STUDIES OF JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULA VARY WIDELY IN TYPE AND SOURCE. DEFINITION OF SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, RECOGNIZED AS A FIRST STEP IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, IS DESCRIBED IN SIX STUDIES AS AN ATTEMPT TO PROVIDE A RATIONALE FOR PROGRAMS, COURSE CONTENT, AND CURRICULUM EVALUATION. SURVEYS OF EXISTING PROGRAMS, REPORTED IN 20 STUDIES, UTILIZED INSTITUTIONAL VISITS, STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS, OR QUESTIONNAIRES. MOUNT SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE'S COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTED IN SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUATION OF EXPANSION OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION OFFERINGS. EVALUATION OF CABRILLO COLLEGE'S CONSTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM WAS BASED ON A QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY OF FORMER STUDENTS AND THEIR EMPLOYERS. IN MICHIGAN, LOW ENROLLMENTS IN TECHNICAL PROGRAMS WERE RELATED TO HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE PROGRAMS, LACK OF INTEREST, AND LACK OF CAREER INFORMATION. MULTITRACK PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH COMPOSITION ARE FOUND IN 65.8 PERCENT OF THE COLLEGES SURVEYED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STUDENT PLACEMENT ARE OFFERED. (A 26-ITEM BIBLIOGRAPHY IS INCLUDED.) THIS ARTICLE WAS PUBLISHED IN "JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW," VOLUME 1, NUMBER 5, APRIL 1967. (HS)
This issue of Junior College Research Review is devoted to studies of junior college curricula. Documents reviewed here were selected from those received, indexed, and abstracted at the Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. These studies represent efforts to collect information useful in evaluating or modifying junior college offerings. Other Clearinghouses operating in association with the United States Office of Education’s ERIC project process curriculum studies in different specialized areas.

Sources: Twenty-six research reports relating to junior college curriculum development and evaluation are reviewed in this issue. Thirteen of these reports were produced by various junior college staff members; five were sponsored by state departments of education; three were prepared as seminar papers for graduate courses in higher education; and two were the efforts of junior college research offices. Included also are a master’s thesis, a doctoral dissertation, and a report by the National Council of Teachers of English.

Methodology: Six of the studies helped develop curricular offerings by defining specific educational objectives. These studies attempted to provide rationales for programs, course content, and curriculum evaluation. In three reports, requisite data were secured by institutional visits, utilizing a structured-interview technique. Seventeen studies surveyed curricular programs at various institutions by means of questionnaires.

Two of the more interesting methodologies were used at Mt. San Antonio College and at Cabrillo College. Mt. San Antonio College developed a college-community occupational and educational survey to study the college’s technical education offerings (JC 670-103). A questionnaire, sent to the parents of 29,196 students in grades 5, 7, 11, and 13, sampled parents’ educational aspirations for their children. The study resulted in specific recommendations for the continuation and expansion of the technical education offerings in the college.

At Cabrillo College, the construction technology program was evaluated by the use of a questionnaire sent to 386 students and to the employers of students formerly enrolled in the program (JC 660-247). The purpose of the study was well defined and the results of the survey provided a rationale for curriculum revision and specific modifications in course content.

Findings: To date, studies of the junior college curriculum have focused attention on the following problems: (1) institutional and departmental curricular programs developed within the framework of specific educational objectives; (2) status studies of curricular programs at other institutions; (3) specific programs for low-ability students; and (4) feasibility studies to determine the need for new, occupationally oriented curriculum programs.

Western Piedmont Community College produced a Manual for Course Planning which emphasizes the need for defining educational objectives as a first step in curriculum development (JC 660-123). The study is valuable because it represents an institutional effort to state learning objectives in terms of desired behavioral outcomes. In the manual, the behaviorally specified learning objectives represent those competencies expected of any student who would receive credit in a course. The document develops the need to state clearly the learning objectives in all curricular areas. Such a process provides the classroom teacher with a sound basis for designing and evaluating a program of study. Related extra-class experiences may also be designed to result in students’ achieving specified learning objectives.

An important study of technical education in Michigan community colleges was prepared by Harris and Yencso (JC 660-093). A summary of responses from 1,637 technical students indicated that only 10 percent of all high school graduates entered full-time study in occupationally oriented programs. Reasons for the low student enrollment were summarized as follows: inadequate vocational guidance in high school; lack of student interest; and lack of career information. Poor articulation between high school and college
counselors and teachers was indicated.

*English in the Two-Year College (JC 660 224)*, a document prepared by the National Council of Teachers of English, included specific recommendations for the placement of low-ability students in junior college English programs. The study indicated that students are placed in various levels of composition (multitrack remedial, regular, and honors) by two-thirds (65.8 percent) of the 187 schools surveyed.

Other studies projected feasible curricular offerings in particular institutions. Those documents made recommendations based on indicated needs for new programs.

**Summary:** Junior college curriculum studies received at the Clearinghouse vary widely in subject matter and methodology. The questionnaire survey is the technique used to gather information in most of the studies reviewed. The common method of data collection in such cases is to mail questionnaires to all students who graduated in a given year in a specified curricular area and to analyze the returns. The technique results in a self-selected sample, defined as those who returned the questionnaire. This sample, even if 50 percent of the questionnaires are returned, is biased. Although the survey methods may provide data of some value, a *truly random* sample of only 10 percent of the population with 90 or 95 percent return would produce more valid and meaningful information.

There is little indication that current research in the area of junior college curriculum results in program modification based upon research findings and recommendations. Emphasis should be given to doing research for the purpose of basing educational decisions on specific findings.

*John E. Roueche*

*David M. Sims*

---
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