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Purposes of the Study

The most important purposes of this study were to: (1) determine the extent of cooperation and coordination that currently exists in selected community colleges which have community school programs in their college districts, and (2) clarify the multi-roles of community schools and of community education in community colleges. Other purposes of the study were to: (1) examine the present educational philosophy regarding community schools and community colleges, (2) determine if duplication of programs exists, and (3) encourage educational administrators to develop a realistic plan for cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.
Procedures

A questionnaire with 46 items was developed to obtain opinions from educational administrators regarding organization, administration, finance, instruction and the level of cooperation between community schools and community colleges. The questionnaire was sent to community school directors or coordinators and community college administrators who supervised adult, community or continuing education.

Five states were selected for this study—Oregon, Washington, California, Michigan and Florida. Each community college selected had at least one community school program operating in the college district. Seventy respondents (35 community college and 35 community school administrators) participated in the study by reacting to the 46 items which were assigned values of one to five on a Likert-type scale with one being strong disagreement and five being strong agreement. All items on the returned questionnaire were analyzed by utilizing the analysis of variance technique.

Selected Findings

Selected findings were:

1. Fifteen items (32.6%) showed significant differences among mean score responses for community college and community school personnel.
2. Except for three items, no differences existed between mean score responses among states.

3. Except for four items, no interaction effect differences existed in mean responses between college/schools and states.

4. The greatest number of rejected items (71.4%) were found in the section on instruction.

5. The finance section had 66% of its items rejected.

6. There were no significant differences in the responses on all items in the general question section.

7. Of the 35 community schools surveyed, the length of time these schools were in operation varied from one to seven years. Thirteen of the schools were in operation just one year.

8. The greatest number of community schools in one college district was 25.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The following selected conclusions were based on a review of literature, the questionnaire and results of statistical analysis.

They are:

1. There is an urgent need for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools in college districts.
2. State laws do not prevent the community colleges and community schools from cooperating in the five states surveyed in this study.

3. State certification and qualifications of instructors in community colleges and community schools were issues which did not prevent cooperation and coordination between those two institutions.

4. Considerable disagreement exists between community colleges and community schools with regard to whether or not the community college should pay part of the community school director's salary.

5. Competition for tax dollars by community colleges and community schools is not the reason for the lack of cooperation between these institutions in the five states surveyed.

6. Community college and community school personnel must come to an agreement regarding who should be responsible for coordinating community education in a community college district.

7. Much disagreement was found between community schools and community colleges in the areas of instruction and finance.

8. A need exists for a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.
The following recommendations are made:

1. Have the community college develop a training program for community school para-professionals, directors/ coordinators and other related personnel.

2. Develop formal guidelines for cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.

3. Further delineate the role and function of the multiplicity of agencies providing community education in a community college district.

4. Develop a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Literature reveals that there is a surging interest and a steady growth in community schools throughout the United States (Community Development, April, 1969). Larry Briggs, Coordinator of Conferences and Visitations, Mott Community School Program, revealed that there are now over 600 formal community school programs in this country and 30-40 new programs will be established each year for the next few years. In addition, almost 10,000 persons from throughout the United States visited the Flint, Michigan, Community School Program in 1971. Briggs indicated that new community school programs in this country are being established at a rate which is greater than the community college movement.

Community Colleges are being established at the rate of 20-30 each year in the United States (Thornton, 1966) and by 1980, it is predicted that there will be a need for 230 to 280 new community colleges for a total of almost 1,300 community colleges serving more than 3.7 million students of all ages (The Open-Door Colleges, 1970).
However, an intensive search in the literature revealed little evidence that cooperation and coordination exist between community colleges and community schools within those college districts.

By visiting with Mott Community School personnel in Flint, Michigan, it was learned that much more cooperation is needed in Flint between the community schools and the local community college in that city. However, in the immediate past, progress has been made in Michigan toward getting the community school personnel and the community college administrators together for a joint meeting to discuss ways in which cooperation and coordination can be achieved in that State (Briggs, 1972). The Flint program was the first community school program in the United States and is the "model" for that concept at present. The Flint officials indicated that there was an immediate need for much more communication, cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools within those college districts to eliminate costly duplication and to develop better programs to meet the needs of many more people in every community.

Statement of the Problem

Because of the many misconceptions, even among community college personnel, of the role of community schools and the role of community education or adult education in community colleges,
there is a need to clarify the multi-roles of both community education and community schools.

Larry Horyna, Director of the Northwest Community Education Development Center, University of Oregon, Eugene, stated that he had spoken to numerous educators throughout the Northwest who had misconceptions about the role of community schools and the role of community education or adult education in community colleges (Horyna, May, 1972). Similar misconceptions regarding the two roles have been found in other personal interviews with personnel who work in community/adult education in Oregon Community Colleges.

Educations have expressed the need for developing methods to set up programs which will allow community schools and community colleges to work together, thus eliminating duplicate courses, activities and programs.

Therefore, the major objectives of this study are:

1. To determine the extent of cooperation and coordination that currently exists in selected community colleges which have community school programs in their college districts.

2. To clarify the multi-roles of community schools and of community education in community colleges.
Need for the Study

Logsdon and Polk recently wrote about the need for a review of the community college-community school relationships in local communities. Polk (1973) in the Community Education Journal states,

No one holds a franchise on Community Education in Florida. The needs of education are as broad and as diverse as the service agencies within the Community.

Cooperation is the key word that describes the relationship between two of the major contributors to Community Education -- the Community School Program and the Florida Junior College.

(p. 11)

Myran emphasized the need for immediate cooperative planning and program implementation between community school and community services personnel in community colleges (Myran and Solloway, 1971). He listed six areas in which cooperation should be on-going. They are: 1) area-wide educational planning, 2) adult basic education, general educational development and high school completion programs for young and older adults, 3) manpower training programs in each community where there is a need, 4) community development, 5) cultural and fine arts programs, and 6) recreation and summer education.

Even though there are few writers on this subject, it is evident from a review of literature (Myran and Solloway, 1971; Logsdon, 1972; Polk, 1973) and from interviews with personnel working with
community school programs (Briggs, 1972; Horyna, 1972; Ellis, 1972) that there is general agreement that duplicate community education programs within each community college district should be eliminated. Each educator suggests that there be a re-evaluation of the present educational philosophy regarding these two areas.

In Oregon, most of the state's population lives within a community college district. In addition, community schools are being implemented, or now exist in over half of the community college districts. Yet, only two community colleges have actually developed an experimental formal program of coordination and cooperation.

Authorities in the field of community education and of community schools insist that more must be done, not only in Oregon but also in all states, so that cooperative programs can be implemented by educational institutions.

Briggs and Horyna have stated that a usable "model" for this type of cooperation is imperative. Yet, nothing exists in the literature dealing with this subject which offers any evidence that many educators are concerned about the duplication of programs. Viable alternatives may be found from this study which will offer solutions to educators and to members of boards of education who are willing to cooperate.
Definition of Terms

Because there are misunderstandings by educators as well as by lay persons in the use of educational terms, the following definitions are included for purposes of standardizing the use of terms in this study.

**Community College:** A public or private two-year institution which usually offers education programs and services in (1) lower division transfer credit, (2) vocational/occupational, (3) general education (adult/community education), (4) counseling and guidance, (5) community services.

**Community School:** An educational institution which actively carries out the concept that all education facilities in every public school within a school district are available to anyone who can benefit from them. Its programs are designed to meet the needs of the people who live in each community, whenever and wherever the citizens want them. Typically, these programs and activities are offered after the regular school day.

**Administrators of a Community School:** Personnel who have the responsibility of organizing and supervising the activities and programs in a community school. Normally, their titles are director or coordinator of community schools.

**Formal Courses:** Courses which are of a specified length, meet
regularly, and may offer credit.

**College Credit Courses**: Formal courses which offer institutional credit and can be either transferable or non-transferable.

**Adult/Community Education in Community College**: Formal courses or activities (organized educational experiences) which may, or may not, offer credit and generally can be recreational, general self-improvement, cultural, social, intellectual and vocational/occupational. Usually these are offered after 6:00 p.m. and are held on and off campus.

**Volunteer Community School Instructor**: Any person who supervises an activity or instructs a class (formal or non-formal) for credit or non-credit and accepts no financial remuneration.

**Programs**: Educational experiences which normally are organized for people who wish to achieve a goal or skill.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

In this study the assumptions and limitations of the research were as follows:

**Assumptions**

1. Administrators of selected community schools and community colleges in five selected states are aware of the concept of community education.
2. Educators have evidenced little progress for the development of a cooperative relationship between community colleges and community schools.

3. Community college and community school administrators have not examined their respective roles in community education where community schools operate within a community college district.

4. Administrators are concerned about duplicate activities and courses where community schools operate within a community college district.

Limitations

1. The study is limited to five selected states: Washington, Oregon, California, Michigan and Florida.

2. The study is limited to community colleges which have at least one community school located in each college district in the five selected states.

3. The study is limited to ten community colleges which were randomly sampled from a list of community colleges in each selected state.
4. The study is limited to one randomly sampled community school in each of the ten community colleges in each state.

5. The study is limited to adult, continuing or community education administrators in community colleges and to directors or coordinators of community schools.

Summary

With the anticipated accelerated growth in community schools and community colleges during the next ten years, an immediate challenge awaits the administrators of those two agencies to develop a realistic educational plan which will allow the patrons of school and college districts to find programs which will meet the needs of all of the people in those communities, regardless of their socio-economic levels.

By having cooperative programs between those two educational agencies, tax dollars can be saved, broader community participation can be expected and greater community support can be realized.

This study, therefore, is an attempt to evaluate the levels of cooperation and coordination which currently exists between these institutions in five selected states: Washington, California, Oregon, Michigan and Florida. The study will also attempt to clarify the role of the community schools and the role of the community colleges in those five states.
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

What is Community Education?

A review of the literature reveals that some authors use the terms community education and community schools interchangeably (Cordasco, 1970; Hawkins and Hensarling, 1971; Herman, 1971; Totten, 1970; Totten and Manley, 1970; Weaver, 1970; Melby, 1969). What is community education? Weaver defines it as an organized process through which the educational needs of the individual and of society are met. He contends that where this concept has been implemented, there have been some noticeable gains in social improvement (Weaver, 1970). He goes on to describe the community school as a part of the community education process. He suggests that the whole idea of the community school is to create a climate in which there is freedom to learn -- to learn how to solve human problems and to gain knowledge.

Minzey (1972, p. 152) asserts, "Community education is the educational concept; community school is the vehicle by which many services of the community education are delivered."

Totten (1972) believes that "the community educator is committed to the idea that people learn from the total environment, that is, the entire community is the school plant. All of the people are potential teachers and everything in the community is a potential
resource. When all members of the family go to school, some of the elements of communication and common purpose are reclaimed. The generation gap is narrowed." (p. 149)

Cordasco's concept of community education includes his contention that no social institution, particularly the school, can be successful unless it is made an integral part of the community it serves (Cordasco, 1970). A number of writers on this subject concur that the concept of community schools is a movement and not an establishment. Minzey and Olsen state that "Community Education has been interpreted to mean different things to different individuals over the years. The varying perceptions have thus resulted in numerous definitions, differing in both activities and scope, depending on the context of the individuals defining it (Melby, et al., 1969, p. 31)." Minzey and Olsen (Melby, et al., 1969, p. 32) remark:

Community education is a process that concerns itself with everything that affects the well-being of all of the citizens within a given community. This definition extends the role of community education from one of the traditional concept of teaching children to one of identifying the needs, problems and wants of the community and then assisting in the development of facilities, programs, staff, and leadership toward the end of improving the entire community.
Goals of Community Education

Totten and Manley listed a number of goals which offer another view toward the concept of community education. Some of their goals are to: make all learning relevant; help people realize their own potential for solving their own problems; harmonize the contributions to learning of all individuals and agencies in the community for total community education; enable each school facility to serve as a human development laboratory; create a home-school-community relationship and program which will enable each individual to have the best possible chance to develop an adequate self-image; establish appropriate life goals and build his personal traits and abilities to the highest possible degree; raise the literacy level of the people in the community; encourage senior citizens to continue active service to their communities, help people to prepare to cope with the impact of societal change in a new kind of world so that adults will be able to meet requirements for certificates, diplomas, degrees on various levels; and bring about an understanding among men and make each community a better place in which to live (Totten and Manley, 1970).

Is there, then, a relationship between the terms adult education, continuing education, community services as they pertain to community college education and the concept of community schools?
A definition of adult education by Thornton (1966, p. 9) is that it:

... should serve the aspirations of the more mature for literacy, for learning new and more remunerative skills, for a higher degree of culture, for understanding the social, physical, and economic environment, for fulfilling the role of responsible citizenship in a nation and world having complex problems, and for enriching the leisure time which is steadily growing as a result of automation, shortened work-weeks, and earlier retirement.

Reynolds (1969, p. 87) defines the concept of community services as providing:

... an extension of the regular school program in terms of the traditional school day, the traditional curriculum, the traditional concept of students. Community services, moreover, often transcend the tradition of education in the sense of student-teacher relationships. In many instances this relationship is entirely absent.

Raines and Myron believe that, in the future, community services should become a communications link between the college and the community, bridging serious social systems through personal contacts in the community (Raines and Myron, 1970). They suggest that perhaps community services can be instrumental in restoring our faith that institutions of higher learning are humanely concerned with the development of the individual and the community in which he lives. The central challenge of the new decade is to discover and rediscover methods of humanizing our institutions and our communities. Community colleges, through community services,
are in a strategic position to facilitate individual and community development.

Myron and Solloway are proponents of the concept of community college -- community school cooperation. They assert that community colleges have, at times, neglected the educational problems of the community in which they are located. Thus, if the wide-range of community problems are not reviewed and acted upon by the community college, then the community school programs will be forced to try to "do the job." (Myron and Solloway, 1971). Most community colleges have community services departments, but the programs are limited in many areas. The community college which encompasses serveral school districts should provide programs which respond to city-wide, or regional, rather than only neighborhood, needs.

The community school philosophy appears to place more emphasis on the family and on the home, on programs for children, and on neighborhood related activities. The community college, through community services, places more emphasis on the adult learner, on occupational programs and on a community problems solving orientation.

Thornton (1966, p. 67) believes that the term "adult education is no longer as limited in meaning as it was when Americanization was the main purpose. Today the term continuing education is a more
accurate description of the function."

The community college is in a strategic position from the standpoint of its basic philosophy, its relation to the community, its facilities either actual or potential, and by clear responsibility to provide adult education on a far more progressive and inclusive scale than is the case at the present time. It would seem that every college, regardless of its size or method of control, should seek out and encourage adults in the community to improve themselves and their occupational status. (Bogue, 1950, p. 67).

Many similarities are found in these definitions which are basic to the concept of adult/community education. However, community education is a broader, more inclusive term which encompasses all of the above definitions and includes the term, community schools.

A summary of the principal characteristics of the community school as given by Totten and Manley, is listed below to demonstrate its relationship to community education. The community school:

1. Makes all facilities and trained personnel available day and night, year around.

2. Adapts its facilities (buildings and grounds) to multiple use and to persons of all ages.

3. Develops much of its curriculum and activities from a continuous study of people's basic needs.

4. Considers with equal importance the afternoon, evening, Saturday, and Sunday program -- and the regular academic daytime program.
5. Integrates, insofar as possible, the educational, social, physical, recreational, and health programs for children, youth and adults.

6. Makes full use of all available resources, both human and material, in carrying out its program.

7. Becomes a source of initiative and gives initial leadership in planning and carrying out constructive community projects.

8. Promotes democratic thinking and action in all phases of its work.

9. Constructs its curriculum and activities creatively and is less dependent upon traditional education patterns.

10. Inspires its staff with a desire to be of service in real life activities and beyond the usual classroom responsibilities.

11. Expands and diffuses leadership throughout the community.

12. Is genuinely life-centered as a social institution.

13. Involves all persons concerned in planning much of its program.

14. Seeks to enrich all phases of the daytime program by use of community resources.
15. Aims to develop a sense of unity and solidarity in its neighborhood.

16. Initiates programs of usefulness for persons of all ages, classes and creeds.

17. Takes responsibilities for coordinating living, learning, and service activities of other agencies in the community.

18. Does much to establish confidence in the minds of people so that they can solve cooperatively most of their own community problems.

Three references were found which specifically referred to the concept of cooperation and coordination of community schools with community college community education programs (Logsdon, 1972; Polk, 1973; Myron and Solloway, 1971).

Role of the Community College in Community Education

McClusky (1972) states, "there is substantial support for the view that community colleges are the key leadership agencies in developing community education. This view holds that the community college should serve as a catalyst and coordinator in staff and program development and in providing special services." (p. 164).

In at least two community colleges in Oregon the view, as supported by McClusky, that the community college should be a
catalyst in the area of community education is now a reality. The new concept (direct cooperation and coordination with community schools within community college districts) is still in the embryonic stage of development, but signs of success are already noticeable. With the expected expansion of community education programs at those colleges, the people in those college districts will have the opportunity to become involved in many more educational activities.

In several other states there is a pronounced move toward greater leadership in community education by community colleges, notably in Iowa, Michigan, Florida and California.

Logsdon recently suggested that the role of community colleges should be a commitment in broadening the American dream of education -- that is making it available to all: the young, the old, the gifted, and those who have been denied access to education because of handicaps or low socioeconomic status (Logsdon, 1972). However, if the community college is truly to make the commitment that its constituents will have a broad education available to them, then "the community college president will have to establish a climate of support for the community education concept," (Logsdon, 1972, p. 198). In addition, the president's staff, particularly the administrators, must acknowledge and accept their role in setting the tone for others on their staff. They must believe and then demonstrate that their institutions can be open early and
remain open late to accommodate community needs and demands.

To be a leader in community education, community colleges must establish definite procedures for obtaining community involvement. They must be flexible -- local colleges must be able to adapt quickly and efficiently to local conditions. It is important that the programs offered by the college are articulated with other educational agencies available in the community education area. Continuous contact should be maintained with all the schools in the supporting area.

To assure the community college that it is effectively fulfilling its role in community education, there should be a program of continuous evaluation of all its activities and programs developed in line with the community education concept.

Effective community education involvement means that the entire community should become the community college campus. Community colleges should become schools without walls.

Logsdon (1972) summarizes his view of the role of the community college in community education by stating that "because of its nature and organization, the community college can play a strategic role in developing the concept of community education..." p. 199.

The Carnegie Commission recommends that the community college should become a strong, flexible institution which should
serve the varied needs of a learning society (Saturday Review, 1970). The Commission also suggests: 1) that the community colleges should guarantee admission to all who can benefit from "higher education," 2) that tuition should be low or non-existent, 3) that more guidance counselors be provided to aid students in making occupational choices, 4) that colleges offer remedial education to suit the needs of the student at whatever level he is, 5) that courses are offered for working adults who want to upgrade occupational skills, and for those who wish to acquire new knowledge merely as an avocation.

The Community College in its community education should offer programs for older adults during the day and evening, including classes at retirement centers. There should be concern in the college staff for preparing people for retirement. The population of that age group is increasing rapidly. By 1988, one of every eleven persons will be over 65 years old (Byron, 1969). It is important, therefore, that community education programs are designed to give the older adult the opportunity to acquire hobby skills and allow for cultural growth and self-expression. The community college should attempt to prepare these people for a satisfying retirement.

Heiner suggests that the community college should be a counselor to the community. Through the concept of community
education the college should: 1) assert itself in coordinating the efforts of community social agencies by putting them into contact with one another, 2) be flexible enough to offer active leadership at a practical level in answer to community problems by responding to local social issues with seminars and discussions, 3) extend its counseling resources to the entire community whether or not members of the community are enrolled in the college (Heiner, 1969).

While some people still believe that community colleges are the second class citizens of higher education, Joseph Cosand, in Campus 1980, feels that the philosophy is changing drastically. The community college, by working closely with the community, with industry and business, is becoming the primary conveyor of undergraduate education and of community education. It will be a true center of learning by providing educational opportunities for both young and adults, day and night, every month of the year.

Cosand believes that future objectives for general/community education will be to provide -- indirectly in all courses and directly in specific courses -- experiences which will lead to the development of a broadly educated person who has a grasp of the interrelationship of knowledge, and who is able, through learning, to think effectively, communicate his thoughts, make relevant judgments, discriminate among values, and make appropriate applications of what he has learned (Cosand, 1968).
The community colleges are beginning to meet the needs of many people in their communities. Voegel contends that by broadening the student base through the "open door" admission policy, keeping tuition costs low, having colleges accessible to its potential students and striving for flexibility in the curriculum, the community colleges are a positive force in their successful role as a leader in community education (Voegel, 1971).

In many community colleges, the community services division is not only a complement to community education, but also an integral part of the entire concept of community education. The Encyclopedia of Education (1971, p. 325) states:

Performance of community services by the community college entails the acceptance of the following principles: 1) In a community college, the campus is the length and breadth of the college district. 2) The program of community services must be designed to bring the community to the college and take the college programs out into the community. 3) The community college must recognize its responsibility as a catalyst in community development and self-improvement. 5) The program must not duplicate existing services in the community.

Role of Community Schools in Community Education

The community school is a vehicle to implement community education in a local area. The concept of community schools is a movement and not an establishment. The community school is
a neighborhood center, a school whose doors "swing open to the community, " a common meeting ground where living and learning join forces. The community school is people, learning new skills, enjoying themselves, finding new talents, and learning beyond the regular curriculum.

The following goals are distinctly related to the community school concept: all learning should be relevant. People are helped to realize their own potential in solving their problems. Self-confidence will be established in persons; for many this will be a replacement of resignation with hope. The contribution of learning to all individuals and agencies in the community will be harmonized for total community development. Each school facility will serve as a human development laboratory. A home-school-community relationship will be created, and a meaningful program will enable each individual to have the best possible chance to develop an adequate self-image. A person will be able to establish appropriate life goals and build his personal trait and abilities to the highest possible level. Barriers to social progress as selfishness, bigotry, prejudice, intolerance and indifference can be eliminated. The illiteracy rate of people in a community will be raised. Senior citizens will be encouraged to continue active service to their communities. People will be better able to cope with the impact of societal change and adults will be helped to meet requirements
for certificates, diplomas and degrees on various levels. Those who need or want to upgrade their skills will have that opportunity and those people in poverty will be helped to gain upward social mobility. Lastly, the economy of the community will be improved, and understanding among men will be brought about which will make the community a better place in which to live.

The community school concept is not new, but the implementation of it on a reasonably large scale is a recent development in education. As early as 1930 a number of educational leaders were interested in the concept but only in the past fifteen years have there been considerable advancements in this movement.

One of the most influential leaders in community schools was the late Charles Stewart Mott who, through the Mott Foundation, implemented his program in 1935 by providing a grant to the Flint, Michigan, schools. Since 1935, the Mott Foundation has given millions of dollars which has led to the development of community schools in Flint which involves many thousands of local residents with the schools and lures thousands of educators to Flint each year to learn about their successful program.

Totten and Manley (1970) made a comparative summary of basic characteristics of the traditional school versus the community school which is listed below to emphasize the basic differences between the traditional and the community school concept:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Traditional School</th>
<th>The Community School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School day - 6 to 7 hours.</td>
<td>1. School day - 14 to 16 hours, or longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. School week - 5 days.</td>
<td>2. School week - 6(plus) days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Limited opportunity for recreational and social activities.</td>
<td>7. Broad opportunity for recreational and social activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enrichment experience limited to what can be worked into the required class hours.</td>
<td>8. Enrichment experience takes place on a broad school day extending into out-of-class periods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Very little use of the community as a laboratory for learning.

10. School generally closed to community groups.

11. People without children in school not closely related.

12. Limited communication with the community as a whole.

13. No direct impact on reduction of unemployment.

14. School concerned primarily with its own school community.

15. Very little direct planning and leadership in bringing about united effort of home, school, and community.


10. School usually open to community groups for meetings and programs of all types.

11. People without children in school actively involved.

12. Broad communication with the community at large.

13. Through retraining programs and counseling, big impact on unemployment.

14. Much effort to condition people for relationship and participation in the various communities of which they are a part.

15. Much planning and direction in establishing coordinated home, school, and community effort the effective development of children and youth.
16. Impact on the solution of social problems largely through the required academic program.

17. Impact on barriers to social progress comes only through the intellectual and interrelationship of children while in school.

18. The "oneness of purpose" concept is related to that which comes primarily from the intellectual.

19. Racial integration is influenced only by interrelationship of children and their teachers.

20. Common goals are related almost entirely to the program in the academic areas.
21. School does not presume to initiate projects for community development.

21. The school initiates many projects for community development and improvement.

22. School does not concern itself directly with community development.

22. School becomes the catalytic agent for setting people in motion on problems of community development.

23. Provides a sense of pride and accomplishment only to the intellectually elite.

23. Builds a sense of pride and accomplishment in all people of the community.

Community schools should also make determined efforts toward involving and assisting the senior citizens in their communities. These schools can function as facilitators for agencies and services. Several suggestions for implementation are: 1) create a crisis center, 2) set up meetings between agency people and senior citizens, 3) provide transportation for seniors to needed services, 4) provide counseling to those who seek it, 5) provide income tax assistance.

Community schools can help senior citizens prepare for retirement by: 1) coordinating printed retirement information, 2) providing recreation information service, 3) helping to establish senior citizen clinics, 4) offering training in food preparation, 5) providing
information on maintaining good health, and 6) finding new ways to take the school and its activities into the homes of senior citizens.

Community schools can assist senior citizens in social and recreational activities in the following ways: 1) organize senior citizen talent shows, 2) operate social and recreational information centers, 3) organize parent sitter services, 4) plan senior citizen trips, 5) implement a "Gold Card" plan (free admission to school activities and classes), 6) provide hot lunch "Meals on Wheels" programs, 7) create a mobile library, 8) have a joint lunch with elementary pupils.

Community schools also should help senior citizens to function as community resources by: 1) encouraging senior citizens to man Legislative Research Committees, 2) using them as recruiters and aids in adult/community education, GED and high school completion, 3) having them conduct community needs surveys, 4) having them on community education advisory councils, 5) having them operate "Dial-a-Friend" Service and telephoning the homebound, 6) using them as sources for transportation whenever possible, 7) involving them in day-care work, 8) using them as part-time teachers, counselors, teacher aides, and 9) having them teach students about forgotten trades.

The activities through community schools could continue almost indefinitely; however, the above suggestions are presented to show
the extensive involvement for community schools in many ways with each community.

**Role of Cooperative Extension Service in Oregon Community Education**

At the present time there is cooperation between community colleges in Oregon and the Cooperative Extension Service. In each college district the level of cooperation with the local cooperative extension service differs because the Oregon community colleges are in various stages of development. However, a study was conducted by the Oregon State University Cooperative Extension Service Administration in late 1971 and completed in July, 1972, which showed that there was considerable cooperation between the Oregon Community Colleges and the Cooperative Extension Service (Extension-Community College Study, 1972).

The Extension-Community College Study (1972) investigated possible areas of cooperation which would strengthen the cooperative activities already underway. The following five points were explored with each community college:

1. **Program areas in which Cooperative Extension is best suited to assume primary responsibility and the community college assumes a supportable role.**

2. **Program areas in which the individual community college is best suited to assume a primary responsibility**
and Extension assumes a supporting role.

3. Within the resources available, information and educational services which Cooperative Extension Service might provide to the community colleges to strengthen their teaching and service programs.

4. Possible methods whereby joint use of community college facilities would be desirable.

5. Alternative mechanisms for maintaining continuing communication between the community colleges and the Cooperative Extension Service (p. 15).

The study showed that:

Extension staff members, county extension agents and specialists, resident at Oregon State University, devoted over 500 man days to teaching formal and informal programs to approximately 5,000 adults and youth in cooperation with community colleges.

In addition to teaching classes and conducting other programs in cooperation with community colleges, county extension staff members regularly participate in meetings of advisory committees established by the community colleges to advise in curriculum development. Community college staff members also serve on Extension program advisory committees and councils (p. 4).

One of the problems encountered by the college and extension staff members in joint discussion was the matter of titles used by community colleges to describe formal and informal educational programs in community education which appear to duplicate offerings. These are called avocational education, continuing education, adult education and special courses (Extension-Community College Study, 1972).
The results of the study pointed out that:

1. No clear determination was made in the areas of adult education regarding extension or community college assuming primary responsibility.

2. Those who returned the completed study recognized the community college's leadership role in courses such as Adult Basic Education, College Transfer, Guidance and Counseling and Placement Services.

3. Extension services to community colleges could include using extension staff as consultants and guest lecturers on a limited basis, interchanging publications and publicity with the two agencies, and training college staff members in selected subjects in which extension staff has expertise.

4. Joint use of community college facilities exists with all colleges.

5. Continued communication between community colleges and Extension Service was desirable and periodic meetings between those two agencies would continue.

Findings of the Extension-Community College study (1972) indicated that:

Community college staff members and administrators recognize no limitations to their informal education offerings. In numerous instances they are expanding into program areas that have traditionally been developed and conducted by extension staff. If such expansion persists without reaching some understanding as to the respective roles and responsibilities of the community college and extension, serious duplication and overlap will occur.

The role of Extension and the community college must be based upon their respective capabilities if the citizens are to obtain high quality programs and
efficient use of tax resources. (p. 9)

The study further asserts that:

We are recommending leadership roles for Extension and community colleges in specific areas, however, we believe that each can help the other by their active support of the total program. (p. 12)

The study concludes that the Cooperative Extension Service and the Oregon Community Colleges have a commitment to provide informal education and service to the people of Oregon. By continuing and expanding the cooperation between these two agencies, individuals in each community will benefit, not only by having improved services and programs available to them, but also by gaining tax dollar savings resulting from elimination of duplicated programs and activities.

Role of the Division of Continuing Education in Oregon Community Education

In 1970 David Etter conducted a survey for the Division of Continuing Education dealing with continuing education and community services courses in Oregon. In this survey, Etter noted that the Division of Continuing Education serves more older adults (average - 37.2 years) than any other agency (Etter, 1970).

To learn about continuing education and community services courses in Oregon, a twenty item questionnaire was mailed to
1,032 prospective Continuing Education and Community Services agencies in Oregon. A 77.8 percent return identified 176 public and private agencies as well as school and non-school agencies. The purpose of the investigation was to ascertain what course and allied learning opportunity activity was being conducted, where it was being conducted and by which agencies (Etter, 1970).

Etter listed ten major findings of which seven have significance for community education in Oregon. Those seven findings are:

1. Continuing Education and Community Services courses and allied learning opportunities are a ten million dollar a year activity in Oregon.

2. The average fee charged the 508,896 enrollees in the 23,066 courses and allied learning opportunities reported was estimated to be $15.50.

3. The Division of Continuing Education provides the greatest number of clock hours of instruction of all Oregon agencies and it serves more older adults than any other agency.

4. Less than ten per cent of the 176 agencies studied concentrate on providing for blue-collars workers and the poor.

5. Outdoor Recreation and Physical Education (4,812) followed by Agriculture (1,296) followed by Safety and First Aid (1,102) were the most frequent offerings during 1969-70.

6. Colleges and universities account for 20 per cent of the Oregon agencies and 42 per cent of enrollments.
Considerable variations were found among different sections of the State and among subject areas with respect to participant age, method of instruction, subjects offered and related factors. (p. 1)

The problem of duplication of services in community education should be reviewed and evaluated continuously. Etter's survey showed that proving or disproving duplication in the field of continuing education and community services is a difficult task. He suggests that the fact that:

Two agencies conduct similar sounding offerings in the same community at about the same time of year is, by itself, insufficient grounds for claiming duplication. A closer inspection of the two similar sounding offerings might reveal that one was a short non-credit course and the other a credit course, or that one was for personnel working for large firms and the other for independent businessmen. (p. 209)

Etter believes that duplication of courses is a rare occurrence basically for the reason of competition. Continuing Education and Community Services courses are products which must find their way in the "marketplace" or else they will be eliminated. In the last analysis, it is the adult learner who is in the best position to decide whether a duplication has occurred (Etter, 1970).

One can conclude from Etter's survey that: 1) Adult education in Oregon is "big business," 2) some of Oregon's less populated
districts appear to get nearly twice as many course offerings per capita as are some of the most populated districts, 3) the average age of participants was estimated to be 37.2 years, 4) most adults who were enrolled in courses and activities have completed high school and many have completed college, 5) most participants are employed in white-collar or professional occupations, and 6) very few "hard core poor" people were enrolled in the 23,000 plus courses recorded in the study.

Role of Other Educational Agencies in Community Education

There are many agencies that offer courses and activities which could be categorized under the heading community education. The four-year colleges and universities must look at their institutions and determine whether or not they should be actively involved in this concept. Seay (1972, p. 201) states:

The provision of trained educational leaders alone is not enough. If strong impetus is to be given to the community education movement, colleges and universities must also serve directly those communities desiring to inaugurate programs in community education.

Logsdon and Wiegman assert that Universities have had some criticism concerning the failure to meet the needs of the societies which they are to serve. Universities should focus attention upon
functions that people accept as traditionally legitimate. The prime concern of a university should be people. Therefore, developing community education is a good example of a university function (Logsdon and Wiegman, 1973).

Florida Atlantic University is an example of what a university can do in the area of community education. In 1966 a Specialist in Community Education was employed to implement a program through their Department of Educational Administration. Since that time, Florida Atlantic University has become a leader in community education in the Southeastern area of the United States. The university now is involved in field work and dissemination of materials on community education, and it also has a professional program for those who are interested in a career in Community Education.

Logsdon and Wiegman say:

These developments will make it possible to provide special leadership for the concept that education is for all citizens regardless of age, and that schools should be the focus of the total community. The College of Education appears to have given this concept wholehearted acceptance.

The success of the program, its implementation and development, is living proof that a complex university can marshall the necessary resources, secure wholehearted cooperation, and put life into a worthwhile idea (Logsdon and Wiegman, 1973, p. 36).
Seay (1972, p. 202) summarizes his concept of four-year college and university involvement in community education in the following manner:

As the four year college and the university contribute to the development of community education, they cannot escape being imbued with a sense of belonging to a community. They will find that they, as institutions of higher education, assume an active responsibility for their communities -- a role often claimed but seldom played.

In the Survey of Oregon Courses and Allied Learning Opportunities, Etter in 1970 found that 176 agencies in the State of Oregon offered some form of "adult education." The two and four year colleges, the universities, the Cooperative Extension Service and the Division of Continuing Education offered the majority of courses and activities. It is noteworthy to add that the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Oregon also is actively involved in community education through their role in making community school material available in any area or community where there is interest in this concept.

In January, 1972, the Oregon Junior Chamber of Commerce held a seminar in Salem in cooperation with the Northwest Community Education Development Center, University of Oregon, Eugene, to discuss ways in which people in various communities can learn how to implement a community school program. That seminar was very
successful so another one was held in the Spring, 1972, in Portland. The outcome of those seminars resulted in the Junior Chamber of Commerce planning to publish a Handbook for Community School Development and Implementation and continued planning for additional seminars on how to implement community schools. These seminars will be organized and presented before 1974 in various cities in Oregon (Munkres, 1973).

Summary

It is obvious from a review of literature that community education is a term used by many individuals who give it numerous meanings. However, it is generally agreed that community education is an educational concept which concerns itself with everything that affects the well-being of all of the citizens within a given community.

There are hundreds of articles written about community schools and community colleges, but to date there is limited literature dealing with the concept of a cooperative arrangement between community colleges and community schools. Nevertheless, an awareness is developing regarding the necessity of eliminating duplicate programs and activities between these two educational agencies. Writers agree that there is a need both for the community school operation and for the community education programs in
community colleges.

The community college can become the catalyst in the area of community education. However, there must be an understanding of the role of the community college and the role of the community school. Both agencies must make commitments to their constituents that will prove their concern for the economic, social and cultural welfare of all the people in their districts. Through an "Open Door" policy, low tuition, and a broad program of educational offerings, the community college can serve the varied needs of the complex society.

The community school is the vehicle to implement the community education in the local area. Its popularity is increasing rapidly and its influence is being felt in most states. The concept of community schools is different from that of the traditional school. Specifically, it involves all of the people directly or indirectly in the local community; it attacks social problems; it initiates many projects for community development and improvement; and it builds a sense of pride and accomplishment in the community.

The Cooperative Extension Service is involved in community education, and a recent study shows that considerable cooperation with community colleges in Oregon currently exists. Yet, there are no clear guidelines in the area of adult education regarding the Oregon Community Colleges and the Cooperative Extension Service.
A study shows that the two agencies are striving to expand the cooperation which now exists thus better serving the people in each community.

The Division of Continuing Education recently conducted a survey which led to the conclusion that the Division of Continuing Education provides many services in the area of community education. The survey showed that duplication of effort from many agencies in Oregon was difficult to determine; however, the results of the survey indicated that the adult learner is in the best position to decide whether there is duplication.

Several educators on the university level see the need for four-year college and universities to become involved in community education. Some university educators are concerned about higher education's lack of involvement and are doing something about it -- Florida Atlantic University is a leader in the Southeastern United States. This should stimulate other institutions of higher education to evaluate their commitment to community education.

In Oregon, the Junior Chamber of Commerce is becoming actively involved in community schools. Its participation in co-sponsoring seminars throughout Oregon with the Northwest Community Development Center offers excellent leadership which can be emulated by other than educational agencies.
III. DESIGN Of THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent and nature of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools in five selected states. It also examines the opinions of educators about the role of the community school and the role of the community college through community education in a college district.

Educators, as well as the general public, are concerned about the efficient use of the tax dollar. Those administrators who are responsible for spending tax dollars should be certain that duplication of programs, activities and courses are carefully evaluated and then eliminated whenever duplication is unnecessary (Polk, 1973).

To accomplish the objectives of the study, a questionnaire was developed to obtain opinions regarding organization, administration, finance, instruction and the level of cooperation between community schools and community colleges in the area of community education. The survey form provided information about duplication of effort, better use of the tax dollar, and about providing expanded services to those people who are to be served by community schools and community colleges.
Preparation of the Questionnaire

The instrument was developed by seeking pertinent information and questions from community college administrators, faculty members and community school personnel. In addition, administrators at the Oregon State Department of Education who are responsible for coordinating community college instruction also provided information and general suggestions.

The "panel of experts" who reacted to and made suggestions on the questionnaire were the following:

1. Dr. John Hakanson, President, Clackamas Community College
2. Dr. Dwight Baird, former Professor of Community College Education, Oregon State University
3. Dr. William Loomis, Director, Community College Instruction, Oregon State Department of Education
4. Dr. Ronald Kaiser, Dean of Occupational Education, Clackamas Community College
5. Dr. Donald Shelton, Executive Secretary, Oregon Community College Association (Salem)
6. Mr. David Spooner, Associate Dean, Community Services, Mt. Hood Community College
7. Mr. Larry Horyna, Director, Northwest Community Education Development Center, University of Oregon
8. Mr. Larry Briggs, Coordinator of Conferences and Visitations, Flint (Michigan) Community Schools
9. Mr. Vic Gibson, Community School Director, North Clackamas School District #12 (Milwaukie, Oregon)
10. Mr. John Helding, Community School Coordinator
Mt. Hood Community College

The above named educators reacted to a list of 58 items. After their reactions to each statement, there were suggested revisions and deletions. The revised questionnaire contained 53 items.

Next, the revised questionnaire was "field tested" by sending it to administrators in six selected Oregon community schools and six selected Oregon community colleges. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire and evaluate the instrument with reference to content, clarity, format (categorized or randomized items), and comprehensiveness. In each case the respondents who "field tested" the questionnaire were not surveyed in the final mailing.

After the survey was "field tested," seven items were eliminated and several other minor revisions were made. Ten of the twelve respondents recommended that the items on the final instrument should be categorized.

The final instrument with 46 items was printed with two instructions sheets, one for community school administrators and one for community college administrators (See Appendix A).

Selection of the Sample

Five states were arbitrarily selected for this study -- three
Western, one Midwestern and one Southern: namely, Washington, Oregon, California, Michigan and Florida. The criteria for selecting the states were: 1) ten or more community colleges were operating in the state, and 2) at least one community school program was currently in operation in each of the ten community college districts in each selected state.

A letter was sent to the Director of the Center for Community Education or Community School Development for each of the five states in the study (See Appendix D). The letter requested names of community school directors or coordinators who supervised community schools which operated in a community college district. Each Center Director responded with appropriate information (See Appendix E). Random sample procedures were used to determine the ten community school administrators to be surveyed in each state.

A letter was also sent to the State Board of Higher Education or the Community College Association in each selected state requesting an endorsement of the study (See Appendix F). After an affirmative response was received from each state (See Appendix G), random sample was made of those community colleges which had community school programs in their district to determine which ten colleges would be included in the study. Addresses of community college administrators of adult, continuing or community education
were obtained from the 1972 American Association of Community and Junior College Directory.

The Statistical Design

In order to reach the objectives of this exploratory study, the general design included the following:

1. A fixed model design was conceptualized with the analysis of variance matrix as given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel types</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/1</td>
<td>MSPT/MS error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/4</td>
<td>MSST/MS error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/4</td>
<td>MSINT/MS error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. A questionnaire using a five-point Likert type scale in which the response (dependent variable) values ranged as follows:

1 - disagree strongly
2 - disagree
3 - uncertain
4 - agree
5 - agree strongly
3. The following computations were made for each item included on the questionnaire:
   a. mean (X)
   b. standard deviation (s)
   c. F - ratio (two-way analysis of variance)

   For rejected items (i.e., items where difference were found between states and between community college and community school personnel), a Least Significant Difference (L.S.D.) Test was computed to ascertain the individual comparison position of the difference.

4. Three hypotheses were tested in this study:

   \( H_{01} \): There is no significant difference between the mean score responses of community college and community school personnel.

   \( H_{02} \): There is no significant difference in the mean score responses among the states.

   \( H_{03} \): There is no interaction effect difference.

   The hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Collection of Data

A letter requesting an endorsement of the study was sent to community college associations or Boards of Higher Education in
five selected states. After receiving endorsements and lists of community school administrators, a selection of 50 community colleges and 50 community schools was made. A letter of explanation (see Appendix H) was attached to each questionnaire and sent to 100 potential respondents.

Data were collected by mailing a stamped, self-addressed envelope, an instruction sheet, a letter of explanation and the questionnaire to the selected participants. All data were collected within a period of four weeks. A 70% response was received on the first mail-out. Seven returns per cell were required to fulfill the requirements of the research design.

After 15 days, a follow-up letter (See Appendix I) was mailed to administrators who had not responded to the original mail-out.

The final step in the collection of data was to log in and code each returned questionnaire before transferring the data to data processing cards for computer analysis.
IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The data collected in this study were analyzed by using the "F" statistic (two-way analysis of variance technique). This technique describes the results of testing for differences in: mean scores from community college and community school personnel, mean scores among states, and mean scores showing interaction effect between colleges/schools and states.

Three null hypotheses were tested for each item. There were 35 community college administrators and 35 directors or coordinators of community schools who responded to the 46 items on the questionnaires.

For rejected items, (that is, where the computed F value was greater than the tabular F value) a Least Significant Difference (L. S. D.) Test was made.

For rejected college/school items, (that is, where the computed F value exceeded the tabular F value), it was noted whether the community college mean response were greater or smaller than the community school mean responses.

For rejected interaction effect items, (that is, where the computed F value exceeded the tabular F value), a list of figures were plotted which showed whether the interaction effect was ordinal or disordinal (Courtney and Segwich, 1972). Comparisons were also
made by ranking the means from high to low which showed where there was significant difference among the interaction effect means.

Means were computed for each variable on the questionnaire from the following:

2. Community school administrator responses.

A standard deviation was also computed for each of the 46 variables.

**Analysis of Variance**

**Differences Among Community College and Community School Personnel Mean Scores**

The null hypothesis \( H_{01} \) was tested using the F-statistic. The hypothesis for this exploratory study states that there is no difference between the mean score responses of community college and community school personnel. Forty-six individual hypotheses were tested. The computed F value was greater than the critical value of 4.000 at the .05 level of significance for 15 items. The mean scores of community college personnel were greater than the mean scores of community school personnel in 7 out of 15 items.

Table 1 lists the 15 rejected items, the statements, mean scores for colleges and schools, the computed "F" and the tabular
Table 1. Differences in Responses Between Community College and Community School Personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Community College Mean Score</th>
<th>Community School Mean Score</th>
<th>Computed Tabular F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community colleges should offer a variety of credit and non-credit courses for all people who can benefit from them.</td>
<td>4.8000</td>
<td>4.3143</td>
<td>7.9541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community schools should offer credit courses, activities, projects, <em>et cetera</em>, which are of interest to the general public and should be open to people from other communities so long as the local patrons are not deprived of seats in the class or activity.</td>
<td>3.1714</td>
<td>3.9429</td>
<td>8.0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Community schools should offer a wide range of credit and non-credit courses, as well as recreational and services activities appropriate to the local community.</td>
<td>3.0857</td>
<td>4.1429</td>
<td>17.4766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Community colleges should restrict their courses, activities, <em>et cetera</em>, to those areas which require the resources of an institution of higher education, i.e., offer only credit courses with approved, state certified instructors.</td>
<td>1.5429</td>
<td>2.1143</td>
<td>9.5238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Community College Mean Score</td>
<td>Community School Mean Score</td>
<td>Computed F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Local school districts should have the responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs within a college district.</td>
<td>2.2286</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>20.6680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The community college should have the responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs within a college district.</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>6.5333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Two or more educational institutions should have the combined supervisory and administrative responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs in a community college district.</td>
<td>2.8571</td>
<td>3.4571</td>
<td>4.9366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The county (Intermediate Education District) or regional education districts should have the responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs within a college district.</td>
<td>1.5143</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
<td>18.6923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Community College Mean Score</td>
<td>Community School Mean Score</td>
<td>Computed F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Community colleges should pay a percentage of the salaries of directors/ coordinators of community school programs where cooperation exists between the two institutions.</td>
<td>2.9714</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>5.3133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Community colleges should not pay any of the salary of directors/coordinators of community school programs in the local communities where cooperation exists.</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
<td>4.6098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tuition and fees for courses in community school programs should be the same as for courses operated by community colleges.</td>
<td>2.5427</td>
<td>1.9429</td>
<td>6.0688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Community colleges should help to initiate community school programs in their college districts by providing some money and some personnel.</td>
<td>3.0857</td>
<td>3.6857</td>
<td>5.2709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Community colleges and community schools are competing for the same tax dollar, keeping those two institutions from setting up a program of cooperation and coordination.</td>
<td>2.6571</td>
<td>2.1143</td>
<td>4.4024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Community College Mean Score</td>
<td>Community School Mean Score</td>
<td>Computed F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Community school programs should use only instructors certified under state department of education guidelines for their formal courses.</td>
<td>2.9429</td>
<td>1.8286</td>
<td>19.9258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Community school programs should use volunteer instructors as well as paid instructors.</td>
<td>3.3714</td>
<td>4.0286</td>
<td>6.6962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"F" values. The results on all items of the two-way analysis of variance among community college and community school personnel are shown in Appendix J.

Differences Among States Mean Scores

The null hypothesis (H₀) was tested and states that there is no difference in the mean score responses among the states. The F-statistic was used to test 46 null hypotheses.

The computed F was greater than the tabular F value of 2.5252 at the .05 level of significance for only three items. The null hypothesis was retained for 43 items. Table 2 shows the three rejected variables, the mean scores for the five states (Oregon, Washington, California, Michigan, Florida), the computed F value, and the tabular F value.

A Least Significant Difference (L.S.D.) Test was made on each rejected item to indicate where significant differences existed among states (See Tables 3, 4, 5).

A priori decisions were made with regard to the testing of null hypotheses when the L.S.D. statistic was used. Because of the degrees of freedom restrictions inherent with the comparisons of the five means, only four comparisons were allowed. Therefore, it was decided to compare the Oregon mean score with each of the other state mean scores (see Table 6). Thus, the following hypotheses were tested:
\[ H_1: \mu_O = \mu_W \]
\[ H_2: \mu_O = \mu_C \]
\[ H_3: \mu_O = \mu_M \]
\[ H_4: \mu_O = \mu_F \]

The results of the above comparisons are reported in Table 6. The results on all items of the two-way analysis of variance among states are shown in Appendix K.

**Differences for Interaction Effect**

The null hypothesis \( H_{03} \) was tested and states that there is no interaction effect difference. The two-way classification analysis of variance tested 46 null hypotheses.

The computed \( F \) was greater than the tabular \( F \) value of 2.5252 at the .05 level of significance for only four items. The null hypothesis was retained for 42 items. Table 7 shows the four rejected items, the mean scores for states and colleges/schools, the computed \( F \) value and the tabular \( F \) value.

The results on all items of the two-way analysis of variance for interaction effect differences are shown in Appendix L.

The plotted results where significant interaction effect differences were found in items 16, 33, 35, and 36 are shown in Appendix M.
### Table 2. Differences in Responses Between States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>States Mean Scores</th>
<th>Computed F</th>
<th>Tabular F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community schools should offer credit courses, activities, projects, <em>et cetera</em>, which are of interest to the general public and should be open to people from other communities so long as the local patrons are not deprived of seats in the class or activity.</td>
<td>Oregon 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington 2.6429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California 4.0000</td>
<td>5.4780</td>
<td>2.5252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan 4.3571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida 3.7857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Community schools should offer a wide range of credit and non-credit courses, as well as recreational and services activities appropriate to the local community.</td>
<td>Oregon 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington 2.5714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California 4.2143</td>
<td>7.5830</td>
<td>2.5252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan 4.2857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida 4.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Formal courses offered through community school programs should utilize only volunteer instructors.</td>
<td>Oregon 2.4286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington 2.7143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California 1.7857</td>
<td>4.6318</td>
<td>2.5252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan 1.6429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida 1.7143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$ (Mean is ranked from high value to low value)</td>
<td>Differences (subtracted)</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4.3571</td>
<td>.3571</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.2143</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3.7857</td>
<td>.7857</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.3571</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2.6429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formula used for computing the L. S. D. Test was as follows: $L. S. D. = t_{.025} \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} \ EMS$.

For Item number 9, the $L. S. D. = .8608$.

The means for Michigan and California, California and Florida, Florida and Oregon, and Oregon and Washington are not significantly different from one another. When the Oregon mean was compared to the Washington and Florida means, there was no significant difference. When the Oregon mean was compared to the California and Michigan means, there were significant differences.
Table 4. Least Significant Difference (L. S. D.) Test for Rejected Items: States. L. S. D. * = . 7986.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>X (Mean is ranked from high value to low value)</th>
<th>Differences (subtracted)</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4.2857</td>
<td>.0714</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>4.2143</td>
<td>.2143</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.4286</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2.5714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For item number 11, the L. S. D. .05 = .7986.

The means for Michigan and California, California and Florida, and Oregon and Washington were not significantly different from one another. The means for Florida and Oregon were significantly different from one another.

When the Oregon mean was compared to the Washington mean, there was no significant difference. When the Oregon mean was compared to the Florida, California and Michigan means, there were significant differences.
Table 5. Least Significant Difference (L. S. D.) Test for Rejected Items: L. S. D. * = .6338.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>( \bar{X} ) from high value to low value</th>
<th>Differences (subtracted)</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>.2857</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2.4286</td>
<td>.6429</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1.7857</td>
<td>.0714</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1.7143</td>
<td>.0714</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1.6429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For item number 39, the L. S. D. \( .05 \) = .6338.

The means for Washington and Oregon, California and Florida, and Florida and Michigan were not significantly different from one another. The means for Oregon and California were significantly different from one another.

When the Oregon mean was compared to the Washington mean, there was no significant difference. When the Oregon mean was compared to the California, Florida, and Michigan means, there were significant differences.
Table 6. Comparison of Oregon Mean Scores With the Other State Mean Scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>States Mean Score</th>
<th>Differences (subtracted)</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>(Retained) Hypotheses (Rejected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>O - 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W - 2.6429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O - 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C - 4.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - 4.3571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O - 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - 3.7857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3571</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
<td>H₁ retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
<td>H₂ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3571</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
<td>H₃ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7857</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
<td>H₄ retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11ₓ</td>
<td>O - 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W - 2.5714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O - 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C - 4.2143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O - 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - 4.2857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O - 3.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - 4.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4286</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
<td>H₁ retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2143</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
<td>H₂ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2857</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
<td>H₃ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
<td>H₄ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39ᵃ</td>
<td>O - 2.4286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W - 2.7143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O - 2.4286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C - 1.7857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O - 2.4286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - 1.6429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O - 2.4286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - 1.7143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2857</td>
<td>No significant difference</td>
<td>H₁ retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6429</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
<td>H₂ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7857</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
<td>H₃ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7143</td>
<td>Significant difference</td>
<td>H₄ rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*L. S. D. = .8608 ₓL. S. D. = .7986 ᵃL. S. D. = .6338
Table 7. Differences in Responses Between Colleges/Schools and States (Interaction Effect Differences).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>States X Coll/Schools MS</th>
<th>Computed F</th>
<th>Tabular F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States X Coll/Schools MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>States X Coll/Schools MS</td>
<td>Computed F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Local school districts should have the responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs within a college district.</td>
<td>O-2.7143</td>
<td>O-3.1429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W-1.4286</td>
<td>W-3.8571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-2.2857</td>
<td>C-3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M-2.1429</td>
<td>M-4.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F-2.5714</td>
<td>F-2.7143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Possible tax-dollar savings resulting from a cooperative community college/community school program are overshadowed by the great need for providing a broad range of programs at different educational levels to meet the needs of the people in each community.</td>
<td>O-3.8571</td>
<td>O-2.2857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W-2.8571</td>
<td>W-3.8571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-3.5714</td>
<td>C-3.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M-3.7143</td>
<td>M-2.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F-3.8571</td>
<td>F-3.7143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Community school programs should use only instructors certified under state department of education guidelines for their formal courses.</td>
<td>O-3.0000</td>
<td>O-2.1429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W-3.2857</td>
<td>W-1.1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-3.7143</td>
<td>C-1.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M-1.8571</td>
<td>M-2.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F-2.8571</td>
<td>F-2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Community colleges should have staff assigned to work with directors/coordinators of local community school programs, but he should not be responsible for the community school programs.</td>
<td>O-3.0000</td>
<td>O-4.5714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W-3.4286</td>
<td>W-4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C-4.1429</td>
<td>C-4.1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M-4.5714</td>
<td>M-3.4286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F-3.4286</td>
<td>F-4.1429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings

By using the two-way classification analysis of variance in this study, statistical comparisons revealed the following:

1. Fifteen items (32.6%) showed significant differences among mean score responses for community college and community school personnel.

2. Of the 15 rejected items, eight (53.3%) community school means were greater than the community college means.

3. Except for three items, no differences existed between mean score responses among states.

4. Except for four items, no interaction effect differences existed in mean responses between college/schools and states.

5. Ordinal interaction was present in item 16. Disordinal and ordinal interaction was present in items 33, 35 and 36.

6. The greatest number of rejected items (71.4%) were found in the section on instruction.

7. The finance section showed that 66% of those items were rejected.

8. There were no significant differences in the responses on all items in the general section (items 42 - 46).

Information from page one of the questionnaire returned by the
respondents revealed additional data about community college and community schools in Oregon, Washington, California, Michigan, and Florida.

1. The greatest number of community schools in one college district was 25.

2. Of the 35 community colleges surveyed in the five states, Florida had the largest number of community schools (61) and Oregon had the fewest (17). The total number of community schools represented in the 35 community college districts was 161.

3. One Florida community school had been in operation the most years—seven. Thirteen community schools were in the first year of operation.

4. Of the community colleges surveyed, one had been in operation 50 years while one was in its first year of operation.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data from which the conclusions listed below were drawn represents the review of literature, 70 returned questionnaires, and the results of the statistical analysis provided by the "F" statistic, two-way analysis of variance.

Conclusions

The conclusions are divided into three areas: cooperation between community schools and community colleges, the role of community colleges, and the role of community schools.

1. There is an urgent need for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools in college districts.

2. State laws do not prevent the community colleges and community schools from cooperating in the five states surveyed in this study.

3. State certification and qualifications of instructors in community colleges and community schools were issues which did not prevent cooperation and coordination between those two institutions.

4. Community college and community school personnel must come to an agreement regarding who should be responsible for coordinating community education in a community college district.
5. Community schools and community colleges cannot assume the combined responsibility for community education.

6. Community colleges will not lose supervisory or administrative responsibilities for community education if there is a cooperative arrangement between these institutions.

7. Considerable disagreement exists between community colleges and community schools with regard to whether or not the community college should pay part of the community school director's salary.

8. Competition for tax dollars by community colleges and community schools is not the reason for the lack of cooperation between these institutions in the five states surveyed.

9. Community schools and community colleges do not want the State Legislatures to determine who should be responsible for community education in a college district.

10. For college credit courses, instructors in community colleges and community schools should be expected to have the same qualifications.

11. Open competition for programs is not beneficial to community colleges or community schools.

12. Significant differences of opinion exist between community colleges and community schools regarding the concept of community schools and of community education in a community college.
13. County and state governing agencies should **not** be responsible for coordinating community education in a community college district.

14. Much disagreement was found between community schools and community colleges in the areas of instruction and finance.

15. State departments of education should be instrumental in disseminating information on programs of cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.

16. A need exists for a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.

The role of the community college and the community school in community education should be to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Community School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offer courses, both credit and non-credit, to all who can benefit from them.</td>
<td>1. Offer courses appropriate to their local community only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offer courses and activities which are <strong>not</strong> part of the community school programs.</td>
<td>2. Offer programs different from community colleges even when community schools are in locations separate from community colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offer a wide range of occupational and lower division transfer credit courses in addition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community College

to adult/community education courses.

4. Assign staff members as consultants or facilitators to community schools

5. Offer services to community schools even when the community college personnel are not specifically asked by community school administrators.

6. Have tuition and fees which are different from community school fees.

7. Be responsible for community education in the community college district.

8. Develop training programs for para-professionals, community school directors, coordinators and other related personnel.

Community School

3. Offer courses and programs which are flexible in length, in starting dates, and in class hours taught.

4. Utilize volunteer and non-volunteer instructors regardless of whether or not they are certified.

5. Allow people from other communities to participate in local community school programs and activities when there is available space.
Recommendations

It is recommended that further study be conducted in the following areas in view of the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. Develop formal guidelines for cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.

2. Have the community college develop a training program for community school para-professionals, directors/coordinators and other related personnel.

3. Further delineate the role and function of the multiplicity of agencies providing community education in a community college district.

4. Develop a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Coordination and Cooperation Between Community Colleges and Community Schools in Selected Community College Districts

QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE

Cooperation and Coordination of Community/Adult Education Programs and Community School Programs in Community College Districts

Purpose of Questionnaire: The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide information which will be useful in determining the extent of cooperation and coordination that currently exists in community colleges which have community school programs in their college districts. This survey will be sent to five (5) selected states: Washington, California, Michigan, Florida and Oregon.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please provide the following information:
   Your name ____________________________
   Institution ____________________________
   Address ______________________________
   City __________________ State ___________ Zip Code ___________

2. Title of Respondent ____________________________

3. Are there community school programs operating within the boundary of your community college district? (Please circle one) Yes No

4. How many community school programs exist in your college district? __________________________

5. How many years has the community college been operating? __________________________

6. If you desire a resume of this study, please place a mark in the space at the right. ☐

7. On the questionnaire, you are asked to circle one choice with reference to how YOU FEEL about each item. PLEASE DO NOT LEAVE OUT ANY ITEMS---there are NO right or wrong answers.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Community College: A public or private two-year institution which usually offers educational programs and services in (1) lower division transfer credit, (2) vocational/occupational, (3) general education (adult/community education), (4) counseling and guidance, (5) community services.

2. Community School: An educational institution which actively carries out the concept that all education facilities in every public school within a school district are available to anyone who can benefit from them. Its programs are designed to meet the needs of the people who live in each community, whenever and wherever the citizens want them. Typically, these programs and activities are offered after the regular school day.

3. Administrators of a Community School: Personnel who have the responsibility of organizing and supervising the activities and programs in a community school. Normally their titles are director or coordinator of community schools.

4. Formal Courses: Courses which are of a specified length, meet regularly, and may offer credit.

5. College Credit Courses: Formal courses which offer institutional credit and can be either transferable or non-transferable.

6. Adult/Community Education in Community Colleges: Formal courses or activities (organized educational experiences) which may, or may not, offer credit and generally can be recreational, general self-improvement, cultural, social, intellectual and vocational/occupational. Usually these are offered after 6:00 p.m. and are held on and off campus.

7. Volunteer Community School Instructor: Any person who supervises an activity or instructs a class (formal or non-formal) for credit or non-credit and accepts no financial remuneration.

8. Programs: Educational experiences which normally are organized for people who wish to achieve a goal or skill.
QUESTIONNAIRE

Cooperation and Coordination of Community/Adult Education Programs
and Community School Programs in Community College Districts

Purpose of Questionnaire: The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide information which will be
useful in determining the extent of cooperation and coordination that currently exists in community
colleges which have community school programs in their college districts. This survey will be sent to
five (5) selected states: Washington, California, Michigan, Florida and Oregon.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please provide the following information:

   Your name ________________________________
   Institution ________________________________
   Address ___________________________________
   City __________________ State ______________ Zip Code __________

2. Title of Respondent ____________________________

3. Is there a community college operating in your district?
   (Please circle one) Yes  No  Name of college _________________________

4. How many community school programs are there in your district? ______________

5. How many years has your community school been operating? ______________________

6. If you desire a resume of this study, please place a mark in the space at the right. □

7. On the questionnaire, you are asked to circle one choice with reference to how YOU FEEL about
each item. PLEASE DO NOT LEAVE OUT ANY ITEMS—there are NO right or wrong answers.
Cooperation and Coordination of Community/Adult Education Programs and Community School Programs in Community College Districts

Please circle a number (1 2 3 4 5) indicating how YOU FEEL toward that item. If your exact feeling is not in one of the choices, select the one which comes closest to your true feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. Organization:

1. Community colleges should offer courses and other activities which differ from community school activities and courses.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

2. Community colleges should not interfere with any locally initiated community school programs.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

3. Community colleges and community schools should offer similar programs but not in the same locations in the college district.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

4. Community colleges should offer a variety of credit and non-credit courses for all people who can benefit from them.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

5. Community schools should offer courses, projects and other activities appropriate to their local community only.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

6. Community colleges should offer only those courses which are considered to be "adult education" credit courses.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

7. Community colleges should offer courses or make arrangements for courses requested by the community, whenever it is legally and morally appropriate to do so.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

8. Community schools should cooperate, rather than compete, with community colleges in offering courses, activities, projects, et cetera, which meet the needs and interests of all persons in their respective communities.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

9. Community schools should offer credit courses, activities, projects, et cetera, which are of interest to the general public and should be open to people from other communities so long as the local patrons are not deprived of seats in the class or activity.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

10. The concept of the community school is different from the concept of adult/community education in a community college.
    - 1 2 3 4 5

11. Community schools should offer a wide range of credit and non-credit courses, as well as recreational and services activities appropriate to the local community.
    - 1 2 3 4 5

12. Community schools should be as flexible as possible and not be concerned with length of courses, beginning class dates, class hours taught and certification of instructors.
    - 1 2 3 4 5
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The laws in this state do not provide for cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>For &quot;non-credit&quot; classes, community school and community college instructors should have the same qualifications.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Community colleges should restrict their courses, activities, et cetera, to those areas which require the resources of an institution of higher education, i.e., offer only credit courses with approved, state certified instructors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Local school districts should have the responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs within a college district.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The community college will lose its supervision and administration of adult/community education programs if there is a cooperative arrangement between community schools and the community college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The community college should have the responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs within a college district.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Two or more educational institutions should have the combined supervisory and administrative responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs in a community college district.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The county (Intermediate Education District) or regional education districts should have the responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs within a college district.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The state governing boards of education should have the responsibility of coordinating the adult/community education programs within a college district.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Community schools will lose local control if there is a cooperative program with the community college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Community colleges should cooperate on a consultant, facilitator, or catalyst level with community school programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Community colleges should be the catalyst for community school development and should offer cooperation and resources in any area only when they are asked to do so by community school personnel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Administration (continued)

25. The state governing board of education responsible for community colleges should develop guidelines which would provide a frame of reference for cooperation and coordination of community colleges and community schools.

C. Finance:

26. Community colleges should pay a percentage of the salaries of directors/coordinators of community school programs where cooperation exists between the two institutions.

27. Community colleges should pay all of the salary of the directors/coordinators of community school programs where cooperation exists.

28. Community colleges should not pay any of the salary of directors/coordinators of community school programs in the local communities where cooperation exists.

29. Tuition and fees for courses in community school programs should be the same as for courses operated by community colleges.

30. Tax dollars can be saved by having a cooperative program between community schools and community colleges.

31. Community colleges should help to initiate community school programs in their college districts by providing some money and some personnel.

32. Community colleges and community schools are competing for the same tax dollar, keeping those two institutions from setting up a program of cooperation and coordination.

33. Possible tax-dollar savings resulting from a cooperative community college/community school program are overshadowed by the great need for providing a broad range of programs at different educational levels to meet the needs of the people in each community.

34. The state legislature should determine who is responsible for community/adult education programs and community school programs by restricting and/or authorizing community colleges or school districts to levy taxes or charge fees for such programs and to provide state funds to support these programs.
### D. Instruction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Community school programs should use only instructors certified under state department of education guidelines for their formal courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Community colleges should have a staff member assigned to work with directors/coordinators of local community school programs, but he should not be responsible for the community school programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Community school programs should use volunteer instructors as well as paid instructors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>For college credit courses, community school instructors should have the same qualifications as community college instructors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Formal courses offered through community school programs should utilize only volunteer instructors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Community colleges should develop a training program for community school para-professionals, community school directors/coordinators, and other related personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>The community college and the community school should have one staff member whose salary is paid by both institutions and who is responsible for the supervision of all community education and community school programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. General:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>A need exists for cooperation between the community college programs and community school programs in the college district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Some changes in the attitudes of educators are necessary for the development of viable forms of cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>It is educationally beneficial to the local community if there is open competition between the community college and community schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>The state governing boards of education should identify exemplary (effective) programs of cooperation and coordination and should provide for the dissemination of such practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>A need exists for a &quot;model&quot; for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Community Colleges and Administrators
Who Participated in the Study
Oregon

01. L. M. O'Rourke, Director, Adult Education and Community Service
    Blue Mountain Community College, Pendleton, Oregon. 97801

02. Harold R. Black, Chairman of the Division of Continuing Education and Community Services
    Central Oregon Community College, Bend, Oregon. 97701

03. Alvin M. Leach, Director of Adult Community Education
    Chemeketa Community College, Salem, Oregon. 97303

04. Bob Ellis, Coordinator of Community Education
    Clackamas Community College, Oregon City, Oregon. 97045

05. Roger T. McDowell, Associate Dean for Extension Services
    Mt. Hood Community College, Gresham, Oregon. 97030

06. Richard L. Young, Director (Acting) Community Education Division
    Portland Community College, Portland, Oregon. 97221

07. Robert M. Moldenhaver, Dean of Occupational and Continuing Education
    Umpqua Community College, Roseburg, Oregon. 97470

Washington

08. Lynn M. Degerstedt, Associate Dean of Instruction
    Clark College, Vancouver, Washington. 98665

09. Gordon Smith, Associate Dean of Instruction, Occupation and Continuing Education
    Everett Community College, Everett, Washington. 98201

10. Fred Huston, Director of Adult Education
    Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake, Washington. 98837

11. Dr. Calvin Watness, Dean of Extension Services
    Community College District Number 11, Tacoma, Washington. 98499
12. James E. Montzheimer, Administrative Assistant for Special Programs  
Shoreline Community College, Seattle, Washington. 98133

13. John Koruga, Associate Dean of Instruction  
Seattle Community College -- North Campus, Seattle, Washington. 98106

14. John T. Blake, Associate Dean of Instruction  
Seattle Central Community College, Seattle, Washington. 98122

California

15. Clifford A. Transeth, Assistant Dean of Instruction  
Evening Division -- Summer Session, San Jose City College  
San Jose, California. 95114

16. Floyd L. Hopper, Director, Evening Division and Summer Session  
Compton Community College, Compton, California. 95221

17. Florin L. Caldwell, Associate Dean of Continuing Education, Extended Campus Programs  
De Anza College, Cupertino, California. 95041

18. Michael C. Beehler, Community Service Assistant, Classes  
Cabrillo College, Aptos, California. 95003

19. Rolf Bruckner, Associate Dean of Instruction  
Gavilan College, Gilroy, California. 95020

20. Joseph R. Laurin, Associate Dean  
San Joaquin Delta College, Stockton, California. 95204

21. C. S. Morris, Dean of Community Services  
College of the Redwoods, Eureka, California. 95501

Michigan

22. Charlie K. Field, Dean of Community Services  
Lake Michigan College, Benton Harbor, Michigan. 49022
23. W. L. Muth, Dean of Community Services
   Southwestern Michigan College, Dowagiac, Michigan. 49047

24. Ernest Lobenherz, Coordinator of Community Education Services
   Muskegon Community College, Muskegon, Michigan. 49443

25. Dr. Donald D. Fink, Associate Dean of Instruction
   Kalamazoo Valley Community College, Kalamazoo, Michigan. 49009

26. Eugene R. Verrette, Director Continuing Education
   Kellogg Community College, Battlecreek, Michigan. 49016

27. Melvin M. Harold, Director of Continuing Education
   Genesee Community College, Flint, Michigan. 48503

28. James E. Fent, Director of Community Services
   Gogebic Community College, Ironwood, Michigan. 49938

Florida

29. L. R. Goldman, Dean for Community and Evening Programs
   Santa Fe Community College, Gainesville, Florida. 32601

30. Eric R. Mills, Dean, Career and Adult Education
    Florida Junior College, Jacksonville, Florida. 32205

31. Otis Harvey, Coordinator of Evening Classes
    Palm Beach Junior College, Lake Worth, Florida. 33460

32. Carrie P. Meek, Director of Community Services
    Miami Dade Community College -- North, Miami, Florida. 33167

33. Lewis M. Tucker, Director, Occupational and Adult Education
    North Florida Junior College, Madison, Florida. 32340

34. J. Griffen Greene, Dean, School of Continuing Education
    Daytona Beach Community College, Daytona Beach, Florida. 32015

35. Plano B. Valdes, Dean of Community Services
    Hillsborough Community College, Tampa, Florida. 33622
Appendix C

Community Schools and Administrators
Who Participated in the Study
36. Shirley Conklin, Community School Coordinator  
Pendleton Community Schools, Pendleton, Oregon.  97801

37. Kenneth O. Netzel, Director of Community Education  
Sisters Community School District #6, Sisters, Oregon.  
97759

38. Dick Firman, Administrator, Community Schools  
Salem Public Schools, Salem, Oregon.

39. Donald B. Young, Community School Director  
Estacada Community School, Estacada, Oregon.  97023

40. Jim McDaniel, Director of Community Services  
Lebanon Public Schools, Lebanon, Oregon.  97355

41. Norma Pulliam, Community School Coordinator  
Corbett Community School, Corbett, Oregon.  97019

42. Charles H. Rose, Community School Coordinator  
Portsmouth Community School, Portland, Oregon.  97203

**Washington**

43. Ron Larson, Community Education Coordinator  
Ridgefield School District, Ridgefield, Washington.  98642

44. A. Jay Arellano, Community School Coordinator  
Jefferson School, Everett, Washington.  98204

45. Douglas Miller, Community School Coordinator  
Ephrata School District #165, Ephrata, Washington.  98823

46. Jerry B. Thornton, Coordinator of Health and Community Schools  
Highline Public School, Seattle, Washington.  98166

47. Dick Erdman, Coordinator of Community Education Programs  
Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, Washington.

48. Harold Newman, Community School Coordinator  
Queen Anne High School, Seattle, Washington.  98109
49. John C. Michelson, Community School Activities Coordinator
    Shorewood Elementary School, Federal Way, Washington. 98002

California

50. Ed Villagran, Community School Director
    Mathson Community School, San Jose, California. 95116

51. Peter Ellis, Director of Community Schools
    Sunnyvale School District, Sunnyvale, California. 94088

52. Mark Seamark, Director of Community Schools
    Live Oak Community School, Santa Cruz, California. 95060

53. Raymond J. Avena, Home School Coordinator
    Morgan Hill Unified School District, Morgan Hill, California. 95037

54. Robert Lewis, Community School Director
    Hagginwood Elementary School, Sacramento, California. 95815

55. Steven Sherman, Community School Coordinator
    Colina Intermediate School, Thousand Oaks, California. 91360

56. Richard Kalebjian, Community Schools Director
    Manteca High School, Manteca, California. 95336

Michigan

57. Wm. H. Tyrus, Jr., Community School Director
    Buchanan Community School, Buchanan, Michigan. 49107

58. Loyal Vannettee, Director of Pupil and Community Services
    Schoolcraft High School, Schoolcraft, Michigan. 49087

59. Gloria A. Gregg, Community Education Director
    Union City Community Schools, Union City, Michigan. 49087

60. Jim Cochran, Director of Community Schools
    Kearsley Community Schools, Flint, Michigan. 48506
61. Thomas J. Wilkinson, Director of Community Schools  
   Gogebic County Community School, Ironwood, Michigan.  
   49938

62. Michael W. Burley, Director of Community Education  
   Monroe Public Schools, Monroe, Michigan. 48161

63. A. John Kovac, Community School Coordinator  
   Niles Community Schools, Niles, Michigan. 49120

Florida

64. Sara S. Driggers, Community School Director  
   Union County High School, Lake Butler, Florida. 32054

65. A. Wayne Wilber, Community Director  
   Westside Elementary School, Daytona Beach, Florida. 32017

66. Leatricia A. Williams, Community School Coordinator  
   Middleton Junior High Community School, Tampa, Florida. 33610

67. Robert G. Shaw, Director of Community Schools  
   District School Board of Monroe County, Sigsbee Elementary  
   School, Key West, Florida. 33040

68. Albert Simmons, Community School Director  
   North Miami Beach Senior High Community School,  
   Miami, Florida. 33162

69. J. Stephen Taber, Director of Community Education  
   Alachua County School System, Gainesville, Florida. 32601

70. Ralph S. Dean, Community School Coordinator  
   Thomas Jefferson Community School, Jacksonville, Florida. 32205
Appendix D

Letters to Regional Centers for Community Education or Community School Development
January 8, 1973

Mr. Larry Horyna, Director
Northwest Community Education
Development Center
1736 Moss Street
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dear Larry:

As you know I am conducting a study to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between community schools and community colleges in five selected states.

I am most appreciative of the help you have already given me. Because of your help and that of several other educators, I will be ready to send the questionnaire to the selected educators in the five states in the very near future. Therefore, would you please send me a list of the community school directors or coordinators whose school district is within a community college district in Oregon?

Thank you for your help. I hope you had a good community school administrators conference at Clackamas Community College last month. You are always welcome to use our facilities.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Weiss

MW/ss
January 31, 1973

Dr. Phillip A. Clark, Director
Center for Community Education
280 Norman Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Dear Dr. Clark:

I am presently conducting a study to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs in those college districts in five selected states. The study will provide data for a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools.

Would you please send me a list of community school directors or coordinators whose school district is within a community college district in your state? It would also be most helpful if you could give me the name of the community college in which each community school is located.

I am enclosing a "draft" of the questionnaire which will be sent to community school administrators and adult/community education administrators in community colleges in each of the five selected states.

I will appreciate an early reply and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services/Education

MWW/ss
Enclosure
January 26, 1973

Dr. Jack D. Minzey, Director  
Center for Community Education  
101 Boone Hall  
Eastern Michigan University  
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Dr. Minzey:

I am presently conducting a study to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs in those college districts in five selected states. The study will provide data for a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools.

Would you please send me a list of community school directors or coordinators whose school district is within a community college district in your state? It would also be most helpful if you could give me the name of the community college in which each community school is located.

I am enclosing a "draft" of the questionnaire which will be sent to community school administrators and adult/community education administrators in community colleges in each of the five selected states.

I will appreciate an early reply and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean  
Community Services/Education

MWW/ ss  
Enclosure
Dear Dr. Martin:

I am presently conducting a study to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs in those college districts in five selected states. The study will provide data for a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools.

Would you please send me a list of community school directors or coordinators whose school district is within a community college district in your state? It would also be most helpful if you could give me the name of the community college in which each community school is located.

I am enclosing a "draft" of the questionnaire which will be sent to community school administrators and adult/community education administrators in community colleges in each of the five selected states.

I will appreciate an early reply and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services/Education
Mr. John Garber, Director  
Center for Community Education  
Learning Resources 2-A  
Northern Michigan University  
Marquette, Michigan 49855

Dear Mr. Garber:

I am presently conducting a study to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs in those college districts in five selected states. The study will provide data for a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools.

Would you please send me a list of community school directors or coordinators whose school district is within a community college district in your state? It would also be most helpful if you could give me the name of the community college in which each community school is located.

I am enclosing a "draft" of the questionnaire which will be sent to community school administrators and adult/community education administrators in community colleges in each of the five selected states.

I will appreciate an early reply and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean  
Community Services/Education

MWW/ss  
Enclosure
January 8, 1973

Dr. Tony S. Carrillo, Director
California Center for Community
School Development
School of Education, Room 423
California State University
San Jose, California 95114

Dear Dr. Carrillo:

I am presently conducting a study to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs in those college districts in five selected states. The study will provide data for a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools.

Would you please send me a list of community school directors or coordinators whose school district is within a community college district in your state? It would also be most helpful if you could give me the name of the community college in which each community school is located.

I am enclosing a "draft" of the questionnaire which will be sent to community school administrators and adult/community education administrators in community colleges in each of the five selected states.

I will appreciate an early reply and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services/Education

MWW/ss
Enclosure
CLACKAMAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Ore. 97045

January 31, 1973

Dr. Robert E. Cheek, Director
Center for Community Education
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33432

Dear Dr. Cheek:

I am presently conducting a study to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs in those college districts in five selected states. The study will provide data for a "model" for cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools.

Would you please send me a list of community school directors or coordinators whose school district is within a community college district in your state? It would also be most helpful if you could give me the name of the community college in which each community school is located.

I am enclosing a "draft" of the questionnaire which will be sent to community school administrators and adult/community education administrators in community colleges in each of the five selected states.

I will appreciate an early reply and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services/Education

MWW/ss
Enclosure
Appendix E

Letters from Regional Centers for Community Education or Community School Development
January 10, 1973

Marvin W. Weiss
Clackamas Community College
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Marv:

This is a very brief response to your letter of January 8 in which you indicated your readiness to proceed with your study. I was pleased to learn that you have been making some progress and that you now feel prepared to distribute your questionnaire. I hope I can be of some help.

You requested that I forward you a list of Community School Directors/Coordinators whose school district is within a Community College district in Oregon. Attached you will find this listing, including an indication of the community College affiliation. You will note that this listing includes people throughout the region, so you will necessarily have to pick out the Oregonians. However, I believe the listing is self-explanatory, so there shouldn't be any problems. If you do run into problems, simply give me a jangle or drop me a note.

Have you made the appropriate contacts to circulate your questionnaire in other areas of the country? If not, the various Regional Centers could probably be of some assistance. Again, let me know if I can help.

That about does it for now, but I hope this does adequately satisfy your immediate needs.

As always,

Larry Horyna, Director

LH:ann
February 7, 1973

Mr. Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services/Education
Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Mr. Weiss:

Enclosed are the materials you requested in your letter of January 31. Please note that the listings in the Directory are arranged according to county. You may also find the following names useful for your study.

Mr. Stephen Taber, Supervisor
Community Education in Alachua County
1817 East University Avenue
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Ms. Sara Driggers, Director
Community Education in Union County
P. O. Box 128
Curriculum Center
Lake Butler, Florida 32054

Mr. Edward Burnam, Director
Community Education in Hamilton County
Route 1, Box 85
Jennings, Florida 32053

If we can be of further assistance please call on us.

Cordially,

Phillip A. Clark, Director
Center for Community Education

PAC: sew
Enclosure
Center for Community Education  
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

February 5, 1973

Dr. Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean  
Community Services/Education  
Clackamas Community College  
19600 S. Molalla Avenue  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Dr. Weiss:

I am enclosing a listing of school districts and directors within our service area in southeastern Michigan that operate Community Education Programs. You will note that I've marked an asterisk (red) by a number of them. These are districts that have worked out a particularly unique working arrangement with Genesee Community College. Your questionnaire would be particularly appropriate to this group.

As yet, the involvement has not spread to other Community Colleges in our service area (but community school programs around the Lansing, Michigan area have a similar set up with Lansing Community College.) These addresses could be obtained by writing to:

Mr. Hugh Rohrer, Director  
Center for Community Education  
Alma College  
Alma, Michigan

Please keep us advised as to the outcome of your study.

Sincerely,

William Hetrick, Assistant Director  
Center for Community Education

WH:jp  
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February 9, 1973

Dr. Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services/Education
Clackamas Community College
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Dr. Weiss:

This letter is in response to your letter of January 26 requesting information on community college-community school districts in our state.

Enclosed is our U. P. Community School Personnel Directory in which we have marked the information you requested. We have also included three four-year institutions.

We hope the information will be of assistance.

Cordially,

John B. Garber, Director
CENTER FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION

JBG/vjd
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Mr. Marvin W. Weiss  
Associate Dean, Community Services/Education  
Clackamas Community College  
19600 S. Molalla Avenue  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Mr. Weiss:

Enclosed please find the information you requested from us earlier. Please forgive the delay in getting this to you.

If we can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us. We trust that we will be able to help you without such delay.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tony S. Carrillo  
Director

TSC:sp  
Encl.
Mr. Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services/Education
Clackamas Community College
19600 S. Molalla Ave.
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Mr. Weiss:

Enclosed is a list of resources people that could be of some help to you.

Presently there are no community schools located within a community college.

We wish you success in your project and would be interested in the "model" developed.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Cheek
Director

REC:pas
Encl.
Appendix F

Letters to Board of Higher Education
and Community College Associations
Dear Dr. Shelton:

I am enclosing a draft of my thesis proposal as per our telephone conversation last week. I am also attaching a revised draft of the questionnaire.

I will appreciate your comments and suggestions regarding the proposal and the revised questionnaire.

I will be enclosing an instruction sheet, a definition of terms and a cover letter with the questionnaire when it is in complete form.

Thank you for taking the time to evaluate my questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services

MWW: ss
Enclosure
CLACKAMAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Ore. 97045

February 23, 1973

Dr. Lee G. Henderson, Director
Division of Community Colleges 523K
Florida State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Dear Dr. Henderson:

Under the auspices of the School of Education, Oregon State University, I am conducting a study to determine the extent of the cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts.

We would like to survey ten selected community colleges in five states (Washington, California, Michigan, Florida and Oregon) and ten community school directors whose programs and activities are within community college districts in the five selected states.

In order to survey ten community college administrators in Florida, we are seeking your endorsement of the proposed study and survey. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire which will be used in the survey. In addition, a copy is enclosed of the letter of endorsement from Dr. Donald Shelton, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association.

We will be most appreciative if you will send us a letter of endorsement by March 7, 1973.

A resume of the findings of this study will be sent to you at the conclusion of the study if you desire a copy.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions, please call me or write to me.

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services

MWW;mb
Mr. John C. Mundt, Executive Director
State Board for Community College Education
P. O. Box 1666
Olympia, Washington 98501

Dear Mr. Mundt:

Under the auspices of the School of Education, Oregon State University, I am conducting a study to determine the extent of the cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts.

We would like to survey ten selected community colleges in five states (Washington, California, Michigan, Florida and Oregon) and ten community school directors whose programs and activities are within community college districts in the five selected states.

In order to survey ten community college administrators in Washington, we are seeking your endorsement of the proposed study and survey. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire which will be used in the survey. In addition, a copy is enclosed of the letter of endorsement from Dr. Donald Shelton, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association.

We will be most appreciative if you will send us a letter of endorsement by March 7, 1973.

A resume of the findings of this study will be sent to you at the conclusion of the study if you desire a copy.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions, please call me or write to me.

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services

MWW:mb
Dr. Robert D. Cahow, Executive Secretary
Michigan Community College Association
814 Michigan National Tower
Lansing, Michigan 48933

Dear Dr. Cahow:

Under the auspices of the School of Education, Oregon State University, I am conducting a study to determine the extent of the cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts.

We would like to survey ten selected community colleges in five states (Washington, California, Michigan, Florida and Oregon) and ten community school directors whose programs and activities are within community college districts in the five selected states.

In order to survey ten community college administrators in Michigan, we are seeking your endorsement of the proposed study and survey. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire which will be used in the survey. In addition, a copy is enclosed of the letter of endorsement from Dr. Donald Shelton, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association.

We will be most appreciative if you will send us a letter of endorsement by March 7, 1973.

A resume of the findings of this study will be sent to you at the conclusion of the study if you desire a copy.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions, please call me or write to me.

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services

MWW:mb
February 23, 1973

Dr. Harry McKinney, Director
Higher Education Planning and Coordination
Bureau of Higher Education
P. O. Box 48920
Lansing, Michigan 48920

Dear Dr. McKinney:

Under the auspices of the School of Education, Oregon State University, I am conducting a study to determine the extent of the cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts.

We would like to survey ten selected community colleges in five states (Washington, California, Michigan, Florida and Oregon) and ten community school directors whose programs and activities are within community college districts in the five selected states.

In order to survey the community college administrators in Michigan, we are seeking your endorsement of the proposed study and survey. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire which will be used in the survey. In addition, a copy is enclosed of the letter of endorsement from Dr. Donald Shelton, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association.

We will be most appreciative if you will send us a letter of endorsement by March 7, 1973.

A resume of the findings of this study will be sent to you at the conclusion of the study if you desire a copy.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions, please call me or write to me.

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services

MWW:mb
February 23, 1973

Dr. Lloyd E. Messersmith, Executive Secretary
California Junior College Association
2017 "O" Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Dr. Messersmith:

Under the auspices of the School of Education, Oregon State University, I am conducting a study to determine the extent of the cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts.

We would like to survey ten selected community colleges in five states (Washington, California, Michigan, Florida and Oregon) and ten community school directors whose programs and activities are within community college districts in the five selected states.

In order to survey ten community college administrators in California, we are seeking your endorsement of the proposed study and survey. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire which will be used in the survey. In addition, a copy is enclosed of the letter of endorsement from Dr. Donald Shelton, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association.

We will be most appreciative if you will send us a letter of endorsement by March 7, 1973.

A resume of the findings of this study will be sent to you at the conclusion of the study if you desire a copy.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions, please call me or write to me.

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services

MWW:mb
February 23, 1973

Dr. Sidney W. Brossman, Chancellor
Community Colleges
825 - 15th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Dr. Brossman:

Under the auspices of the School of Education, Oregon State University, I am conducting a study to determine the extent of the cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts.

We would like to survey ten selected community colleges in five states (Washington, California, Michigan, Florida and Oregon) and ten community school directors whose programs and activities are within community college districts in the five selected states.

In order to survey ten community college administrators in California, we are seeking your endorsement of the proposed study and survey. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire which will be used in the survey. In addition, a copy is enclosed of the letter of endorsement from Dr. Donald Shelton, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association.

We will be most appreciative if you will send us a letter of endorsement by March 7, 1973.

A resume of the findings of this study will be sent to you at the conclusion of the study if you desire a copy.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions, please call me or write to me.

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services

MWW:mb
Appendix G

Letters from Boards of Higher Education and Community College Associations
Oregon Community College Association
1201 Court Street, N. E.
Salem, Oregon 97301

February 22, 1973

Dear Community College Administrator:

Mr. Marvin Weiss, Director of Community College Service Programs at Clackamas Community College, requested the approval of the OCCA for Oregon community colleges to participate in a research study. In accordance with our OCCA Research Policy Code 5.1 to 5.5, we appointed an advisory committee to review his study and make recommendation to him and to us concerning it. The review committee was composed of Dr. John Hakanson, President Clackamas Community College; Dr. William Loomis, Department of Education; and Mr. Dave Spooner, Dean of Community Services, Mt. Hood Community College. This committee unanimously approved his proposal.

It will be appreciated if you will cooperate with Mr. Weiss in the conduct of his study. You may rest assured that the results of the study will be available to you as prescribed in the OCCA Research Policy Code.

Thank you for your kind attention to this request.

Cordially yours,

Donald K. Shelton
Executive Secretary

DKS:ms
Mr. Marvin W. Weiss  
Associate Dean, Community Services  
Clackamas Community College  
19600 S. Molalla Avenue  
Oregon City, Oregon 97045  

Dear Mr. Weiss:

I am writing in response to your letter of February 23 requesting a letter of endorsement from this office for your study about cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs.

Your topic is one that is of current interest to this Division and to the community colleges of this state. I regret, however, that we are unable to write you a letter of endorsement for the study as it is contrary to the policy we have agreed on with our community college presidents, which prohibits us from endorsing studies unless they contribute substantially to the planned research efforts of the state system. I would suggest, therefore, that you communicate directly with those colleges which you would like to include in your study. My guess is that most of them will be quite willing to cooperate with you.

Even though I am not in a posture to endorse your study, I would very much appreciate having a resume of the findings if you would care to make them available to us.

With personal best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Lee G. Henderson
March 6, 1973

Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean
Community Services
Clackamas Community College
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Mr. Weiss:

Your request of an endorsement of your proposed study in the state of Washington has been referred to me.

Mr. Mundt, State Director of Community College Education, appointed Dr. George Douglas, Shoreline Community College, Mr. George Dorr, Highline Community College, and me to a committee on the subject of coordination of community colleges with the school districts interested in community school programs. We have been meeting with school district representatives to affect this coordination. The results of this proposed study should be of direct interest to this committee as well as to the community colleges and school districts involved in community school programs. The community college system community school committee therefore endorses your proposed study.

Sincerely,

Richard G. Moe
Education Program Director

RGM:jb
March 6, 1973

Mr. Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean
Community Services
Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Mr. Weiss:

Please find enclosed a letter of introduction signed by Dr. Robert L. Huxol, Associate Superintendent for Higher Education and Adult Continuing Education.

This letter is being provided you with the understanding that the results of this study will be shared with us as soon as they have been tabulated. We wish you well in this study in that this is certainly an important area of concern.

Sincerely,

David H. Bland, Coordinator
Community College Affairs

DHB:hjw
Enclosure
Dear Community College Administrator:

Mr. Marvin W. Weiss, Associate Dean, Community Services, Clackamas Community College, Oregon City, Oregon, has requested our endorsement to conduct a study to determine the extent of the cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts. On studying the attached questionnaire, it appeared that the information which would result from the study would be beneficial to Michigan as we consider the delivery of adult education services.

In light of this, it would be appreciated if you would cooperate with Mr. Weiss in the conduct of this study. As he has committed to us, the results of this effort will be available to you.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Huxol
Associate Superintendent for
Higher Education and Adult
Continuing Education
March 2, 1973

Mr. Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services
Clackamas Community College
19600 South Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Mr. Weiss:

Dr. Messersmith asked me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 23 regarding a proposed study to determine the extent of the cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts.

Copies of your letter and enclosed questionnaire are being sent to Dr. Otto A. Heinkel, Chairman of the CJCA Committee on Research and Development, for his perusal. We are sure that as soon as he has had the opportunity to review the proposal in behalf of the Committee, he will be in touch with you.

Sincerely yours,

Alice M. Takahashi
Administrative Assistant
March 14, 1973

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services
Clackamas Community College
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Mr. Weiss:

The Research and Development Committee of the CJCA is pleased to see that you plan to conduct a study, Cooperation and Coordination of Community/Adult Education Programs and Community School Programs in Community College Districts. The results of your study should prove helpful in the continued operation and improvement of our community colleges.

Would you please send us a copy of the results when it is completed? Also, please let us know if we can help in any way.

Sincerely,

Otto A. Heinkel
Chairman, Research and Development Committee

OAH:et
March 5, 1973

Mr. Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean
Community Services
Clackamas Community College
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Dear Mr. Weiss:

We are, of course, very interested in the results of your study to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between Community College and community school programs within Community College districts. However, it is our policy not to endorse studies or surveys unless conducted under our direct supervision.

During the past two years, we conducted extensive negotiations between adult high schools and Community Colleges concerning a delineation of functions between the two segments of education. I'm forwarding a copy of the legislation which was passed and a copy of the guidelines for implementation of the legislation which were recently passed by our Board of Governors. I think you'll find the items answer a good share of the information requested in the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Sidney W. Brossman, Chancellor

Enclosures
Appendix H

Cover Letter to Community College
and Community School Administrators
March 15, 1973

A study is being conducted to determine the extent of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community school programs within community college districts. Completion of this study necessitates gaining your reaction to a survey form. Your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire, which should not require more than 45 minutes, will be greatly appreciated.

The data supplied by you will be held in strictest confidence. In no way will your name or the name of your institution be used in this study. Information from this questionnaire will be included in the final report in statistical form only. A resume of this study will be sent to you upon completion of the study.

It would be appreciated if you could return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope by March 30. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melvin D. Miller
Assistant Director
Division of Vocational, Adult, and Community College Education
Oregon State University

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean
Community Services
Clackamas Community College

enclosure
Appendix I

Follow-Up Letter to Community College
and Community School Administrators
March 30, 1973

Recently I mailed you a questionnaire, "Cooperation and Coordination of Community/Adult Education Programs and Community School Programs in Community College Districts," and requested your help in providing information which will help to determine the level of cooperation and coordination that exists between the community colleges and community schools in five selected states. If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, please consider this letter as an expression of my appreciation.

If you have not responded, please do so at your earliest convenience. I also have enclosed another questionnaire in the event that the first mailing was misplaced.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Weiss
Associate Dean, Community Services
Clackamas Community College

MWW:mb
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Appendix J

Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Among Community College and Community School Personnel
Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Colleges/Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Computed &quot;F&quot;</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Computed &quot;F&quot;</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0396</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.0397</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4176</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3542</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0345</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.3133</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.9541</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.0436</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.6098</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0600</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.0688</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8421</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.0183</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.5952</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.2709</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0110</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.4024</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.1424</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.0444</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.4766</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.0033</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.1791</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.9258</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8609</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8037</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.6962</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5238</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.4680</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.6680</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.7297</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.0242</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.7946</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.5333</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.0116</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.9366</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.0352</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.6923</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.8972</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0870</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.4887</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.0889</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.1179</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.3908</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.0132</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The level of significance was .05.
The tabular "F" was 4.000.
Appendix K

Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance Among States
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Computed &quot;F&quot;</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Computed &quot;F&quot;</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8622</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.2461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5103</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4404</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9000</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.0226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4875</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.0183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9572</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2738</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.6155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4780</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0786</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.0464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5830</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.6371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4030</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.3472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3402</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.6258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.5429</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.6582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8095</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.3980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7869</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.6318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3871</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.5432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.6458</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7463</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.8768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.8188</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.3937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.1444</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.8558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.4770</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.5592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The level of significance was .05.
The tabular "F" was 2.5252.
Appendix L

Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance
For Interaction Effect Differences
## Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance: Interaction Effect Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Computed &quot;F&quot;</th>
<th>Hypothesis*</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Computed &quot;F&quot;</th>
<th>Hypothesis*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7079</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.8096</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7173</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.3903</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5690</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.0060</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4862</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.9683</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9000</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.9774</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4875</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.9771</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9572</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.4360</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6071</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.1773</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4560</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.5122</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.5208</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.0423</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.4340</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.0284</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3545</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.0240</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.4639</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.8974</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.3313</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.3165</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.9524</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.4380</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2705</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.6791</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.6290</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.5108</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.3875</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.9093</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.6828</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.1444</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.0641</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.5818</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.3841</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0995</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.5889</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.3957</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.6494</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.4276</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The level of significance was .05.
The tabular "F" was 2.5252.
Appendix M

Plotted Results Where Significant Interaction Effect Differences Were Found
Figure 1. Plotted Results Where Significant Interaction Effect Differences Were Found.

The plotted results show that there is significant difference between the mean responses from community college personnel and community school personnel in the five states. The interaction effect for Item 16 is ordinal.
Figure 2. Plotted Results Where Significant Interaction Effect Differences Were Found.

The plotted results indicate that the interaction effect is disordinal between Oregon and Washington and Washington and California. The interaction effect is ordinal between California Michigan and Michigan and Florida.
The plotted results indicate that the interaction effect is ordinal between Oregon and Washington and Washington and California. The interaction effect is disordinal between California and Michigan and Michigan and Florida.
The plotted results indicate that the interaction effect is ordinal between Oregon and Washington and California and Michigan. The interaction effect is disordinal between Washington and California and Michigan and Florida.
Appendix N

Letter to J. W. Ross, Cooperative Extension Service
Oregon State University
January 23, 1973

Dr. Jack Ross
Extension Hall 102
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Dear Dr. Ross:

As per our telephone conversation on January 22, I am enclosing a copy of my thesis proposal which was submitted to my committee and approved on January 18.

As I indicated in our conversation, Dr. Mel Miller, my committee chairman, asked me to explore the possibility of an addendum to my study which would include surveying the various cooperation extension offices throughout the State of Oregon.

After you have read my proposal, I would appreciate your answering the following questions:

1. Is it feasible to include a study on cooperation and coordination between the state cooperation extension and community colleges?

2. Could the questions on the survey be revised so that they would be pertinent for cooperation extension personnel also?

3. If I include cooperation extension in my study would this be a repetition of your study which you recently completed in the State of Oregon?

4. Are you aware of any other study now being conducted in Oregon which relates to cooperation between community colleges and community extension?

I thank you in advance for taking the time to read my study and would appreciate your reply to this letter.

Marvin W. Weiss,
Associate Dean,
Community Services
Appendix O

Letter from J. W. Ross, Cooperative Extension Service
Oregon State University
Dear Marvin:

Please pardon my tardy response to your letter of January 23 in which you asked whether or not Cooperative Extension should be included in your study on cooperation and coordination between community colleges and other community educational programs. As I mentioned to you on the telephone, this question has been a live issue.

We have just received word that the Board of Education at its last meeting made some rather profound decisions affecting community education. As I am sure you are aware, the board has decreed now that all areas of the state can now be served by community colleges. In addition, the board has decreed that community colleges in the state should take action right away to develop memoranda of understanding with all other agencies and groups in the community which are offering what they call "community college-type" programs. At this point I am not sure what they mean by community college-type programs. There are many agencies offering educational programs in the communities that may or may not fall within this definition. We have been offering adult education, continuing education-type educational programs in the communities many years prior to the establishment of community colleges in Oregon. We are reluctant to title our programs community college-type programs.

In response to your specific question, I would say at this point that it is not feasible to include within your study a study of the cooperation and coordination between Extension and community colleges. With some colleges Extension has developed an extremely close working relationship. We have established joint advisory committee structures, are meeting regularly with the community
colleges and making every effort to coordinate our programs to avoid
duplication of effort. In other areas the coordination has not been
as close as we would desire. I am not aware of any other study now
being conducted in Oregon which relates to cooperation between
community colleges and Extension.

We intend to report to the legislature the extent of our efforts
to coordinate our programs with the various community colleges
throughout the state. The State Department of Education staff has
advised us that the formal coordination of programs with community
colleges is to be handled by representatives of the State Board of
Education and the State Board of Higher Education. Until we receive
more instructions from the State Board of Higher Education, we do
not plan to conduct any additional studies.

I found your thesis proposal to be very interesting and if carried
out like you outlined, should be very constructive in helping many
of us get a clearer picture of the situation in the state. I was
particularly interested in the effort to get a better definition of the
kinds of programs we are talking about. For example, what do we
mean by adult education, continuing education, community service
and so forth. I would add the need for a better definition of the term
vocational education. Community college and State Department of
Education staff members have a different definition of vocational
education than others engaged in community service educational
programs.

I would be interested in being kept advised of your progress on
your study and would be pleased to make any input that you feel would
be appropriate.

Sincerely,

J. W. Ross
Assistant Director

JWR:mf

cc: Palmer Torvend