeship
National Council on Aging
Area Agency on Aging
Single Parent/Displaced Homemaker
Teen Parent
Women in Non-traditional Services Sex Equity Grant
Custom Training
R.N. Retraining - Minnesota Job Skills Partnership (JTPA)
Youth Training
VEA
GAIN
State Chancellor Employee Training Office funds
Dislocated Workers
Mass Jobs - Bay State Skills Corporation
Adult Education
Employment training panel
Women's Center
State OJT
At-Risk Alternative High School
Industrial Training Grant
Job training
10/10 funds
State funding for training in new technology and
 new/expanding business
Aids for handicapped
Trade Adjustment Act
Prairie State 2000 Authority
Kansas Department of Corrections - basic education
Coop Education
State PIC
State Department of Vocational Technical Education
 and Economic and Employee Development
Quik-Start/Industrial Start-up
N.J. Department of Higher Education Challenge Grant
State Department of Labor customized training program
Small Business Center
Working opportunities for women
Department of Labor - machinist retraining
Non-traditional opportunities, single parent, displaced
 homemakers
High school dropouts
Job skills, upgrade, placement
Small business training
Maryland Industrial Training Program

Table Seventeen (continued)

Activities and Programs Funded through other
Federal, State, or Local Initiatives

Project Forward Step (Perkins)
Work Force Initiative (On-the-Job Literacy)
Tennessee Small Business Development
AFDC, Title 3
Custom Training for Economic Growth
Women in High Technology
Welfare recipients - assessment, testing, counseling,
literacy
CDA training
U.S. Department of Health Training for Native Americans
Critical Industry and SBDC training programs - displaced
workers, career counseling, high school dropouts
U.S. Department of Education - Coop Ed and Project Success
JTPA summer youth program
United Way -illiteracy
F.A.R.M. Project
Prison and transition training
JTPA Individual Referral
LPN-to RN Transition Program
Women in Technology/Dislocated Workers
Project Hire
Public Assistance, Information, Referral, Retention
Customized job training and Weatherization training
Department of Education Industry Service Grants
Sunshine State Skills
M-Job (State of Michigan)
State - Pre-employment training
Elevator installation and Maintenance - VEA grant
REACH - NJ state precursor to Federal Jobs/Welfare
Vocational Opportunity Training Education - Division
of Alcohol and Substance Abuse
Migrant Education
JTPA-ICCB State Department of Education - training for
small businesses
State workforce/upgrade training
Women in Transition
Governor's Workforce Initiative Program
Kansas Technology Enterprise Corporation
Pennsylvania Customized Job Training Program
Pace, VCIP, Student Support Services

contracted basis, no definition for the term "course" was provided. Thus, data on the number of "courses" offered may be based on a number of activities ranging from short workshops lasting only an hour or two to semester-long classes encompassing several hours of instruction.³ Third, the survey responses came from a sample of colleges. Although this sample appears similar to the population of public community, technical, and junior colleges in terms of enrollment size and location (urban, rural, or suburban), no formal test of nonrespondent bias was made.

Nonetheless, the data lead to several tentative conclusions, shedding light on the nature of contracted training for employers, on the community college role in economic development, and on the support community colleges receive from government agencies that target funds for business assistance and labor force development. These findings are highlighted below.

Contracted Education

- o The vast majority of public community colleges (93 percent) offered at least one course on a contract basis to public or private employers. The number of courses offered per college ranged from one to 1,065; the number of students served in these courses ranged from 10 to 27,000, and the number of employer clients served ranged from one to 1,023.

³The first draft of the survey instrument, which we pilot tested in the summer of 1989, asked colleges to list the courses they provided and to indicate the number of hours of instruction each entailed. When it became apparent that the colleges could not easily provide information on the number of instructional hours, the questionnaire was revised to ask only for the number of courses, regardless of duration.

- o The proportion of colleges providing at least some contracted training--93 percent--is higher than figures reported in earlier studies. Deegan and Drisko (1985) found that 65 percent of the nation's two-year colleges had established contract education programs by 1983. Cohen (1987) found that 75 percent of the nation's public community colleges offered "customized" courses to business and industry in 1986. This variance may be due to differences in survey methodology, differences in the way questionnaires were worded, and uncertainties that emerge in the inexact terminology used to label contracted education. It may also signify growth in contract education as a community college enterprise.
- o Despite the large proportion of colleges that provide some contract training, most colleges have relatively modest contract education programs. The number of courses offered at the median college was only 50; the median number of students enrolled was 919; and the median number of employer clients served was 24. These data are in line with earlier studies showing that most of the contracted education offered by community colleges is accounted for by a relatively small number of institutions (see Palmer, 1990, pp. 25-26).
- o It is also important to note that at most colleges, enrollment in regular credit courses--which also serve the economic development needs of the community--outstrips enrollment in contracted classes.
- o The most frequently offered contract courses deal with job-specific skills (offered by 93 percent of the colleges), followed by courses in basic reading, writing, and math skills (offered by 60 percent of the colleges), "other", miscellaneous courses (offered by 46 percent of the colleges), and academic courses that are tied to apprenticeship programs.
- o Courses focusing on job-related skills are more likely than other contracted courses to be customized (that is, developed specifically for the employer rather than taken "off-the-shelf" from the regular college curriculum). On average, approximately 67 percent of the job-related courses offered per college were customized, as opposed to only 27 percent of all other courses.
- o On average, private firms make up the majority (approximately 70 percent) of the employer clients served by community college contract education programs. Public agencies account for 20 percent of the clients served.
- o Colleges often collaborate with their clients in the development of customized courses. On average, 61 percent of

the job-specific courses offered were developed jointly by colleges and their clients. Other courses, including basic skills and academic courses are more likely to be taken off the shelf; on average, only 46 percent were developed jointly, while the remainder were developed solely by the college.

- o Employers themselves provide the largest share of revenues needed to support contracted education, followed by subsidies from state and local governments.

Other Economic Development Activities

- o Community colleges engage in other, noninstructional services to the business community. But these services are not as widespread as contract training. Approximately one-third of the colleges provide special services to small businesses, 20 percent help businesses obtain funding or loans, and approximately 13 percent help businesses in contract procurement. This is in line with earlier studies indicating that most colleges confine their economic development role to instruction and do not venture into wider service functions (see Palmer, pp. 19 -24).

Vocational Education Act and the Job-Training Partnership Act

- o During 1988-89, approximately 80 percent of the public community, technical, and junior colleges received funds through the Vocational Education Act (VEA). Approximately two-thirds of these monies were used to support credit instructional programs; another 17 percent was devoted to non-credit instruction, and the remainder was utilized for other activities.
- o Approximately 50 percent of the colleges received Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) funds during 1988-89, and 20 percent served as regional administrative agencies for JTPA.
- o In terms of dollars received and clients served, participation in VEA and JTPA varied greatly from college to college. For example, JTPA funds allocated per college ranged from \$2,411 to as much as \$5,108,645; the median allocation was \$109,234.

Other Government Programs

- o VEA and JTPA are not the only government programs that support college economic development activities. During 1988-89, approximately 50 percent of the colleges participating in the survey received funds from other state, local, and federal agencies that support business assistance programs or vocational training. The amount of money awarded per college by these agencies ranged from \$1,800 to \$1,715,131.

Information

Experience with the survey--particularly with the initial survey instrument used in the pretest--once again confirms that colleges rarely gather data on educational processes and outcomes. Though college leaders have promoted contracted education and other economic development services as one of the community college's premier societal contributions, information on the scope and effects of these programs rarely goes beyond the anecdotal.

Additional Questions

This survey has documented the wide-spread involvement of community colleges in contract education programs and in government business assistance and labor force development efforts. Most colleges have at least some sort of contract education program. The data also suggest that a sizable minority of the colleges are heavily involved, with contract education enrollments--as well as JTPA client rolls--that rival enrollment in regular, credit classes.

A full appreciation of college involvement in these nontraditional vocational education activities, however, awaits more precise measures. What is a contract course? Is the definition used in the survey adequate, or is a more precise

definition required? How should students be counted? Should the student enrolled in a one-hour workshop be given the same weight as a student enrolled in a semester-long class? When non-instructional services are provided, how should they be measured? For example, what does a college mean when it indicates that its small business center served X number of businesses during a given academic year?

Problems encountered in gauging college economic development activities are the same problems that have long plagued efforts to measure non-credit programs and services. Without state-mandated reporting requirements, consistency goes by the board. How can comparisons of institutional effort in non-credit programming be made, for example, when one college reports only enrollment in noncredit classes, while the other includes data on the number of area citizens who visit the college art gallery or attend college-sponsored concerts? Studies of economic development programs will be subject to the same inconsistencies unless standard definitions are agreed upon and applied. Future research should concentrate on the development of those definitions and their use in collecting trend data that gauge the college role in economic development over time.

References

- Cohen, A. M. Community College Involvement in the Education of Adults: A Progress Report Submitted to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1987. (ED 277 428)
- Deegan, W. L., and Drisko, R. "Contract Training: Progress and Policy Issues." Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 1985, 55 (6), 14-17.
- Palmer, J. "How Do Community Colleges Serve Business and Industry? A Review of Issues Discussed in the Literature." Paper prepared for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National Alliance of Business, 1990. (ED number not yet assigned).

SURVEY

1988-89 WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AT COMMUNITY, TECHNICAL, AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

A SURVEY CONDUCTED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
AND
THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Community, Technical, and Junior colleges are increasingly involved in providing education and training to America's workforce. These "workforce" or "laborforce" development efforts take a variety of forms: specific training partnerships with employers, services and educational programs for specific target populations, "vocational" courses open to all students, and local "economic development" activities which assist individual (and groups of) business and community members.

With your help, this survey will enable educators and policy-makers to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the role our institutions play in providing training and education for America's workforce.

This survey asks you to provide information on "workforce development" efforts in which your institution participated during the 1988-89 academic year (roughly, July 1, 1988 through June 30, 1989, or whatever comparable time frame is most convenient for you to use to reflect the last "academic year").

The professional staff member primarily responsible for providing non-credit courses and services can most likely complete most of this survey, although some assistance from other staff may be necessary. We understand that some of the data being requested may be difficult to retrieve (or simply unavailable); in these cases, **please provide your best educated estimate of the data.** Our pretesting of this survey suggests that it takes less than two hours to complete.

All your responses will remain confidential! While your participation in the study will be acknowledged, no institution's name will be associated with any of its individual responses.

Please indicate here a contact person or the primary respondent to whom we could address any additional questions we may have:

NAME: _____ PHONE: (____) _____

TITLE: _____

COLLEGE: _____

If you have any questions at all, please contact the survey coordinator:

Bob Lynch
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7050

45

PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY BY OCTOBER 27, 1989

Thanks very much for your assistance!!

1988-90 WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AT COMMUNITY, TECHNICAL, AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Throughout this survey, use available data; in cases where data are inaccessible, please provide your best educated estimate. Please do not omit any items!

PART A - General Information: 1988-89 Academic Year

1. Is your institution formally represented on the local Private Industry Council (PIC)? YES _____ NO _____.
2. In the Fall, 1988 semester or term, how many individual students were enrolled in credit courses? _____.
What percent were in a "Vocational" or "Occupational curriculum/major"? _____ %.

3. For your TOTAL non-credit/community services/continuing education activities in all of 1988-89:

Category/Type/Focus of Course	No. of Enrollments	No. of Courses
Vocational, Job-related, Apprenticeships	_____	_____
Basic ("remedial") Academic Skills and E.S.L.	_____	_____
All Other (health, recreation, personal interest, etc)	_____	_____
TOTAL FOR 1988-89	_____	_____

PART B - Contract Training For Employers: 1988-89 Academic Year

The questions in this section refer to courses or programs which you provided in 1988-89 specifically to or for a business, industry, public agency, or union, rather than courses which are "open" to anyone. These are often referred to as "contract," "employer-specific," or "customized" programs or courses.

1. Please indicate the number of courses offered, number of employers/companies, and number of student enrollments during 1988-89 for the following categories of courses:
(Some companies may be counted in more than one "category" - that's okay!)

Types of Courses/Training in 1988-89	No. of Courses	No. Companies/ Employers	No. Students/ Enrollments
Job-Specific Skills training to provide skills or knowledge to perform a job, improve current performance, or prepare for advancement: e.g., word-processing, accounting, welding, CAD/CAM	_____	_____	_____
Formal Apprenticeships - the academic (typically classroom) portion of apprenticeships	_____	_____	_____
Basic Academic Skills - courses focused on basic English, reading, and math skills (often considered "remedial", "pre-college" or "workplace literacy"), including E.S.L.	_____	_____	_____
All other courses that do not fit one of the above categories; for example, personal interest, recreational, health, other academic courses, etc. provided to employers/businesses	_____	_____	_____

2. Since the previous question may include companies counted more than once, please indicate for how many separate, unduplicated companies/employers your college provided courses: _____.

3. This question has several parts, and, like Questions 1 & 2, refers to courses provided to or for specific employers, companies, or agencies. If data are inaccessible, provide your best estimate.

For Courses Provided to Employers/Companies/Clients

- a. Types of employers/companies/clients
 - Percent of clients that were private companies or firms _____ %
 - Percent of clients that were local/state/federal government _____ %
 - Percent of clients that were other (e.g., non-profit) organizations _____ %
- b. Percent of courses with some form of assessment conducted at the outset of students' basic academic skills or ability to learn _____ %
- c. Percent of courses for which college credit (not CEUs) was available _____ %
- d. Percent of courses offered at employer/client worksite _____ %
- e. Approximate dollar value of equipment/materials donated to the college by employers to support these courses/programs \$ _____
- f. Total revenues (dollars received) in 1988-89 for these courses/programs \$ _____
 - Percent (or \$\$) from employers/companies _____ % or \$ _____
 - Percent (or \$\$) from students/employees (tuition, fees, etc.) _____ % or \$ _____
 - Percent (or \$\$) from Federal programs or funds _____ % or \$ _____
 - Percent (or \$\$) from State/Local programs or funds _____ % or \$ _____
 - Percent (or \$\$) from any other sources (please list below) _____ % or \$ _____

100%

100%

4. For this question, please separate the courses provided to employers or companies into two categories: (a) job-specific skills plus apprenticeships, and (b) basic academic skills plus all other courses.

	<u>Job-Specific</u>	<u>All Others</u>
a. Percent of courses that were "customized" (vs "off-the-shelf") for client	_____ %	_____ %
% of those customized courses developed solely by college faculty/staff	_____ %	_____ %
% of those customized courses developed cooperatively with employer/client	_____ %	_____ %
% of those customized courses developed solely by company/employer/client	_____ %	_____ %
	100%	100%
b. Instructors		
% of courses taught by "regular full-time" college faculty/staff	_____ %	_____ %
% of courses taught by "regular part-time" college faculty/staff	_____ %	_____ %
% of courses taught by employees of company/client	_____ %	_____ %
% of courses taught by others not regularly employed by the college	_____ %	_____ %
	100%	100%

PART C - Other Economic Development Activities

In addition to courses and training provided to specific employers, many colleges engage in a variety of other "labor force development" and "economic development" activities. During 1988-89, how many clients/companies/businesses did the college serve in any of the following activities:

<u>Activities in 1988-89 Academic Year</u>	<u>No. of Businesses Served</u>
a. Small Business Development Center (SBDC)	_____
b. Business Incubators	_____
c. U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) training (number of workshops _____)	_____
d. Advanced Technology Centers	_____
e. Minority Business Development Centers	_____
f. Assistance to business in obtaining financing/funding/loans, etc, in 1988-89 --->>(Approximate \$\$ value of financing received: _____)	_____
g. Contract procurement assistance to businesses in 1988-89 --->>(Approximate \$\$ value of contracts received: _____)	_____
h. Other economic development activities in 1988-89:	_____

PART D - Allocating Local, State, and Federal "Vocational" Funds

This section asks questions related to all "workforce," "laborforce," or "vocational"-related training, courses, or activities - not just service provided to specific employers. Please provide your best estimate of your institution's level of funding and the allocations of those local, state, or federal government funds in 1988-89. Your accounting office may have some of this information or might assist you in providing estimates.

1. Perkins Act ("Vocational Education") Funding Received in 1988-89 \$ _____
 Percentage allocated to credit faculty, staff, equipment, courses, programs: _____ %
 Percentage allocated to non-credit faculty, staff, equipment, courses, programs: _____ %
 Percentage allocated to other activities (please specify): _____ %
 _____ %
 _____ %
100%

2. Did your college serve as an "Administrative Entity" for JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act) during 1988-89? YES _____ NO _____
 a. If "No," skip to question 3
 b. If "Yes,": What was the total amount administered by the college in 1988-89? \$ _____
 Number of separate, unduplicated JTPA clients receiving services: _____
 Approximate % of clients receiving the following services (may total over 100%):
 Assessment _____ % Vocational Education in credit classes _____ %
 Counseling _____ % Vocational Education in non-credit courses _____ %
 Job Search Skills _____ % Other: _____ %
 Placed in jobs _____ % _____ %
 Remedial/Basic Skills _____ % _____ %

3. Did your college receive any JTPA funds directly in 1988-89? YES _____ NO _____
 a. If "No," skip to Question 4
 b. If "Yes,": What was the total amount received directly by the college? \$ _____
 Number of separate, unduplicated JTPA clients receiving services: _____
 Approximate % of clients receiving the following services (may total over 100%):
 Assessment _____ % Vocational education in credit classes _____ %
 Counseling _____ % Vocational education in non-credit courses _____ %
 Job Search Skills _____ % Other: _____ %
 Placed in jobs _____ % _____ %
 Remedial/Basic Skills _____ % _____ %

4. Many local and state governments have developed special programs to provide funds to help businesses or special target populations (displaced homemakers, displaced workers, welfare recipients, high school dropouts, etc) obtain job training or upgrading, generate new jobs, etc. Please list here any of these special local or state funds or programs, as well as any federal funding not covered above, that your college used to provide services, courses, or training in '88-89.

Title (& brief description) of Program or Source of Funding	Dollars Received	Students Served	Businesses Served
	\$ _____	_____	_____
	\$ _____	_____	_____
	\$ _____	_____	_____
	\$ _____	_____	_____

PLEASE REVIEW THE SURVEY AND RESPOND TO EACH ITEM WITH DATA . IF THE INFORMATION REQUESTED IS INACCESSIBLE, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR BEST INFORMED ESTIMATE