

ALTERNATIVE FUTURES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

K. Patricia Cross

Harvard Graduate School of Education

I have entitled my remarks today, "Alternative Futures for Community Colleges" because I believe that the two major influences that shape community colleges are changing. Students, to whom community colleges have always been responsive, continue to change, but perhaps even more importantly, the world external to higher education is changing, and the 1980s will call for a re-evaluation of the comprehensive mission. That doesn't necessarily mean a replacement of the comprehensive mission -- although that possibility must be entertained, along with other options. My purpose today is to stimulate thought about the future direction of community colleges. Thus I shall state my propositions forcefully in the hope of sparking debate and discussion.

It is not easy to define the purpose and mission of community colleges today -- not nearly as easy as it was in the 1960s when community colleges were in high agreement nationwide on a mission to open the doors of higher education to previously unserved segments of the population. Once the doors have been opened, however, and

Prepared for the Women in Community College Education Leaders' Workshop,
Phoenix, Arizona, January 24, 1984.

those previously unserved students are in attendance, what is the goal? Is it, for example, to retain students until they have completed some defined set of learning experiences that constitutes a "program" of study? Or is it to provide students with whatever educational experiences seem to serve their needs at the time? How important is retention, and what constitutes "reasonable progress" in a community college? Are community colleges failing in their task when up to 40 percent of the students in California community colleges complete fewer than two courses in two years? (Hunter and Sheldon, 1982). How important is the transfer function? Should community colleges be distressed that studies have shown that "not more than one in twenty enrollees completes a two-year program and transfers in the succeeding term?" (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, p. 54).

The answers to these questions depend heavily on what community colleges are trying to do. The easy way out of the goals problem is one that was used with success by most community colleges in the 1960s and 70s -- to embrace comprehensiveness. The problem with the comprehensive mission is that carrying it out with quality suggests that all of the basic functions that constitute the comprehensive community college must be done well. The transfer program must prepare students just as well as the university does for upper division work. Vocational programs must prepare students for entry-level jobs, as well as advancement in their chosen occupations. Remedial programs must actually ameliorate

past educational inequities and prepare students for college-level learning. Community education must respond appropriately to the educational needs of a wide range of people and organizations.

Can any college perform all of those functions with excellence -- or even adequately in today's climate of scarce resources and heavy competition for students? Some people think not, and friends as well as critics of the community colleges, are wondering out loud if the community colleges can be all things to all people. Are there some functions that should not be provided and some people who should not be served -- at least not by a given community college?

The difficulty of the questions and the rising confusion about institutional purpose has college presidents worried. In a recent survey, college presidents were asked to name the most critical issues facing their college in the next decade. Out of some twenty critical issues listed, "changing mission and purpose" ranked second; only "inflation and financial concerns" ranked higher with presidents of public colleges (Duea, 1981).

Fortunately, the question of mission for community colleges has stimulated a growing number of thoughtful articles in the literature. While none will answer the questions for any given college, they should spark discussion and illuminate the options available. I have identified six possible themes or foci running through the current community college mission debate. I shall

label them as follows: 1) the comprehensive focus, 2) the vertical focus, 3) the horizontal focus, 4) the integrated focus, 5) the remedial focus, and 6) the networking focus.

The Comprehensive Focus

The comprehensive mission is far and away the favorite, and at the present time many of the other foci are proposed, not as alternatives to the comprehensive mission, but rather as priorities or improvements within the comprehensive mission. So strong is the commitment to the comprehensive mission that those who have been either bold enough or foolish enough to suggest the elimination or de-emphasis of one of the five original program functions of community colleges have found themselves almost immediately in the midst of heated controversy. Consider, for example, the reaction to the recommendation of the Brookings Report (Breneman and Nelson, 1981) that community colleges should de-emphasize the transfer function and leave the education of baccalaureate-bound students to four-year institutions. Or consider the reaction to Ed Gleazer's (1980) suggestion that it is time for community colleges to de-emphasize their association with higher education in favor of building stronger associations with the non-academic community. Community colleges are, like any other organization, nation, or person, hesitant to give up anything once gained, even if doing so might refocus resources on an area of greater potential strength.

Whether community colleges are going to have to give up the comprehensive mission remains in doubt, but there is little doubt that priorities will have to be set and observed over the next decade. Most of today's analysts question the continuation of the comprehensive mission on the grounds that it spreads resources too thin. Breneman and Nelson (1981) think the decision regarding mission will ultimately be settled on the basis of financial support. They label the comprehensive mission a gamble, observing that "the greatest risk of an unflinching commitment to the comprehensive mission is that sufficient financial support will not materialize, and the college will suffer across the board, becoming less competitive and less distinctive in all program areas" (p. 213). The California Postsecondary Commission sounded pretty much the same warning, saying that "unless the colleges make programmatic choices and set budget priorities they will probably do many things less well and some things unsatisfactorily in the future" (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1981, Preface).

Despite such warnings, most colleges resist strongly any talk of abandoning the comprehensive mission. And indeed it has some notable strengths. In the first place, the comprehensive mission has strong roots in the historical arguments for equal access to educational opportunity, namely that all potential students should be within commuting distance of the type of education that serves their needs. Furthermore, despite its com-

plexity, it is easy to administer. Faculty will grumble but will understand a leader who allocates scarce resources with an even hand as long as every department is equally deprived. What they are less likely to understand is an out-and-out statement that vocational education or community education or transfer programs or whatever are going to get more money because they are the wave of the future for the college. There are community colleges that have enunciated clear priorities quite successfully, but the battle is never easy if it means giving up some function that already has incumbents. The comprehensive mission is enormously powerful; it is attractive to most community college educators; it avoids the controversy of setting priorities, and it has become part of the community college tradition. It is mostly outside researchers and analysts who are warning that in the long run, community colleges will have to set priorities in order to use scarce resources where they will do the most good.

The Vertical Focus

The vertical focus is generally conceded to be the most prestigious and most easily understood model. Firmly anchored in traditional concepts of what a college should be, it places the community college between the high school and four-year college as an essential part of the formal education system. Basically, the vertical focus calls for establishing relationships with high schools to assure that recent high school graduates are prepared

for college level work and for articulating with four-year institutions their requirements for transfers.

There is now considerable activity, both within community colleges and outside, for strengthening the vertical focus. Indeed, some of the most powerful voices in higher education are more supportive of the vertical focus than of any other. There is the prestigious Carnegie Foundation, deploring the discontinuity of American education and calling for "an effective progression from elementary school through high school through college" (Hechinger, 1981, p. 128). Derek Bok (1982), President of Harvard, has just come down heavily on the side of continuity in education by suggesting that financial aid should be based on the likelihood of the student's completing college. The University of California task group studying retention and transfer is urging more articulation and communication with community colleges in the hope of greater continuity through the system (Kissler, 1980). *FORD FOUNDATION has just granted 25 community colleges \$25,000 apiece to improve transfer rate* Dozens of examples could be cited of concern in high places for *minorities* the breakdown in the vertical transition of students through the formal school system. The widespread conclusion is that better articulation between high schools and colleges is a high priority and that community colleges have a major obligation to establish smooth connections to enhance the flow of more students through the system.

Attention, of course, almost always goes to areas perceived as neglected, and there is widespread agreement throughout the

nation that traditional academic values have been neglected. The point is that the vertical position of the community colleges between the high schools and four year institutions is being vigorously reasserted, and it constitutes one major focus for the community college of the 1980s.

The Horizontal Focus

The horizontal focus has strong roots in the community college movement. It reaches out to develop linkages with the community rather than building linkages within the formal educational establishment. This focus has been most vigorously articulated by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Although Ed Gleazer, the former president, and Dale Parnell, the current president, would establish their linkages in somewhat different places, the leadership of both men is concerned with reaching out to embrace new partners in education. Ed Gleazer (1980) has a sweeping vision of the community college of the future. He sees community colleges as the hub of all education going on in the community, serving people of all ages throughout their lifetimes and helping the community solve problems and build a better community through education.

Gleazer upset many in the community college movement by making a choice between horizontal and vertical emphases. In his book, Values, Vision and Vitality (1980), he raised the question of whether it might not be time for the community colleges

to de-emphasize their identification with higher education and even to reconsider their use of the term "college." "It may get in the way of what really needs to be done in the community" (p. 5), he said.

Although many regard Gleazer's horizontal focus as idealistic and too radical for implementation in the 1980s, I suggest that it should not be dismissed too quickly. As soon as the current crisis on academic quality is resolved -- which will be within the next five years or so -- community colleges will be faced with even harder decisions with respect to the viability of the comprehensive mission and will be asking whether their future lies more in the concept of the "junior" or transfer college or in some other direction. I ^{suggest} ~~predict~~ that the horizontal focus will challenge the vertical for predominance before the end of the ^{Century} ~~decade~~. That seems to me a ^{possible} ~~likely~~ scenario for two reasons; first, as every educator knows only too well, the pool of traditional college students has just started its downward slide, and traditional students will be increasingly scarce for the rest of the decade. This means that traditional four-year colleges, that were once content to leave low-achieving students to the community colleges, are going to reassert their "right" to go after any student who is able to spend full time in residence on the campuses that many four-year colleges must maintain. Unless community colleges can establish a competitive transfer program and can

keep costs significantly below those of four-year institutions, they ~~will probably~~ ^{could} ultimately lose the fight for the baccalaureate-bound market.

The second reason the horizontal focus will emerge stronger than ever after about 1990 is that community colleges are far ahead of traditional four-year colleges in capitalizing on the rich and only partially tapped adult part-time market. Community colleges are ideally suited, philosophically and geographically, to serve lifelong learners with jobs, families, and roots in the local communities. Furthermore, the less cumbersome faculty committee system of community colleges makes them able to respond quickly and appropriately to cooperative educational ventures with other providers of education. The rising interest of business and industry in human resource development makes corporate education the most actively growing educational activity in the nation. Community colleges appear to have the inside track on alliances with business, and Dale Parnell and the current AACJC Board are pushing hard for national legislation to strengthen this particular form of horizontal extension (Parnell, 1982).

The evidence is just beginning to pile up that students are using community colleges in a strikingly different manner than most traditionalists think, and most of the current student usage patterns are creating pressures toward the horizontal focus. Almost two-thirds of all community college students are studying part-time, and the typical load is one course per semester. Most

of today's community college students do not fit the vertical focus very well; they are not coming directly from high school, nor do most plan to go on to a four-year college. In fact, the authors of the Statewide Longitudinal Study of California Community Colleges found that very few students enrolled in or even identified with any "program" of study. They concluded that "It is obvious that California community colleges are neither 'two-year transfer institutions' nor 'two-year vocational education institutions,' but something very different" (Hunter and Sheldon, 1981, p. 3-11).

The Integrated Focus

The term "integrated focus" may be used to contrast Arthur Cohen's proposal for a general education focus with the horizontal and vertical foci already discussed. Cohen is proposing major attention to linkages within the college rather than external linkages either vertically or horizontally. Cohen's intent is to make liberal arts and the humanities an important part of the learning experience of all learners, ~~be they transfer, career, compensatory, or community education students.~~ The trend that distresses Cohen most in community college education is the collapse of the sequential curriculum. He believes that a community college education should contain a "sequence of intended learnings" in which "sequence" is defined as "a pattern of progression that has some rationale, order, and deliberate arrangement" and "intended learnings" have outcomes that are defined

in advance (Cohen, 1981, p. 35).

Cohen's focus advocates a program of studies that calls for a reconceptualization of all five of the traditional functions of the community college. His integrated focus would place liberal education for the informed citizen at the hub of career, compensatory, collegiate, and community education. Community colleges would not only guarantee the availability of liberal education to all students at any time in their lives, but would require it lest, as Cohen says, "the gulf between social classes in America be accentuated as members of the elite group learn to control their environment, while the lower classes are given career education and training in the basic skills" (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, p. 327).

The Remedial Focus

The remedial focus recommended by the Carnegie Council in 1979 has received little discussion and has generally been met with little enthusiasm by community colleges. I don't find it especially surprising that community colleges failed to respond to the Carnegie proposal that community colleges assume "residual responsibility for youth." Clark Kerr and the members of his council tried to address the real and growing youth problem in the United States by suggesting that community colleges develop a comprehensive set of "youth service functions" which would include guidance, job preparation, job placement, referral to other community agencies for help with legal and medical advice,

apprenticeships, and almost any other type of service needed by young people to help them become responsible and productive citizens. In this remedial focus, the community colleges would be identified as "full service institutions for the young."

There are many problems with the proposal which, to its credit, does tackle a problem in serious need of attention. First and foremost is the fact that community colleges have not been rewarded in the past for their social concern. Indeed, they are quite likely to have been the targets of sometimes vicious criticism for enrolling disproportionate numbers of minorities, for recruiting students with poor academic skills, for poor retention of students, for failure to provide upper division transfers to four-year institutions, for preserving the social class structure, and a host of other charges related to their present remedial role of taking on the "youth problem." Having been burned in the past for their handling of a problem that no one yet knows how to deal with, it is unlikely that they are going to move more heavily into remedial functions in the future unless some sorts of rewards are forthcoming -- special funding, feelings of accomplishment, recognition by others, and the self-satisfaction of knowing that they are serving individuals and society well.

A second major flaw in the Carnegie Proposal is that almost no college wants to be identified these days as the "institution for youth" which is a declining population and quite opposite from the direction in which most community colleges are currently

moving. Community colleges, more than any other type of institution, are becoming institutions for adults. What seems more likely is that community colleges that have borne most of the remedial functions will now be joined in those efforts by the high schools, under vigorous public pressure to improve academic programs, and by the four-year colleges under severe demographic pressures to recruit and retain students.

The Networking Focus

Finally, I have left until last the description of the networking focus because it is a hybrid. Instead of lopping off one or more of the traditional functions of community colleges, networking focuses on shrinking the whole through contracting for some services with other providers in the education network. It would place the community college in the role of catalyst, coordinator, and contractor in the delivery of postsecondary education services. The community college would diagnose the education needs of the local community and then, through contract^s and cooperation with the most appropriate provider, deliver those services. Contracts might be negotiated with business and industry, libraries, museums, hospitals, other colleges, television stations, senior citizens' centers and any other community agency that provides or needs education services.

Approximations of this model already exist. John Wood Community College in Illinois contracts with a local industry to provide technical education and with a local private liberal arts

college to provide general and liberal education (Heath and Peterson, n.d.). Bay de Noc Community College in Michigan's upper peninsula pays some fifty-seven local employers \$240. per student to provide instruction in forty-four different fields that would otherwise be unavailable to students of a small college (Chronicle of Higher Education, October 27, 1982, p.3). Counseling and employment services are other services usually provided by community colleges that could be networked into community social service agencies.

The virtue of networking is that the community can have access to more facilities and can use resources to greater advantage when providers are cooperating instead of competing for students. As efficient as the networking focus sounds, however, it too has its problems. First and foremost, there is the problem of identity for a college that buys instruction from other providers. The concept of a college is intimately related to a campus, a faculty, and instruction. Although these traditions are beginning to break down with the increase in part-time faculty, off-campus instruction, and credit for experiential learning, most teachers, counselors, and administrators value their identification with "the college," and despite rhetoric about the learning society, few have truly shifted their allegiance to "the community."

Conclusion

The 1980s will present difficult choices for community colleges. The comprehensive mission which has served as the flag

around which community colleges could derive strength and identity is not as strong or as clear today as it was ten to twenty years ago. While current criticism regarding lack of quality is directed largely at slippage on the vertical dimension, fidelity to the comprehensive mission will require new efforts to establish standards and quality across all programs. That, as many people have pointed out, will be a gamble as long as resources remain limited. Shoring up one program necessarily results in at least temporary neglect of some other function. The yo-yo syndrome could be the result. The transfer function receives attention until criticism becomes strong over failures in the community education program. Resources diverted to that program for a few years permits criticism to arise over the failure of vocational programs to keep up with the changing times. And so it goes. The result is that community colleges are perpetually defending themselves against criticism, constantly putting out fires instead of getting on with establishing their own identity and moving toward quality in the goals they set for themselves. The institutions that have the best chance of maintaining the comprehensive mission are large colleges, and especially those in multi-campus districts where individual colleges can diversify their "specialties."

The vertical focus has the advantage of legitimacy in the eyes of most people -- legislators, educators (especially those in four-year colleges and universities), and the general public.

But that more stereotyped version of a "real college" can also be a disadvantage when community colleges must compete with four-year colleges on their terms. When community colleges were established, and especially during the great growth decade of the 1960s, four-year institutions were delighted to leave the new populations, who were generally less well prepared academically, to the community colleges. That situation is changing dramatically, and four-year institutions will be tough competitors in the 1980s and 90s for full-time students. Colleges that appear to have the best chance of succeeding in the vertical focus are those located in states with growing populations of youth and low competition among four-year institutions, and those in areas with relatively high income and education levels.

The horizontal focus has the advantage of tapping into the most rapidly growing population of learners, namely adult part-time learners. That population will continue to expand throughout the 1980s and 90s, not only in numbers, but also in demand for education services. Most adults are location-bound, and four-year residential campuses have a difficult time competing in that market. The problems in the horizontal focus are 1) that it may come close to the comprehensive focus in spreading resources too thin, and 2) that there is a great deal of work to be done in selling the concept to the general public -- and to many community college faculties, and 3) that the current move away from local control and funding is counterproductive to

establishing the community relationships that are essential for success. Nevertheless, for small to moderate-sized community colleges dedicated to establishing the necessary relationships in the community and selling the concept to students, taxpayers, and local business and community agencies, the horizontal focus seems viable for the 1980s.

The integrated focus also has a lot of "selling" to do to gain understanding and acceptance. It may, however, be a "sleeper" with more potential for the future than is apparent now. Job skills are changing so rapidly and many are of such a specific nature that some industries are saying that what they want colleges to do is to provide a general education background, and to develop the capacity in workers to continue to learn new job demands as they come along. Such industries are convinced that they will have to teach the specifics on the job, and many industrial programs are growing at a rate that far exceeds even the Golden Age of growth for higher education in the 1960s. Consolidated Edison's training budget, for example, ballooned from \$400,000 in 1970 to 5.5 million in 1980, and the Bell System is spending \$1.7 million annually on education and training (Craig and Evers, 1981). There are at present many calls for greater cooperation between community colleges and industry. If that "cooperation" should take the form of greater differentiation between the "education" offered by colleges and the "training" offered by industry, then the integrated focus would be an appro-

priate role for community colleges. If, on the other hand, "cooperation" takes the form of jointly developed and taught programs, then the viability of the horizontal focus is strengthened.

Job-related education is not, however, the major argument used by advocates of the integrated focus. There was once considerable hope among underemployed humanities faculties that more mature adult learners would have a greater appreciation of liberal education than would traditional college students. That hope has not yet been turned into college enrollments; adults appear just as interested in career education as younger students. There is, however, the argument that there would be an adult market for general education if colleges taught it as a truly integrated educational experience rather than as preparation for academic majors.

The remedial focus will probably continue to be a part of the program of every open door college, but the major focus of very few. Although there is brave talk about improving the high schools to the point where remediation is no longer needed, most community college students are not coming directly from high school, and even if high schools improve their teaching of the basic skills greatly over the next decade, there will still be a great deal of "catching up" to do. So far, remediation is a well-accepted part of the community college mission and funding has been protected reasonably well in most places for that critically important social function.

Finally, the networking focus would leave all of the traditional programs of community colleges in place, but would shrink on-campus responsibilities through contracting and cooperating with other community agencies. This focus seems most appropriate for small colleges in isolated areas unable to provide adequate variety, and for colleges of any size located in resource-rich areas where wasteful competition exists among providers.

These then are the choices: 1) to remain with the comprehensive mission and gamble that it can be done well -- less of a gamble for large institutions than for smaller ones, 2) to work hard on improving the vertical focus and gamble that community colleges can compete with four-year institutions for the baccalaureate-bound student, 3) to define a community-based horizontal mission and gamble that constituents and the community can be convinced to support and lobby for that function, 4) to tackle the integrated focus and gamble that industry and society really do want liberally educated workers and citizens, 5) to give renewed effort to remedial programs and gamble that confidence can be won and that the community college will continue to receive the major portion of funds marked for remedial services, 6) to try to establish beachheads of cooperation with other providers whenever possible and gamble that the college can maintain its identity for faculty, students, and staff.

No mission definition is guaranteed success in the 1980s and 90s, but by a careful analysis of the strengths of the college

and the market available to it, the risk can be reduced considerably. It seems clear that no college will "succeed" by settling for mediocrity across the board or by letting some of the traditional programs of the comprehensive mission slide into disrepute through neglect and lack of attention to standards of performance for both faculty and students.

Blazing new trails and marshalling people and resources to meet changing needs is the strongest of all community college traditions. The 1980s are likely to be even more interesting and challenging to educators than were the golden days of the 1960s when growth was the predominant activity.

REFERENCES

- Bok, Derek. The President's Report. 1980-81. Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, March, 1982.
- Breneman, David and Nelson, Susan. Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1981.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission. Missions and Functions of the California Community Colleges. Commission Report 81-14. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, May, 1981.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Giving Youth a Better Chance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Chronicle of Higher Education, October 27, 1982, p. 3.
- Cohen, Arthur M. "Dateline '79 Revisited." In Vaughn, G. (Ed.), Questioning the Community College Role: New Directions for Community Colleges. No. 32. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Cohen, Arthur M. and Brawer, Florence B. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Craig, Robert and Evers, Christine. "Employers as Educators: The Shadow Education System." In Gold, G., (Ed.), New Directions in Experiential Learning: Business and Higher Education -- Towards New Alliances. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, September, 1981.
- Duea, Jerry. "Presidents' Views on Current and Future Issues in Higher Education." Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1981, pp. 586-588.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. Values, Vision, and Vitality. Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.
- Heath, Paul R. and Peterson, Susan L. The Common Market Concept: Contracting for Community-Based Educational Services. Stockton, California: Combase, n.d.
- Hechinger, Fred. The High School-College Connection. In Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Common Learning: A Carnegie Colloquium on General Education. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981.

Hunter, Russel and Sheldon, M. Stephen. Statewide Longitudinal Study. Report on Academic Year 1979-80 Part 4 - Spring 1980 Results. Sacramento: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, 1981.

Kissler, Gerald R. (Chairman) Report of the Task Group on Retention and Transfer. Office of the Academic Vice President, University of California, Berkeley, June, 1980.

Parnell, Dale. "Putting America Back to Work: Community, Technical, Junior Colleges Ready." Community and Junior College Journal, September 1982, pp. 12-15.