

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Gayle Willis Melendy for the Doctor of Education degree in education  
presented on May 2, 1972.

Title: A Study Evaluating the Business Curricular Practices in the Public  
Community Colleges of California

Redacted for privacy

Abstract approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Fred E. Winger

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the business curricula in the community colleges of California through the use of a set of criteria developed specifically for this function.

The criterion checklist was submitted to a nationwide group of respected business educators whose opinions set the standard against which the procedures and opinions of the chairmen of the community college business divisions were compared. The criteria represented an attempt at stating an ideal toward which business educators might strive.

The submission of the criteria to the panel of educators served also as a trial run of the survey instrument. In addition, the criteria were tested by a group of businessmen and a group of community college business students. Modification and revision was based on the responses of those participating in the sampling.

The revised instrument was submitted to all community colleges in California. The rate of return was 62 responses out of 91 possible for a 68.1 percent usable return.

The study was limited to the evaluation of only objectives, courses, and curricula. The choices of response were also limited to avoid presenting a continuum which would necessitate an interpretation of gradation or matter of degree. The degree of compliance was considered unimportant for the purposes of this study.

It was anticipated that most respondents in both groups would agree with a majority of the criteria. Because this did occur, the most important consequence of the survey was the determination of the number of individuals who actually adhered to the practices which they had indicated they felt to be desirable.

It must be remembered that the set of criteria was not intended to apply in its entirety to all situations. Size, location, and social setting are but some of the variables which make the universal application of the criterion set impossible. The standards set for a community college must reflect the demands of those it seeks to serve.

In most instances, it is quite likely that the criteria which were judged as being undesirable were criteria which did not fit into the programs offered by that particular community college for good reason. The reasons behind many of the responses to the criteria are needed in order to better comprehend the total evaluative process.

Because all criteria in the set do not apply to all programs, only those criteria which do apply should be considered for the purposes of conducting a self-evaluation. However, before any criteria are eliminated as not being applicable, the faculty of the community college business division must be absolutely certain of their inapplicability.

Are the statements truly inapplicable or are they being rated as such merely to avoid facing circumstances as they really exist?

Each community college business faculty should use this criterion set only as a model for the development of its own evaluative instrument.

"Canned criteria" with no room for individuality are not the answer.

Evaluation should be conducted by following only those criteria with specific applicability to each community college's individual circumstances. Do these standards allow for meeting the needs of today's world?

A Study Evaluating  
the Business Curricular Practices in  
the Public Community Colleges of California

by

Gayle Willis Melendy

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1972

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

\_\_\_\_\_  
Coordinator, Business & Distributive Education  
and Professor in Charge of Major

Redacted for privacy

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of Education

Redacted for privacy

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented May 2, 1972

Typed by Joan Harper for Gayle Willis Melendy

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of his committee and especially the guidance of his chairman, Dr. Fred E. Winger, Coordinator, Business & Distributive Education. An expression of gratitude is also in order for the aid and encouragement given by his colleagues in the Department of Business Education/Office Administration at Humboldt State College.

A note of appreciation is extended to Dr. Theodore Yerian, Professor Emeritus, Oregon State University, for his counsel in the early stages of the dissertation. Special thanks goes to Dr. S. J. Wanous, Professor of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, whose efforts were the impetus for this study.

Certainly this effort could not have been completed without the love, patience, and understanding of his wife and daughter during the sometimes seemingly endless hours spent developing and writing the study. Their sacrifices are acknowledged with his affection.

-- G. W. M.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction . . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	2
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	3
Purposes of the Study . . . . .	5
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	6
II. Review of Related Literature . . . . .	9
III. Procedures, Techniques, and Instruments . . . . .	13
IV. Presentation and Interpretation of Findings . . . . .	20
Vocational Business Programs . . . . .	44
Courses and Curricula Criteria . . . . .	53
V. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations . . . . .	78
Summary . . . . .	78
Conclusions . . . . .	80
Recommendations . . . . .	82
Bibliography . . . . .	88
Appendix A . . . . .	90
Appendix B . . . . .	96
Appendix C . . . . .	98
Appendix D . . . . .	101
Appendix E . . . . .	102
Appendix F . . . . .	110
Appendix G . . . . .	111
Appendix H . . . . .	113
Appendix I . . . . .	114

# A STUDY EVALUATING THE BUSINESS CURRICULAR PRACTICES IN THE PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF CALIFORNIA

## I. INTRODUCTION

Business curricular offerings at the community colleges are as numerous and complex as the number of individual community colleges themselves. This situation is, no doubt, as it should be, for a major premise of the very existence of the community college is that it seeks to serve the local community in which it is organized and from which it receives its support. Communities differ; community needs differ; community colleges differ. Because the needs of the urban community college are not the needs of the suburban or rural community college, its curricular offerings will be organized specifically to meet the interests of the community it serves.

How does the business division of the community college know that its curricular offerings are meeting the needs, wants, and interests of its students? This fact must be determined through a program of evaluation. Evaluation of the total program in light of the goals and objectives which have been determined as guidelines to meet the needs, wants, and interests will involve not only the curricula presently available but a determination of whether additional offerings are desirable.

How does one proceed with a program of assessment? What will the evaluation program involve? The method and procedure of such appraisal is as important as the final outcome of the evaluative effort itself. Evaluation, then, attempts "to assess the worth, the value, or the success of some phenomenon. In other words, a value judgment,



an appraisal, is the core of the responsibility of the respondent to an evaluative survey instrument." (3, p. 26) The evaluative effort for this study involved the use of such an evaluative survey instrument.

Evaluation intimates that one is forming a qualitative judgment about a person, place, thing, or event. Such evaluation requires placing a value of some sort on the object of the evaluation. Because the formulation of the judgments or opinions is so subjective, guidelines are drawn within whose perimeters judgments are made. The framework of these perimeters lends a degree of objectivity to the appraisal; however, the guidelines themselves may have little reliability or validity.

#### Need for the Study

In light of such pessimism, there are those, then, who would argue that there is little reason to even attempt to evaluate or to determine the quality of, in this case, a set of curricular offerings. These individuals are content to remain in a state of stagnation. Those, however, who see a need for improvement and change, who realize that the status quo may not be the "best" that can be achieved or obtained, will argue that one must do what he can while realizing that he is operating within the limiting perimeters of these inadequacies and shortcomings. He realizes that evaluating curricula with the idea of possibly initiating change for "something" better requires a more positive attitude, an optimistic outlook, and as much objectivity as is possible to muster.

Having accepted the premise that the current situation should be examined in order to determine whether change is wise or feasible, the

business educator has taken the initial step--the biggest and most important in the chain of events that comprise any program of appraisal.

Having determined that curricular evaluation is not only desirable but even essential, the business educator embarks on a program which will be a continual self-examination, realizing that modification will not always result. Change for the sake of change is little better than no action of any kind.

The Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education says:

The total curriculum is continuously evaluated. With the pace of contemporary life comes the imperative to be fully sensitive to the continuing appropriateness of what is provided. A sense of the timelessness of certain attitudes will not cloud vision in the areas where rather complete, sweeping reform is needed from one era to another.

The department chairman and his staff must plan for regular assessment of what is being offered. First, they will determine the kinds of evidence that will help them make a wise assessment. . . . Second, the department will review the evidence with wisdom and assess its implications and relevance for the program. . . . Third, the department will make plans for modifications and changes that will make the program more meaningful for students (11, p. 3).

#### Statement of the Problem

Evaluation of the curricula of any institution of learning must be a continuous, on-going effort. In the process, questions arise. How shall the evaluation be done? Exactly what should be evaluated? Who shall do the evaluating?

Should businessmen be involved in curricular evaluation? Some would say emphatically, "Yes!" The curriculum thus is evaluated in

terms of the "product" it produces--how the graduates function as seen through the eyes of the businessman. It has been found, however, that many businessmen do not actually know what they do want from their employees; and, therefore, they are unable to evaluate curricula. What the businessman wants may not be what he needs.

In addition, as is a well-known fact, those businessmen who do set certain standards or limits do so merely because they feel that "such-and-such a level of competence" "sounds" as though it is "what should be." Furthermore, rarely do they adhere to their own "standards." It is difficult to determine just what practices are desirable.

Should students evaluate their own curricula? Most students, like the businessman, are not qualified to be able to say, in most instances, just what "should and should not be." In the sampling done for this study, students were consulted. Many indicated just that--that they did not feel qualified to answer.

Another problem with student evaluations is that too many students will center their opinions on a pet-peeve or a favorite subject. This, too, was evident in the survey. Many students were not familiar with subjects outside their own areas of concentration. Some students would mark certain items only with clarification or comment, which often changed the intent of the statement completely.

Are parents qualified to evaluate curricula? Is the public in general? It is doubtful that either group is so prepared. The most logical evaluators would likely be those directly involved in the educational process--the instructors themselves.

Who is better qualified to determine what curricular modification should be considered? Changes are not made hastily. Those individuals in the teaching profession give much thought to any suggestions calling for curricular change. Due consideration is given all proposed modifications.

As Wyllie says, the purpose of self-evaluation "is to enable staff members to assess their programs in light of optimum conditions and practices with the view toward striving to achieve or approximate the optimum program of business education in their community." (21, p. 1)

Because evaluation involves the exercising of value judgments, a device that is as free from bias as possible is needed to help make these judgments. The criterion list developed for this doctoral study is an attempt in this direction. The fact that value judgments are less than perfect does not preclude the need for assessment, nor should it. Appraisal of necessity precedes effective curricular change and improvement.

#### Purposes of the Study

The purposes, then, of this study were (1) to develop a tool with which to evaluate the business programs as organized and administered at the community college level; and, (2) to evaluate the business programs in the community colleges of California through the use of this criterion set. This evaluative instrument would apply, in general, to all community colleges no matter where they are located, keeping in mind the fact that all criteria would not be applicable in each situation.

This evaluation enabled the business faculty to appraise its programs and to compare its opinions with those of the panel of respected business educators who previously completed copies of the survey during the trial run and, in effect, "set the standard."

The evaluative criterion checklist presents, hopefully, what may be described as "the ideal or optimum practices and conditions necessary for a department to effect an ideal program." (21, p. 1)

### Limitations of the Study

Because the writer sought to deal exclusively with the evaluation of community college business programs, a survey instrument was designed with only the community college level of the educational spectrum in mind. The criterion checklist developed for this study was constructed specifically to focus on limited aspects of the business program; thus, the criterion set was devised to evaluate only objectives, courses, and curricula. No attempt was made to evaluate such areas as physical plant, organization, staff, and the like. Because of this limited purpose, the instrument provides an in-depth study of standards and practices pertaining to goals, courses, and curricula.

On the other hand, because the specificity of the instrument increased the number of items included, its length may have tended to be a drawback in some instances because certain items were not completed on all survey forms. (In the instrument sent to the panel of educators, a column was provided for the individual to check an item felt to be an undesirable standard.) Therefore, not all tallies equal the same total.

The primary difficulty in attempting to analyze the returns from the educators was the necessity for making value judgments as to just what each expert intended his "markings" to indicate. The problem may have been due in part to the ambiguity of some of the instructions (later revised, with this thought in mind) as well as to the apparent ineptness, of some of the individuals involved, in following even the directions felt to be very forthright and direct by individuals consulted by the writer prior to submission of the instrument to the panel. Certain assumptions had to be made in tabulating individual items in some instances. These assumptions were made within the scope and realm of the purposes of the study.

Some of the respondents indicated a need for more choices of response. As Wanous discovered through his survey,

A common element appearing in their letters related to the declarative form of standards statements. These statements indicated that a particular practice should or should not be adopted. In many cases the leaders would have preferred statements suggesting that teachers 'consider adopting' this or that standard, depending, no doubt, on a consideration of many factors--such as size of school, character of community in which the school is located, availability of equipment, employment opportunities, and the like (18, p. 52).

Respondents to this survey expressed similar views.

A typical remark in this regard is the following: "I find it a bit 'unrealistic' to describe it all as 'black or white' when there are grey areas!" However, because evaluators tend to mark an "average or middle point" when faced with multiple, matter-of-fact responses, the form, by design, sought to eliminate the degree of compliance with a standard. To be sure, there are matters of gradation; but it was felt that

such "degrees" would serve no useful purpose and would only unduly complicate the compilation of the information being sought.

The subjectivity of value judgments should be acknowledged.

"The formulation of criteria, the opinions of the experts, is subjective in nature. However, an evaluator must bear in mind that frequently expert opinion is the best available." (20, p. 21)

## II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Several evaluative criterion checklists in the area of education for business have been developed for use in evaluating the entire business program or specific aspects of it. Most such instruments have been developed for use in the high school. Statements found on such criterion lists will apply, to a large degree, to either the secondary or post-secondary level.

One of the better-known publications of evaluative criteria is the volume, covering all subject areas to be found in the secondary school, developed by the National Study of Secondary School Education (6, pp. 77-84). The business education checklist is organized into various topic areas. It is all-inclusive and includes the aspects dealt with in this study among the following headings: (1) organization; (2) nature of offerings; (3) physical facilities; (4) direction of learning, including the instructional staff, instructional activities, instructional materials, and methods of evaluation; (5) outcomes; (6) special characteristics of business education; and (7) general evaluation of instruction in business education.

This instrument contains a list of standards for each of the above headings, and the evaluator is asked to indicate whether or not the school in question meets these standards. The instrument is devised in such a way that an evaluator is able to indicate the degree of compliance with a standard.

Armbrister (1, p. 385) used these areas to evaluate the college business department: teacher personnel; equipment; objectives of the



department; methods of instruction, testing, and grading; courses being offered; and course content. This instrument was of a less formal nature than that of the National Study of Secondary School Education.

The format developed in the instrument devised by Wanous (18, pp. 6-10) has been especially helpful in this study. The criterion list included herein is based on an adaptation of the Wanous format and deals only with objectives, courses, and curricula. Wanous, too, "set the standard" through the opinions of experts in the field.

Another valuable criterion set is the evaluative checklist developed by Wyllie (21, pp. 9-13). His statement of purpose corresponds to that employed in the development of this survey instrument. Wyllie suggests evaluation under these headings: (1) curriculum; (2) instructional content; (3) instructional activities, methods, and procedures; (4) instructional materials; (5) guidance; (6) extra-class activities; (7) home, business, and community relations; (8) physical facilities and equipment; and (9) staff. The standards are arranged under the classifications indicated; the rating scale used allows the evaluator to indicate how well or how poorly a given standard is being met.

The instrument prepared by Tau Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon, is another good reference source (14, 26 pp.). Evaluative Criteria for Business Departments of Secondary Schools is organized as follows:

(1) articulation with other departments within the school; (2) club activities; (3) community resources; (4) curriculum; (5) equipment and its utilization; (6) guidance practices; (7) instructional material--visual and auditory; (8) library materials and facilities; (9) placement and follow-up;

(10) qualifications and professional growth of teachers; (11) supervisory practices; (12) teaching methods; and (13) work experience.

Several criteria are listed under each of these headings. Following each criterion, additional information is provided to assist in the determination of whether the standard is being met and to what degree.

The Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction (12, pp. 19-22+) has developed a checklist of criteria for evaluating the business departments in the high schools. This instrument is quite detailed, listing over 150 standards statements grouped under ten headings:

(1) physical plant and equipment; (2) organization and staff; (3) book-keeping; (4) business mathematics; (5) general business; (6) office practice; (7) shorthand; (8) typewriting; (9) special counseling service; and (10) community and school relations. The form provides for indicating only whether or not the standard is being met.

Several studies, articles, and the like were consulted which dealt with current practices and issues in education for business. Many of the criterion statements incorporated into this study were formulated as a result of ideas gleaned from these sources. These sources included dissertations by Lawrence W. Erickson (2, 461 pp.) and Richard S. Perry (9, 596 pp.).

And finally, Evaluative Criteria for Survey Instruments in Business Education by Erickson and Oliverio (3, 89 pp.) proved an invaluable aid in the preparation of the complete study. This study analyzes the actual tasks involved as one undertakes survey research.

Numerous other studies, articles, books, pamphlets and community college catalogs were examined and consulted for ideas in the preparation and formulation of this criterion set. The total number of sources consulted during the development of this criterion list is far too numerous to mention here. The more valuable of these references will be found in the bibliography.

### III. PROCEDURES, TECHNIQUES, AND INSTRUMENTS

As earlier stated, the objective here was an attempt to evaluate the business curricula of the California community colleges through the use of a checklist of evaluative criteria developed for use in this study.

The list of criteria had its beginning as an adaptation of the general format of a survey instrument developed by S. J. Wanous for his study conducted at the high school level in 1967. His study sought to evaluate curricular practices through the use of a set of criteria as did this study.

Wanous indicated that evaluation is conducted in order to make curricular improvements. Usually a checklist of some sort is used in the process. He felt that the lists available had an inherent weakness--the items contained therein did not pertain to all school settings yet these forms were designed to be used in the same manner in all situations. Therefore, he recommended that those using his form consider only the statements which applied to their school settings. In effect, each school used a slightly different set of standards.

The ideas gleaned from the many sources which were read, examined, and consulted evolved into the criterion statements found in the instrument later utilized to conduct the survey. The survey instrument was revised numerous times following extensive re-evaluation as a result of much additional reading, reviewing of reference sources, and consulting with colleagues and fellow business educators.

When it was felt that a reasonably acceptable list of criteria had been compiled through repeated revision, the criterion set was submitted

to a random sample of 55 business students in the community college serving the area wherein the writer resides. The students were chosen at random from classes taught by several different business instructors at the community college. Forty of the 55 students completed the instrument for a 72.7 percent return (see Appendix A). The value of the student sample was questionable inasmuch as several of these students indicated that they did not feel qualified to engage in curricular evaluation.

No follow-up was used. The students involved in the sampling were not personally contacted; the community college instructors who cooperated in this phase of the study attempted to increase the rate of return by urging their students to complete and return the form.

The same criterion set was submitted to a group of 55 businessmen, members of the Redwood Empire Purchasing Association (see Appendix B). This group, representing several divergent types of businesses in the writer's geographical vicinity, was selected upon recommendation as being a group of individuals vitally concerned with and interested in the concept of community college education. The rate of return, however, proved to be much lower than that of the students--only 17 or 30.9 percent.

Based on statements made by some of the businessmen returning the form, it was assumed that many businessmen did not return the survey because they did not feel qualified to evaluate curricula. In view of these comments, no follow-up reminders were sent to this group of individuals.

Several student respondents as well indicated that they had no background to properly assess curricula. One reason for these comments, both on the part of the businessmen and the students, might be that no attempt was made to design a form specifically "for" them. The form they received was the same as the one ultimately sent to the educators who formed the panel of experts (see Appendix C).

After the form had been sent to the students and businessmen and a reasonable period of time had elapsed with no additional forms being received, the survey instrument was sent to the business educators who formed the panel of experts. The purposes of the panel were twofold: First, the writer sought to modify the criterion set through their opinions; and second, their opinions "set the standard."

The panel of experts was chosen following quite closely those criteria indicated by Wunsch (20, p. 20).

The authorities can be selected according to the following guidelines: (a) academic contributions, (b) pertinent experience, (c) current professional reputation, and (d) nomination by persons in the field.

The standard was set through the opinions of this selected group of respected business educators located throughout the country and representing all levels of education for business. Seventy forms were sent to business educators and curricular specialists in high schools, large city school districts, community colleges, four-year colleges and universities, and state departments of education.

A follow-up reminder in the form of a postal card was sent after a lapse of two weeks from the time the original instrument was mailed (see Appendix D). No further attempts were made to encourage the return

of the survey instrument in the trial run.

The rate of return from the panel of educators was 52 or 74.3 percent. Three of the forms, however, were unusable; thus, all computations involving returns from the panel of experts were based on 49 usable returns or 70.0 percent of the survey population.

The survey instrument was revised based on the criticisms of the panel, and additions and deletions were made as a result of their suggestions. Pertinent responses gathered from the sampling of businessmen and community college business students were also included and/or taken into consideration.

Following the completion of the sampling, the criterion statements were reviewed and revisions were made. Then the survey instruments were mailed to the heads of the business divisions in the 92 California community colleges. (The percentage of return was based on 91 community colleges rather than 92. The reason for this is that San Diego Evening College indicated that it is actually part of San Diego City College and should not be considered an individual community college.)

The first mailing was sent out on May 7 (see Appendix E). Ten days later a postal card reminder was sent to the participating colleges that had not responded (see Appendix F).

Approximately two weeks later another copy of the survey, accompanied by a letter, was sent to the colleges which to date had not returned the survey instrument (see Appendix G). The final reminder was mailed on June 8 (see Appendix H), with the last returns having been

received shortly after the middle of June. Then the tabulation of the actual survey was begun.

All computations involving community college business division chairmen are based on a population of 91 community colleges. There were 62 usable returns or 68.1 percent.

In many instances totals will not equal 100 percent because for such items all respondents did not check or answer the item in question. For this reason, no totals have been shown in the tables used.

The data have been tabulated and are presented in tables comparing the responses of the panel members with those of the heads of the business divisions in the community colleges.

The NOT APPLICABLE responses were not tallied. The reason for this apparent disregard for the NA (NOT APPLICABLE) responses is easily explained.

If a business division chairman indicated by his response that some criterion was NA, he was responding to the criterion in question as it related only to his particular situation in the community college spectrum. The criterion, then, did not apply, in his opinion, to his individual setting or situation. Another chairman might very well indicate, as they in fact often did, that a totally unrelated criterion did not apply to his community college. The chairmen were instructed to view all criteria in this light; i.e., how did each criterion relate to only his community college.

Conversely, the experts were instructed to view these criteria in relationship to all community colleges. They were asked to indicate how,



in their own minds, each individual criterion applied to community colleges as a whole--as a total segment of the educational spectrum. Hopefully, their responses reflect the total picture and no single community college with which they may have been familiar.

Because the NOT APPLICABLE response was viewed from two different viewpoints, no valid comparison can be made of the responses. Therefore, it was felt that the inclusion of this data would be valueless in terms of the objectives of the study.

Where differences exist between the instrument used in the sampling and the revised instrument used in surveying the community colleges, they are indicated.

The intent of this study was to provide a rating instrument with which the business divisions of the individual community colleges might do a self-evaluation in order to determine areas needing consideration and possible improvement. Hopefully, the form as designed will be used in this manner.

In reviewing the findings of this survey, it should be remembered that each evaluator was instructed to consider those criteria appropriate to his individual program. Thus, the instructors in one community college may have been using, in effect, one set of standards; those in another community college may have been using a modified set. It would be impossible, as was pointed out by several of the panel of experts, to come up with a list of "what is" and "what should be" that would apply to all community colleges. One of the experts pointed this out when he said, ". . . the community college is not and should not be 'limited' in

its services to the individual student and the community; and that means, as I see it, that ALMOST ANYTHING may be justifiable if it fulfills a real educational need and demand in its 'community.'"

#### IV. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

A major purpose of this study was to compare the responses of 62 business division chairmen with those of the panel of 49 respected business educators. To that end, the responses of the two groups are shown in the pages which follow. The criteria which each group felt to be desirable and which they felt to be undesirable are indicated. In addition, the degree of adherence to those criteria the division chairmen have indicated as being desirable is shown.

At this point, it should be noted that the figures used in this survey to indicate responses from the division chairmen involved some simple calculating. The DESIRABLE responses recorded for the chairmen in Tables 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 18, and 20 were arrived at by adding the replies of the respondents checking only the "D" column with those who had checked both the "D" or DESIRABLE column and the "A" or ADHERES TO column. The reason for this is that 34 of the respondents who marked items in the "A" column, did not mark the "D" column for the same item. Because these 34 respondents were consistent throughout the forms they completed, one can assume that they felt the item to be DESIRABLE whenever they checked only the ADHERES TO column. However, two forms were mixed; that is, sometimes ADHERES TO was marked along with DESIRABLE. At other times, only the ADHERES TO column was marked and not the DESIRABLE column. Therefore, one may reasonably assume that these people apparently are following some practices which they do not feel are desirable!

In indicating the degree of adherence to desirable criteria by the division chairmen (Tables 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 15, 17, 19, and 21), the responses of the chairmen who checked only the "A" column without checking the "D" column were added to the responses of those chairmen checking the "D" column along with the "A" column. (It was expected that a respondent would check the "A" column only if he had FIRST checked the "D" response for that same item, and 27 respondents did so; 34 respondents did not follow this procedure but marked one column or the other and did not check both columns for the same items.) The findings should be viewed with these thoughts in mind.

#### Criterion No. 1

Both the panel of experts and the division chairmen felt, by a large majority, that specific behavioral objectives should be developed for all courses (see Table 1). Eighty-eight percent of the experts felt that this criterion was desirable as did 90 percent of the division chairmen. Only 8 percent of each group indicated an undesirable response to this item.

Of the chairmen responding to No. 1, 44 percent (see Table 2) who rated the item desirable did not adhere to it; 47 percent of those who felt the practice to be desirable had developed behavioral objectives for their business courses. Over half of the community college business divisions have not yet developed these behavioral objectives even though many more have said, in effect, that they should have done, or should be doing, so.

TABLE 1. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 1 - 5 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Develop behavioral objectives for all courses . . . . .	43	87.8	56	90.3	4	8.2	5	8.1
2. Develop general course goals . .	44	93.6	58	93.6	2	4.3	4	6.5
3. Make goals and objectives available to: students . . . . .	49	100.0	62	100.0	0	0	0	0
teachers . . . . .	49	100.0	62	100.0	0	0	0	0
counselors . . . . .	46	95.8	60	96.8	1	2.1	0	0
parents . . . . .	38	84.4	40	64.5	4	8.9	15	24.2
the general public . .	28	71.8	42	67.7	6	15.4	17	27.4
4. Include among its functions: preparation for upper-division training . . . . .	42	91.3	55	88.7	2	4.3	4	6.5
terminal vocational education .	49	100.0	62	100.0	0	0	0	0
general education . . . . .	44	93.6	59	95.2	2	4.3	2	3.2
community service programs . .	46	93.9	58	93.6	1	2.0	1	1.6
adult education & guidance . .	46	93.9	52	83.9	1	2.0	6	9.7
5. Offer general education courses dealing with: economic efficiency . . . . .	39	86.6	57	91.9	4	8.9	2	3.2
consumer education . . . . .	45	95.7	61	98.4	2	4.3	1	1.6
ethical business practices. .	36	80.0	55	88.7	5	11.1	4	6.5

TABLE 2. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 1 - 5)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. Develop behavioral objectives for all courses . . . . .	27	43.6	29	46.8
2. Develop general course goals . . . . .	20	32.3	38	61.3
3. Make goals and objectives available to: students . . . . .	28	45.2	34	54.8
teachers . . . . .	18	29.0	44	71.0
counselors . . . . .	25	40.3	35	56.5
parents . . . . .	27	43.6	13	21.0
the general public . . . . .	29	46.9	13	21.0
4. Include among its functions:				
preparation for upper-division training . . . . .	6	9.7	49	79.0
terminal vocational education . . . . .	8	12.9	54	87.1
general education . . . . .	11	17.7	48	77.4
community service programs . . . . .	13	21.0	45	72.6
adult education and guidance . . . . .	13	21.0	39	62.9
5. Offer general education courses dealing with:				
economic efficiency . . . . .	28	45.2	29	46.8
consumer education . . . . .	20	32.3	41	66.1
ethical business practices . . . . .	29	46.9	26	41.9

### Criterion No. 2

The feeling was similarly high on the part of the experts that general end-of-course goals should be developed for all courses. However, the division chairmen did not rank this criterion as highly as did the experts. The experts, 94 percent of them, indicated that this criterion was desirable, but only 65 percent of the division chairmen felt it to be desirable. The experts apparently felt that general goals were more desirable than specific measurable objectives; however, the division chairmen, as a group, felt just the opposite. Four percent of the chairmen and seven percent of the experts felt these two criteria to be undesirable (see Table 1).

Of the division chairmen responding to this item, 32 percent felt the item to be desirable but did not adhere to it; 61 percent, checking that the item was desirable, also adhered to the criterion (see Table 2).

General, broad course goals have been in evidence for a number of years. They have been written by teachers at all educational levels. It seems strange that only 61 percent of the respondents to this survey have developed them. Furthermore, one wonders what type of course guidelines are being followed by those few individuals who indicated that developing such goals is undesirable.

### Criterion No. 3

The goals and objectives should be available, agreed a large majority of each group, to students, other teachers, and counselors. Some respondents felt that this information should not be available to parents and the general public. In fact, 24 percent of the division

chairmen checked that it was undesirable to make this information available to parents. In addition, making this information available to the public was considered undesirable by 15 percent of the experts and 27 percent of the division chairmen.

Why this practice would be undesirable is unknown. Perhaps it was the feeling of those indicating the practice to be undesirable that only those individuals directly involved would understand why the stated goals and objectives would be important enough to be desirable.

Another 11 percent of the chairmen indicated that making this information available to parents was not applicable to their community college situations. Such reasoning is difficult to interpret. It would seem that such a procedure would either be desirable or undesirable, but how does one arrive at the conclusion that such a move would not apply?

Approximately 55 percent of the chairmen indicated that they do make the goals and objectives available to students, and another 71 percent make them available to teachers. About 57 percent of the community colleges make this information available to the counselors (see Table 2). It would seem that if the counselors are going to be effective, they should all have this type of information at hand and especially so if they are doing any type of career counseling.

Only 21 percent of the chairmen indicated that they made this information available to parents and the general public, yet the experts felt that this information should be available to these two groups by 84 and 72 percent, respectively.



Criterion No. 4

Community college statements of philosophy, or the reasons for the very existence of such institutions, may be found in their catalogs. Among the goals often stated are those included in this statement: The community college should include among its functions preparation for upper-division training. The experts and chairmen agreed; however, there was a very small percentage of both groups who indicated that such practice was undesirable (see Table 1).

The overwhelming majority of the experts felt that the community college business division must also offer terminal vocational programs, general education, community service programs, and adult education and guidance. Here, too, the chairmen agreed, for the most part. Nonetheless, about 10 percent of the chairmen did not feel that adult education and guidance was a function for which they should be responsible.

A small percentage of the experts felt that community service programs and adult education programs were not applicable to the community college. A small percentage of the chairmen also indicated these two functions to be inapplicable to their individual community colleges. Perhaps the size of these community colleges or their locations or the make-up of their constituency preclude the need for programs of this nature.

Most chairmen who indicated the desirability of these functions were in practice following through with them: 21 percent of those who felt that community service programs were desirable were not offering them, however; and 21 percent were not offering adult education and

guidance. In looking at these two areas, one must take into account the fact that these community colleges may be located in areas where the local high schools are conducting extensive adult education programs. If this is the case, these functions would be controlled by the adult divisions of the high schools (see Table 2).

#### Criterion No. 5

Many business educators today feel that they have an obligation to offer courses, which might be classed as general education, for non-business majors who would otherwise be unlikely to come into contact with the topics covered in such courses. Thus, this criterion was developed with such thought in mind.

Nine percent of the experts and only three percent of the chairmen indicated that it would be undesirable to offer a course dealing with economic efficiency, and even fewer felt that a course dealing with consumer education would be undesirable. A course dealing with ethical business practices met with just slightly less enthusiasm. One individual "wrote in" "investments" as another possibility; perhaps there are others. A few individuals also checked that these types of course offerings were not applicable to the community college or to their individual community colleges (see Table 1).

Even though a great majority of the chairmen (and the experts) agreed that such offerings are desirable, many were not making such general education courses available (see Table 2). About half of those who felt that a course dealing with economic efficiency and one dealing with ethical business practices were desirable were offering them, about

half were not. Consumer education fared somewhat better; 66 percent were offering such a course, and 33 percent of those who felt that such a course would be desirable were not.

#### Criterion No. 6

It would appear to be a reasonable assumption that it is desirable for the community college to provide the basic lower-division courses required by four-year colleges and universities, and most respondents agreed. Again, a very few (see Table 3) indicated that the practice was undesirable.

Eighty-nine percent of the community college business divisions were adhering to this practice. Of the approximately 10 percent who were not, even though they had indicated that such a practice was desirable, the question might be asked, "Why aren't you?". It would be interesting to learn their reasons for not providing these courses. One possibility might be that these very few community colleges may be so very small that their course offerings are not (cannot be) extensive enough to meet such requirements (see Table 4).

#### Criterion No. 7

This criterion dealt with the idea of having prospective business teachers complete their fundamental skill courses while lower-division students. Eleven percent of the experts and thirteen percent of the chairmen did not subscribe to this suggestion (see Table 3).

Five chairmen checked this criterion as being inapplicable to their community colleges. Perhaps these chairmen had no prospective

TABLE 3. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 6 - 10 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6. Provide the basic lower division courses required by the four-year transfer schools . . .	42	89.4	61	98.4	2	4.3	1	1.6
7. Recommend that business teacher majors complete fundamental skill courses as lower division students . . .	37	78.7	49	79.0	5	10.6	8	12.9
8. Provide non-credit courses and informal educational activities such as forums, workshops, and seminars . . .	44	89.8	52	83.9	3	6.1	5	8.1
9. Involve in curricular revision:								
students . . . . .	43	93.5	51	82.3	2	4.3	6	9.7
alumni . . . . .	45	97.8	42	67.7	1	2.2	10	16.4
business & community leaders .	49	100.0	62	100.0	0	0	0	0
10. Provide curricular information through public relations . . . .	45	91.8	58	93.6	3	6.1	3	4.8

TABLE 4. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 6 - 10)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
6. Provide the basic lower division courses required by the four-year transfer schools . . . . .	6	9.7	55	88.7
7. Recommend that business teacher majors complete fundamental skill courses as lower division students . . . . .	27	43.6	22	35.5
8. Provide non-credit courses and informal educational activities such as forums, workshops, and seminars . . . . .	28	45.2	24	38.7
9. Involve in curricular revision:				
students . . . . .	18	29.0	33	53.2
alumni . . . . .	25	41.0	17	27.9
business and community leaders . .	17	27.4	45	72.6
10. Provide curricular information through public relations . . . . .	33	53.3	25	40.3

business teachers going through their programs at the time the survey instrument was completed.

Of the business division chairmen who indicated the criterion to be desirable, only 36 percent adhered to the practice and 44 percent did not (see Table 4). The difficulty may be that they, the business divisions themselves, had to date made no attempt to identify these individuals. If such was the case, they would, of course, have to take steps to identify who the prospective business teachers were.

#### Criterion No. 8

One of the basic functions of the community colleges as indicated by almost all of them in their statements of purpose is the area of public or community service. If the community colleges actually subscribe to this statement of purpose, certainly all curricular areas should make an effort to comply with the implied intent. This statement was developed originally with this thinking behind it.

The business division should provide non-credit courses and informal educational activities such as forums, workshops, and seminars. Six percent of the experts did not agree with this statement nor did eight percent of the division chairmen. Ninety and eighty-four percent, respectively, did agree. Eight percent of the chairmen felt that the item was not applicable to their colleges (see Table 3).

It would be of interest to be able to determine why these practices were felt to be undesirable. Did these chairmen feel that community service in these areas was undesirable or did they disagree with community service being a function of the total community college effort?

Almost 39 percent of the community colleges were making these activities available. Forty-five percent of the chairmen favoring these non-credit courses and related types of activity were not adhering to the proposal (see Table 4).

#### Criterion No. 9

Just who should be involved in curricular revision? The experts, by a large majority, indicated that students, alumni, and business and community leaders should assist in this task. Division chairmen were less enthusiastic; 82 percent of them felt that students should assist in this activity, and 68 percent felt that alumni should be involved. There was 100 percent agreement on the involvement of business and community leaders (see Table 3).

Fifty-three percent of the community colleges did involve students in curricular revision; 29 percent of those who favored the idea, did not. Only 28 percent consulted alumni; 41 percent favoring the idea were not doing so. The rate of business-and-community-leader consultation was high--73 percent were doing so, and 27 percent who favored the procedure were not (see Table 4).

#### Criterion No. 10

The business division should keep the public informed through a program of public relations about its curricula. Over 90 percent of both groups queried agreed with this criterion (see Table 3).

Why don't more of the community colleges who felt that this was desirable "spread the word"? Forty percent were doing so, but 53 percent

favoring the idea were not (see Table 4). Perhaps lack of funds or someone to do the job were the reasons. It may have been that some community colleges did not publicize more because of heavy enrollments.

#### Criterion No. 11

Is it important to maintain articulation with other educational institutions? This statement concerning articulation evoked the following responses: with two-year colleges--experts, 98 percent; chairmen, 97 percent. Four-year colleges and universities--experts, 98 percent; chairmen, 100 percent. High schools--experts, 98 percent; chairmen, 100 percent (see Table 5).

Apparently, articulation is important and, at least to the respondents of this survey, educational level was of insignificant importance. Contact should be maintained at all three levels.

Is this articulation actually taking place? Yes, to a large degree, as is evident by the following:

	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>
two-year colleges	32%	65%
four-year colleges and universities	27%	73%
high schools	29%	71%

Virtually no one indicated that such articulation was undesirable (see Table 6).

#### Criterion No. 12

"Terminal curricula" indicated those courses of study which, upon completion, lead directly into a particular occupational area. This



TABLE 5. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 11 - 15 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
11. Maintain close articulation with: other two-year colleges . . . . .	48	98.0	60	96.8	0	0	2	3.2
four-year colleges and universities . . . . .	47	97.9	62	100.0	0	0	0	0
nearby high schools . . . . .	48	98.0	62	100.0	0	0	0	0
12. Provide for the long career in business--not just the first job--through the terminal business curricula . . . . .	37	74.0	61	98.4	4	8.7	0	0
13. Work closely with community advisory committees on terminal curricula . . . . .	49	100.0	61	98.4	0	0	0	0
14. Provide certificate programs of less than two years' duration in appropriate areas . . . . .	42	91.3	61	98.4	1	2.2	0	0
15. Set specific individual student objectives as well as minimum standards for all business students . . . . .	39	84.8	54	87.1	6	13.0	5	8.1

TABLE 6. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 11 - 15)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
11. Maintain close articulation with:				
other two-year colleges . . . . .	20	32.3	40	64.5
four-year colleges and				
universities . . . . .	17	27.4	45	72.6
nearby high schools . . . . .	18	29.0	44	71.0
12. Provide for the long career in business--not just the first job-- through the terminal business curricula . . . . .	29	46.9	32	51.6
13. Work closely with community advisory committees on terminal curricula . . . . .	13	21.0	48	77.4
14. Provide certificate programs of less than two years' duration in appropriate areas . . . . .	11	17.7	50	80.7
15. Set specific individual student objectives as well as minimum standards for all business students . . .	35	56.5	19	30.6

criterion indicated that these curricula should provide for more than just the first or entry job in business. The idea behind this statement is that one should be prepared for a longer-range career than just the first position one would have upon entry into the world of work.

The division chairmen, 98 percent of them, agreed, but only 74 percent of the experts felt this criterion to be good. Nine percent of the experts said this criterion was undesirable, and eleven percent felt it to be inapplicable to the community college (see Table 5). Perhaps one can assume that approximately 20 percent of the experts apparently feel that the community college business division should prepare for only the entry-level job. Their reasoning might be that from the entry job one could learn on an on-the-job basis.

Just about 52 percent of the division chairmen checking DESIRABLE actually adhered to the practice. Thirty-two percent were not providing for the career (see Table 6).

#### Criterion No. 13

The desirability of working with advisory committees, made up of members from the community-at-large, assisting in the guidance and direction of terminal curricula has long been recognized; there was virtually 100 percent agreement from both groups of respondents (see Table 5). Perhaps the argument sometimes heard, that in theory the idea is more workable than it has been found to be in practice, is not as prevalent as those opposing such an arrangement would have one believe.

On the other hand, perhaps the 21 percent who favored the idea but were not putting it into practice may have had some reservations

stemming from this argument. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were making use of these advisory committees in their business division (see Table 6).

#### Criterion No. 14

Should certificate programs requiring less than two years for completion be provided? Of the experts, 91 percent thought so; 98 percent of the division chairmen agreed. Only one individual, a member of the panel of experts, said that such a practice was undesirable (see Table 5).

The 81 percent of those chairmen who were providing these programs have apparently adopted such techniques that would facilitate "shorter" programs. This criterion leads one quite logically into the area of individualized instruction, for example. The experts are saying, apparently, that such types of instruction are good--and most do agree. However, those chairmen not providing these programs, 18 percent of those favoring the idea, were perhaps having difficulty putting the theory into practice and were not offering such certificate programs in their community colleges (see Table 6).

#### Criterion No. 15

This statement suggests that specific, individual objectives should be set for the student based on his ability as well as minimum standards for all business students. A large majority of both the experts, 85 percent, and the division chairmen, 87 percent, thought that the proposal of developing objectives based on the individual's ability was

desirable.

On the other hand, those who indicated that this was not desirable did so, in most cases, probably because most of them felt that this criterion suggests that some standardized measurement would have to be used; and, as some people pointed out, few such acceptable measurements exist.

Thirteen percent of the experts and eight percent of the division chairmen indicated that the item was undesirable. Five percent of the chairmen felt that the statement did not apply to their community college situations (see Table 5).

Even though 87 percent of the division chairmen responded that the item was desirable, only 31 percent adhered to the criterion. More than half, 57 percent, did not follow this practice. Again, they may have been unable to resolve the problem of finding an adequate measurement device (see Table 6).

#### Criterion No. 16

Should the advanced skill subjects be taken toward the end of the terminal business curriculum? Eighty percent of the experts thought so as did seventy-one percent of the chairmen. Nonetheless, there were more respondents who disagreed with the statement than with most other criteria. Sixteen percent of the experts indicated that the item was undesirable as did twenty-one percent of the division chairmen. An additional 8 percent of the chairmen felt that the item did not apply (see Table 7).

Fifty-three percent of the chairmen marking the item as desirable also followed the procedure, and eighteen percent of them did not (see Table 8). Perhaps those who felt this to be an unwise practice reasoned that the skill subjects should be taken in more of an immediate sequence, but again this is only speculation.

#### Criterion No. 17

This criterion dealt with the guidance of prospective business students into the business program. Who are the business majors? Who should they be? Should students be guided into business majors based upon aptitude tests and previous achievement?

A majority of those polled agreed that such practices may be followed; but it should be noted that although 65 percent of the chairmen indicated this criterion to be desirable, 24 percent felt that it was not. Slightly more than 72 percent of the experts said this was desirable with 11 percent indicating that it was not (see Table 7).

Of the chairmen favoring this procedure, only 26 percent were actually using such methods; 39 percent were not doing so even though this would be their preference (see Table 8). The opposition here stems, no doubt, from the fact that the validity of the few prognostic tests available is highly questionable. Once again, standardized measurement is suggested; and many people believe present measures to be unreliable.

TABLE 7. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 16 - 20 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
16. Advanced skill subjects should be taken toward the end of the terminal curriculum . . . . .	36	80.0	44	71.0	7	15.5	13	21.0
17. Guidance into the business program should be based on aptitude determined by tests and previous achievement . . .	34	72.3	40	64.5	5	10.6	15	24.2
18. Specific proficiency and accuracy standards should be developed in line with the demands of business . . . . .	48	98.0	61	98.4	0	0	0	0
19. Proficiency tests should be required for terminal students								
in: English . . . . .	35	79.5	48	77.4	3	6.8	8	12.9
math . . . . .	32	72.7	51	82.3	6	13.6	6	9.7
typewriting . . . . .	37	86.0	49	79.0	2	4.7	9	14.5
20. Remedial courses should be required for students weak								
in: math . . . . .	43	93.5	53	85.5	0	0	7	11.3
grammar . . . . .	43	93.5	56	90.3	1	2.2	3	4.8

TABLE 8. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 16 - 20)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
16. Advanced skill subjects should be taken toward the end of the terminal curriculum . . . . .	11	17.7	33	53.2
17. Guidance into the business program should be based on aptitude determined by tests and previous achievement . . . . .	24	38.7	16	25.8
18. Specific proficiency and accuracy standards should be developed in line with the demands of business . . .	15	24.2	46	74.2
19. Proficiency tests should be required for terminal students in:				
English . . . . .	25	40.3	23	37.1
math . . . . .	30	48.4	21	33.9
typewriting . . . . .	25	40.3	24	38.7
20. Remedial courses should be required for students weak in:				
math . . . . .	18	29.0	35	56.5
grammar . . . . .	18	29.0	38	61.3



Criterion No. 18

Ninety-eight percent of both groups felt that proficiency and accuracy standards for the skill courses should be developed based on the requirements of business. No individuals in either group indicated that this was an undesirable criterion (see Table 7).

Seventy-four percent of the chairmen adhered to the procedure. Twenty-four percent had not as yet developed such standards (see Table 8). One reason, perhaps, why they have not done so is that the standards which business demands, or perhaps one should say "desires," are often extremely difficult to ascertain.

Criterion No. 19

Requiring proficiency tests for terminal students in English, math, and typewriting brought the following responses (see Table 7):

<u>Chairmen</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Experts</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
English	77%	13%	English	80%	7%
Math	82%	10%	Math	73%	14%
Typewriting	79%	15%	Typewriting	86%	5%

The basic idea was popular among the respondents. The opposition expressed by some respondents to proposed proficiency examinations may be traced to the fact that again one is faced with the problem of determining what the level of performance is to be.

Of the chairmen rating the items desirable, 37 percent did require proficiency exams in English and 40 percent did not; 34 percent required them in math and 48 percent did not; 39 percent required them in typewriting and 40 percent did not (see Table 8).

Criterion No. 20

Remedial courses should be required of students found to be deficient in math and grammar. The experts agreed, 94 percent indicating DESIRABLE, that remedial courses in math should be mandatory. The chairmen agreed, with 86 percent favoring the idea and 11 percent not favoring it. Regarding grammar, the chairmen favored the idea, 90 percent for and 5 percent against. The experts approved the plan by 94 percent (see Table 7).

Fifty-seven percent of the community colleges required remedial work for students deficient in math, and sixty-one percent required remedial work in grammar. Twenty-nine percent in both areas had not yet required such a procedure even though they favored doing so (see Table 8).

The following suggestions were written in as possibilities for remedial courses which should be required: reading, spelling, writing, typing, economics, and shorthand. One respondent stated "all disciplines."

It is assumed that by "writing" the individual meant written communication. Perhaps remedial work should be considered in several of these areas. Of course, this suggestion is certain to stir up old controversies concerning just what the functions of the community college are. It is beyond the scope of this study to determine how far reaching these remedial programs should be.

## Vocational Business Programs

### Criterion No. 21

The following table shows the balance of vocational and general education believed to be proper for the vocational business student as reported by the survey respondents.

TABLE 9. BALANCE OF VOCATIONAL AND GENERAL EDUCATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL BUSINESS PROGRAMS

	<u>Experts</u>		<u>Chairmen</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
50% Vocational and 50% General	13	26.5	13	21.3
More than 50% Vocational	17	34.7	43	70.5
Less than 50% Vocational	4	8.2	5	8.2

There was no response to this item from 14 members of the panel of experts. All of the division chairmen responded, with but one exception. It appears that the majority favor more than 50 percent vocational education courses for the students enrolled in vocational business programs.

Many more of the division chairmen were in favor of the vocational programs being comprised of more than 50 percent vocational education than were the experts. The number of experts selecting "an equal balance" and "more than 50 percent" was quite close.

### Criterion No. 22

This statement was concerned with developing vocational business programs relevant to community needs such as those receiving federal

funds under Manpower Development, the Vocational Education Act, and the like. Almost 88 percent of the experts indicated the desirability of this criterion as did 95 percent of the division chairmen. Eight percent of the experts said the item was undesirable as did three percent of the chairmen. Nine of the experts did not respond at all to this criterion (see Table 10).

Only 16 percent of the chairmen who indicated the desirability of this criterion were not adhering to it; 70 percent were developing such programs (see Table 11).

#### Criterion No. 23

This statement and the next concern the requiring of work experience in the office occupations and the distributive occupations for all vocational business students and/or terminal business students. Fifty-three percent of the experts felt that all vocational business students should have work experience in office occupations; 24 percent felt that this practice would be undesirable.

For terminal students, however, 86 percent of the experts felt that such students should have this work experience and only eight percent did not. The division chairmen were less enthusiastic--only 40 percent would require such experience for all vocational business students, and 68 percent would require it for terminal students. Forty-two percent said that such a requirement would be undesirable for all vocational business students with 23 percent indicating that this requirement would not be desirable for the terminal students (see Table 10).

TABLE 10. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 22 - 28 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
22. Develop relevant programs such as those funded under VEA, MDTA, and other federal acts . . . . .	35	87.5	59	95.2	3	7.5	2	3.2
23. Require work experience in the office occupations for: all business students . . . . .	18	52.9	25	40.3	8	23.5	26	41.9
terminal students . . . . .	31	86.1	42	67.7	3	8.3	14	22.6
24. Require work experience in the distributive occupations for: all business students . . . . .	17	51.5	21	33.9	7	21.2	26	41.9
terminal students . . . . .	31	83.8	38	61.3	3	8.1	14	22.6
25. Offer structured sequences of required and essential courses for specialization in various occupational fields . .	41	89.1	52	83.9	3	6.5	6	9.7
28. Use performance tests to determine competency in each area of specialization . . . . .	26	65.0	51	82.3	12	30.0	10	16.1

TABLE 11. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 22 - 28)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
22. Develop relevant programs such as those funded under VEA, MDTA, and other federal acts . . . . .	10	16.1	49	79.0
23. Require work experience in the office occupations for:				
all business students . . . . .	19	30.7	6	9.7
terminal students . . . . .	26	41.9	16	25.8
24. Require work experience in the distributive occupations for:				
all business students . . . . .	15	24.2	6	9.7
terminal students . . . . .	25	40.3	13	21.0
25. Offer structured sequences of required and essential courses for specialization in various occupational fields . . . . .	18	29.0	34	54.8
28. Use performance tests to determine competency in each area of specialization . . . . .	29	46.9	22	35.5

Of those chairmen favoring the work experience requirement in office occupations for all vocational business students, only 10 percent adhered to the criterion; 24 percent did not. Regarding the terminal students, 21 percent of the chairmen adhered to the practice and 40 percent did not (see Table 11).

It would seem that perhaps the division chairmen should give serious study to the whole area of work experience programs. Some transfer students may need such background for vocational certification as teachers.

#### Criterion No. 24

Work experience for all vocational business students should be required in the distributive occupations--so indicated 52 percent of the experts with 21 percent saying that this would be undesirable. The division chairmen felt that this would be undesirable by a majority of 42 percent with but 34 percent favoring this procedure. For terminal business students, the experts agreed 84 percent to 8 percent that such experience would be desirable with the chairmen reporting 61 percent for the practice and 23 percent against it (see Table 10).

Only 10 percent of the chairmen were adhering to the practice of requiring work experience in the distributive occupations for all vocational business students while 24 percent favoring the practice were not doing so. Twenty-one percent of the chairmen required the terminal students to have work experience in the distributive occupations while forty percent favoring the concept did not (see Table 11).

It would seem reasonable for this type of experience to be mandatory for vocational business students interested in the field of distributive education. More community colleges should consider this type of practical experience for their terminal vocational students.

#### Criterion No. 25

This statement put forth the idea that vocational business programs should be comprised of structured sequences of required courses leading toward specialization in various occupational areas. The experts agreed, 89 percent of them, and the chairmen did likewise, by 84 percent. On the other hand, only 7 percent of the experts indicated this criterion to be undesirable with 10 percent of the chairmen concurring (see Table 10).

Of the chairmen desiring this arrangement, 55 percent were adhering to this criterion; 29 percent of those favoring it were not presently adhering to it (see Table 11).

#### Criterion No. 26

Community college vocational business programs should include certain terminal curricula. Some will be two-year programs; others will be certificate programs of varying lengths. The respondents had three choices to consider for each area of specialization contained in a list of selected vocational curricula.

The areas of specialization could be rated in one of three ways-- "Include in-depth programs;" "Include basic courses only;" or "No terminal program justified." The responses are summarized in Tables 12 and 13.



TABLE 12. TERMINAL VOCATIONAL BUSINESS CURRICULA

Area of Concentration	Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Accounting	32	71.1	35	53.0
Bookkeeping-Clerical	25	55.6	37	58.7
Clerk Typist	23	51.1	49	74.2
Data Processing	35	77.8	42	66.7
Distributive Education	36	80.0	36	58.1
General Business	11	24.4	19	29.7
Management	15	33.3	23	27.1
Real Estate	19	42.2	38	61.3
Secretarial: Executive	31	68.9	34	57.6
Legal	28	62.2	31	55.4
Medical	27	60.0	31	55.4
Technical	28	62.2	25	48.1
General	32	71.1	44	77.2

TABLE 13. NON-TERMINAL VOCATIONAL BUSINESS CURRICULA

Area of Specialization	Include Basic Courses Only				No Terminal Program Justified			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Accounting	11	24.4	28	42.4	2	4.4	3	4.6
Bookkeeping-Clerical	16	35.6	23	36.5	4	8.9	3	4.8
Clerk Typist	17	37.8	17	25.8	3	6.7	0	0
Data Processing	8	17.8	18	28.6	0	0	3	4.8
Distributive Education	8	17.8	22	35.5	1	2.2	4	6.5
General Business	23	51.1	34	53.1	9	20.0	11	17.2
Management	23	51.1	31	50.0	6	13.3	8	12.9
Real Estate	21	46.7	21	33.9	2	4.4	3	4.8
Secretarial: Executive	7	15.6	16	27.1	2	4.4	9	15.3
Legal	12	27.7	19	33.9	0	0	6	10.7
Medical	12	27.7	19	33.9	1	2.2	6	10.7
Technical	11	24.4	19	36.5	3	6.7	8	15.4
General	9	20.0	13	22.8	0	0	0	0

Criterion No. 27

This criterion was developed with the "cluster" concept in mind. Criterion No. 26 dealt with more specific jobs; this criterion, with occupational groupings. The thought was that perhaps vocational business programs in the community college should be designed to prepare the student for a "cluster" of occupations rather than for more specific positions. If the respondent felt that this criterion was desirable, he was asked to designate what he believed these clusters should be.

Many who did respond did not understand the item as is evident by the responses given, in many instances. Lack of understanding may also be the reason for the low rate of response of the item--only 50 percent of the experts and 34 percent of the chairmen responded to it. Apparently, most respondents either did not find the proposal to be of merit or did not understand the concept.

Those individuals who did respond indicated wide and varied opinions as to what "clusters" should be available. The division chairmen listed such clusters as follow: management, stenographic, marketing, and office occupations. The panel of experts listed as possible clusters secretarial, general clerical, accounting/data processing, and distributive education/marketing or distributive education/merchandising.

The fact that the concept was not understood by many respondents is exemplified by the suggestion that "nursing" be included as a cluster. It is difficult to understand how nursing is included in the list; for that matter, what would be the "hospitality cluster"? It is not understood how these would fit into the community college business division.

## Courses and Curricula Criteria

### Criterion No. 28

Is it wise to use performance tests to determine competency in the various areas of specialization? The responses: experts, 65 percent desirable and 30 percent undesirable; chairmen, 82 percent desirable and 16 percent undesirable (see Table 10).

Thirty-six percent of the chairmen favoring the idea were using such tests, and forty-seven percent were not using them (see Table 11). Those individuals who did not feel this criterion to be desirable may be part of the group which feels that there are no tests available with which one can accurately measure the degree of competency. This fact may also account for the large number of chairmen not adhering to the idea even though favoring such a procedure.

### Criterion No. 29

All experts responding to the survey indicated agreement with this statement: The business division should conduct surveys of employers, students, and graduates to assist in curricular evaluation and revision. Ninety-seven percent of the division chairmen concurred--only three percent marked the UNDESIRABLE column (see Table 14).

What was the rate of adherence to the criterion? Fifty-six percent of the division chairmen actually made use of such surveys to assist them in curricular revision; forty percent indicated that they were not doing so (see Table 15). The advisability of using such sources to aid in curricular revision is apparent.

TABLE 14. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 29 - 33 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
29. Conduct surveys of employers, students, and graduates to assist in curricular evaluation and revision . . . . .	49	100.0	60	96.8	0	0	2	3.2
30. Consult other community colleges, business colleges, etc., when evaluating curricula . . . . .	44	89.8	61	98.4	2	4.1	1	1.6
31. Assist placement office in the placement of business students . . . . .	44	89.8	55	88.7	1	2.0	3	4.8
32. Keep informed of community needs and job standards through contact with placement and through surveys of employers and graduates . . . .	49	100.0	60	96.8	0	0	0	0
33. Work with business and advisory committees in student selection and placement in work experience programs . . .	47	95.9	55	88.7	1	2.0	7	11.3

TABLE 15. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 29 - 31)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
29. Conduct surveys of employers, students, and graduates to assist in curricular evaluation and revision . . . . .	25	40.3	35	56.4
30. Consult other community colleges, business colleges, etc. when evaluating curricula . . . . .	23	37.1	38	61.3
31. Assist placement office in the placement of business students . . . . .	20	32.3	35	56.4
32. Keep informed of community needs and job standards through contact with placement and through surveys of employers and graduates . . . . .	28	45.2	32	51.6
33. Work with business and advisory committees in student selection and placement in work experience programs . . . . .	24	38.7	31	50.0

Criterion No. 30

This statement pertains directly to the actual evaluation process. The business division should consult other community colleges, business colleges, and the like when seeking to assess its curricula. All chairmen, save one, agreed; the experts felt the item to be desirable to the extent of 90 percent (see Table 14).

Those chairmen indicating a desirable response actually adhered to the practice at the rate of 61 percent while 37 percent favoring the idea did not follow the procedure (see Table 15).

Criterion No. 31

Should the business division aid its students in seeking employment by assisting the placement office in placing business students? Five percent of the division chairmen thought this practice to be undesirable; 89 percent thought it to be good. Ninety percent of the experts liked the idea--only one individual disagreed (see Table 14).

The division chairmen indicated that the business division often did assist in placement; 56 percent were doing so. Thirty-two percent who liked the plan were not actually doing so (see Table 15).

Criterion No. 32

The business division should keep itself informed of community needs and job standards through close contact with placement and by conducting surveys of employers and its graduates. The proposal has merit; all experts polled agreed as did 97 percent of the responding chairmen. Two division chairmen felt the item to be inapplicable to their

community college (see Table 14). Perhaps the graduates of business programs in these two schools did not remain within the community college's geographic area to seek employment.

Fifty-two percent of the business divisions were maintaining contact through these procedures. Forty-five percent of the division chairmen favoring the proposal were not adhering to the idea (see Table 15). Conceivably, part of the reason for the lack of implementation may be that no one person had taken the task upon himself or had not been assigned the job of conducting the surveys.

#### Criterion No. 33

This item suggests that the business division work jointly with business and advisory committees in selecting and placing students within the various work experience programs. Ninety-six percent of the experts felt this criterion to be desirable, and eighty-nine percent of the chairmen agreed. Eleven percent of the division chairmen felt that the proposal was undesirable (see Table 14).

Half of the division chairmen were carrying out the procedure, and 39 percent favoring it were not adhering to the plan (see Table 15). Possibly the community colleges which were not following the plan did not have advisory committees or have committees which did not function in as full a capacity as they might.

#### Criterion No. 34

The division chairmen should assist the guidance counselors in keeping up to date concerning current occupational trends in business;



this in turn will enable the counselors to be in a better position to aid students in determining vocational goals. Only two chairmen disagreed; 95 percent of them felt the idea to be one of virtue. The experts likewise agreed by 96 percent. Two experts did not feel that this criterion was applicable to the community college; one division chairman felt the criterion did not apply to his community college (see Table 16).

Forty-five percent of the chairmen actually did assist the guidance staff in this manner; fifty-two percent of them did not even though they favored the idea (see Table 17). Once again, time may well be one important reason why the idea has not been implemented.

#### Criterion No. 35

Would it be desirable for the business division to have its own counselor within the division to deal with only business students? The chairmen responded 89 percent in favor and 11 percent not favoring the idea. Seventy-four percent of the experts thought the statement to be desirable with thirteen percent not liking the suggestion. Twelve percent of the experts checked that the item was not applicable (see Table 16).

Thirty-four percent of the business division chairmen responding actually had such an arrangement. Of the chairmen favoring the plan, 55 percent had not put it into practice (see Table 17). Size of the community college and/or the business division may have been a factor for those not as yet adhering to the suggestion. Budgetary considerations may also have been involved.

TABLE 16. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 34 - 39 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
34. Help keep guidance counselors informed of current occupational trends in business to aid students in determining vocational goals . . . . .	47	95.9	59	95.2	0	0	2	3.2
35. Have a guidance counselor within the business division . . . . .	34	73.9	55	88.7	6	13.0	7	11.3
36. Offer adult education programs:								
vocational . . . . .	47	97.9	55	88.7	0	0	3	4.8
personal, non vocational . . .	38	80.9	42	67.7	5	10.6	14	22.6
37. Provide refresher and re-training courses . . . . .	46	95.8	61	98.4	0	0	0	0
38. Offer more courses with general education value for non-business majors . . . . .	19	50.0	51	82.3	10	26.3	7	11.3
39. Permit program of student completing high school diploma to include business courses . . .	37	88.1	50	80.6	1	2.4	3	4.8

TABLE 17. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 34 - 39)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
34. Help keep guidance counselors informed of current occupational trends in business to aid students in determining vocational goals . . . . .	32	51.6	27	44.5
35. Have a guidance counselor within the business division . . . . .	34	55.0	21	33.9
36. Offer adult education programs:				
vocational . . . . .	14	22.6	41	66.1
personal, non-vocational . . . . .	11	17.7	31	50.0
37. Provide refresher and retraining courses . . . . .	20	32.3	41	66.1
38. Offer more courses with general education value for non-business majors . . . . .	36	58.1	15	24.2
39. Permit program of student completing high school diploma to include business courses . . . . .	22	35.5	28	45.2

Criterion No. 36

The business division of the community college should offer adult education programs of two types. The experts indicated that 98 percent of them felt that vocational programs for adults were desirable. The division chairmen felt the same way by a slightly lower percentage--89 percent designated a DESIRABLE response. Five percent of the chairmen did not approve of this idea.

The second type of adult-education program, one of a personal, non-vocational nature, was not as highly regarded. Eighty-one percent of the experts favored this type of program, but only 68 percent of the chairmen agreed. Eleven percent of the experts and twenty-three percent of the division chairmen indicated this type of program to be undesirable (see Table 16).

Sixty-six percent of the division chairmen indicated that their community colleges were offering a vocational adult-education program. Twenty-three percent were not offering this type of program even though they have indicated the desirability of it. Fifty percent of the community colleges were offering the personal, non-vocational type of adult-education program; eighteen percent of those favoring the plan were not (see Table 17).

Criterion No. 37

The community college business division should provide refresher and retraining courses for individuals seeking occupational advancement or entry into a business occupation. None of the experts or chairmen disagreed; 96 percent of the experts checked DESIRABLE and 98 percent

of the division chairmen indicated the desirability of this statement (see Table 16).

Sixty-six percent of the community colleges were actually making such courses available to their students; thirty-two percent were not yet doing so in spite of their opinions that it would be wise to do so (see Table 17).

#### Criterion No. 38

Only 50 percent of the experts thought it desirable to offer more courses with general education value for non-business majors. Twenty-six percent of them did not favor the idea. An additional 18 percent felt that this function did not apply to the community college.

Eighty-two percent of the division chairmen indicated that they felt the idea to be a desirable one. Eleven percent did not feel it to be desirable; seven percent indicated that the criterion did not apply to their colleges (see Table 16).

To say that offering such courses is not applicable to the community college is difficult to understand. However, it is possible that these individuals felt that this function might be handled by the high schools in their evening adult programs.

Of the chairmen rating the item desirable, 24 percent of them were actually providing such courses; 58 percent, even though favoring the proposal, were not adhering to it (see Table 17).

Criterion No. 39

Should the community college business division permit the student seeking completion of the high school diploma to include business courses in his program? Eighty-one percent of the division chairmen indicated "yes" that such a practice is desirable. The experts agreed by an even higher percentage--88 percent. Fifteen percent of the chairmen felt that this criterion did not apply to their community colleges; eight percent of the experts also felt the item to be inapplicable to the community college. One expert designated UNDESIRABLE as did 5 percent of the division chairmen (see Table 16).

Forty-five percent of the community colleges actually did permit this practice. Thirty-six percent of those favoring the practice did not do so. Possibly the objection stemmed from the fact that there are other sources from which one can obtain the diploma from correspondence courses, to adult evening programs, to continuation high schools, and the list is not complete (see Table 17).

There are those chairmen who may feel that their functions need to be limited in order to be sure that those functions which are attempted may be carried out successfully rather than to "spread themselves too thin."

Criterion No. 40

Day and evening courses should be (theoretically) identical in these three areas: content--experts, 58 percent desirable; division chairmen, 95 percent desirable. Methods--experts, 40 percent desirable; division chairmen, 79 percent desirable. Credit granted--experts,

51 percent desirable; division chairmen, 95 percent desirable. Thirty-five percent of the chairmen did not favor content; fifty-one percent did not favor methods; and forty-four percent did not favor credit granted. Only one of the division chairmen rated as UNDESIRABLE the idea of the same content and credit granted. However, 13 percent rated identical methods as being undesirable (see Table 18).

Of the chairmen ranking the items as desirable, the percentage adhering to the criterion is as follows (see Table 19):

	<u>Adhering</u>	<u>Not Adhering</u>
Content	74%	21%
Methods	60%	19%
Credit Granted	81%	15%

The experts found these three areas undesirable to a much greater extent than did the division chairmen. Apparently, the methods of instructing the two types of classes is of greatest concern. The feeling may be that the evening classes are to be taught on more an individual basis since it may be assumed that backgrounds and abilities of the evening students represent an even greater disparity than among full-time day students.

The amount of credit granted seemed to be next in rank of importance. Are these people to receive less credit or are they to take the courses on only a credit/no credit or audit basis? What type of system is to be used?

Considering the content of the courses, are such courses to be "easier" and/or of less substance than the same courses taught in the "regular" program? Answers to these questions are needed.

TABLE 18. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 40 - 44 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
40. Day and evening courses should be (theoretically) identical in:								
content . . . . .	25	58.1	59	95.2	15	34.9	1	1.6
methods . . . . .	17	39.5	49	79.0	22	51.2	8	12.9
credit granted . . . . .	22	51.2	59	95.2	19	44.2	1	1.6
41. Business curricula should include courses appropriate for the "less able" student . . . .	43	91.5	60	96.8	1	2.1	2	3.2
42. Transfer-program curricula should emphasize concepts . .	38	75.7	55	88.7	4	10.8	5	8.1
43. Terminal curricula should emphasize practical applications . . . . .	37	82.2	56	90.3	5	11.1	4	6.5
44. Transfer and terminal students should have separate instruction in the same basic subject areas . . . . .	15	33.3	21	33.9	23	51.1	26	41.9



TABLE 19. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 40 - 44)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
40. Day and evening courses should be (theoretically) identical in:				
content . . . . .	13	21.0	46	74.2
methods . . . . .	12	19.4	37	59.7
credit granted . . . . .	9	14.5	50	80.7
41. Business curricula should include courses appropriate for the "less able" student . . . . .	19	30.7	41	66.1
42. Transfer-program curricula should emphasize concepts . . . . .	15	24.2	40	64.5
43. Terminal curricula should emphasize practical applications . . . . .	13	21.0	43	69.4
44. Transfer and terminal students should have separate instruction in the same basic subject areas . . . . .	10	16.1	11	17.7

Criterion No. 41

The business division should provide courses appropriate for the "less able" students. Ninety-two percent of the experts and ninety-seven percent of the chairmen agreed that such an arrangement is desirable. Dissenters were few in number (see Table 18).

Was this procedure being carried out? Yes, in 66 percent of the community colleges the business division made such provision for these students. Thirty-one percent who supported the principle were not adhering to it (see Table 19).

Criterion No. 42

The transfer-program curricula should be conceptually oriented. The rate of concurrence with this criterion was 76 percent of the experts agreeing along with 89 percent of the division chairmen. Eleven percent of the experts felt the item to be undesirable as did eight percent of the chairmen. Another 10 percent of the experts felt the item to be inapplicable (see Table 18).

Sixty-five percent of the chairmen adhered to this principle, twenty-four percent of those favoring it did not (see Table 19). Of the experts opposing this idea, the objection of most would probably center around the thought that even though students are going on beyond the two-year program, theory should not be emphasized to the detriment of practicality.

Criterion No. 43

The terminal curricula should emphasize practical applications. Eighty-two percent of the experts felt this to be desirable as did ninety percent of the division chairmen. Eleven percent of the experts felt this criterion to be undesirable and so did seven percent of the chairmen (see Table 18).

Over 69 percent of the division chairmen adhered to this principle; 21 percent were not holding to it (see Table 19).

What the proper degree of "mix" should be between theory or conceptual learning and practical application remains unknown. The individuals who felt that the idea expressed in this criterion was unsound may feel that an even balance needs to prevail between the two positions. It is a difficult question to resolve.

Criterion No. 44

Should transfer and terminal students have separate instruction in the same basic subject areas? This criterion suggested this arrangement. Separate instruction was not favored by 51 percent of the experts and by 42 percent of the division chairmen. Approximately 33 percent of each group, however, thought the idea to be of merit (see Table 18).

Looking more closely at the matter, it will be noted that only 18 percent of the community colleges actually followed this procedure; another 16 percent who said they favored it had not put the procedure into practice (see Table 19).

Criterion No. 45

This statement recommended that instruction be individualized to permit students to progress at their own achievement rates--not on the basis of fixed time schedules. Ninety-four percent of the experts indicated the desirability of such a plan; eighty-one percent of the division chairmen favored the idea. Eleven percent of the chairmen felt this plan to be undesirable; only two of the experts did not care for the idea (see Table 20).

The degree of adherence to this criterion was quite low, however. Only 18 percent of the chairmen were using the procedure to any extent. Sixty-three percent of those indicating the desirability of such an arrangement were not adhering to the proposal (see Table 21).

The low rate of adherence may be traced, doubtlessly, to the problems encountered in implementing such individualized programs. Arranging, scheduling, evaluating--all create unique situations which must be resolved. The theory is admirable; seeing the plan through to fruition is not without difficulty.

Criterion No. 46

This criterion did not appear on the original form submitted to the panel of experts during the conduct of the trial-run phase of the project. The division chairmen did favor the idea presented with 77 percent liking it and 15 percent finding the proposal to be undesirable. Eight percent felt that the item was not applicable to their community colleges (see Table 20).

TABLE 20. RATINGS OF CRITERIA 45 - 47 BY CHAIRMEN AND EXPERTS

Criteria	Desirable				Undesirable			
	Experts		Chairmen		Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
45. Instruction should be individualized to permit students to progress at their own achievement rates--not on the basis of fixed time schedules . . . . .	45	93.8	50	80.6	2	4.1	7	11.3
**46. Rigid "course" structures should be given up in favor of skill and competency performance criteria for individualized instructional programs . . . . .	--	--	48	77.4	--	--	9	14.5
47. All business majors should have a common core of required courses . . . . .	36	81.8	46	74.2	7	15.9	12	19.4

\*\*No. 46 did not appear on the original instrument sent to the panel of experts.

TABLE 21. DEGREE OF ADHERENCE TO CRITERIA (NOS. 45 - 47)  
DEEMED DESIRABLE BY DIVISION CHAIRMEN

Criteria	Rated Desirable But <u>Not</u> Adhered To		Rated Desirable <u>And</u> Adhered To	
	No.	%	No.	%
45. Instruction should be individualized to permit students to progress at their own achievement rates--not on the basis of fixed time schedules . . . . .	39	62.9	11	17.7
**46. Rigid "course" structures should be given up in favor of skill and competency performance criteria for individualized instructional programs . . . . .	37	59.7	11	17.7
47. All business majors should have a common core of required courses . . .	20	32.3	26	41.9

\*\*No. 46 did not appear on the original instrument sent to the panel of experts.

The criterion: The rigidity of the "course" structure should be given up in favor of skill and competency performance criteria for individualized instructional programs. Departure from traditional classroom routines appeals to many, but setting up and evaluating the programs is quite another matter. This reasoning was reflected by the number of chairmen who actually were making attempts to provide for individual needs as opposed to the number of those who said that the idea was of merit. Eighteen percent of the community colleges responding to this survey were offering these programs to their students; an additional sixty percent had not yet put such plans into practice although favoring the concept (see Table 21).

#### Criterion No. 47

This statement suggests a more traditional approach than the preceding criterion. Eighty-two percent of the experts surveyed believed that all business majors should have a common core of required courses. Seventy-four percent of the chairmen were of the same opinion. Sixteen percent of the experts found the suggestion undesirable as did nineteen percent of the division chairmen (see Table 20).

Forty-two percent of the chairmen followed such a course of action; thirty-two percent favored this requirement but did not adhere to the practice (see Table 21).

#### Criterion No. 48

This item was comprised of a list of representative courses which may be found among the offerings of a community college business

division. The respondent was directed to indicate which courses should be available to all business majors; which courses should be required of all business majors; and which courses would be desirable for non-majors who desired a general knowledge of business and economics. (The information was presented to the division chairmen as shown in Appendix E.)

This format is a revision of the form originally sent to those respected business educators comprising the panel of experts (see Appendix C). Items 49 and 50 on the original survey instrument were revised into the No. 48 appearing on the revised form (Appendix E).

Because of this revision, Table 22 is the most complete of the three tables based on Criterion No. 48. Tables 23 and 24 reflect the form before its revision; because of the desire to show the responses on a comparative basis, these two tables are not as inclusive as is Table 22. Nevertheless, the data shown represent a reasonably accurate picture of the opinions of the two groups surveyed regarding their preferences on selected courses desirable for non-majors and those courses which should be required of all business majors.

Most of the experts did not follow the directions for this item. They checked the items as those which should be available for the business student but did not indicate the number of terms (if more than one was desirable) which should be offered. On the other hand, the business division chairmen indicated the number of terms which should be offered as part of each response in this section.



The chairmen indicated that as many as six terms (quarters, it was assumed) of a particular subject should be available to the business major. The most common responses indicated that from one to three terms should be offered for most of the courses listed.

The comparisons shown in the tables merely indicate the number and percentage of those respondents (experts and chairmen) who felt that the course in question should be available to the community college business student.

TABLE 22. SELECTED COURSES WHICH SHOULD BE  
AVAILABLE TO ALL BUSINESS MAJORS

	Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Accounting	35	94.6	60	98.3
Advertising	25	67.6	52	85.2
Bookkeeping (Recordkeeping)	22	59.5	55	90.1
Business Communication (letter writing)	37	100.0	58	95.1
Business English (fundamentals)	26	70.3	50	83.6
Business Law	34	91.9	61	100.0
Business Machines	30	81.1	60	98.3
Business Math	30	81.1	60	98.3
Consumer Economics	27	73.0	48	78.7
Data Processing	35	94.6	53	86.9
Economics	33	89.2	56	91.8
Finance	24	64.9	33	54.1
Finite Math	13	35.1	41	67.2
Human Relations	33	89.2	49	80.3
Industrial Relations	19	51.4	27	44.3
Insurance	24	64.9	37	60.7
Introduction to Business	29	78.4	45	73.8
Machine Shorthand**	--	--	33	54.1
Management	32	86.5	49	80.3
Marketing	31	83.8	53	86.9
Merchandising	23	62.2	49	80.3
Office Management	25	67.6	36	59.0
Office Procedures	32	86.5	59	96.7
Personal Shorthand	10	27.0	24	39.4
Real Estate	26	70.3	53	86.9
Records Management	28	75.7	41	67.2
Report Writing	27	73.0	32	52.5
Retailing	26	70.3	52	85.2
Salesmanship	25	67.6	51	83.6
Shorthand & Transcription	32	86.5	58	95.1
Statistics	27	73.0	47	77.1
Taxation	16	43.2	38	62.3
Transportation	12	32.4	28	45.9
Typewriting	36	97.3	59	96.7

\*\* This item did not appear in the survey sampling.

TABLE 23. SELECTED BUSINESS COURSES WHICH ARE DESIRABLE  
FOR NON-MAJORS SEEKING BUSINESS AND  
ECONOMIC UNDERSTANDING

	Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Accounting	10	23.3	33	54.1
Bookkeeping (Recordkeeping)	26	60.5	26	42.6
Business Communication	24	55.8	28	45.9
Business English	13	30.2	26	42.6
Business Law	25	58.1	36	59.0
Business Machines	10	23.3	24	39.3
Business Math	16	37.2	29	47.5
Consumer Economics	36	83.7	34	55.7
Data Processing	12	27.9	31	50.8
Economics	27	62.8	35	57.4
Finite Math	12	27.9	10	16.4
Human Relations	27	62.8	30	49.2
Introduction to Business	30	69.8	50	82.0
Management	7	16.3	10	16.4
Marketing	7	16.3	9	14.8
Statistics	5	11.6	11	18.0
Typewriting	31	72.1	44	72.1

TABLE 24. SELECTED COURSES WHICH SHOULD BE  
REQUIRED OF ALL BUSINESS MAJORS

	Experts		Chairmen	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Accounting	38	88.4	48	78.7
Bookkeeping (Recordkeeping)	8	18.6	14	23.0
Business Communication	42	97.7	38	62.3
Business English	24	55.8	28	45.9
Business Law	34	79.1	46	75.4
Business Machines	25	58.1	29	47.5
Business Math	34	79.1	41	67.2
Consumer Economics	19	44.2	15	24.6
Data Processing	33	76.7	41	67.2
Economics	40	93.0	43	70.5
Finite Math	11	25.6	14	23.0
Human Relations	36	83.7	29	47.5
Introduction to Business	35	81.4	42	68.9
Management	27	62.8	13	21.3
Marketing	24	55.8	17	27.9
Statistics	25	58.1	19	31.2
Typewriting	37	86.0	36	59.0

## V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The methods being used to aid the student in achieving sought-after goals and objectives must be constantly observed in order to determine their effectiveness. This observation of accomplishment involves assessment and appraisal. Curricular evaluation, then, involves a program of continual examination.

### Summary

Curricular evaluation is essential in assuring that student wants, needs, and interests are being met and achieved. Curricular evaluation may take shape in many forms. The problem is the consideration of the questions "how is it to be done" and "who is to do the evaluating." All possibilities being considered, the general consensus appears to indicate that this evaluative process should be conducted by the individuals involved in directing student learning--the instructors themselves. Developing standards against which a community college business division may compare the quality or the results of its accomplishments is one way in which this appraisal and assessment procedure may be carried out.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the business curricula in the community colleges of California through the use of a set of criteria developed specifically for this function.

The criterion checklist was submitted to a nationwide group of respected business educators whose opinions set the standard against which the procedures and opinions of the chairmen of the community

college business divisions were compared. The criteria represented an attempt at stating the ideal--an objective toward which business educators might strive with a high degree of assurance that such movement is in the right direction and that the goal at the end of this path is a relevant educational program or set of curricula.

The submission of the criteria to the panel of educators served also as a trial run of the survey instrument. In addition, the criteria were tested by a group of businessmen and a group of community college business students. Modification and revision was based on the responses of those participating in the sampling.

The revised instrument was submitted to all community colleges in California. The rate of return was 62 respondents out of 91 for a 68.1 percent usable return.

The study was limited to the evaluation of only objectives, courses, and curricula. The choices of response were also limited to avoid presenting a continuum which would necessitate an interpretation of gradation or matter of degree. The degree of compliance was not considered important for the intended purpose of this study.

It must be remembered that this set of criteria was not developed with the intent that each and every statement should apply to all situations. Size, location, and social setting are but some of the variables which make the universal application of the criterion set impossible. The evaluator should note that the standards he sets for his community college must reflect the demands of those he seeks to serve. Nevertheless, he must be absolutely sure that he is not just relegating to a NOT

APPLICABLE status any criteria which his community college is failing to meet.

A long, hard look--an honest appraisal--must be taken to be certain that an item is truly inapplicable. The experts' statements of "what is" and "what should be" should serve as guidelines, however. Again the question must be asked, "Are we meeting the needs and demands of our community?" The answer can be "yes" if curricular evaluation is an honest, continual, and cooperative effort.

The conclusions which follow are derived from an analysis of the data represented by the respondents' opinions as interpreted from the survey instruments.

### Conclusions

1. The experts and division chairmen favored consulting students and businessmen to assist in curricular evaluation and revision. However, from a limited sampling of the test-run respondents, students and businessmen do not share this opinion. Therefore, the extent to which people outside the academic "family" are really qualified to aid is questionable. Perhaps with an organized procedure and some necessary background preparation, such a plan could be very workable. Involvement of advisory groups seems to be especially successful in revising vocational programs.

2. Despite the fact most chairmen agreed with the experts that surveying businessmen should be included as a segment of curricular evaluation, only slightly over 50 percent were doing so. As has been

earlier stated, many businessmen do not seem to know what they want from an employee in terms of "standards." Thus, surveying businessmen for this purpose is questionable.

Conversely, note what one businessman had to say regarding the inclusion of businessmen in such surveys:

Very definitely. Some of us in business are amazed at what the academic world thinks we need in the way of employee skills. This also holds true of the high school counselors who have very little knowledge of the vocational skills we are looking for in an employee. Ninety percent of the jobs in California do not require an AB degree, but this seems to be the emphasis exercised by the high school counselor.

One isolated comment, to be sure, yet a bit of food for thought. Perhaps a midpoint between these two extremes will never be reached, but attempts must still be made to arrive at acceptable alternatives.

3. In retrospect, perhaps it would have been wise to have made two separate criterion statements from Criterion No. 15. It is felt that some of the dissenters may be accounted for by the fact that the two statements were combined into one. It stated that specific, individual objectives should be set for the student based on his ability and that individual standards should be set for all business students. Some respondents may have favored one part of the statement but not the other.

4. As was anticipated, most respondents, both those respected business educators comprising the panel of experts and the chairmen of the community college business divisions, agreed with the majority of the criterion statements. This outcome was expected; the most important consequence of the survey was the determination of the number of individuals who adhered to the criteria they felt to be desirable. In most



instances, it is quite likely that the criteria which were judged as being undesirable were criteria which did not fit into the programs offered by that particular community college for good reason. The reasons behind many of the responses to the criteria are needed in order to better comprehend the total evaluative process.

5. The community college business division faculty should remember that all criteria in the criterion set do not necessarily apply to their programs. Only those criteria which do apply should be considered for purposes of conducting a self-evaluation--but before any criteria are eliminated as not being applicable, the faculty of the community college business division must be absolutely certain of their inapplicability. Are the statements truly inapplicable or are they being rated as such to avoid facing circumstances as they really exist?

### Recommendations

1. General course goals and specific behavioral objectives should be developed for all courses. The fact that many of the business divisions have not developed behavioral objectives, even though favoring them, is a matter of some concern. Furthermore, some of the chairmen indicated that even broad, general goals had not been developed. The desirability of general goals has long been recognized, and their utilization as an operational framework is widespread.

2. Goals and objectives should be available to students and teachers, as well as counselors. If counselors are going to be effective in career guidance, an understanding of specific behavioral objectives in

vocational areas is especially important.

3. If the community college finds that it is not living up to its stated goals, some assessment and modification should take place. Does the fault lie with the statement of philosophy or in its application? Perhaps the stated philosophy and the practicability of such programs are at odds, or at least are so in the minds of certain of the business division chairmen.

4. The community college should prepare the student seeking a four-year degree for his upper-division work by providing the necessary lower-division courses.

5. Terminal vocational business programs should constitute a very large part of the effort put forth by the business divisions.

6. All business division chairmen should implement procedures to provide remedial course work in math and grammar. Remedial courses should be considered in other appropriate areas.

7. The community college should offer adult education programs of a vocational nature; another part of its community-service program is to offer personal, non-vocational programs.

The chairmen did not think as highly of offering the non-vocational programs as did the experts. The colleges who felt the practice to be desirable but which were not carrying it out may have had poor response to their overtures in this direction. Some business divisions may be having difficulty putting the theory into practice.

8. Refresher and retraining courses are desirable. Such courses, however, are not easy to organize because of the wide variation in

student needs. Individualized instruction is suggested as a partial solution to this dilemma.

9. Half of the experts felt that offering more courses of a general-education nature for non-business majors was desirable; over three-fourths of the chairmen agreed. Those who disagreed may have felt that this function might be handled, once again, by the high school in its evening adult program. If this need is not being met, however, the community college business division should assume this responsibility.

One might successfully defend the position that business English, business math, and consumer economics, to name but a few possibilities, could very logically be classed as "general education" with proper organization and emphasis.

10. Depending upon community need and acceptance of such programs, the business division should be providing general education, community-service programs, and adult education and guidance. The community must understand the community college's aims before widespread acceptance will be evident. Some of these programs, however, may never gain acceptance in certain locales, and recognition of this fact is essential.

11. If community service and adult education programs are not readily accepted by the community, the community college should let the public know what it seeks to do for the populace it serves. A program of public relations can do much to inform the public about curricula. This dissemination of information on course offerings and programs brings in many students.

12. All community colleges should examine their statements of philosophy and purpose to determine whether or not they are in fact adhering to the statements. Those division chairmen who felt that some of the stated functions were not applicable to their community colleges should examine the situation closely to determine whether they are meeting the needs and desires of the communities they serve. Perhaps adjustments are in order.

13. It is recommended that students, alumni, and advisory committees share in the task of curricular evaluation. However, little help will be forthcoming if these individuals are not prepared to offer such aid.

14. If the division chairmen have not been recommending that prospective business teachers complete basic courses in the community college simply because the chairmen have not identified these students, they should take steps to do so. This matter could be handled through application or registration materials filled out by the student or through the student's counselor.

15. Business division faculty should work with the placement office in aiding business students to find employment.

16. Articulation with high schools from which the community college students will come as well as with the colleges and universities to which its students will transfer must take place. Liaison with other two-year colleges should also be maintained.

17. Prepare students for more than just the first job which they will hold upon completion of their vocational business programs. Move in the direction of career preparation.

18. Work to encourage more individual learning and pacing of the students' programs. Don't "lock" the students into rigid schedules which require that some students only "mark time." All programs do not require two years and an Associate of Arts degree.

19. It is recommended that diligent effort be made to provide whatever aid and assistance is possible for the "less able" student, as many community colleges are already doing. One example of such a course might be a general clerical program in which these students would learn to do routine typing, filing, and the like. There are positions which these individuals can fill and do a creditable job.

20. Seek the development of tests which accurately measure probable student success and tests which will measure the degree of proficiency and achievement.

21. It is recommended that community college business divisions seek to make work experience an integral part of the programs of vocational business students entering this segment of the business world.

22. The "open-door" philosophy might better be termed the "revolving-door" philosophy. The student should be able to come and go--to leave the community college and re-enter--taking as much time as he wishes to achieve whatever goal he is seeking. If the student fails in his endeavor, he should be free to steer off in another direction. His charted route may not be the one he ultimately follows. Permit a more circuitous route, but always provide ample opportunity for as much counseling and guidance as the student feels he needs.

23. Each community college business division should examine its curricula on a continual basis.

24. Another recommendation is that any community college business division faculty using the evaluative instrument developed for this study do so cooperatively in the manner intended. All faculty within the division should participate in the appraisal and assessment process, and a consensus should be the basis for the direction toward which the division directs its efforts.

25. If a criterion is rated as desirable and it is not being adhered to, careful examination should be made to determine why the procedure is not being followed. Does revision need to be made?

26. If a criterion does not apply, it should be examined in order to determine the reason for its inapplicability and to consider the possibility and desirability of implementing the suggestion it conveys.

27. Each community college business faculty should use this criterion set only as a model for the development of their own evaluative instrument. In actuality, they will be doing so by following only those criteria with specific applicability to their individual circumstances.

28. Finally, it should be remembered that each item on the form must be viewed only as it pertains to the individual community college. "Canned criteria" with no room for individuality are not the answer. Evaluation should be conducted only on the basis of the agreed-upon standards. Do these standards allow for meeting the needs of today's world?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Armbrister, Lloyd P. Evaluation of a college business department. *Journal of Business Education* 26:385-386. 1951.
2. Erickson, Lawrence W. Selected business education practices in the public senior high schools of California. Doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles, University of California, 1955. 461 numb. leaves.
3. Erickson, Lawrence W. and Mary Ellen Oliverio. Evaluative criteria for survey instruments in business education. Monograph 111. Chicago, South-Western, 1964. 89 p.
4. Goddard, M. Lee. The potential role of the junior college in education for business. Doctoral dissertation. Bloomington, Indiana University, 1963. 346 numb. leaves.
5. Lomax, Paul S. and W. Harmon Wilson. Improving research in business education. Monograph 105. Chicago, South-Western, 1962. 21 p.
6. National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. Evaluative criteria. 1960 edition. Washington, D. C.
7. \_\_\_\_\_. Evaluative criteria. 1969 edition. Washington, D. C.
8. Oelrich, Elizabeth S. and Robert W. Sanders. Guidelines for junior college business curricula development. *The Balance Sheet* 47:295-296, 323. 1966.
9. Perry, Richard S. A critical study of current issues in business education in the public junior colleges of California. Doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles, University of California, 1956. 596 numb. leaves.
10. \_\_\_\_\_. Needed improvements in junior college business education. *California Journal of Secondary Education* 32:400-405. 1957.
11. The Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education. Policy Statement No. 6, Guidelines for curriculum planning in business education for secondary schools. *Business Education Forum* 19:1-3. Dec. 1964.
12. Revised criteria for evaluating a business education program. *Business Education World*, June 1960.

13. Schramm, Dwayne. The development of a tool for evaluating business departments in junior colleges in California. Unpublished paper prepared for Education 297, Los Angeles, University of California, 1965.
14. Tau Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon. Evaluative criteria for business. Monograph 90. Chicago, South-Western, 1954.
15. Thompson, Robert J. Strengths of the past and present. In: Business education: an evaluative inventory, ed. by J. Curtis Hall, Washington, D. C., National Business Education Association, 1968. p. 302-312.
16. \_\_\_\_\_. Part A. Outcomes in vocational and technical education in junior college. In: New perspectives in education for business, ed. by Doris H. and Floyd L. Crank, Washington, D. C., National Business Education Association, 1963. p. 371-383.
17. Wanous, S. J. The high school business curriculum. National Business Education Quarterly 31:43-57. Summer 1963.
18. \_\_\_\_\_. Curriculum standards in business education. The Balance Sheet 50:4-10, 52-55. 1968.
19. \_\_\_\_\_. An evaluation of curriculum practices and trends in business education. In: Recent and projected developments affecting business education, ed. by Theodore Woodward, Washington, D. C., National Business Education Association, 1968. p. 21-38.
20. Wunsch, Michael R. Re-evaluating a program by use of the criterion method. Business Education Forum 22:19-21. Jan. 1968.
21. Wyllie, Eugene Donald. An evaluation plan for business education programs in high schools. Monograph 109. Chicago, South-Western, 1963. 34 p.



## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

This appendix includes the trial survey form, the directions, and an introductory statement as submitted to the community college business students included in the survey sample.

## CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE BUSINESS CURRICULAR STANDARDS

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the business program in the community college. At the same time, a rating instrument is provided with which the community college may determine the status of its own program by outlining the standards it desires and the practices designed to achieve them. Such curricular evaluation will provide a point of departure from which curricular modification and improvement may evolve. Perpetual change demands continual study and revision to assure curricular relevancy.

Your assistance in the trial run of this study is sincerely appreciated. Your opinions, as well as any comments you may wish to make, will enable the writer to develop a rating instrument which will be of maximum value to any subsequent user. Thank you for your cooperation.

Would you please fill out the enclosed instrument. YOUR opinion is important! Please use the following system in completing the form:

1. If you feel that the criterion statement is DESIRABLE, check Column "D."
2. If, in your opinion, the criterion statement is UNDESIRABLE, check Column "A."
3. If you feel that an item does not apply OR if you feel that you do not have enough background to enable you to respond otherwise, check Column "NA."

Feel perfectly free to make any comments you may desire. If something is unclear or should be omitted, please say so. Likewise, feel free to suggest items that are not included. Sign your name at the end of the form only if you wish to do so. Your efforts are sincerely appreciated.



19. Specific standards, both in proficiency and accuracy, should be developed for the skill courses.
20. Proficiency tests should be required for terminal students in: English . . .  
math . . . . .  
typewriting. .  
other \_\_\_\_\_
21. A remedial course should be required for students who are weak in the fundamentals of: math. . . . .  
grammar . . . . .  
other \_\_\_\_\_

\* \* \* \* \*

Vocational Business Programs at the Community College Level Should:

22. be vitally concerned with developing programs such as those funded under VEA, MDTA, and other Federal acts.
23. consist of a balance between vocational and general education. Check the combination which you believe to be the proper balance.  
\_\_\_\_\_ 50% vocational and 50% general  
\_\_\_\_\_ MORE than 50% vocational  
\_\_\_\_\_ LESS than 50% vocational  
\_\_\_\_\_ other \_\_\_\_\_
24. include specific course content related to influencing attitudes and habits.
25. require work experience in distributive occupations: all students? . . . . .  
terminal students? . . . . .
26. require work experience in the office occupations: all students? . . . . .  
terminal students? . . . . .
27. have a carefully structured sequence of required courses for specialization in various occupational areas.
28. include the following types of specialized terminal curricula: (some may be two year programs; others may be certificate programs of varying lengths). Please check one of the three categories for each of the specialized curricula indicated.

	<u>Include In- Depth Programs</u>	<u>Include Basic Courses Only</u>	<u>No Terminal Program Justified</u>
Accounting . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Advertising. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Bookkeeping-Clerical . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Clerk Typist . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Data Processing. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Distributive Education . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
General Business . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Management . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Merchandising. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Real Estate. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Secretarial: Executive. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Legal. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Medical. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Technical. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
General. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Other _____ . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
_____ . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
_____ . . . . .	_____	_____	_____



49. Indicate which of the following courses would be APPROPRIATE for the non-major desiring business and economic understandings and those which should be REQUIRED OF ALL business majors.

	<u>Required of</u> <u>all majors</u>	<u>Desirable for</u> <u>Non-majors</u>		<u>Required of</u> <u>all majors</u>	<u>Desirable for</u> <u>Non-majors</u>
Accounting	_____	_____	Finite Math	_____	_____
Bookkeeping	_____	_____	Human Relations	_____	_____
(Record Keeping)	_____	_____	Introduction to	_____	_____
Business	_____	_____	Business	_____	_____
Communications	_____	_____	Management	_____	_____
Business English	_____	_____	Marketing	_____	_____
Business Law	_____	_____	Statistics	_____	_____
Business Machines	_____	_____	Typewriting	_____	_____
Business Math	_____	_____	Other	_____	_____
Consumer Economics	_____	_____		_____	_____
Data Processing	_____	_____		_____	_____
Economics	_____	_____		_____	_____

50. Place a check in the blanks preceding those courses which you feel should be included in the business curriculum. Where appropriate, indicate, with a digit in the blank, the number of courses which should be offered in that area.

Check or  
Number

\_\_\_\_\_ Accounting  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Advertising  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Bookkeeping  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (Record Keeping)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Business Communication  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Business English  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Business Enterprise  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Business Law  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Business Machines  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Business Math  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Charm & Self-Improvement  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Consumer Economics  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Data Processing  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Economics  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Finance  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Finite Math  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Human Relations  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Industrial Relations  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Insurance  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Introduction to Business  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Management

Check or  
Number

\_\_\_\_\_ Marketing  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Merchandising  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Office Management  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Office Procedures  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Personal Shorthand  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Production  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Real Estate  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Records Management  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Report Writing  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Retailing  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Salesmanship  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Shorthand  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Statistics  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Taxation  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Transcription  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Transportation  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Typewriting  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

## APPENDIX B

The businessmen included in the preliminary survey received the following letter along with the same trial survey form sent to the students.



HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS  
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA 95521

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS EDUCATION  
DEPARTMENT OF OFFICE ADMINISTRATION

January, 1971

Dear Redwood Empire Purchasing Association Member:

The junior (community) college seeks to serve the residents of its district. The enclosed instrument is an attempt to evaluate its business curriculum. As a businessman, you are interested in the education offered by a relevant business curriculum; i.e., one that meets the needs of the people it serves. This survey is a part of a doctoral study which I am completing through Oregon State University.

Would you please fill out the enclosed instrument. YOUR opinion is important!  
Please use the following system in completing the form:

1. If you feel that the criterion statement is DESIRABLE, check Column "D."
2. If, in your opinion, the criterion statement is UNDESIRABLE, check Column "A."
3. If you feel that an item does not apply OR if you feel that you do not have enough background to enable you to respond otherwise, check Column "NA."

Feel perfectly free to make any comments you may desire. If something is unclear or should be omitted, please say so. Likewise, feel free to suggest items that are not included. Sign your name at the end of the form only if you wish to do so. Your efforts are sincerely appreciated.

Cordially,  
Redacted for privacy

G. W. Melendy  
Assistant Professor

Enclosures

If you wish, telephone me (826-3750) for clarification of any statements or for answers to any questions concerning the form. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Won't you reply today?

## APPENDIX C

The business educators who comprised the panel of experts received the letter which follows and the same trial survey copy as sent to students and businessmen.

HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS  
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA 95521

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS EDUCATION  
DEPARTMENT OF OFFICE ADMINISTRATION

February, 1971

Dear Business Educator:

Would you please fill out the enclosed instrument? Your opinion, as a member of a panel of respected business educators, is valued. The purpose of this doctoral study, being completed through Oregon State University, is to evaluate the business curriculum in the community/junior college. At the same time, a rating instrument is provided with which the community college may determine the status of its own program by outlining the standards it desires and the practices designed to achieve them.

As a result of your responses, I hope to accomplish two things. First, the survey instrument will be refined and evaluated through your opinions. Secondly, the opinions of the panel will set the standard against which the business educators in the individual community colleges may compare their programs.

- INSTRUCTIONS:
1. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column "D" if you believe that the criterion statement listed is a DESIRABLE curricular standard.
  2. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column "A" if you feel that the criterion statement listed is an UNDESIRABLE standard.
  3. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column "NA" if, in your opinion, the criterion statement is NOT APPLICABLE to, or is inappropriate for, a community college situation.

Your assistance in the preliminary stage of this study is sincerely appreciated. Feel free to make any comments you may desire. If something is unclear or should be omitted, please say so. Likewise, feel free to suggest items that are not included. Your efforts will enable the writer to develop a rating instrument which will be of maximum value to any subsequent user.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. Melendy  
Assistant Professor

Enclosures

Please return this letter with your completed survey. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Won't you reply today?

NOTE: The following instructions are those that will appear on the rating instruments to be used by the community colleges themselves.

1. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column "D" if you believe that the criterion statement listed is a DESIRABLE curricular standard.
2. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column "A" if the business division of your community college actually ADHERES to the curricular standard.
3. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column "NA" if the criterion statement is NOT APPLICABLE to the situation in your community college.
4. Place no mark in any box if you feel that the criterion is an UNDESIRABLE standard.

---

The basic format for this survey is based, by permission, on a high school study conducted by S. J. Wanous.

## APPENDIX D

This postal card follow-up was sent to the members of the panel.

Just a Reminder . . .

March 13, 1971

Recently you received a copy of a survey I am conducting as part of my doctoral study. It would be greatly appreciated if you would complete the form and return it as soon as possible.

Your comments and opinions are valued as they will form the standards against which the community college will evaluate its business curriculum.

Thank you so much.

G. W. Melendy  
1691 11th Street  
Arcata, CA 95521

May I hear from you soon?

## APPENDIX E

The first mailing of the actual survey of community college business division chairmen was comprised of the letter, the explanatory form, the data sheet, and the survey form which follow.

HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS  
Arcata, California 95521

Department of Business Education  
Department of Office Administration

May 7, 1971

Dear Business Division Chairman:

Will you please fill out the enclosed instrument? Your cooperation is solicited. The purpose of this doctoral study, being completed through Oregon State University, is to collect information in order to evaluate the business curricula in the community colleges of California. At the same time, a rating instrument is provided with which the community college may determine the status of its own program by outlining the standards it desires and the practices designed to achieve them.

Each evaluator will indicate whether the program, as currently organized and administered, meets the agreed-upon standards; i.e., does the program adhere to those practices designated as being desirable. Your responses will be compared with those of a nationwide panel of respected business educators to determine where, in the opinions of the latter, there is need for closer examination and possible modification.

You should, however, consider these criteria in light of the circumstances prevailing in YOUR community college. Thus, in effect, you may be using one set of standards; those individuals in another community college may be using a modified set.

Please provide the information requested concerning your community college; be sure to return the form with your completed survey. Your assistance is sincerely appreciated; your efforts will enable the writer to make observations and recommendations which, hopefully, will aid in curricular improvement.

Sincerely yours,

Redacted for privacy

Assistant Professor

md  
Enclosures

A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. It is hoped that all public community colleges in California will participate in this study. Won't you reply today?

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM WITH YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY

Name of Person  
Completing Form: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of  
Community College: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Area Served: \_\_\_\_\_ basically rural  
\_\_\_\_\_ primarily urban  
\_\_\_\_\_ mainly suburban

College Enrollment: \_\_\_\_\_

Business Division Enrollment: \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time

\_\_\_\_\_ Full-time

\_\_\_\_\_ Transfer

\_\_\_\_\_ Terminal

Number of Full-time Business Instructors: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Part-time Business Instructors: \_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU!

If you wish a synopsis of the results of this curricular  
survey, please check here: ☐

\_\_\_\_\_  
The basic format for this survey is an adaptation based,  
by permission, on a study conducted by Dr. S. J. Wanous.



## CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE BUSINESS CURRICULAR STANDARDS

## INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column 'D' if you believe that the criterion statement listed is a DESIRABLE curricular standard.
2. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column 'A' if the business division of your community college actually ADHERES to the curricular standard.
3. Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Column 'NA' if the criterion statement is NOT APPLICABLE to the circumstances in your community college.
4. Place no mark in any box if you feel that the criterion is an UNDESIRABLE standard.

## NOTE:

Because evaluators tend to mark an average point on a continuum, this form is designed to eliminate the degree of compliance with a standard. Because of the specificity of the criterion statements, they are more likely to produce an objective measurement of the status of the business program.

Admittedly, such evaluations based on judgments are certain to be less than perfect. This shortcoming does not preclude the need for evaluation, nor should it. Perpetual change demands continual study and revision to assure curricular relevancy.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE BUSINESS CURRICULAR STANDARDS

The Business Division of the Community College Should:

1. develop specific, behavioral objectives for all courses.
2. develop general, end-of-course goals for all courses.
3. make the course goals and objectives available to: students? . . . . .  
teachers? . . . . .  
counselors? . . . . .  
parents? . . . . .  
the general public? . . . . .  
other \_\_\_\_\_
4. include among its functions: preparation for upper-division training? . . . . .  
terminal vocational education? . . . . .  
general education? . . . . .  
community service programs? . . . . .  
adult education and guidance? . . . . .  
other \_\_\_\_\_
5. offer general education courses dealing with: economic efficiency? . . . . .  
consumer education? . . . . .  
ethical business practices? . . . . .  
other \_\_\_\_\_
6. provide the basic lower-division courses required by the four-year transfer schools.
7. identify future business teacher majors in order to recommend completion of the fundamental skill courses as lower-division students.
8. provide non-credit courses and informal educational activities such as forums, workshops, and seminars.
9. involve in the process of curriculum revision: students? . . . . .  
alumni? . . . . .  
business and community leaders? . . . . .  
other \_\_\_\_\_
10. keep the public informed about its curricula through a comprehensive program of public relations.
11. maintain close articulation with: other two-year colleges? . . . . .  
four-year colleges and universities? . . . . .  
nearly high schools? . . . . .
12. provide for the long career in business--not just the first job--through its terminal business curricula.
13. work closely with community advisory committees on terminal curricula.
14. provide certificate programs of less than two years' duration in appropriate areas.
15. set specific individual objectives for each student according to his abilities, as well as minimum business standards for all students.  
\* \* \* \* \*
16. The advanced skill subjects (e.g., typing, transcription, etc.) should be taken toward the end of the terminal business curriculum.
17. Guidance into the business program should be based on aptitude as determined by tests and previous achievement.
18. Specific standards, both in proficiency and accuracy, should be developed for the skill courses in line with the demands of business.

[illegible]

19. Proficiency tests should be required for terminal students in:

	D	A	NA
English . . . . .			
math. . . . .			
typewriting . . . . .			
other _____			

20. Remedial courses should be required for students who are weak in the fundamentals of: math. . . . .

	D	A	NA
grammar . . . . .			
other _____			

\*\*\*\*\*

Vocational Business Programs at the Community College Level Should:

21. consist of a balance between vocational and general education. Check the combination which you believe to be the proper balance.

\_\_\_\_\_ 50% vocational and 50% general

\_\_\_\_\_ MORE than 50% vocational

\_\_\_\_\_ LESS than 50% vocational

22. be concerned with developing programs (relevant to community needs) such as those funded under VEA, MDIA, and other Federal acts.

23. require work experience in the office occupations for:

all business students? . . . . .			
terminal students? . . . . .			

24. require work experience in distributive occupations for:

all business students? . . . . .			
terminal students? . . . . .			

25. have carefully structured sequences of required and essential courses for specialization in various occupational areas.

26. include the following types of specialized terminal curricula: (some may be two-year programs; others may be certificate programs of varying lengths). Please check one of the three categories for each area of concentration or specialization.

	<u>Include In-</u> <u>Depth Programs</u>	<u>Include Basic</u> <u>Courses Only</u>	<u>No Terminal</u> <u>Program</u> <u>Justified</u>
Accounting . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Bookkeeping-Clerical . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Clerk Typist . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Data Processing. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Distributive Education . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
General Business . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Management . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Real Estate. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Secretarial: Executive. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Legal. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Medical. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Technical. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
General. . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

27. be designed to prepare the student for a "cluster" of occupations rather than for more specific positions such as those indicated in the preceding statement (No. 26). If this criterion is desirable, what do you believe these "clusters" (e.g., stenographic; marketing) should be?

The Business Division of the Community College Should:

28. use performance tests to determine competency in each area of specialization.
29. conduct surveys of employers, students, and graduates to assist in curricular evaluation and, ultimately, revision.
30. consult and compare with other community colleges, business colleges, etc., when evaluating its curricula.
31. share responsibility with the placement office for the placement of business students.
32. be kept informed of community needs and job standards through close contact with the placement program as well as through surveys of employers and graduates.
33. work jointly with business and the advisory committees in student selection and placement within the various work experience programs.
34. assist the guidance counselors in keeping informed about current occupational trends in business to aid students in determining vocational goals.
35. have "its own" guidance counselor who is well-versed in the problems of the business student.
36. offer adult education programs: vocational program? . . . . .  
personal, non-vocational program? . . . . .
37. provide refresher and retraining courses for those seeking occupational advancement or entry into a business occupation.
38. include more courses with general education value for the non-business major.
39. permit the student seeking completion of the high school diploma to include business courses in his program.  
\* \* \* \* \*
40. Day and evening courses should be (theoretically) identical in:  
content? . . . . .  
methods? . . . . .  
credit granted? . . . . .
41. The business curricula should include courses appropriate for the "less able" student.
42. Transfer-program curricula should emphasize concepts.
43. Terminal curricula should emphasize practical applications.
44. Transfer and terminal students should have separate instruction in the same basic subject areas.
45. Instruction should be individualized to permit students to progress at their own achievement rates--not on the basis of fixed time schedules.
46. The rigidity of the "course" structure should be given up in favor of skill and competency performance criteria for individualized instructional programs.
47. All business majors should have a common core of required courses.

[illegible]

48. The following courses may be found among the offerings of a community college. Please indicate with a digit (e.g., 0, 1, 2, etc.) in Column 1 the number of terms (quarters; semesters) in each area which should be available to students majoring in business curricula. In addition, check in Column 2 those which you feel should be required of all business majors and, in Column 3, those which would be desirable for the non-major desiring business and economic understandings.

	Col. 1 Available to all business majors	Col. 2 Required of all business majors	Col. 3 Desirable for non-majors
Accounting . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Advertising . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Bookkeeping (Recordkeeping) . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Business Communication (letter writing) . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Business English (fundamentals) . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Business Law . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Business Machines . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Business Math . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Consumer Economics . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Data Processing . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Economics . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Finance . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Finite Math . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Human Relations . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Industrial Relations . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Insurance . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Introduction to Business . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Machine Shorthand . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Management . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Marketing . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Merchandising . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Office Management . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Office Procedures . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Personal Shorthand . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Real Estate . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Records Management . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Report Writing . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Retailing . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Salesmanship . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Shorthand & Transcription . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Statistics . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Taxation . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Transportation . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Typewriting . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
Other _____ . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
_____ . . . . .	_____	_____	_____
_____ . . . . .	_____	_____	_____

## APPENDIX F

A reminder in the form of a postal card went to all survey participants who had not replied to date.

Just a Reminder . . .

Humboldt State College  
May 17, 1971

Recently you received a copy of a survey being conducted as part of my doctoral study. It would be greatly appreciated if you would complete and return the form. Your reply will be treated confidentially.

As a result of your responses, observations and recommendations will be made which, hopefully, may influence curricular modification.

G. W. Melendy  
1691 11th Street  
Arcata, CA 95521

Thank you for your efforts.  
May I hear from you soon?

## APPENDIX G

The second follow-up went out as the following message. The remainder of this mailing consisted of the same explanation, data sheet, and criterion set sent out in the first mailing to the division chairmen (Appendix E).

HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS  
Arcata, California 95521

Department of Business Education  
Department of Office Administration

May 29, 1971

Dear Business Division Chairman:

It's easy to put something aside on one's desk and later find that it's been "lost in the shuffle." With the thought that the survey instrument you received from me early in May may have been misplaced, another copy of the form is enclosed. As I am eager to begin tabulating and writing, please complete and return the form today.

Your response is needed to assure the validity and reliability of the study, which is the basis of my doctoral work. Therefore, before being caught up in the numerous year-end projects which we all must face, won't you give a little time to this survey instrument. Your responses will be treated confidentially. A return, postage-paid envelope is enclosed for your use.

Gratefully yours,

Redacted for privacy

G. W. Melendy  
Assistant Professor

md  
Enclosures

The success of this venture depends upon cooperation. May I have yours?



## APPENDIX H

The fourth mailing (third follow-up) went to the division chairmen again in the form of a postal card.

The pressure is on . . .

Arcata, CA 95521  
June 8, 1971

right now; but before you clear your desk for the summer, won't you please complete and return my survey. I'll be so appreciative of your help.

Perhaps a 100 percent response is too much to hope for, but I'd like to come as close to that as possible. It does take time to complete a survey; and for that which you are willing to lend, I am grateful. May I expect to receive your copy this week?

G. W. Melendy  
School of Business & Economics  
Humboldt State College

If you've already  
mailed it, thanks!

## APPENDIX I

List of Terms

The following terms are clarified as to the meaning which they convey in the context of this dissertation.

- Community college - a public junior college offering transfer programs (freshman and sophomore years) and at the same time providing vocational programs of a terminal nature.
- Terminal program - vocational programs which, upon their completion, lead directly into employment.
- Transfer program - the freshman and sophomore years of college. The credits so earned will transfer to educational institutions offering upper division (junior and senior years) programs leading to baccalaureate degrees.
- Cluster concept - grouping related occupations into logical clusters. The idea is to prepare an individual for employment in not just one occupation but a "field" of related types of employment.