

TEACHING IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

K. Patricia Cross

Harvard Graduate School of Education

Your conference theme, Promoting Great Teaching, is a timely and challenging one. It is timely because the topic needs attention; it is challenging because there are so many ways to deal with it. Let us start with the assumptions that are implied in the thesis that great teaching can be promoted through professional development. It makes two assumptions that I hope we are prepared to accept. It is, first and foremost, a flat rejection of the old saying that "Great teachers are born, not made." It suggests that even ordinary teachers can learn to become great teachers and that professional development can enhance that possibility.

The second assumption is revealed in the diversity of the program that has been planned. Apparently there are many components in great teaching. The topics you will be discussing today and tomorrow run the gamut from motivating students to designing courses to promoting self-renewal in teachers.

Prepared for the Institute on Staff Development and the Conference of Presidents, University of Texas, Austin, May 25, 1982.

Since I have the honor of opening the conference, I am going to seize this opportunity to talk about an aspect of great teaching that seems especially important for community colleges in the 1980s. My basic text this morning is that great teaching is supported and strengthened by an identity with the mission of the institution and a sense of its priorities. While it is quite possible to find master teachers outside of institutional settings -- Anne Sullivan, Helen Keller's teacher, comes to mind -- the development of a faculty of competent and dedicated teachers requires some sense of purpose and a general agreement on the mission of the institution. A possible, if understated, subtitle for my remarks today is that teachers teach better if they know what they are doing.

I submit that many teachers today don't know what they are supposed to be doing. They aren't sure, for example, whether they should expect students to attend class until the course ends or until the student has learned what he or she wants from it. A fascinating study just completed in California found that only 14 percent of the students enrolled in vocational courses were interested in completing a program of study (Hunter and Sheldon, 1981). What are teachers, most of whom are identified with academic or vocational programs of study to think about that? Is the mission of the community

college to provide students with whatever educational experiences seem to serve their needs at the time, or is it to get them through some defined set of learning experiences that constitute a "program" of study?

This same California study had to develop eighteen separate prototypes of students in order to describe the community college student body. The four largest groups, none constituting more than 17 percent of the student body, consisted of such diverse student prototypes as job seekers, leisure skills students, improving job skills students, and full time transfer students. Other prototypes, involving fewer students but familiar to all of you, were the "undisciplined transfers" who claim a Bachelor's degree as their goal, but whose sporadic attendance and poor performance makes any such goal seem totally unrealistic, the "inter-collegiate athletes" who attend college to participate in athletics, and the "license maintainers" who are usually found taking one course in the evening to renew a license. Can any teacher be a great teacher given such a wide range of student diversity and purpose?

One community college teacher, in an article entitled, "What is a College For?" (Slutsky, 1978), suggests that today's community college teachers have been given so many diverse roles that they are demoralized, anxiety-ridden, and just downright angry. It is hard to imagine such teachers being even

adequate; it is impossible to think that they might be great teachers. This same author goes on to complain that, "What the faculty thinks a college should be and what the college really is are at opposite poles" (p. 10). If she is right -- and there is some evidence that faculty morale in community colleges is considerably lower than it was a decade ago (Cross, 1980) -- then one of the first items on the agenda of any college setting out to improve the quality of its teaching is to answer the question, what is this college for?

It is not easy to define the mission of a community college today -- not nearly as easy as it was in the 1960s when money and students were plentiful and community colleges were the new hope of the nation, driven by a sense of missionary zeal and national purpose to open the doors of higher education to previously unserved segments of the population. Now that the doors of community colleges have been opened and the rhetoric has become reality, there are some who are calling for a redefinition of the open door, while others are convinced that the problem lies not in the definition but in its implementation.

The easy way out of the definitional problem is the one that was used with reasonable success by most community colleges in the 1960s and 70s -- to embrace comprehensiveness. Today with the cutback in funds and the competition for students, there is some disillusionment with the comprehensive mission,

and people are beginning to wonder out loud if the community college 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 college?

The difficulty of the questions and the rising confusion about institutional purpose has stimulated a growing number of articles in the literature on community college reform and a call for some clarification of the community college mission. Thus it seems appropriate, yes even necessary, to spend some time thinking about the purposes of our institutions if they are to serve as the settings for great teaching.

One of the things that has made the community college movement so powerful over the past twenty-five to thirty years has been the united sense of mission that joined community college educators all over the country in the national priority of creating democratic and unpretentious colleges to serve the common people. While there was room for local priorities, there was widespread agreement on the five basic functions of the community college -- transfer education, vocational education, general education, community education, and remedial/developmental education. Leaders could lead; legislators could legislate; and teachers could teach when people agreed about general directions. There is no such agreement today. The community college "movement" which represented a mighty river with a

rapid and purposeful current in the 1950s and 1960s may be branching now into smaller streams and rivulets, each moving at different speeds and in somewhat different directions. Time will tell whether the momentum of the river has simply slowed in its channel or whether it is cutting new, vigorous streams into virgin territory. Personally, I cannot see a single mission that stands out above all others as the mission for community colleges in the 1980s. Each vision currently advocated has strengths and weaknesses, and I suspect that each college will have to set its own priorities in the years to come. Such dispersion may weaken the bonds of the national community college "movement" but it may strengthen individual colleges.

It's hard to find a term that adequately represents the different visions that people have for community colleges as we enter the 21st Century. I could talk about community college "models" for the future, but the image of a model is too strong. Moreover, it suggest either a miniaturization of the real thing or a prescription for others to follow. The word "focus" seems better suited to my purpose of discussing future directions for community colleges. Focus, according to Webster, is "a position in which something must be placed for clarity of perception" or it is "a center of activity, attraction, or attention." There seem to be a number of foci emerging now. In general they strive for clarity of perception of the goals of

community colleges, and they are given focus by a set of activities that emphasize the importance of a given role.

I have labeled the five foci surfacing in the current literature as follows: 1) the comprehensive focus, 2) the vertical focus, 3) the horizontal focus, 4) the integrated focus, and 5) the remedial focus. It should be said in the very beginning that the idea of pulling these foci out for separate examination would not be endorsed by most of their designers and advocates, who for the most part insist that their focus can be incorporated into the comprehensive community college. It is my own injudicious approach to suggest that priorities are implied and choices are being made that will lead colleges down one stream rather than another. I say that it is injudicious to suggest that there are alternatives to the comprehensive mission because those who have been either bold enough or foolish enough to suggest the elimination or deemphasis 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 deemphasize the transfer function, thus encouraging more freshmen to start their college careers in four-year colleges, or consider the reaction to Ed

Gleazer's (1980) suggestion that it is time for community colleges to deemphasize their prized 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.

I am not going to dwell on an analysis of the comprehensive focus because it is familiar to all of you. Its strengths are that it has history on its side in the sense that the comprehensive mission is understood and accepted by most community college educators and students. Whether the general public understands the evolution of the comprehensive mission is subject to more speculation. A 1981 Gallup Poll showed that 48 percent of the American public think that the primary function of community colleges is "to provide academic training so that students can go on to a four-year college or university and earn a Bachelors degree if they want to." Twenty-eight percent think it is "to provide vocational or technical training, such as typing, auto mechanics, etc." Ten percent think it is to provide community programs. Although these statistics seem to suggest that the community college has not presented its comprehensive mission to the general public very well, I can't help wondering how we -- who presumably understand community

colleges -- would answer Mr. Gallup's question. For some inexplicable reason, the poll which was commissioned by the AACJC, failed to offer the comprehensive mission as a choice, and respondents were forced to select only one so-called "primary" mission. One of the things most distasteful to the average pollster is to have all the responses bunch up under a single response, but what if there had been an option that said, "all of the above"? This particular poll does not answer the question of how well community colleges are understood by the general public. It does show, however, that the public is not familiar with the current balance between transfer and vocational education.)

A second strength of the comprehensive mission is that 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. Because the comprehensive mission is enormously powerful and it would require extraordinary

courage to lead community colleges to even articulate the priorities within it, I will return to its potential as a viable focus for the future later. But first, I would like to explore the potential of some other alternatives.

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 students move through the formal educational system toward more advanced levels of education. 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 in some ways, the most powerful voices in higher education are more supportive of the vertical focus than of any other. At the level of conceptualization, 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). I could cite dozens of examples of concern in high places for the breakdown in the vertical transition of students through the formal school system. The universal 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 at least some students through the system.

The most effective implementation of the vertical function is underway at Miami-Dade Community College. What has become known as the "Miami-Dade system" is spreading like wildfire throughout the country. Miami-Dade has many arrows to its bow, and without question they are a comprehensive community college. They do everything. Nevertheless, the current priorities of Miami-Dade are clearly cast in the direction of traditional academic values and standards while preserving the concept of the open door (McCabe, 1981). The gems in their computerized crown involve an individualized monitoring system for making sure that students are making satisfactory progress in their courses

of study (Anandam, 1981; Kelly, 1981), a system for articulating course requirements with each of the four-year institutions in Florida (Harper, Herrig, Kelly, and Schinoff, 1981), a special program for academically superior students (Robertson and Thomas, 1981), and most recently a brand new program of research and conversations with Dade county high schools to improve student preparation prior to their entry into postsecondary education (Losak, Schwartz, and Morris, 1982).

I doubt if in the history of the community college movement there has ever been as much attention given to traditional academic standards as there has been in the last two or three years. 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.

Given the momentum today of the vertical emphasis, it is going to be hard to argue that any college should not jump aboard such a noble and virtuous bandwagon. There is however, another bandwagon that is building momentum in a different direction. The horizontal focus is reaching out to develop linkages

with the community rather than building linkages within the formal educational establishment. This focus is 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 the most 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 to solve problems and build a better community through education. He urges community colleges to provide the leadership for assessing community needs and convening and coordinating educational services for the community.

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), Gleazer, in a section significantly entitled "Trapped in Tradition" raised the question of whether it might not be time for the community colleges to shed 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, given current funding restrictions, and too radical for implementation in the 1980s, I believe that it is far more realistic than many of his critics would like to think. It is realistic for two reasons. First, as every educator knows only too well, the pool of traditional college students is shrinking while the pool of adult part-time learners is rising. 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 traditional quality in the vertical focus and can keep costs significantly below those of four-year institutions, they will probably ultimately lose the fight for the traditional market.

Second, the horizontal focus is realistic because community colleges are far ahead of traditional four-year colleges in capitalizing on the rich and only partially tapped part-time adult 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 this particular form of horizontal extension. They are currently preparing legislative proposals that will "encourage cooperation between the private sector and community colleges to address national human development concerns including re-training, upgrading, basic skill development, and improved worker productivity" (Wilson and Davis, 1982).

There is plenty of evidence 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. Half of all community college students studying for credit are over the age of 21; 37 percent are 25 or older (AACJC, October 2, 1981). Most of them 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. It is estimated that fewer than 5 percent of students enrolled in all types of community college programs complete two years at a community college and then transfer to a four-year institution (Cohen and Brawer,

1981, p. 349). Thus in terms of current student usage, the transfer function serves a miniscule number of students. Almost two-thirds of all community college students are studying part-time, and the typical load is one course per semester. Enrollment in non-credit courses has increased 500 percent over the last decade, and is still the fastest growing program in higher education, increasing at the rate of about 16 percent per year.

A fascinating series of longitudinal studies being conducted in California community colleges (Hunter and Sheldon, 1982) reveals that 40 percent of the students enrolled in California community colleges in the fall of 1978 had passed only one or no courses by the spring of 1980. The data further established that "a very small percentage of students enroll in or identify with programs (p. 2-14), meaning that the courses they take seem unrelated either to their declared major or to the major claimed in research interviews. When large numbers of students take one course per semester -- and that usually unrelated to a college-defined program -- drop courses as soon as they have learned what they need, and drop in and out of college on unpredictable schedules, they are certainly flunking any test related to the vertical focus where the standards must be some sort of predictable progress through courses, programs, and credits. Do we count the students who produce such behavior ne'er-do-wells and the colleges that countenance it failures?

The answer is a resounding "yes," when measured by traditional vertical standards, but we need to look further for measures of success by horizontal standards.

The California data show that 65 percent of the vocational students judged their courses related to their current jobs, and 73 percent found the courses helpful on the job, despite the fact that only about one-third felt the courses were helpful in getting pay raises. Students enrolled in special interest courses, such as hobbies, general education or culture courses, had similar reactions. More than 80 percent felt the courses met their needs, and more than 70 percent planned to return for additional courses. These statistics from pieces of the horizontal focus can be given greater coherence when viewed from the perspective of a college in the process of implementing the horizontal focus.

Rio Salado Community College is the fastest growing college in the seven-college Maricopa District in Arizona. Its 1981 self-study report claims that the college sees itself "cooperating with other kinds of educational programs to make an education as attainable as possible" (p. 30). It further states that "Rio Salado derives its energy from the forward thrust of its community. The community is the institution's *raison d'etre*; it is the institution's survival. Outreach programs and continuing education are often appendages to traditional daytime-

oriented college; they are Rio's primary reason for being" (p. 7). Ninety-two percent of Rio's students are enrolled in six credit hours or less per semester, and the self-study report observes that "our student is not generally a transfer student but is interested in obtaining a specific piece of knowledge to be used in a specific way" (p. 9). Rio has established linkages with Williams Air Force Base, with the council for unionized trades, with the Arizona Department of Economic Security, with the Phoenix Public Library, with the seniors in Sun City, with local radio and television stations, and a major activity is represented in their custom-designed programs to meet the training needs of local business and industry. Rio Salado's focus is clear. Measurement of their accomplishments or those of their students against a vertical focus is as inappropriate as a measurement of Miami-Dade's computerized system for advising students on graduation and transfer requirements would be against the horizontal focus.

So far, I have outlined and illustrated the essential elements and philosophy of three foci for community colleges in the 1980s -- the vertical, the horizontal, and the comprehensive. The remaining two foci are the integrated focus and the remedial focus. I use the term integrated focus 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 community 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 experiences 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 or progression that has some rationale, order, and deliberate arrangement" and "intended learnings" have outcomes that are defined in advance (1981, p.35). He takes a dim view of the community college that "purports to serve up anything that anyone in the community wants" (p. 36).

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 it would be required "lest the gulf between social classes in America be accentuated as members of the elite groups learn to control their environment, while the lower classes are given

career education and training in basic skills" (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, p. 327).

Finally, a proposed focus for community colleges 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 obvious 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 far more likely to have had sand kicked in their collective faces for enrolling disproportionate numbers of minorities, for "watering down" college courses so that students with poor

academic skills could pass them, for poor retention of students who may have had little intention or motivation for completing courses and semesters, for failure to provide upper division transfers for 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 taking on a problem too hot and too difficult for more prestigious institutions to handle, 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 having served 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 four-year institutions will move increasingly into the remedial function in order to gain enough full-time students to protect their enrollments from serious declines in the 1980s. If anything, it seems likely that the community colleges that have borne most of the remedial functions will now

be joined in these efforts by the high schools under vigorous public pressure and by the four-year colleges under severe demographic pressures.

In what kinds of institutions will great teachers be teaching in the 1990s? Almost all analysts are questioning the continuation of the comprehensive mission. Brenneman and Nelson (1981) think the decision regarding focus will be settled on the basis of financial support, and they don't see enough financial support forthcoming to support the comprehensive mission. 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 Education 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 Commission, 1981, Preface).

The priorities of some colleges and some leaders is becoming clear. Every current focus has its roots in an earlier era and is represented among the five programs in the comprehensive model. Until now, however, missions of the community colleges

have ebbed and flowed together with most colleges in the 1930s emphasizing their juniorcollege role of preparation of transfer students and most colleges in the 1970s emphasizing vocational and community education. But the difference now is that colleges are beginning to break out of a united identifiable community college movement; they are making individual college choices that may weaken the community college movement, but will probably strengthen individual colleges.

The choices are perhaps easiest for the multi-campus district that can presumably maintain comprehensive services throughout the district by recognizing different functions for different colleges. One reason for Rio Salado's success may be that its horizontal focus is supplemented by other colleges in the Maricopa district. But if the comprehensive focus is to be distributed among colleges, it will take a firm yet fair hand on the central tiller. Faculties dedicated to one focus are bound to be less well-informed and less sympathetic to the work of their colleagues dedicated to another focus. Unfortunately, those endorsing the vertical focus are usually the critics whereas those concerned with other foci find themselves on the defensive, required to demonstrate how their departure from the traditional represents quality and even sometimes why it should be countenanced at all by a community college.

If the analysts are right that community colleges are going to have to make some choices in the years ahead, then the problems of small colleges are going to be the most urgent -- to make hard choices before resources are depleted -- and the problems of the middle-sized colleges most difficult -- because they may delay too long in setting priorities.

The one thing that all community colleges are well-advised to attend to in the next five years is the building of linkages with other providers of educational services. Higher education is only one small part of the Learning Society, and no provider will long endure without working in concert with others from high schools, four-year institutions, business and industry, labor unions, community organizations, educators from the media, licensing agencies, the military, and a host of other providers of lifelong education. Faculty members who aspire to great teaching must understand the real world beyond the classroom and must have a personal and professional commitment to their particular piece of the action in the Learning Society.

Teachers will teach better if they know what they are doing, and that means they will need to know how their expertise is supported and complemented by the expertise of colleagues carrying out other equally important roles in the Learning Society.

REFERENCES

- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
Individual and Community Development. Washington, D.C.:
AACJC, 1980-81.
- Anandam, Kamala. Promises to Keep. . .: Academic Alert and
Advisement. Paper. Miami-Dade Community College, May, 1981.
- Bok, Derek. The President's Report. 1980-81. Harvard Uni-
versity, 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 Edu-
cation Commission, May, 1981.
- 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.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. Values, Vision, and Vitality. Washington
D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges,
1980.
- Harper, H., Herrig, J., Kelly, J.T., and Schinoff, B.R.
Advisement and Graduation Information System. Paper. Miami-
Dade Community College, March, 1981.
- 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.
- Kelly, Terence J. Restructuring the Academic Program: A Systems
Approach to Educational Reform at Miami-Dade Community College.
Paper. Miami-Dade, March 2, 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.

Losak, John, Schwartz, Margery I., and Morris, Cathy. High School Preparation as Viewed by Academically Underprepared Students. Miami, Florida: Office of Institutional Research, Miami-Dade Community College, February, 1982.

McCabe, Robert H. Why Miami-Dade Community College is Reforming the Educational Program. Paper. Miami-Dade Community College, March, 1981.

Rio Salado Community College. Self-Study Report. Phoenix, Arizona: Maricopa County Community College District, March, 1981.

Robertson, P. F., Thomas, S. C. Emphasis on Excellence. Paper. Miami-Dade Community College, May, 1981.

Slutsky, Bette. "What is a College For?" In Marty, Myron A., Responding to New Missions: New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978, pp.9-13.