

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 969

CE 006 548

AUTHOR Griffith, William S.
 TITLE Synergy in Urban Relationships--Public School Adult Education, Community Colleges, and Community Education.
 PUB DATE 8 Nov 75
 NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the National Council of Urban Administrators of Adult Education, National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education Conference (Chicago, Illinois, November 6-9, 1975); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage
 DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; Community Colleges; Community Education; *Interagency Cooperation; Interagency Coordination; Local Issues; National Programs; *Organizational Development; Organizations (Groups); Public School Adult Education; State Programs; *Urban Education

IDENTIFIERS National Council Urban Administrators Adult Educ; NCUAAE; *Synergy

ABSTRACT

The presentation reviews selected developments in inter-organizational cooperation and coordination at the local, State, and national levels in order to provide a basis for identifying major questions and issues faced by the National Council of Urban Administrators of Adult Education (NCUAAE) as they strive for synergy in adult education. Trends and innovations in organizational development are capsulized for: California, New York, Connecticut, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, Virginia, and Massachusetts. Special attention is directed to two doctoral dissertations concerning community education at Flint, Michigan, and a nationwide survey of interagency cooperation of agencies in each State responsible for adult and continuing education, vocational and technical education, and community junior colleges. Likewise, efforts of the 1975 national seminar of leaders in adult continuing and community education (Flint) are viewed as a strong potential source of coordination. NCUAAE members are presented with 11 pertinent issues related to joint national conferences, advisement of State legislatures on coordination in adult education, coordination with postsecondary/secondary level institutions, Community Education Act, adult education program funding in urban areas, research funding, improved delivery systems for adult education, and adoption of a policy on synergy in adult education. (EA)

ED118969

Proceedings of the National Council of Urban Administrators of Adult Education

NAPCAE Annual Conference, November 6-9, 1975

Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Second General Session, Part Two, Saturday, November 8

Topic: SYNERGY IN URBAN RELATIONSHIPS - PUBLIC SCHOOL ADULT EDUCATION, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presiding: Dr. H. Carlton Smith, Director of Continuing Education
South Seattle Community College
Seattle, Washington

Presenter: Dr. William S. Griffith, Associate Professor
Department of Education
University of Chicago

Reactors: Mr. Walter R. Lund, Director of Community Education
Cincinnati Public Schools
Cincinnati, Ohio

Mr. Bob Allen, Director of Adult Education
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas

Mrs. Mary Turner, Director of Adult Education
Washington, D.C. Public Schools
Washington, D.C.

SYNERGY IN URBAN RELATIONSHIPS -
PUBLIC SCHOOL ADULT EDUCATION,
COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND
COMMUNITY EDUCATION

William S. Griffith
Department of Education
The University of Chicago

The purposes of this paper are to review selected developments in inter-organizational cooperation and coordination at the local, national and state levels to provide a basis for identifying major questions and issues which I think face the members of the National Council of Urban Administrators of Adult Education as they strive for Synergy in Adult Education.

Historically adult education councils, which are the smallest unit operating at the local level for coordination, have been very weak organizations. They have served as media for the exchange of information yet seldom have they done an outstanding job. Examples of sophisticated inter-organizational cooperation at the local level might be identified in a few, but not in very many cases because where we do find local cooperation it is usually the result of stimulation coming from the state level and it is usually the result of some dollars tied to the suggestion. As Mr. Allen has pointed out so eloquently, the need for coordination became ever-so-much clearer to the people in the various areas of Texas when there were some dollars coming from Washington. And I find no fault with that.

CALIFORNIA

Let us look at California as an example of a place where some of us may be in terms of our organizational development sometime in the future. In California the state legislature has attempted to solve the problem of unnecessary duplication and competition between tax supported institutions by encouraging agreements on the delineation of functions between the major providing bodies of adult education in each school district.

In Los Angeles, for example, there are a great number of potential adult students and two major institutions seeking to provide adult education programs. We have had a representative of one district within Los Angeles speak to us this afternoon and tell about a rather impressive program that he has developed within that area and ways in which he is cooperating with a great variety of institutions. We have at the present time a formal memorandum of agreement between the Board of Education of the Los Angeles Unified School District and the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District. This agreement was entered into in May, 1974, and I would like to point out just the main points of that agreement to show you how it has evolved. I quote from the agreement:

. . . delineation is viewed as an ongoing process requiring continuous feedback and guidance and is designed to provide superior and efficient educational opportunities as needed by the public.

Remediation Courses. Community adult schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District shall provide remedial classes. The Los Angeles Community College District will offer only required review or remedial courses that are essential to the educational progress of students concurrently enrolled in an occupational program or an Associate Degree program. Classes preparing students for high school equivalency tests shall be the responsibility of the Unified District. The community colleges may offer classes necessary to comply with specially funded Higher Education Act programs.

Short-Term Vocational Education Courses. The Los Angeles Unified School District shall provide short-term vocational programs to students seeking employment or retraining. The Los Angeles Community College District shall provide vocational education courses applicable to an occupational certificate or degree program. Both districts may offer courses to provide upgrading opportunities for persons in their field of employment. Mutual agreement is necessary whenever the Los Angeles Community College District proposes a new program of less than a year's duration, or whenever the Los Angeles Unified School District proposes a new program of more than a year's duration. In case agreement cannot be reached at the staff level, the matter shall be referred to the Delineation of Functions Committee for resolution.

Regional-Occupational Centers and Programs, offering short-term occupational programs of one year or less to prepare students for immediate job placement, retraining or upgrading, shall continue to be the function and responsibility of the . . . Unified School District. The program offered . . . shall be developed to avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities and courses of the . . . Community College District.

Articulation of Students . . . Students should be granted appropriate college credit for satisfactory completion of articulated occupational programs upon acceptance by a community college into a college-level occupational or degree program.

English as a Second Language. Community Adult Schools in the . . . Unified School District shall offer all English as a Second Language classes except that the . . . Community College District may offer English courses to meet the needs of students of non-English speaking origins currently enrolled in other course work applicable to an Associate Degree or to an occupational certificate. It is recognized that the remedial language function of non-English speaking professionals may be provided by either district.

Community Service/Adult Education. Both the . . . Unified School District and the . . . Community College District may offer programs of community services designed to meet the cultural, recreational, social, and civic needs of the community served. In addition, both districts may offer educational classes, lectures and seminars which do not duplicate the regular classes or course offerings of either district in the local areas served.

During the 1974-75 school year the Delineation of Functions Committee met four times: in October, December, February and May, and dealt effectively with a consideration of cost factors for similar classes offered by the two districts. Four seminars were held during July, 1974, to provide in-service training for adult education principals and for community college presidents and deans to facilitate the implementation of the delineation agreement.

Despite the apparent progress that is being made in Los Angeles in dealing with delineation functions, and despite the fact that the Los Angeles Community College District and the Unified School District appear to be working with some degree of harmony, it looks as though Sacramento is still not happy. I should like to quote briefly from some current information from Sacramento. First of all, imagine how the people in your state would feel if they received a copy of a letter put out on August 27, 1975, by the Assembly's Select Committee on the Implementation of Career Education, Joseph B. Montoya, chairman, that said the following:

Adult educators have obtained what has never been attained before in human history - a system of methodology of providing mass continuing education. Precisely because we are innovators because we continue to experiment to meet individual needs, the luxury of not thinking about the who, the what, the when, the how and at what cost, is not permissible. It is something of a corruption of our language to describe our present efforts in adult education as a system. The guide sheets of the Department of Finance in their present wonderings on the campuses of community colleges is indicative of how little is systematically available. The shared responsibility of the community colleges and unified and high school districts is under question. Newspaper articles from Solano, San Bernardino, and Los Angeles counties highlight the bickering over who should provide what service to the public. The ending of the unified adult education delivery system in San Diego city is further evidence of the need to examine the questions: Should our present methods be maintained? Would the public be better served by a single agency?

As a society we mobilize our resources to educate our youth. Even within that frame we have difficulty ascertaining what is to be offered. What is Education? What is an activity? What is necessary? What can we afford? But at least we know how many youths we are talking about. Can our discussions clarify priorities and boundaries?

Adult education has not benefited from such a sustained review effort. Our present activities represent a blank check signed by the legislature and delivered to the educators. It is a method that has made educators and education highly vulnerable to criticism. Political columnist have criticized the extensive advertising. The governor relates to an instance where paid canvassers have gone house to house to recruit students. Yesterday a legislator stopped me in the hall and commented on a publication from Los Rios Community College District which raised in his mind a question regarding the difference between community service classes and classes for adults. Income averaging, or the concept of funding adult education as if the cost of education were the same as regular graded students, also calls for review. When the difference in income for classes for adults and expenditures for defined adults differ by 90 million dollars, a valid public question is raised. Moreover, when a Santa Cruz taxpayer understands that 63¢ of the tax rate in that district is to support adult education, he is capable of exercising greater discretion than without such understanding. A clear concise policy that addresses the problems of adult education with the same commitment of thought and energy as expended on the education of youth is in the service to all of us.

Signed Joseph B. Montoya, Chairman

California, I would suggest has had more experience in funding and conducting adult education than virtually any other state in the United States. Sept. 10 & 11 the board of governors of the California Community Colleges met and heard a report from the director of analytical studies. It's a lengthy report that deals with the basic organization and functions and essentially calls for changing the coordinating mechanism again. To summarize: In April 1975 Assembly Bill 1821 was introduced by Assemblyman Montoya. It has subsequently gone through several revisions and is currently still in the legislative process. It may be proposed as urgency legislation in January 1976. The bill repeals legislation which established area vocational planning committees and area adult continuing education coordinating committees - the very system which is now being operated with some degree of success in Los Angeles. The bill provides for the creation of regional adult and vocational educational councils, composed of representatives of local educational agencies to review and make recommendations on vocational and adult continuing education courses and to prevent unnecessary duplication of courses within a region. But the bill also provides for the creation of advisory committees to such councils. The composition of the council is to be eleven members as follows: (1) four representatives of high school or unified districts within the council boundaries (2) four repre-

representatives of the community college district or districts within the council boundaries (3) a representative of a county office of education (4) a representative of a prime sponsor under the federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (5) a representative of a private postsecondary educational institution within the council boundaries. It is also possible that the legislature in Sacramento will call for a mandatory fee structure for the entire state of California and it is felt by some who are very knowledgeable about the attitude of the California legislature that we are now beginning to see the first signs of the legislature's unwillingness to increase, or perhaps even maintain at the same level, its historic commitment to funding adult education classes and programs.

NEW YORK

Crossing over to the other side of the United States we look at New York. In New York State the Regents of the University of the State of New York examined the provisions for adult education and offered a number of observations and recommendations. The Regents said:

There is a need for comprehensive planning arrangements that work. Arrangements must be developed at the State level, and in each region of the State, for participatory planning of a coordinated approach to assess and meet occupational education and manpower needs. The responsibility for leadership and coordination of the planning process rests with the established occupational education agencies of the State and the various regions--the State Education Department, the State University of New York, the public schools, the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services, 2-year public and private colleges as well as proprietary schools. Planning arrangements must involve all agencies and groups which administer, or have direct concern for, occupational education programs and related services. Also the plans developed through such arrangements must recognize and utilize all of the educational resources of these agencies and groups. The responsibilities of the State and regional planning mechanisms should include the following:

1. articulating and coordinating the occupational education programs of the public schools and BOCES with the programs of the public and private 2-year colleges, urban centers, and proprietary schools.
2. coordinating the planning of occupational education programs operated and funded within the public schools and colleges with the various federal, state and local government sponsored manpower training programs.
3. identifying the respective roles of public and private occupational education agencies to minimize duplication of resources and effort and to maximize variety and quality of opportunity.
4. insuring the fullest possible utilization of the training capacity of private business and industry.
5. providing resources at central locations within each region's educational system, whether public or nonpublic, which insure that every adult or out of school youth in need of training or related services can receive either direct assistance or referral to the kind of program which

best meets his needs.

6. actively involving in the planning process all community groups affected by occupational education--including students, parents, teachers, business and industry, labor and government--through advisory councils as well as less formal channels of communication. ²

In conclusion we would have to realize that the financial plight of the City of New York is going to have great implications for the funding of education in all of the state of New York. We can expect a move for economy everywhere. And since adult education has never been one of the favorite places for the New York State Legislature to spend its money, we might expect that things could get a little tighter.

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut also is examining the way in which things have been going on. In Connecticut a resource group on continuing education and community service submitted a report on lifelong learning to the Commission for Higher Education in July, 1975. (And you will note that these reports I have been mentioning are all essentially within the last 12 months.) The commission has tentatively adopted 6 of 10 recommendations, ³ including the following:

1. That the Commission for Higher Education develop, in conjunction with all constituencies purveying continuing education and community service, policy guidelines suitable for application at the regional level, by means of which institutions can determine the kinds of programs most appropriate to their missions and least wasteful of public and private resources for serving students in continuing education and community service programs.

2. ...encourage the further development of its regional organizations of higher education toward consortia of postsecondary education including, for the purpose of administering community service programs within the region; all organizations providing such services within the region as wish to be included, under the policy guidelines of the Commission for Higher Education. ⁴

In Connecticut there has been a special problem because there is a group of creatures called Technical Colleges which are not governed by the normal governing board for community colleges and four year schools and universities. So they are having some considerable problems that may seem foreign to the rest of us.

ILLINOIS

Activity is also noteworthy in the Midwest as we look at what Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa have done in looking at their adult education provisions. In Illinois a special committee of the Board of Higher Education submitted a report on community services and continuing adult education. This committee found that:

Community Education activities are usually performed by a single institution,

... In this study few educational activities involved two or more educational institutions in an instructional role. Responses indicated that a variety of institutions--differentiated by institutional mission, level of academic offering, location and size of public service programs--were involved in similar but separate activities...

Inter-institutional cooperation in the development and delivery of community education activities appears to be underdeveloped.⁵

In Illinois we do not act precipitately being the 48th state of 50 to have a state board of education. We may also be number 48 in coordinating community education, but believe me, we are examining the situation! The Committee also made some suggestions: "Community Services and Community Education should exist in an essentially free market atmosphere." (I might depart here from the quotation to say this looks like something other than a forward looking statement.) Continuing with the quote: "Individual institutions should identify their strengths and articulate their various activities, programs, courses and services with those of other public and private institutions which may be affected by such efforts."⁶ The suggestion here is that in the state of Illinois there is still a belief, which I think more practical states have already abandoned, that cooperation can be brought about by exportation.

There are active adult educators in Illinois who are trying to exert greater influence on adult education and development in our state. The Northern Illinois Round Table of Adult Educators, the Illinois Adult Education Association, the Public Adult and Continuing Educators Association of Illinois and the Adult Education Council of Greater Chicago formed a creature a little over a year ago called the United Coalition for Legislative Action. The purposes of this not-for-profit organization are:

1. to provide leadership in the design, promotion, and support of legislation beneficial to adult education. (To carry this out, each of the cooperating organizations pays the partial salary of a lobbyist in Springfield.)
2. to coordinate legislative efforts of adult educators
3. to provide for communication between legislators and adult educators
4. to keep the membership informed of proposed legislation affecting adult education on the state level
5. to educate the membership about legislative and political processes.⁷

MICHIGAN

In Michigan a coalition approach, which resembles the national Coalition of

Adult Education Organizations, has been functioning for some time. This organization, which embraces the Adult Education Association of Michigan, the Michigan Association of Public Adult and Community Education, the Michigan Community College Community Service Association and the Michigan Community School Education Association, seeks to:

provide all professionals in the field with an opportunity to maintain a high degree of individuality, focus and limited influence within their separate organizations while at the same time providing a consolidated platform where the many overlapping short and long range goals and objectives of all the organizations can be advanced in a much more complementary fashion. The Coalition in Michigan provides a vehicle through which institutions and professionals of like interests can work toward achieving common goals, announced by themselves. At the same time the Coalition makes it increasingly difficult for any group, institution or person to unilaterally attempt to implement any relatively simplistic answers to complex problems that face the whole State with its myriad local needs, resources and aspirations.⁸

According to Ray Ferrier, the first president of our organization here and one of the founding fathers of the Coalition in Michigan, the basic premises of the Coalition officers were as follows:

1. The broad area of adult, community and continuing education is too vast a field of endeavor for any one institution to be designated as the official coordinator throughout the State;
2. This may occur on a regional basis only after adequate input from all key delivery systems and users is involved in some kind of consensus decision.
3. Members and leaders of individual organizations or types of institutions who unilaterally insist on their views being accepted throughout the State on a uniform basis are fostering short sighted simple solutions that will not meet the complexities of the situation and they are creating many more problems throughout the State, in the Michigan Department of Education, and in the Legislature than they are resolving.⁹

If we were to look at the Congress of the United States and to ask about the advice being received from at least 25 institutions - national organizations of adult educators - I wonder if we could repeat very well the same statement.

MINNESOTA

In Minnesota the approach that is being tested is the dissolution of existing organizations and the formation of a new one. The tentative constitution of the Minnesota Association of Continuing Adult Education states:

The name of this association results from combining the names of the two education associations merged by the adoption of this constitution (Minnesota Adult Education Association and Minnesota Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education).

Article II - Purpose

Section 1 - This Association is an educational, non-profit organization of adult educators and has as its purpose the furthering of adult education as well as furthering the welfare and intellectual and professional growth of its membership and others working in the field of adult education. ¹⁰

IOWA

To the west in the state of Iowa 13 months ago the Iowa Adult Education Association and the Iowa Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education merged to form one organization, the Iowa Association for Life Long Learning. This organization was established after two years of work by a merger committee consisting of members of both of the predecessor organizations. The purposes of the Iowa Association for Life Long Learning are spelled out in Article II of its constitution as follows:

Realizing that learning is a life long process the purpose of this organization shall be to encourage the growth and development of Continuing Education in the State of Iowa. This encouragement shall be through many approaches: (1) to serve as a medium of exchange of information among individuals, industry, agencies and organizations in Adult Continuing Education through publications, conferences, workshops and other media. (2) to keep the public informed regarding legislation and other factors in the field of adult education. (3) to encourage professional growth among adult educators (4) to cooperate with local, state, regional and national adult education organizations in promoting adult and continuing education. And (5) to promote a broad concept of adult continuing education that will include formal and informal activities in the career, avocational, cultural and citizenship education fields.¹¹

So we have then in Minnesota and Iowa the move toward actual merger. One of which has been consummated and one is in the latter stages.

VIRGINIA

Turning to the southeastern portion of the United States, concern is being expressed over the apparent exploitation of adult educational programming by some institutions of higher education. There is apparently some temptation for ambitious community college financial eagles to find ways of making adult education programs economically attractive even at the expense of the taxpayers across the state. In Virginia a program evaluation of the Community College System stated:

Each year a number of public service courses are reclassified for credit offering. Prior to the 1974-75 school year, the department required the colleges to request approval to change a course from non-credit to credit. This policy was discontinued and, now, the colleges may offer any course appropriate for an approved curriculum if it appears in the VCCS

State Curriculum Guide. Unfortunately records have not been maintained by the department on the number of courses that were changed from public service to credit status. The college report that most changes occur in arts and crafts courses and are only made when enrollment demand justifies the action. The status change, however, means that a course no longer needs to be self-supporting and, while it costs the student less, it costs the State more. 12

In Virginia the Council of Higher Education has prepared a document "Coordination of Continuing Higher Education in Virginia--A State Plan for Regional Consortia for Continuing Higher Education" which does not consider any programs of adult education conducted by other than colleges and universities. Evidently coordination with the public schools is not seen as a need or a desirable activity.

And here we come upon the big problem that Abe Friedman suggested in the major session yesterday afternoon when he asked what postsecondary education is. On November 13, 1974, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges adopted a policy statement on community education. The Association pledged to work toward cooperation with other associations in community schools, adult education, and university extension fields. The American Association of Community & Junior Colleges continues to confuse adult educators as well as other educators and especially the public by its unusual and unprecedented use of the term postsecondary. "Community colleges approach community education with special attention to postsecondary needs, that is in regard to age level, not grade level."

Though the official position of AACJC is that the word postsecondary is in no way related to the word secondary or elementary, it is a term used to describe the age of students served by community colleges. I believe the AACJC is making a serious error by using postsecondary in this way because idiosyncratic definitions hinder rather than facilitate communications. And second, the 1202 Commissions are going to coordinate what they call postsecondary institutions; but they won't coordinate adult and community education programs of public schools and other agencies which offer programs to persons above the ages conventionally associated with secondary education. The AACJC does, however, advocate cooperation, a close working relationship with community schools, to avoid unnecessary duplication efforts:

In every program plan there should be careful consultation between all concerned parties that the educational agency best prepared to do the job should receive the assignment and treat it as a stewardship with information on progress continually shared.

Then the Association goes on to give a warning that it is going to take more than good intentions to have synergy or cooperation occur in programing at the local level when they say:

These are not just institutional arrangements. They are arrangements which have to be facilitated by the framework of public policy within which the institutions operate. Thus policy making bodies and funding sources must become a part of the planning to be sure that such cooperative arrangements are facilitated and not frustrated.

I would submit that the funding policies have tended to frustrate more frequently than to facilitate interinstitutional cooperation in nearly every state in the United States.

MASSACHUSETTS

In the Northeast the lack of coordination among institutions providing adult education has been noted by the Advisory Council on Education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The Advisory Board recommended that the State,

To foster greater cooperation between institutions and expanded service, Service Area Planning Boards should be established in 13 geographic service areas defined by actual attendance patterns. Each institution in a service area offering continuing and part-time programs--including proprietary and other schools--would be represented. The SAPB would review programs and course offerings, provide a forum for staff communication and analyze service area needs and opportunities. Other proposed functions include counseling, outreach and dissemination of information about programs within the service area to be performed through Area Educational Opportunity Centers which would be jointly operated and focused on serving the disadvantaged. ¹³

Interinstitutional cooperation and formal coordination is still a perplexing problem despite years of effort and countless studies and sets of recommendations.

MEANWHILE, BACK IN FLINT . . .

I think that when we hear the gospel of community education we have a hope that maybe here's an answer. But speaking realistically, we ought to take another look at Flint, Michigan and see what it has to say. Flint is often looked upon as a Mecca for Community Education. Everybody has to make a pilgrimage to Flint in order to function effectively in community education in the United States. Because of this, a doctoral dissertation completed by James Miklich at the University of Michigan is of special interest.¹⁴ Miklich

examined the perceived conflict and cooperation that existed among four recreational agencies in the city of Flint that offered similar types of programs to the people of the community. Miklich concluded:

1. A large amount of perceived conflict existed between the agencies.
2. A low level of perceived cooperation existed among the agencies.
3. Much better planning was needed within and among agencies as all indicated they were doing too little or too much in some program areas.
4. Much better communication was needed within and among agencies.

So even in the community where more funds per capita have been available to support the idea of community education than probably any other community in the world the problems have still not all been worked out.

There is still hope. That's not surprising. We will continue to have problems. The important thing is that we work on them and not believe that anyone has succeeded in finding the magic solution to all of our problems. The data base which we need to use in considering ways of improving coordination is still very weak. A recent research report from the University of Florida provides some basic information for anyone who cares to think about coordination in more than one state.

STATE AGENCY STRUCTURE

In his doctoral dissertation, Dean Maurice Hansen examined avenues of cooperation among three state agencies responsible for post high school education.

Hansen made a nationwide survey of joint agency interinvolvements of the agencies in each state responsible for, respectively, adult and continuing education (ACE), vocational and technical education (VTE) and community junior colleges (CJC).

He reported that:

Mandated avenues of interagency cooperation were more preferred by ACE agency directors, whereas voluntarily arranged methods were more preferred by VTE and CJC agency directors. Regular going agency meetings were designated as the most effective and preferred mode of cooperation. The most effective total agency approach was perceived to include an integration of formally structured, informally structured, mandated and voluntary avenues of cooperation. . . .

ACE, VTE and CJC agencies reported being responsible to one board in 18 states, but divided under two state boards in 31 states and three boards in 1 state. ACE and VTE agencies were responsible to a common board in 28 of the 32 multi-board states. Independent or equal levels of responsibility, operation and/or administrative parity were reported by three agencies in 31 states, with unequal or dependency agency relationships reported in 19 states--generally involving an ACE agency dependency on the VTE agency. Significantly, interagency cooperative involvements

were reported more by single-board states, especially those having dependent or mixed-parity agencies. ¹⁵

So if we try to think about it--the complexity of the national situation--we have all of these states with different ways of putting the structures together. And coordination is a problem that is going to require a great deal of art as well as science.

NATIONAL SEMINAR '75

Let us turn to consider some national efforts to improve coordination and perhaps an analysis of some of the efforts. If we look at the Coalition of Adult Education Organizations, which is the successor to the Committee of Adult Education Organizations, I think frankly speaking we would have to admit it hasn't gained any visibility in the field. I know very few people who would regard CAEO as a spokesman for anything. Educational organizations in CAEO have not produced statements and reports which capture the imagination--which inspire adult educators to work together in their own setting or collectively on a state and national basis. A potentially most promising recent event in the area of cooperation was a national seminar of leaders in adult continuing and community education, held April 24-26, at the National Center for Community Education in Flint; NAPCAE, AEA - USA and the NCEA National Community Education Association each named 12 representatives to meet for two days in April to examine the advantages and the disadvantages of working together more closely in the future. The participants were grouped into four task forces following the opening plenary session. The first group dealt with an exploration of legislation. The second dealt with strategies for cooperation, the third with missions, roles, and functions; and the fourth with preparation for training and leadership.

Although all four groups produced reports calling for action, the second group which produced a strategy for cooperation is perhaps of more concern to this group. Group 2 calls for governing bodies of NAPCAE, AEA-USA and NCEA to begin their cooperative work on the following eleven fronts:

1. Establish a joint annual conference at the earliest possible date.
2. Establish joint committees to investigate
 - a. Joint membership
 - b. Joint legislative efforts
 - c. Joint research
 - d. Joint international focus
 - e. Joint government relationship activities
 - f. Joint publications
3. A joint task force be established to study the possibility of a future federation of the three organizations, and that in the meantime, the three organizations direct their staff to explore the possibility of

- a single joint national facility, national organizational structure and a single national secretariat.
4. Immediately study the feasibility of coordinated lobbying by their respective staffs.
 5. Efforts should be made to include NCEA in the current joint committee of NUEA, AEA-USA, ACHE and NAPCAE, to consider reorganization.
 6. To establish a National Community and Adult Education Week.
 7. To establish the mechanism necessary to seek cooperative funding for programs.
 8. To establish joint leadership conferences.
 9. To establish a joint national clearinghouse.
 10. Develop a common calendar to facilitate joint board meetings.
 11. Establish a joint committee to consider the commonalities associated with the training of professionals within their ranks.¹⁶

The Seminar participants resolved to transmit the recommendations to the three governing boards and to request that the recommendations be implemented.

Since the April Seminar the members of NCEA have received the September-October 1975 issue of Community Education Journal which has as its theme Inter-Agency Cooperation. This issue was co-edited by Donald Butcher and Jim Dorland. It reports on a number of innovative inter-agency programs in Florence, South Carolina; Cleveland, Ohio; Los Angeles, California; Battle Creek, Michigan; Big Rapids, Michigan; all of Appalachia, and various places in Virginia and several others. It also includes all of the recommendations coming from the national seminar held last April. But even though the report comes out looking as though everyone is ready to cooperate, in all honesty I would have to admit that members of NAPCAE and AEA who were present for that session were probably wondering if perhaps they hadn't been outflanked one more time by politically more sophisticated community education people. I think that if we were very frank, most of us would have to recognize that the people who have been working in community education have been doing a better job of relating to the Congress and state legislatures than most of us in NAPCAE and AEA. I realize that there is a great deal of overlapping membership, but never-the-less, the amount of state legislation being enacted to support community education and the passage of the community school act by our Congress is clear testimony to the effectiveness of the community education lobby, not only in state capitals but in our national capital.

Now if one tries to figure out what community education is, as we mentioned last year, it presents a very serious problem. It's much easier perhaps to think about what it isn't. But I think that one of the speakers at our conference this year, Dr. Jack Minzey, has done perhaps the best job of stating the 6 components of community education. And I should like to read into the record his 6 components

of community education which he divides into two categories. The first four categories are program categories. He says that a community education program includes an educational program for school age children, the conventional K-12 type group. Second, that it includes the community's use of the school facility. Third, that it involves additional programs both for school age children and for youth, outside of the regular curriculum, week-ends, summers, and evenings. And fourth, the community education program includes programs for adults such as basic education, high school completion, recreation, avocational, cultural and vocational programs - all of which are part of a community education program.

Minzey then moves on to the two process elements of the community education program. The first of the process elements is the delivery and coordination of community services, in which it is the responsibility of the coordinator or principal or director of community services, (1) to identify problems and resources, (2) to provide the coordination to bring them together by serving as a broker for his community, (3) to assist with new programs in his own institution only when existing agencies are unable to provide services. The second of the process elements in the continuing education model which Minzey proposes is that of community involvement. Minzey says that the community education director should work for the development of community councils in areas the size of an elementary school attendance area. The purpose of this is to facilitate and promote participatory democracy at the elementary school attendance area level.

ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

At this point in the third day of the NAPCAE Conference with a theme Striving for Synergy in Adult Education, what issues and what questions should be facing the National Council of Urban Administrators of Adult Education? I think that there are at least 11 items which probably are worthy of your best thought:

1. Should NCUAAE convey a position on the matter of joint national conferences? Do you have an opinion on this? Or are you willing to go along with whatever somebody else decides?
2. If you do favor a national conference, who ought to be joining with you in such conferences? All 25 associations? Which ones? - And you have to get specific when you are talking about real cooperation.
3. Who do we believe ought to be advising the state legislatures on coordination in adult education? Should it be the coalition of adult education organizations? Should it be NAPCAE? Should it be NCUAAE? Or should we leave it up to the state departments of education?
4. Who ought to be considering how coordination is to be achieved with

institutions at the postsecondary (and here I use it in its proper sense) as well as the secondary level? It is clear that the 1202 Commissions are not empowered to coordinate adult education at the secondary level. It's clear that most state departments of education haven't yet learned that they can control at least a part of it if they have hold of the purse strings. I think Texas may have some blessings for them there.

5. Should the Community Education Act be regarded as the major vehicle for promoting coordinated need assessment, resource identification, program planning, and evaluation? And I would like to call your attention to the regulations for the community education act. If you haven't looked at these, you might want to take a look at the sections that talk about how it's supposed to work because the guide lines for the Community Education Act make no question. They state specifically that there is to be a clearly identified procedure used and described for identifying the community needs and for identifying the community resources, and that all of these resources and all of these needs ought to be spelled out. Now Bob is, I guess, just too bashful to admit he had to mail back some of those community education plans that came in.¹⁷ He didn't reject them; he just suggested that they be revised. The basis for revision was that, in a number of cases (not all institutions were represented at joint meetings) of everybody called together to learn about how things were going to work together in Texas. . . . So the State didn't reject the plans, it just acted to gain people the opportunity to do a little more thorough job of planning. I think that that is a fair statement. The exact number of those I have been unable to determine, but I have identified at least two of them.

The Community Education Act also says that there must be an advisory group; that it must include representatives of parents, of other community people, and of the participants of the program; and they must be involved in need assessments, in resource identification, in planning, and in evaluation. Now that is what it says! How it's going to be carried out remains to be seen. We do have now on paper some guide-lines which say if you want the federal dollars, you are going to cooperate. And you are going to have to put on paper a convincing case to show that you are cooperating. Otherwise you don't get them.

6. How should adult education programs be funded in the urban areas? Should funding be contingent upon a cooperative approach being demonstrated?

7. Does NCUAAE favor a Coalition of Adult Education Organizations or an overarching organization with many interest groups and divisions?

8. How can funding agencies be persuaded that research into various approaches to cooperation and coordination is deserving of a high priority? I'm very unhappy that we do not have people at work right now following very carefully the Texas experience and the California experience. I'm afraid that the rest of us in the other 48 states are going to have to repeat many of the mistakes that are being made and we are not going to benefit as fully as we could from the experience because nobody is documenting it to my knowledge. And to my knowledge no one is eager to fund such research.

9. How much time, how much energy, how many material resources are the members of NCUAAE, collectively and individually, willing to commit to developing better delivery systems for adult education at the local level?

I would like to say that I always enjoy hearing Bob's statements because he makes it sound so easy. As example the commissioner of education in Texas started working for the legislation, according to Bob, as though it was dashed off on a weekend, no big thing. In fact he worked on that since 1964 - how to persuade the Texas legislature that there was any need to provide money beyond the eighth grade level for adult people in the state of Texas. J. P. Adaire put together the first documents for your commissioner of education and the legislature was totally deaf to it, blind and deaf! But the composition of the legislature has changed a bit too, and there are people in there who can hear minority voices more loudly than they could before. And the kind of legislation which is being proposed, which got passed, and which is being implemented pretty darn well, does extend opportunities a bit beyond the conventional groups and services.

But it's going to take a lot of energy and a lot of time and maybe it's a 10 or 12 year plan. So that's why I think it's important for us to realize that, while Texas has something to crow about right now, it isn't something that just came about yesterday. It took a very sophisticated commissioner of education working hard for 10 years to put the idea across of getting some funding that will make it possible to reward people for cooperating.

10. Should NCUAAE adopt a policy on synergy in adult education, and if so, is it prepared to provide dedicated leadership which is apparently now needed if we are to move beyond our individual organizational concerns?

11. And finally, I would ask should NCUAAE try to develop alone or in cooperation with other concerned groups some guidelines, some principles and some suggestions on ways to approach the problem of improving the adult education delivery system in the urban areas of the United States.

Thank you.

REFERENCES

¹ Delineation Agreement, enclosure with 1973-74 Annual Report of the Delineation of Functions Committee Chairman, Los Angeles Unified and Community College Districts, May 10, 1974.

² New York State Education Department, Education Beyond High School: The Regents' Statewide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education, 1972. (Albany: The University of the State of New York, the State Education Department, November, 1972), pp. 177-78.

³ Letter from Donald H. Winandy, Director, Program Planning, Commission for Higher Education, State of Connecticut, to William S. Griffith, October 16, 1975.

⁴ Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, Independent Resource Group on Continuing Education and Community Service, "In Support of Lifelong Learning" (Hartford, Connecticut: Commission for Higher Education, July 1975), pp. 12-13.

⁵ Illinois Board of Higher Education, Committee on Community Services and Continuing Adult Education for Master Plan - Phase IV "Public Service - Non Degree Programs and Activities," Springfield, Ill.: Board of Higher Education, August, 1975. (mimeographed) p. 26.

⁶ Ibid., p. ii.

⁷ Keeping PACE in Illinois, Vol. VI, No. 4 (October, 1975), p. 4.

⁸ Ray Ferrier and others, "Yours, Mine and Ours" (pamphlet prepared under the sponsorship of the Coalition of Adult, Community and Continuing Education Organizations of Michigan, n.p.; n.d.)

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Tentative Constitution, Minnesota Association of Continuing Adult Education presented at the 1975 Annual Conference of the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. Council of Affiliate Organizations, October 27, 1975, Salt Lake City, Utah.

¹¹ "Iowa Association for Lifelong Learning formed by Merger of IAEA and IAPACE" Adult Business Occupations Newsletter Vol. VIII, No. 1 (Cedar Falls, Iowa: University of Northern Iowa, December 1974), p. 3.

¹²Virginia General Assembly Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission, Program Evaluation: The Virginia Community College System (Richmond: The Virginia General Assembly, March 17, 1975), p. 93.

¹³Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Advisory Council on Education, "A Short Summary of the MACE Study: Strengthening the Alternative Postsecondary Education System: Continuing and Part-time Study in Massachusetts" (Boston: Advisory Council on Education, n.d.), p. 2. (mimeographed.)

¹⁴James Miklich, "A Study of the Need for Agency Cooperation in Planning Coordination of Recreational Programs Among Four Recreational Agencies in Flint, Michigan." Ann Arbor: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1974.

¹⁵Dean Maurice Hansen, "Avenues of Cooperation Between Three State Agencies Responsible for Post High School Education" (Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Department of Educational Administration, December, 1974), unpublished Ph.D dissertation abstract, pp. xxi-xxiii.

¹⁶William F. Kromer, editor. National Seminar '75 Report: National Seminar of Leaders in Adult, Continuing and Community Education (Flint, Michigan: National Center for Community Education, 1975), p. 15.

¹⁷Refers to Bob Allen, Texas State Director of Adult Education.