

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 643

JC 940 346

AUTHOR Martorana, S. V.
 TITLE Upper-Division Collegiate Offerings on Community College Campuses and Implications for Restructuring American Postsecondary Education: A Report to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges.
 INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
 SPONS AGENCY National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges.
 PUB DATE Mar 94
 NOTE 41p.; For a preliminary report, see ED 355 990.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Advanced Courses; Articulation (Education); Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; Educational Administration; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Institutional Cooperation; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; National Surveys; Program Content; Research Design; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

To gather data on the place of community colleges in the overall structure of American postsecondary education, a study was conducted of state-level administrators of community colleges regarding the practice of baccalaureate degree-granting institutions offering programs of upper-division collegiate credit at community colleges. Administrators were queried as to the level of practice and the extent of interest raised by the issue as well as whether or not there was a stated policy bearing on the activity. Initial responses were received from 33 states, analysis of which indicated that in the majority (n=13) there was some practice but no policy. Following distribution of a preliminary report and requests for validation of findings or further information, responses were received from 16 states. Four states indicated that the preliminary report was accurate, while three disagreed with their placement in the practice/policy matrix. In addition, nine new states provided information on practices and policies related to the issue. An analysis of additional responses received as of May 1993 validated the three general findings of the preliminary report. First, the practice is fairly widespread, with 35 out of 41 states reporting four-year offerings on college campuses. Second, the practice has not yet attracted widespread policy attention, with 26 states indicating no policy. Finally, neither the level of practice nor the strength of related policies can be described as high except in a few states, such as Florida and states where community colleges are an integral part of the state university system. Contains 19 references. (KP)

*Upper-Division Collegiate Offerings on Community College
Campuses & Implications for Restructuring
American Postsecondary Education*

A Report to the
National Council of State Directors of Community & Junior Colleges

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.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S.V. Martorana

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

S. V. Martorana, Professor Emeritus
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
403 South Allen Street, Suite 104
University Park, PA 16801-5252

March 1994

346

9410

Acknowledgements

When a cooperative project such as the systematic review of and reporting on state legislation relating to community college education continues successfully for as long as it has, one tends easily to forget how much its accomplishment depends on so many people. The continuing inquiry on which this report is based and the larger survey of state legislation to which it is related simply could not be done without the strong interest in it expressed by members of the National Council of State directors of Community and Junior Colleges, on the one hand, and the leadership of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Penn State University, on the other. The support of these officials, extending from their interest in the purposes of the project, makes available staff attention and help to its progress which are absolutely essential to its conduct and results.

The nature of the project and procedures it follows require repeated communication and requests for information from the office of the state directors and the strong and cordial accommodation of these requests by the council members and their staffs is deeply appreciated. So is the feeling which has resulted of strong association and acquaintance with persons known in many cases only from a distance.

Closer at hand but equally essential to regular progress and final outcomes of the project is the support and assistance of the staff of the Penn State Center for the Study of Higher Education. Among the many who helped, Sally Kelley deserves a special mention. Her assistance in maintaining the communications necessary and in the production of the final report are very much appreciated.

S. V. Martorana
Emeritus Professor and
Senior Research Associate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Preface

This report is the most recent of many publications which have emanated from the cooperative effort of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges and the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Penn State University, to maintain a continuing monitoring of state-level public policy touching significantly on community, junior, and two-year technical colleges throughout the nation. Started by S. V. Martorana in 1975, the project is now approaching twenty years of conducting a national survey of actions of state legislatures and related governmental policy statements, the project has become the primary source for historical reference of trends in governmental oversight of the field as well as inquiry into emerging issues which give early indication of interest on the part of governmental officials.

The subject of this report, upper-division collegiate offerings on community college campuses, is such an issue. Members of the Council as well as leadership in community college education at institutional and system-wide levels will find Dr. Martorana's presentation of findings and conclusions from his continuing inquiry in this subject of interest in seeing the emergence of a new trend of significance to their work and leadership in the field. I am pleased to see its presentation to the Council and confident that a wider publication will add to its notice in the field.

-- James L. Ratcliff, Director
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Preface	ii
Introduction & Background	1
Structure as an Issue	2
Emergence and persistence of the issue	2
Current evidences of attention to structure	3
State Director Interest	6
Procedure	7
Results	10
Results from Initial Survey	10
Results from Continuing Study	16
Attitudes toward the practice	22
Subordinate or corollary policy issues	23
Content of courses or programs offered	27
Extent of practice	28
Mode of delivery	28
Conclusion, Implications, and Recommendations	30
References	34
Appendix A	36

Introduction & Background

How best to place community college education in the structure of the total American postsecondary educational system is a question asked of the "movement" to establish and strengthen institutions that provide that level of education since its inception. Some American education analysts have claimed a firm location for community colleges within the total structure, basing their argument primarily upon concepts of differentiation of mission, students served, and approaches to instruction and curriculum development; they see these considerations as most critical in determining the proper place of community college education within the total American system.

The fact of the matter, however, is that the institutions that collectively comprise community college education and provide "community based" (Gleaser, 1973) postsecondary education in America (comprehensive community colleges, junior colleges, two-year technical colleges, branch campuses of baccalaureate and higher degree granting colleges and universities, proprietary technical and trade schools) have evolved to a place in the total post-high school system rather than put there by design. These institutions as an aggregation are increasingly being termed generically "community colleges" as evidenced by the recent decision of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, formerly named the American Association of Junior Colleges, to drop the term "junior" from its title. The place that these institutions have made for themselves within the total system has come largely from slow shifts in how they actively operate and what happens at their locations. Even the states that formulated statewide plans for establishing public community and junior colleges accommodated the prior evolution of two-year colleges in the particular state when

the plans were first formulated, and in state after state there have been continuing amendments to state plans to recognize the reality of changes taking place in the field.

Structure as an Issue

A wide range of interests enters into the question of what organizational structure is best for American postsecondary education. Among the most important are location of control, centralization or decentralization; responsibility for provision of financial support, local versus state or other auspices; and determination of the "role and scope" of programs and services that institutions or operating units comprising a total postsecondary educational system are authorized to provide. In the United States, authority to determine the organizational structure of public college and university systems rests with the states.

Emergence and persistence of the issue. Analysts of the start and growth of community college education show a strong agreement that its adoption and spread would have a serious impact of the way that schools, colleges, and universities would be expected to function as a system within a state. The alert came as early as the 1920's when Koos (1925) forthrightly declared from his investigations that among the functions that junior colleges (the ancestral institutions of community college education) would perform within American higher education would be to force its restructuring. He foresaw creation of a new institution integrating the upper level of high schools and the lower one of universities (Koos, 1946), a concept reflected even today in efforts to establish a "tech-prep" approach in providing occupational education. Other early writers accepted the general conclusion that all postsecondary education would be affected but took a different view of its implementation. Led by Eells (1931), these thinkers claimed that the "movement" would

have a stronger attachment to the universities and the structuring of higher rather than secondary education. Practically everyone who has since been involved in studying and community college education has made note of the fact that the issue of its proper placement, in the structure of state postsecondary educational systems is persistent (Bogue, 1950; Martorana, 1957; Medsker, 1960; Gleazer, 1969; Deegan, Tillery & Associates, 1985; Cohen & Brawer, 1989), and persons acting as consultants to states or in positions of official responsibility for statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary systems from the period of the great nationwide expansion from 1945-1975 to the present, were forced to deal with it. Examples of studies of state systems which illustrate this point, chosen for the special attention given to the structural placement of community colleges, the span of time and coverage of states, are ones done by Glenny (Illinois, 1957); Koos and Martorana (Pennsylvania), 1947; Martorana (Alaska, 1952; New Mexico, 1956; Michigan, 1957; Puerto Rico, 1958; Virginia, 1959; Hawaii, 1962); McConnell (California, 1955); Strayer (California, 1948); Young (Illinois, 1957); and Wattenbarger (Florida, 1956).

Current evidences of attention to structure. That current conceptions of structure of American postsecondary education, even those recently formulated, will remain fixed for very long is highly problematic in view of what is happening in the field. For a variety of reasons that are beyond the scope of this report to cover, schools, colleges, and universities are under a widespread scrutiny and challenge of their effectiveness and efficiency of operation. Calls for a more intense assessment of their performance are coming in virtually all of the states and, indeed, from the national level as well. This general condition coupled with more specific pressures stemming from the nation's changing economy and new

technological developments especially in telecommunications are contributing to new adaptations and reform in all aspects of education; they are also forcing new attention to questions of how these can bear on decisions to restructure the field. Here some mention to illustrate the case will be made briefly of four approaches to structural reform: (1) mergers of institutions; (2) interorganizational arrangements short of merger; (3) redesign of state systems; and (4) networking through telecommunications.

Merging two or more institutions to create a new single organization is seen by some as a new strategy to accommodate change in American postsecondary education (Martin et al., 1993). The approach is mentioned here because some of the practices to be reported in later sections can be viewed as preliminary or contributing actions causing precursor conditions that will lead ultimately to a complete merger of the institutions involved.

A variety of approaches short of merging institutions continue to be tried; they emphasize cooperative and collaborative action between and among institutions as an alternative to a total unification of structure and control. Consortial arrangements first attracted notice in the 1950's (Martorana et al., 1961; L. Patterson, 1967; F. Patterson, 1974) and continue to be seen in the field. Regionalism and regionalization similarly emphasizes multi-unit and multi-agency cooperative planning and programming (Martorana & Nespoli, 1978). The underlying principles of both consortia operation and regionalism are evident in places where facilities are shared (Knoell, 1990) and where higher education "university centers" such as those in Rochester, Minnesota and Bend, Oregon that are mentioned later in this report are set up.

Redesign of an entire postsecondary educational system in a state is a major change that can come about in different ways. Recent instances of such action are seen in the recombination of the community and technical college systems in Connecticut; in the reorganization of the community college, vocational institutes, and the state university system in Minnesota; in the redesignation of function of the two-year agricultural and technical colleges of the State University of New York as four-year colleges of technology; and to a lesser degree in the upward extension of a technically-oriented two-year college in Pennsylvania whereby Williamsport Area Community College became Pennsylvania College of Technology within the larger corporate structure of Penn State University.

The current widespread interest in action to redesign entire state systems is seen also in program actions of the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO). In its January 1994 issue of the newsletter *Network News* it announced:

In September 1993, SHEEO began a three-year project to foster redesign of higher education delivery systems. If your state is engaged in redesign efforts, SHEEO would like to hear from you. Any ideas, both practical and futuristic, may be highlighted in upcoming policy briefs (p. 7).

Finally, to be noted here is the weighty effect that new developments in telecommunication is apparently having on both thought about and action on changing the structure and process of postsecondary education in the country. Advances in distance education making provision for independent study and individualized learning and the rapidly expanding use of interactive television, computer networking, and other components of telecommunication cannot be ignored. A flood of publication attention focuses on these topics both in the scholarly books and journals and in the more popular press. The new operating conditions in postsecondary that are being created must be recognized; they make

the assumptions used to date to underlay organizational planning and action obsolete. The prominent presence of community college mention in the publications of the day on this subject show that they are not merely caught up in the changes that result--they are in the vanguard of that change.

State Director Interest

This is a report of the results of a survey done for the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges, examining a practice that bears on the issue of community college mission and the place of community colleges in the overall structure of postsecondary education in the United States; that is the practice of baccalaureate degree-granting colleges and universities offering courses and programs of upper-division collegiate credit on the campus sites of community colleges. The survey question was circulated to the state directors as a part of the regular call for information on actions of the legislatures pertaining to community college education. The annual survey is a cooperative venture of the National Council of State Directors and the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Penn State University. I initiated the survey in 1975 shortly after joining the staff of the Center, moving from the position of vice chancellor for community colleges in the central administration of the State University of New York. The results of the survey and analysis of replies to it have resulted in a series of monographs published by the Center and many related publications (Martorana & others, 1975-1991).

A standard practice in the state legislation survey is to ask the directors also to react to an issue which is of interest to them and believed to have implication for public policy and possible legislative, or other official government, attention. The question posed in the call

for material on the 1990 sessions asked about upper-level offerings on community college sites. It was included because state directors in a number of states were being confronted with community college interest and action to provide upper-level opportunities in their localities. This report is built from the responses received from that initial survey request and follow-up communications which have proceeded. A preliminary report was presented a year ago at the Council's annual meeting and this one builds upon it. It is expected that the inquiry will continue to be refined and that a further expanded and updated presentation of it will be included as a major section of the next full report of the project on state legislation affecting community colleges now being directed by colleagues Peter H. Garland and Robert M. Hendrickson at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Procedure

The call for materials reporting action by legislatures is addressed each year to the official responsible for state-level administration of community colleges (by whatever title designated in a particular jurisdiction) in each of the fifty states as well as the District of Columbia, Guam, Northern Marianas, and Puerto Rico. The accompanying policy issue on which we ask these officials to comment is presented in the same letter as that calling for information on governmental actions taken or seriously considered during the year's legislative session. It is an open-ended question to which an initial unstructured response can be given, usually by letter but at times by phone. More detailed information pertinent to the issue is then obtained from respondents when the initial reply indicates such action would be helpful to the survey. It is done quite informally by follow-up correspondence and telephone

conversation. Often respondents provide both official documents such as agency study reports or policy statements and unofficial descriptive materials such as press and public media articles. The result is a cumulative file of information both subjective in nature, that is, views of respondents, and objective, that is, documentary, in form. Our task then becomes one of analyzing and interpreting these data and reporting the outcomes of that work to the Council and to the field.

The question basic to this report initially stated simply that an interest expressed among the state directors for more factual knowledge about the extent to which four-year colleges and universities offered courses and programs for which upper-division (junior and senior) academic credit toward a degree was awarded. Respondents were asked to comment on: (1) whether or not the practice had attracted particular notice as a policy issue; and (2) whether or not there was a stated policy bearing upon the practice.

The question was put in two parts, one to establish the level of the practice and the other to identify the existence of relevant policy position, on the assumption that state director interest stemmed from the implications for policy development when the level of or interest in the practice became high enough to warrant it. In examining the information obtained, therefore, a four-by-three matrix was developed which would show the relationship of the level of the practice to the presence and strength of relevant policy. Practice, as described by the resources available, was categorized as "None," "Some," "Notable," and "High" and relevant policy was categorized as "None," "Some," and "Strong."

At this point, a caveat emphasized in the preliminary report bears repeating. It said:

Note should be taken that such classifications at this stage of examination of the question are necessarily quite subjective and must be viewed as "subject to

change." This is for two reasons: first, because the information has been compiled in anecdotal fashion as seen and reported by persons in official places and in position to know conditions in a particular jurisdiction but who were not called upon or expected to probe deeply into the matter in responding. Thus, the perceptions they reported of the degree and nature of development of the practice and relevant policy may not mirror exactly what actually obtains; and second, because the categorization of responses received as augmented by information from telephone calls and, in some cases, documentary material provided by respondents, was made by the presenter of this report and, again, must be seen as an initial action and related conclusions open to improvement and refinement.

The working definitions of the four levels of practice were established as follows:

1. None--self evident;
2. Some--existence of an awareness of the practice of some place(s) and way(s) but viewed as not significant in attracting notice either in terms of frequency or the nature of the approach to the practice;
3. Notable--a view that the practice is attracting specific notice either because of frequency of occurrence or the nature of the approach to it;
4. High--practice is clearly recognized and active in frequency as well as attracting notice by virtue of approach.

Similarly, the working definitions of the three levels of policy were established as follows:

1. None--self evident;
2. Some--evidence of an awareness of tangential or indirect policy that can be related to the practice by interpretation;
3. Strong--indication of a clear-cut and direct policy framework applicable to the practice.

After presentation of the preliminary report in Portland last year, a request to all state directors was extended asking them to authenticate the information presented and particularly to check the placement of states in the matrix. They were also asked to send additional

information believed to be useful to the project and important to have in the file that was accumulating. The memorandum sent out is shown as Appendix A to this report.

Results

In the main, the outcomes to date of the May 21, 1993 follow-up request and the continuing communications maintained with offices of state directors are a validation of the information and observations made in the preliminary report and a more complete pool of documentary material describing developments pertinent to the survey questions taking place throughout the states. Having said that, however, it needs also to be noted that the validity of the caveat concerning definition of the terms used in the survey and interpretation of conditions surrounding the issue in a particular jurisdiction is also evident. To facilitate appreciation of the progressive development of understanding of the subject, results of the initial survey will be presented briefly with more extended material from the later inquiries to follow.

Results from Initial Survey

The jurisdictions asked to reply and the ones from which usable information had been obtained at the time of the preliminary report (April, 1993) are shown in Table 1, which is reproduced from that report. Usable information was obtained from 33 states and 17 had not replied to the question.

Table 1
Jurisdictions Responding to Initial Survey on Policy Question Concerning
Upper-division Collegiate Offerings at Community College Sites

Jurisdiction	Answer	No Answer
Alabama	X	
Alaska		X
Arkansas	X	
Arizona	X	
California	X	
Colorado		X
Connecticut	X	
Delaware		X
Florida	X	
Georgia		X
Hawaii	X	
Idaho	X	
Illinois	X	
Indiana	X	
Iowa	X	
Kansas	X	
Kentucky		X
Louisiana		X
Maine		X
Maryland	X	
Massachusetts	X	
Michigan	X	
Minnesota	X	
Mississippi	X	
Missouri	X	
Montana		X
Nebraska		X
Nevada	X	
New Hampshire	X	
New Jersey	X	

Jurisdiction	Answer	No Answer
New Mexico		X
New York	X	
North Carolina	X	
North Dakota		X
Ohio	X	
Oklahoma	X	
Oregon	X	
Pennsylvania	X	
Rhode Island	X	
South Carolina		X
South Dakota		X
Tennessee		X
Texas	X	
Utah	X	
Vermont		X
Virginia		X
Washington	X	
West Virginia	X	
Wisconsin	X	
Wyoming		X
D.C.		X
Virgin Islands		X
Puerto Rico		X
Northern Marianas		X
Guam		X
TOTAL	33	22

Also, no replies were received from the District of Columbia, Guam, Northern Marianas, and Puerto Rico.

The results of the cross-classification of levels of practice and presence of relevant policy as first determined are shown in Table 2, which is also reproduced from the first report. Five states fell in the category of no practice and no policy. By far the largest group of states (13) fell in the category of some practice but no relevant policy. The next largest group (6) evidenced notable practice and some policy. One state, Florida, was classified as exhibiting high practice and some policy and another (North Carolina) was seen as having no practice and a strong relevant policy--one that discouraged the practice. As will be shown later, however, this placement was questioned by respondents in the state and was changed. Note was also taken of indications that Hawaii which was classified as having some policy and a notable level of the practice would move to a classification of high practice and strong policy because of an increasingly favorable view of the use of community colleges within the University of Hawaii system of institutions as outreach centers for upper-level as well as lower-division academic opportunity.

Among the places noted for specific mention by virtue to the approaches applied to the practice, with consequent amplification of possible policy implications were Rochester, Minnesota; McComb, Michigan; and Bend, Oregon. In each of these locations, the community college was seen as a pivotal place for offerings of upper-division programs by four-year institutions. Rochester Community College is the hub of the Rochester University Center; McComb Community College provides housing built by the local community college

district specifically for upper-level institutions to use; and Central Oregon Community College is using a consortium approach to bring upper-division academic opportunity to its area which is seen as a potential model for adoption elsewhere in the state.

Table 2
 Distribution of 33 States Reporting in the Initial Survey of Relationship of
 Practice and Policy Concerning Offerings for Upper-division Credit by
 Baccalaureate Degree-granting Institutions at Community College Sites*

Policy	Practice	States	Number
None	None	Alabama, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin	5
None	Some	Arkansas, Arizona, California, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington	13
None	Notable	Michigan, New Jersey, Oregon, Texas	4
Some	Some	Connecticut, New Hampshire	2
Some	Notable	Hawaii**, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri	6
Some	High	Florida	1
Strong	None	North Carolina	1

* West Virginia is reported as not classifiable because two-year colleges are integrally related to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

** Hawaii is a special case because all community colleges are integral units of the University of Hawaii.

Results from Continuing Study

Following distribution of the preliminary report and the request for further information, replies were received from sixteen states. Four said that the report was accurate for their states as first presented and in some cases added comment or material about the issue for our file. Nine were states that had been reported as not responding to the initial survey question but replied and provided material for the update, South Dakota reporting simply that there were no community colleges in that state. Three questioned the placement of the state in Table 2 of the preliminary report which summarized placement of states in the matrix relating existing level of activity and existing policy on the practice of colleges and universities offering courses for upper-division academic credit on community college campuses. The revised information describing the latest coverage of jurisdictions among respondents is shown in Table 3 and that showing the additions and changes in placement in the policy/practice matrix is shown in Table 4. A comparison of the information in Tables 2 and 4 shows that eight were added in the matrix because of new information provided (Alaska, Colorado, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Virginia), and three states (Illinois, Missouri, and North Carolina) were relocated in the matrix.

Although those changes were made, the three broad generalizations drawn from the data and compiled and interpreted a year ago remain true after the update for this report. First among the generalizations is that the practice of having opportunity for acquiring upper-division academic credit on community college campuses is quite widespread. A large majority (35 out of 41, or 85 percent) of the states shown in Table 4 report presence of the

Table 3
 Jurisdictions Responding to Initial Survey on Policy Question Concerning
 Upper-division Collegiate Offerings at Community College Sites as of December 1993

Jurisdiction	Answer	No Answer
Alabama	X	
Alaska	X	
Arkansas	X	
Arizona	X	
California	X	
Colorado	X	
Connecticut	X	
Delaware		X
Florida	X	
Georgia		X
Hawaii	X	
Idaho	X	
Illinois	X	
Indiana	X	
Iowa	X	
Kansas	X	
Kentucky	X	
Louisiana	X	
Maine		X
Maryland	X	
Massachusetts	X	
Michigan	X	
Minnesota	X	
Mississippi	X	
Missouri	X	
Montana		X
Nebraska	X	
Nevada	X	
New Hampshire	X	
New Jersey	X	

Jurisdiction	Answer	No Answer
New Mexico	X	
New York	X	
North Carolina	X	
North Dakota		X
Ohio	X	
Oklahoma	X	
Oregon	X	
Pennsylvania	X	
Rhode Island	X	
South Carolina	X	
South Dakota*		
Tennessee		X
Texas	X	
Utah	X	
Vermont		X
Virginia	X	
Washington	X	
West Virginia	X	
Wisconsin	X	
Wyoming		X
D.C.		X
Virgin Islands		X
Puerto Rico		X
Northern Marianas		X
Guam		X
TOTAL	42	13

* South Dakota reports that there are no community colleges in the state.

practice. A second large generalization is that, while the practice is widely observed, it has not yet attracted much policy attention. More states on which information about the question is available fall into the category of some practice and no policy than in any other; 15 of the 41 (37%) were so classified. Twenty-six states (63%) are reported as having no policy on the practice even though, as just noted, 15 of the 26 see some of the practice and in five of the group the practice is of notable level. A third generalization is that as yet neither the level of practice nor the strength of a related policy can be described as high in any but a few states. Florida is shown in the high classification in presence of

Table 4
 Distribution of 41 States* in Matrix of Relationship of Practice and Policy
 Concerning Offerings for Upper-division Credit by Baccalaureate
 Degree-granting Institutions at Community College Sites

Policy	Practice				
	None	Some	Notable	High	Total N
None	Alabama Massachusetts No. Carolina Pennsylvania Rhode Island Wisconsin (N=6)	Arkansas Arizona California Colorado Iowa Kansas Maryland Mississippi Nebraska Nevada New York Ohio Oklahoma Utah Washington (N=15)	Michigan New Jersey Oregon Texas Virginia (N=5)		26
Some		Connecticut New Hampshire New Mexico (N=3)	Hawaii** Idaho Indiana Minnesota Missouri S. Carolina (N=6)	Florida (N=1)	10
Strong			Alaska** Illinois Louisiana*** Missouri (N=4)	Kentucky** (N=1)	5
Total N	6	18	15	2	41

Table 4 Notes:

* South Dakota replied as shown in Table 1 but to say only that there are no community colleges in the state.

** Alaska, Hawaii, Kentucky are special case states because community colleges are integrally related to state universities.

*** Louisiana answered survey but as applicable to branch campuses of universities.

West Virginia is reported as not classifiable because community colleges are integrally related to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

the practice with some policy existing on it, and five states are shown as having strong related policy, four with notable level of practice within them and one with a high level.

The group of states categorized as having strong policy on the practice, however, merits more specific comment. It includes two states where the community colleges are integral parts of the state university system (Alaska and Kentucky) and another (Louisiana) where the respondent indicated that reference in the reply to the survey request was more based on branch campuses of universities than on the free-standing community colleges in the state. To this group of states where the issue under study is complicated by structures tying two-year campuses with a parent university or university system can be added, Hawaii. In Table 4 it remains as classified last year, that is, some policy and notable practice. In the preliminary report, note was made of indications that upon further study Hawaii would be placed at a higher level in policy classification but no information came forth to support that action.

Returning to the point that this kind of inquiry places a heavy reliance on judgments and perceptions of observers, further comment on the relocation in the matrix of three states between making the 1993 and the present report should be made. In all three cases (Illinois, Missouri, and North Carolina) the placement in the matrix as recommended by respondents in the state director office was accepted. Illinois pointed to a statewide policy on telecommunication networking and distance learning as evidence of a strengthening policy position; Missouri claimed a stronger policy level because of the monitoring of the practice by the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education and its studies toward a model development to guide the practice; and North Carolina clarified information earlier acquired

to establish that neither an official policy position nor presence of the practice was evident in the state.

From these data and the insights that their analysis provides, the perception created of the practice under study is that it is one of emerging and perhaps likely growing importance but that it is not yet a clear and present matter attracting public policy consideration.

However, when the accumulated file of information is examined for insights beyond the frequency counts such as are shown in Table 4, the perception strengthens significantly to become a sense that the practice is indeed one of considerable current concern and impending public policy notice. An initial content analysis of the materials accumulated thus far was done of this report and as this was done five topical areas emerged that appeared to be meaningful to the inquiry and this report. They were:

1. The attitudes toward the practice and possible policy implications in it expressed by interested personnel in the states as their own and in some cases as believed to be held by others in position of leadership at institutional or state agency levels.
2. The subordinate or corollary policy issues touched upon either directly or indirectly by respondents in our communications with them or in the documentary material they provided.
3. The content or scope of the upper-division credit offerings observed.
4. The extent of the practice among the total number of community colleges in a state.
5. The mode of delivery of the offerings on the community college campuses.

Attitudes toward the practice. As one probes for a better understanding of the actual situation with respect to upper-division credit offerings on community college campuses, understanding increases that not only is it occurring but that, in the main, the

practice is supported by persons in the field who are in position to act concerning it. Both in frequency of comment and in the nature of the language used to describe it, respondents indicated that the practice was getting positive support and encouragement. A posture of restrained advancement and careful development of model approaches to the practice was expressed by respondents in Missouri and Oregon. Only two states, Alabama and North Carolina, gave a firm indication that the practice was not encouraged but both also report that no specific policy position concerning it has been taken. In the case of North Carolina, earlier communications had suggested that a strong guiding position of discouragement of the practice existed but follow-up communications after the preliminary report made clear that there was no official policy on the matter.

Subordinate or corollary policy issues. Although not specifically requested to do so in the survey inquiry, state director responses raised a number of more specific policy questions related to the practice in their direct communications and through the documentary material that they sent in. As the file was examined with intent to identify such issues seven topical areas of issue or concern were established:

1. community college mission;
2. relationship to the "transfer problem";
3. adequacy of resource support;
4. roles in joint planning;
5. quality of academic services provided;
6. relationship to economic development; and
7. opportunity to enhance cooperation between public and private institutions.

A brief elaboration of each of these topics based on notes from the file examination follows.

As would be expected, the principal more focussed policy issue identified in connection with presence of upper-division credit opportunities on community college campus

is that of its possible impact on the "community college mission." This concern emerges whenever a juxtaposition of two- and four-year colleges is proposed; an excellent example of this being shown in the title chosen for a presentation and discussion by leadership personnel of Pennsylvania College of Technology at a national conference shortly after it received authorization to change from a community college to a college of technology. They titled it "Expanding the Mission" (Middleton, Gilmour, Baker & Gioffre, 1992). Indications of concern about impact on community college mission were evident in comments that the practice caused difficulties in defining the proper "service area" of the community college as well as that of the upper-level institutions. Observations came forth also that the practice generated need to be alert to an "upward creep" of associate degree academic requirements as well as a "downward creep" of those attached to a baccalaureate degree.

Information compiled also shows quite clearly that provision of upper-division offerings on community college campuses is an effect due at least in part to the current high interest and concern that opportunity for students to carry their studies to the bachelor's degree be provided as fully as possible. The pressure on both community colleges and four-year colleges and universities to do this by facilitating transfer of students from associate-degree to baccalaureate-degree levels is intense and ways to enhance progress of students bound for a bachelor's degree are being widely sought; the "transfer" issue in community college education needs no elaboration in this report. In that context, however, any action to bring upper-level study closer to the student becomes more valid of consideration, more easily justified, and more viable for implementation. Direct provision of upper-division

credit offerings on community college campuses is seen as a ready and, in many cases, compelling response to the transfer challenge.

Preservation of quality of academic offerings also came to the fore in this review. It is seen, for example, in comments of concern about the excessive use of adjunct or part-time faculty by the four-year degree-granting institutions providing the upper-level courses and about the problems encountered in articulating course and program content and related academic requirements. Again, these observations will likely strike a familiar note among recipients of this report.

Still another corollary issue is that of roles to be played in working out arrangements whereby upper-division credit offerings will occur. While indications point strongly to policy directions which advocate and emphasize joint effort and cooperative planning as essential, they also suggest that the determination of relative levels of responsibility for and authority over both the planning of initial decisions to offer upper-level courses and the management of offerings when finally operating is not always clear among the parties involved.

Adequacy of resource support of upper-division offerings is another matter of general concern. It is related to the quality issue discussed above as well as to others. How well the resources to support upper-division credit offerings on community college campuses match those provided for the same offerings at the main campuses of the four-year institutions is a question not answered by the material at hand but it is one that can clearly be raised from it. Not only is there evidence that the amount of support provided upper-level offerings is an issue, but indications are that the issue of a proper division of responsibility to provide

support comes into play. The model of local effort to facilitate four-year college and university offerings on the local campus that exists at McComb Community College in Michigan, for example, is exceptional in the field. Its success is attracting notice both throughout the state and elsewhere. At present it appears that the general policy position among the states is to leave determination of relative two-year and four-year college share of the burden of support of the practice to local determination by the institutions involved.

Relationship of the practice to institutional service in the economic development of a locality is another issue area identified in this project. It is reflected, for example, in observations that the practice has an affect on the community college's capacity to "market its own" programs and services. Here an explanatory connection is possible when the concern is associated with the typical community college commitment to provide as full and complete a service to its locality as possible. Respondents indicate that service to economic development motivates institutional action to expand offerings either to be provided directly or through various interorganizational arrangements.

Finally to be reported in this narration of insights gained from the project into significant subordinate policy questions to date is the opportunity seen by some sources to turn the practice of offering upper-division credit opportunity on community college to a purpose not often found in either state-level or institutional planning, namely, bringing about a higher order of cooperation between public and private institutions. Mention of private four-year colleges offering upper-division courses for credit on public community college campuses was noted by respondents in several states, in all cases with an affirmative view

expressed. The "Plus Two Model" being tested by the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education is a good example.

Content of courses or programs offered. Again, detailed information about the scope and depth of the courses and programs offered was not called for specifically in the initial survey nor in the follow-up request. Examination of the materials sent in by state respondents to support continuing interest in the subject, however, gives some preliminary indication of the nature of the offerings and may be useful in planning further inquiry on behalf of the state directors. Mention was made most frequently of upper-division courses in business fields, education, engineering technology, nursing, and vocational education. In the case of the two programs reported in New Jersey involving Camden County College and Burlington County College (both public comprehensive community colleges), the program coverage envisioned in their cooperative arrangements with four-year institutions was the ultimate provision of "comprehensive educational programs to area citizens."

These early observations provoke a number of questions the answers to which I believe would be of high interest and significance to formulation of future policy pertaining to the practice that is the focus of this report. Among such questions would be these: To what extent is determination of the scope and depth of the upper-division offerings a function of the strengths of the existing academic programs of associate-degree offered by the community college? To what extent is that determination a function of gaps in the scope and depth of the community college's curricular offerings? Programs of Associate Degree level in business fields, nursing, and engineering technology are often among the strongest that community colleges offer; courses in education and vocational education are not common.

The former group of course offering areas seems related to the first question suggested; the courses in education (often reported to be a service in professional development for teachers in the area) seems connected to the second question given. Clearly, these kinds of queries merit more recognition and attention both among researchers and policy makers in the field.

Extent of practice. The follow-up request for information that was addressed to state directors after the April 1993 report did ask for detail on the levels of presence of the practice existing in the state. Quantitative information came forward for only 21 states. It shows a wide variation in the level of practice from state to state. The replies from the 21 states ranged from "None" for the six states shown in Table 4 as reporting no presence of the practice to such statements as "Both of the two community colleges but none at the two-year technical college" (Idaho), and "Eight of fifteen" community colleges in Iowa. The intent to involve community colleges inclusively in future planning and programming associated with the practice was clear in reports received from Alaska, Illinois, Kentucky, and South Carolina. An early next step in a continuation of the present project should be to get more quantitative data on the level of incidence of the practice looking at both states and individual localities as units of analysis. We need to know more about the number of courses and programs offered as well as more about the number and types of institutions involved.

Mode of delivery. An observation that became more striking as experience in this study progressed is that new advances in telecommunications and in distance learning are reshaping conditions in the field and in so doing are redefining approaches to programming offerings on community college campuses. Comments and materials received from state after state came forward indicating that to be a fact. As one looks over what is coming from

the state officials, two significant but quite different attachments to telecommunications and distance learning by those interested in upper-division on community college campuses are apparent. One is to the formation of large-scale networks in which community college and four-year colleges and universities are a part. From Illinois, for example, comes a report that, "Both the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Community College Board are actively pursuing the development of a statewide telecommunications network in which senior institutions will offer upper-division and graduate courses through telecommunications on community college campuses," and the spring 1993 issue of the Community College Board's newsletter, *Excel*, headlines the board chairman's view as "Telecommunications: Our 'New Frontier'" (p. 2). Similar network formation appears in reports from Alaska, Indiana, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Virginia. The second attachment is by individual colleges or a small group of institutions moving to bring courses offered by four-year colleges to their campuses using interactive television and acting outside of a framework of statewide or systemwide planning. Reports of such developments or explorations of them come from Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, and New Mexico.

State directors should note that the increased use of telecommunications and growing acceptance as well as advances in distance learning are factors affecting changes in higher education that reach far beyond the practice under examination in this report. Consider, for example, the potential for changes, not only in the structure of American postsecondary education, but also in standard approaches to its planning, programming, and management, that appears in the following excerpt from a response to this survey from the state director's office in South Carolina:

In South Carolina increasing numbers of baccalaureate degree-granting institutions are offering academic credit programs on community and technical college campuses. . . . Currently the Commission on Higher Education has approved six different baccalaureate-granting institutions to offer seven bachelor's degrees at technical colleges or two-year branch campuses of the University of South Carolina. A total of two USC branch campuses and five technical colleges are serving as sites for one or more of these degrees.

In addition to baccalaureate programs, USC-Columbia offers three master's degree programs via television to fifteen two-year campuses. Also, the Greenville Higher Education Consortium, housed on the Greenville Technical College campus, coordinates upper-level baccalaureate and graduate level evening and weekend course offerings for four public and private universities. A copy of the consortium by-laws is enclosed for your information.

In a future report of studies of the reshaping of American postsecondary education that took place late in the 20th Century, South Carolina may be identified as a bellwether state.

Conclusion, Implications, and Recommendations

A somewhat inelegant and unscholarly way to put before the Council of State Directors both the major conclusion to come from results of analysis of survey information accumulated thus far and the major related recommendation that would appear to follow from it, is to say, "Prepare for the bandwagon and how the colleges within your jurisdiction will be getting on it!" Indications are strong that courses and programs for upper-division collegiate academic credit are already well entrenched in many communities in a majority of the states, and, furthermore, that prevailing attitudes of leadership at both state and institutional levels as well as new developments in modes of delivery of instruction will foster future expansion of the practice. Chief among the elements shaping the attitudinal context are empathetic views held at both institutional and state levels toward expanding the

concept of community college mission to include its provision of on-campus opportunity for upper-division study. Those views are encouraged by strong prevailing beliefs that students should be assured optimum access to attainment of the baccalaureate degree, that students of all ages and backgrounds of education and experience be accommodated, and that local area needs for economic development which can be served through education and training be met as comprehensively as possible. Chief among the elements shaping the technological context are the advances in use and acceptance of interactive television, multi-media instruction, computer networking, and the consequent joining of telecommunication technology with distance learning. Both contexts appear favorable to the presence of upper-division credit instruction on community college campuses; as one community college worker has observed cogently, "The pursuit of education is no longer linear" (Michelski, 1993). If it is not, the question of impact on the structure of the enterprise rises immediately.

It is not the purpose of this report to project another design for structuring postsecondary education but the thought should not remain a passing one. It is too much tied to the main discussion as survey results were presented. Where are community colleges headed in the restructuring of schools, colleges, universities, and other centers for education which in the light of what has been presented seems to be inevitable? Will they become more and more "Centers for Adult Education and Training," increasingly unstructured as to level and concentrations of academic specializations? Will they be increasingly seen as "Education Consumer and Community Service Centers," serving more as local places of delivery of instruction and related informational services while tied to remote centers where

instruction is initiated located afar in a state or at even more remote places? The speculation is provocative--and "time will tell" us the answers.

A more specific and thereby perhaps more helpful set of recommendations, however, can be advanced for consideration of the state directors. One would be that the National Council undertake a more active role in sifting out the public policy issues generated by observable developments in the field with respect to the practice. Such issues could include roles to be played by community college leadership at the institutional and state levels in determining procedures for establishing upper-level programs at community college campuses, provision of fiscal and other types of support, assurance of quality at all levels of academic credit attached to the offerings provided, and modes of assessing the results or outcomes of the practice. We are all well aware that these issue areas are already matters of high concern and much study in the American postsecondary education scene; leadership personnel in every state in the nation is wrestling with the challenges the issues present. The point here, however, is that the practice of providing upper-division academic credit courses and programs on community college campuses and the likelihood of its expansion needs more visibility and consideration as these broad policy issue areas are examined and decisions by governmental officials as well as educators concerning them are made. The National Council of State Directors can help bring this about by giving more attention to an examination of the practice on its own agenda as well as promoting its notice by others.

Another and final recommendation for this report is that the National Council join forces with analysts of change in American higher education to get more in-depth understanding of the practice as it is developing in the field. This report and the continuing

exploratory study on which it is based are only a start at the kind of inquiry and analysis the practice appears to merit as a new development that will shape not only the future of community colleges but the entire postsecondary educational enterprise of the nation. Scholars in universities and elsewhere will surely see in the practice many questions in need of more penetrating and extended analytical inquiry and evaluation. Action to create a public policy framework to guide future developments are sure to follow at both state and federal levels of government. The National Council of State Directors should be in the vanguard of the push forward in research, reporting, and public policy formulation. Council members, acting in individual states as well as collectively, are in excellent position both to promote that push and to make gainful use of the results it has the promise to produce.

References

- Bogue, J. P. (1950) The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cohen, A. and Brauer (1989) The American Community College (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Deegan, W. and Tillery, D. (1985) Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Eells, W. C. (1931) The Junior College. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Gieazer, E. J., Jr. (1969) This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Gieazer, E. J. Jr. (1973) Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Knoell, D. M. (1990) "Joint or shared Use of Facilities in Higher Education in Selected States." Technical background paper to Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Planning Commission.
- Koos, L. V. (1925) The Junior College Movement. New York: Ginn and Company.
- Koos, L. V. (1946) Integrating High School and College. New York: Harpers.
- Martin, J., Samuels, J. E. and Associate (1993) Merging Colleges for Mutual Growth: A New Strategy for Academic Managers. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Martorana, S. V. (1957) "Consideration of two-year Colleges in Recent Statewide Studies of Higher Education." Higher Education. Oct., 1957, 23-27; and Nov. 1957, 46-50.
- Messersmith, J. W., and Nelson, L. O. (1961). Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities. Circular No. 649. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education.
- Messersmith, J. W. and others (1975-1990). State Legislation Affecting Community, Junior and Two-Year Technical Colleges. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Penn State University.

- Messersmith, J. W. and Nespoli, L. A. (1978) Regionalism in American Higher Education: Concepts and Practices. University Park, PA, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Penn State University.
- Medsker, L. L. (1960) The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Michalski, M. (1993, September 21) "Bachelor's Pad." Community College Times. p. 4.
- Middleton, J. E., Gilmoer, D. J., Baker, G. L., and Gioffre, D. C. (1992). "Expanding the Union: Initiating Bachelor Degrees at a Traditionally Two-Year College." Presentation at Leadership 2000: Leagues for Innovation in Community Colleges. July 21.
- Patterson, F. (1974). Colleges in Consort. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Patterson, L. (1967) Academic Cooperative Agreement Directory. Kansas City and Missouri: Kansas City Regional Council of Higher Education.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 21, 1993
FROM: S. V. Martorana
TO: State Directors
RE: Upper-Division Collegiate Offerings in Community College Campuses

The attached preliminary report to the National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges was presented and discussed at the Council's April 28 meeting in Portland, Oregon. Persons present expressed a keen interest in the subject and urged us to produce and distribute a final report soon. To do that it was agreed that I should send a copy of the preliminary report to all persons on our mailing list of state directors with a request for a final review and quick response so that we can update and expand on the subject in a final report.

Accordingly, will you please check the information shown for your state in the preliminary report. If in Table 1 it shows no response was received to date of the report, please give us one now. For states shown in Table 2, please examine placement in the matrix comparing level of practice and presence of policy concerning upper-division, academic degree credit courses and programs offered by baccalaureate degree-granting institutions on community college campuses. If the placement of your state shown should be changed, please tell us the better placement and why the change should be made. Descriptive material about the level and nature of the practice and the type and strength of any relevant policy guiding or otherwise bearing on the practice will be included.

REPEAT ... We need to know: (1) If the practice exists in your state and, if so: (a) on how many public community college (or similar public associate degree-granting college) campuses is it occurring; an approximate (best estimate) number is acceptable; (b) is there any notable innovative feature in the approach to the practice in your state; and (c) what policy guidelines, if any, exist in your state that bear on the practice (whether or not the presence of the practice exists). Again, descriptive materials will be helpful.

Thanks much for your help. We will get the final report out as soon as possible.

sjk

Enclosure

cc: Peter H. Garland
Robert M. Hendrickson