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The problem of this study is the development of a philosophy for two-year occupational programs in public junior college business curricula. The Vocational Education Acts of 1963 and 1968 provided funds to finance separate and distinct programs of study to prepare students for immediate entry into various occupational areas. The design of these new public junior college occupational programs in the area of business administration is the broad concern of this investigation.

The purpose of this study is to develop and rationalize a philosophy which might support contemporary and future two-year occupational programs in business that may be offered by the public junior colleges of Texas. The philosophy is developed and presented for consideration on its own merit and no particular effort is made to justify it authoritatively.

The design of the study may be outlined as follows:

1. Survey established reference works to discover the historical development of the significant philosophy(ies) of
the public junior college upon which the institution has flourished and the relationship of this discerned philosophy to occupational programs in business. The purpose of this step is to give direction to the study and to serve as a background out of which primary questions might emerge concerning the relationship between theory and practice.

2. With the comparison of junior college philosophy and practices accomplished in Step 1 serving as a background, significant questions are posed to which those responsible for the development of junior college business curricula should give some attention in the current social setting. Contemporary literature, current publications, and other sources have been searched to bring together materials out of which certain concepts are presented and from which basic questions have been formed.

3. The primary questions formed in Step 2, and the dilemma posed by these questions for curricular development of two-year occupational programs in business have been articulated in order to focus attention on them. A comprehensive statement of philosophy has been developed and proposed which might serve as a source for the study and possible modification of existing philosophy and practices.

4. The statement of philosophy presented in Step 3 has been examined along with the historic philosophy of the
junior college reviewed in Step 1 to discern what relationship exists between the two.

5. Recommendations concerning the possible use of the statement of philosophy proposed in Step 3 have been made in two general areas:

a. Adjustments to current programs which could represent movement toward the implementation of the philosophy developed in the study.

b. New programs which might be offered to reflect the spirit of the philosophy developed in this study.

The survey of the historic development of public junior college philosophy seems to indicate that the junior college has an identity problem concerning its place within the American system of education. The problem of identity poses a question concerning the kind of institution which may be needed to support the proposed occupational programs in business. The survey also seemed to indicate that the description of the kind of occupational proficiency which occupational programs are designed to develop may also be significant. Finally, when institutional identity has been established philosophically and occupational proficiency has been adequately described, the questions that remain concern the components of an occupational program which will be
consistent with stated institutional philosophy while developing the desired occupational proficiency in the students enrolled.

This report makes and discusses nineteen distinct proposals for a new kind of institution--the responsive community college--and the development of comprehensive occupational programs in junior college business curricula which may be designed to develop the kind of occupational proficiency described in the study.
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CHAPTER I

A PHILOSOPHY FOR TWO-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS IN
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE BUSINESS CURRICULA

Built on the premise that post-high school educational opportunities should be open and available to all citizens who might benefit from the experience, the American public junior college has established itself as a unique institution with several recognizably different roles to perform. Maintaining a close relationship to the needs of the communities they have been created to serve, these public colleges have opened wide their doors to many different segments of the population who for various reasons have desired to enter.

Among the diverse purposes of the public junior college has been the effort to offer programs designed to expand or extend an individual's general education while providing the opportunities of rather specialized training for initial entry and advancement in the world of work. Whatever the general advantages of a college education may be considered to be, the American public junior college has attempted to make these advantages accessible to individuals in their home communities.
The earliest standard on philosophy and purpose of the junior college, as adopted by the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1929 presented the role of the junior college in these terms:

The aims of the curriculum are to meet the needs of the student for maximum growth and development, to further his social maturity, and to enable him to make his greatest contribution as a member of society. (24, pp. 167-168)

In an effort to translate this general statement of philosophy into more specific operational terms, most junior colleges have historically pledged themselves to offer programs and courses designed to accomplish three basic purposes:

1. Enrichment. To give the advantages of college education of a general nature to high school graduates who could not otherwise secure it for geographical or economic reasons; and to give similar benefits to mature residents of the community.

2. Transfer. To give two years of work equivalent to that given in the freshman and sophomore years of standard universities to prepare students for transfer to upper division specialization in senior colleges.

3. Occupational. To give specific preparation by vocational-technical courses for specific occupations on the semi-professional level, qualifying students who finish them for immediate entry in a definite life occupation.

Even though these three basic purposes seem to offer the curriculum maker a broad foundation upon which to build,
there seems to be some evidence to indicate that distinct programs in all three areas have been but rarely offered by the public junior colleges of Texas. Although Texas was an early leader in the public junior college sector of higher education, Texas junior colleges seem to have concentrated their resources in the single area of transfer programs perhaps to the neglect of the other two program areas.

In the curricular area of business administration, many public junior colleges in Texas offered one set of courses to fulfill all three of the basic junior college purposes given above. A single set of courses was provided for students whether their purpose for enrolling was enrichment, transfer, or occupational. This apparent melding of three distinct purposes into a single curriculum area in the field of business administration seems to have been advantageous to both students and public junior colleges in Texas. If after completing a two-year program in business administration in a public junior college, the student decided to transfer to a senior college, he was able to do so with a minimum loss of credit. If instead of transferring, the student decided to terminate his formal education with the junior college experience, perhaps he had received the enriching
advantages of a two-year college education and he seemed to be well enough prepared occupationally for initial job entry. This melding of purposes into a single curriculum area was a great advantage to the public junior college because of the efficient utilization of their limited resources.

The funding provided by the Vocational Education Acts of 1963 and 1968 made the offering of one set of courses to serve three purposes very difficult if not impossible. These vocational acts specified that the provided funds were to be used to finance separate and distinct programs that should be complete in themselves and which should not be designed for transfer but to help students achieve a high degree of occupational and personal proficiency.

The design of new public junior college occupational programs in the area of business administration which would meet the funding requirements of the Vocational Education Acts of 1963 and 1968 was the broad concern of this study.

More specific areas of concern may be briefly expressed as follows:

1. Would traditional junior college philosophy which historically undergirded the curricular offerings of public junior colleges in Texas support newly designed occupational
programs in business administration? If, in accordance with traditional junior college philosophy, general educational opportunities should be provided for all students regardless of occupational goals, should all two-year occupational programs in the area of business administration be a mixture of specialized and non-specialized courses? If so, what should be the appropriate mixture of these two elements?

2. Was either a new philosophy or a restatement of traditional philosophy needed to provide the ground out of which new occupational programs may grow to meet contemporary and future needs? Where should the curriculum maker go for help to discover a basis for recommending the specialized and non-specialized elements which should be included in occupational programs in business? Would a survey of the literature pertaining to junior college philosophy offer foundations upon which a curriculum maker might build new programs?

3. If a major portion of the financing of new occupational programs in business should be provided by federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and as amended in 1968, how compatible should these specified programs be with transfer and/or enrichment programs? What kind of philosophy may be needed to support all of these
programs? Should the public junior colleges of Texas continue their attempt to provide a single curriculum area to meet the multiple purposes as stated in historic junior college philosophy?

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is the development of a philosophy for two-year occupational programs in public junior college business curricula.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to develop and rationalize a philosophy which might support contemporary and future two-year occupational programs in business that may be offered by the public junior colleges of Texas. The philosophy which will be developed will be presented for consideration on its own merit and no particular effort will be made to justify it authoritatively.

The major purposes of this study are to

1. Survey the historical development of the significant philosophy(ies) of the junior college upon which the institution has flourished.

2. Pose significant questions to which those responsible for the development of junior college business curricula should give some attention in the current social setting.
3. Develop and propose a comprehensive statement of philosophy which might serve as a reference for the study and modifying of two-year occupational programs in business curricula.

4. Examine the inter-relationship of the philosophy developed in this study with the historic philosophy(ies) reviewed in Step 1 above.

5. Make recommendations about
   a. Areas for experimentation concerning the expansion or modification of existing two-year occupational programs.
   b. Possible programs which might be offered in the near future to reflect the spirit of the philosophy developed in this study.

Definition of Terms

1. Public Junior College—An institution of higher learning which provides education and training for all residents of its geographic area who are high school graduates, or above high school age, on the basis of their needs, interest and abilities to benefit thereby. It is a tax-supported institution established through the initiative of the local people and is locally controlled by a board of elected trustees.
2. **Occupational education** in business administration refers to the two-year post-high school programs offered by a public junior college aimed at preparation for immediate employment as distinguished from curriculums designed for transfer to four-year colleges. Although not always used in exactly the same context, both **occupational education** and **technical education** denote a level of training less than required for a profession but greater than it is possible to acquire in the four-year high school period.

3. **Technical course** refers to a specialized course designed to develop a high level of occupational proficiency in a particular area of work.

4. **Terminal program** refers to a program of study designed by the junior college which is two years or less in length, which is intended to be complete in itself, and which is terminated by the awarding of an associate degree or other certificate.

Design of the Study

1. Established reference works about the junior college have been surveyed to discern statements of philosophy and purpose relating to occupational programs in business. Historical development of junior college philosophy and
purpose since 1900 have been traced, delineated, and related to resulting practices of Texas public junior colleges in offering programs in occupational education as part of their business curricula. This comparison of philosophy and practice has been made to point the way for additional investigation in this study and no list of criteria concerning what the programs should have been or should be has been developed or applied. The purpose of this step has been to give direction to the study and to serve as a background out of which primary questions might emerge concerning the relationship between theory and practice.

2. With the comparison of junior college philosophy and practices accomplished in Step 1 serving as a background, significant, primary, essential questions have been formed which might constitute a logical basis for the decision-making necessary in structuring two-year occupational programs in business. Contemporary literature, current publications, and other sources have been searched to bring together materials out of which certain concepts may be presented and from which basic questions have been formed. The purpose of this step has been to identify questions which should be given attention in the development of relationships among community conditions, institutional philosophy, and curricular designs and practices.
3. The basic questions formed in Step 2, and the dilemma posed by these questions for curricular development of two-year occupational programs in business have been articulated in order to focus attention on them. A comprehensive statement of philosophy has been developed and proposed which might serve as a source for the study and possible modification of existing philosophy and practices. This statement of philosophy has been presented for consideration on its own merit, and no particular effort has been made to justify it authoritatively or connect it to any recognized classification of philosophic thought.

4. The statement of philosophy presented in Step 3 has been examined along with the historic philosophy of the junior college reviewed in Step 1 to discern what inter-relationship existed between the two.

5. Recommendations concerning the possible use of the statement of philosophy proposed in Step 3 have been made in two general areas:

   a. Adjustments to current programs which could represent movement toward the implementation of the philosophy developed in the study.

   b. Programs which might be offered to reflect the spirit of the philosophy developed in this study.
CHAPTER II

PHILOSOPHY OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AS RELATED TO
TWO-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS IN BUSINESS

Statements of philosophy and purposes of an educational institution are intended to serve as reference points for the nature of the educational programs offered. Therefore, it seemed pertinent to this study to survey the available literature in order to trace the historical development of the significant philosophies of the junior college upon which the institution has flourished and to relate these philosophies to the programs offered in the area of business administration.

The location of a definite point of conception of the American junior college movement may not be identified with any degree of certainty. Since evolving social institutions may be difficult to describe with precision at any given time, perhaps it is not surprising that even the earliest observers of what is now called the junior college movement found the genesis of the movement rather uncertain and the gestation period between mental image and institutional reality largely indeterminable.
Even though the philosophical origins of the junior college movement may be rather uncertain, there appears to be general agreement that the idea of a two-year institution, inserted between the secondary school and the university, originated in America between 1850 and 1900. A search of the literature reveals that beginning with 1900 the historical development of junior college philosophy and purposes as proclaimed by professional bodies such as the American Association of Junior Colleges and as published in numerous junior college catalogs may be traced with a minimum loss of continuity. In the pages which follow, the development of the philosophical background of the junior college, particularly the public junior college, is presented in an unbroken flow, primarily through the use of quotations from the literature, with a minimum of comment and interpretation. Since the primary interest of this study is the relationship between junior college philosophy and the two-year occupational programs in business curricula as offered by the public junior college of Texas, the development of these programs will be presented along with the developing philosophy which supposedly supported them. Following this broad description of developing philosophy and representative programs, excerpts from selected definitive studies of the junior college have been
used to focus attention upon the relationship of these
broad statements of philosophy and the practices of junior
colleges as described by various investigators.

It should be borne in mind throughout this presentation
that proclaimed purposes of collegiate associations and
stated philosophies found in college catalogs are rarely
definitive enough statements to provide the criteria against
which any individual college may or should be evaluated.
It seems highly unlikely that any individual junior college
would define itself by using all of the statements of purpose
identified in this tracing of historical development even
though the statements seem to be very general in nature.
It seems equally unlikely that any individual junior college
would define itself without using many of the statements of
purpose identified.

What emerges, then, from the presentation of the broad
historical development of philosophy and the descriptions
of various two-year programs in business may be considered
a composite, a portrayal, of what the public junior college
and the two-year programs might look like in the aggregate.
At the proper point in the drawing of this portrait, special
attention will be given to the development of the public
junior college movement in Texas and to the study of how the
financial support of these public institutions influenced the two-year occupational programs in business curricula.

Junior College Philosophy Prior to 1920

Even though the junior college is considered to be a product of the twentieth century, suggestions related to its formation may be found in the middle of the nineteenth century among those concerned with the organization and structure of American higher education. Whether by coincidence or design, two of the stronger suggestions with implications for the junior college were made seventeen years apart in inaugural addresses by two outstanding university presidents. Henry W. Tappan, inaugurated as president of the University of Michigan in 1852, and W. W. Folwell, inaugurated as president of the University of Minnesota in 1869, advocated that the first two years of university work should be separated from the last two years of advanced or professional work. Both of these men suggested that the lower division of common college work could be transferred back to the secondary school so that the university could then concentrate its resources on professional work which was the true mission of the university. The published thoughts of these men do not indicate that either of them visualized the formation of
an institution such as the modern junior college or even that they visualized a separate college department as a part of the secondary school. Others, such as President James of the University of Illinois, offered similar suggestions of separation during the latter part of the nineteenth century, but no formal action was taken until 1892, when William Rainey Harper reorganized the University of Chicago into two distinct divisions. Freshman and sophomore work of the university was grouped in a division which was called the "Academic College" while the upper two years were called the "University College." The considerable influence of William R. Harper on the junior college movement will be described later.

Even though the suggestions of Tappan, Folwell, James, and others were not adopted until Harper's action, the idea of separation of the lower division work from upper division and graduate work in colleges and universities seems to have been well established in higher education circles by the close of the nineteenth century. At the same time that the idea of separation was developing among certain university leaders, the idea of adding two additional years of post-high school work to the secondary school was being strongly urged by leaders of the secondary school. Commenting in 1915 on the junior college movement in the high schools,
President Angell of Yale stated that "the immediate motivation for the junior college came not so much from the universities, however much they may have served the cause through occasional educational leaders and occasional agitation of educational ideals, but rather from the secondary schools and from the intelligent public that supports them."(16, p. 53)

By 1900, at least two distinct patterns contributing to the development of the junior college are discernable: (1) Separate the first two years of college work from upper division and graduate offerings in the university, and (2) add two years of post-high school work to the secondary school. There was another important variation in the first pattern that should be mentioned. The suggested amputation of lower division work from the university encouraged some educators to advocate another kind of surgery for weak four-year colleges: cut off the upper division courses and offer only freshman and sophomore work.

William Rainey Harper is very frequently referred to as the "father of the American junior college." This recognition is accorded him not only for his 1892 reorganization plan, but because he actively urged the establishment of junior colleges by both kinds of surgery on colleges and universities as well as by the extension of the secondary school program.
Following his separation of divisions at the University of Chicago, Harper made strong statements concerning junior college philosophy and purpose on numerous occasions. For example, in an address made to the National Education Association meeting in Charleston, South Carolina, July 10, 1900, Harper presented what many consider to be the Magna Charta of the junior college movement even though his remarks were addressed primarily to weak four-year colleges whom he urged to become strong two-year colleges. It was in this speech that he used for the first time the term "junior college" for, as he put it, "lack of a better term, to cover the freshman and sophomore years." Reorganization of weak, four-year colleges as junior colleges would have the following advantages, he declared:

1. The money now wasted in doing the higher work superficially could be used to do the lower work more thoroughly.

2. The pretense of giving a college education would be given up, and the college would become an honest institution.

3. The student who was not really fitted by nature to take the higher work could stop naturally and honorably at the end of the sophomore year.

4. Many students who might not have the courage to enter upon a course of four years' study would be willing to do the two years of work before entering business or professional school.
5. Students capable of doing the higher work would be forced to go away from the small college to the university. This change would in every case be most advantageous.

6. Students living near the college whose ambition it was to go away to college could remain at home until greater maturity had been reached--a point of the highest moment in these days of strong temptation. (24, pp. 60-61)

Three noteworthy events occurred in 1902 which prompted two early students of the junior college to mark that year as the true beginning of this significant segment of American higher education. Leonard V. Koos in 1925 and Walter C. Eells in 1930 published studies of the junior college in which the three 1902 occasions are described in some detail.

First, in a report following the close of his first ten years as president of the University of Chicago on July 1, 1902, Harper formally presented the philosophy, the resulting advantages and the problems of the junior college. This report is the earliest published statement of philosophy and purposes identified directly with the junior college. The statement is very similar to the remarks presented to the National Education Association in 1900 which are quoted above. In the 1902 report, Harper focused his attention on the newest section of American education, the junior college, whereas in his speech to the NEA, his remarks were directed to small four-year colleges.
The second event of significance in 1902 was the founding of the first public junior college in the United States at Joliet, Illinois. Eells points out that there is some confusion in the literature regarding the actual date that junior college work was first offered at Joliet, and that at the first meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1920, Joliet's claim to being the first public junior college was disputed by one of the delegates. Eells disposed of the matter by pointing out that "the only claim made for Joliet is that it is the first public institution still in existence." (24, p. 54) Other writers, such as Reynolds, state that "It would be fruitless to argue . . . . The significant point is that a junior college was established in Illinois in 1902 . . . that served as a prototype for many new institutions that were later established." (56, p. 54)

The third 1902 event significant to the development of the junior college occurred at the Conference of the Academies and High Schools Affiliated with the University of Chicago. Speaking to this group, Harper proposed a reorganization of these schools all along the line from elementary school through the university, including the six-year high school. As a result of this conference, several public schools added two additional years to their high schools, and by
1904, similar arrangements were established in other states including Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, and Missouri.

Harper's influence and impact on the junior college movement seems unmistakable. Until his death in 1906, Harper continued to promote the establishment of these two-year lower division colleges throughout the United States, either as a reorganization of a four-year college or as an extension of the high school. It would appear, however, that in his zeal to encourage the organization of junior colleges either by altering existing four-year colleges or by the extension of high school programs, Harper unintentionally may have encouraged the development of a duality of organization and purpose among these developing institutions.

The problem of duality of organization and purpose seems to have been a matter of considerable concern to those interested in the junior college in the years following World War I and during the early 1920's. The duality problem may be briefly summarized in these questions: Should the junior college become a part of a public high school and thus become something like the thirteenth and fourteenth grades or should the junior college be entirely separated from the high school and become the lower division of college by offering freshman and sophomore work? In addition to
questions about organizational structure and sources of financial support, the duality problem seems to have become particularly disturbing when those associated with the junior college attempted to agree on statements of purpose and role definitions while holding these two different philosophic orientations. These difficulties were particularly disturbing in the early 1920's and are discussed in more detail in the next section of this study.

Many observers of the junior college movement indicate that in addition to the two patterns of origin mentioned above, at least two other patterns are discernable: the evolution of educational institutions established specifically to provide vocational-technical training to young people in rural areas and the creation of junior colleges by special interest groups for either philanthropic purposes or for profit as private enterprise. Even though the primary interest of this study is the development of a philosophy for public junior colleges as related to occupational programs in business, the development of all kinds of junior colleges seems to have had an influence on the public junior college and the two-year occupational programs in business.

Although the first two patterns of origin—the upward extension of high schools and the reduction of four-year
schools--accounted for the largest number of junior colleges established during this early period, those established primarily for rural youth and those established for philanthropic or private purposes have added a definite dimension to the junior college movement. Those junior colleges established primarily to bring educational opportunities to young people living in small towns or rural areas were concentrated in three states--Mississippi, Oklahoma, and New York. Those established in Mississippi and Oklahoma had a strong agricultural orientation, and those in New York provided primarily vocational and technical education of an industrial nature.

The so-called "independent" junior colleges established by small groups or even by individuals, had a wide variety of purposes. Many of these independent colleges had highly restrictive admission policies including the admission of only one sex, and a narrowly structured curriculum. Although found in nearly all of the states, the greatest concentration of these schools was in the northeastern section of the country.

With at least these four discernable sources of origin, the identification of a single junior college philosophy supporting such widely divergent institutions would be a
challenging endeavor. Following Harper's pronouncements of 1900 and 1902, the first published attempt to identify the purposes of the junior college was made by F. M. McDowell in a bulletin published by the United States Bureau of Education in 1919. McDowell ranked the purposes of junior college education as suggested by a survey of seventy-five junior college administrators. Of the institutions surveyed, fifty-four were private junior colleges and twenty-one were publicly supported. The public junior college administrators ranked the purposes in the following order:

1. Desire of parent to keep children at home.

2. To provide a completion school for those who cannot go further.

3. Desire of students to secure college work near home.

4. To meet specific local needs.

5. Geographical remoteness from a standard college or university.

6. To meet entrance requirements of professional schools.

7. To provide vocational training more advanced than high school work.

8. Financial difficulty in maintaining a four-year course.

9. To provide additional opportunities for teacher training.
10. To secure the segregation of the sexes.

11. To provide opportunities for higher education under church control.

The administrators of private junior colleges ranked the purposes in approximately the same order with three exceptions: 
Desire of parent to keep children at home, ranked first by public administrators, was ranked ninth by private administrators; Geographical remoteness, ranked fifth by public administrators, was ranked eleventh by private administrators; Opportunities for education under church control, ranked eleventh by public administrators, was ranked first by private administrators. The reasons for these differences are rather easily explained: Geographic location of the institution was very important to the public junior college, but was relatively unimportant to the private college whose students would tend to seek out the college regardless of its location, and, since most of the private colleges were church sponsored, religious environment and training would be paramount in their thinking.

McDowell's survey indicated that public junior college administrators perceived the primary purpose of these institutions to be the provision of "a completion school, close to home."
Occupational Programs in Business Prior to 1920

Business occupational programs in the junior college prior to 1920 were very limited and contained very few specialized courses in business. The "completion" listed in McDowell's survey referred to general education, and business courses of a specialized nature were not generally regarded as proper collegiate offerings. Formal programs of education for business in the United States had their beginning in the private business colleges. The public high schools soon followed the lead of the private business colleges; and as business occupations required more advanced preparation, departments of business were established by senior colleges and universities, but very few junior colleges established separate departments during this period. Business courses were generally limited to accounting and economics while primary emphasis was placed on general education courses in order for a student to "complete" his education.

Junior College Philosophy 1920 to 1940

A survey of the literature published between 1920 and 1940 revealed that considerable attention was given to junior college philosophy and purposes. In 1920, one year
following the publication of McDowell's list of purposes, the first junior college conference involving institutions from all parts of the United States was held in St. Louis. George F. Zook, then specialist in higher education for the United States Bureau of Education, pointed out to the thirty-four conferees that although junior colleges had been discussed at meetings of educational societies, until then there had been no "gathering of representatives from the junior colleges themselves at which the place and function of the junior colleges in our system of education have been discussed." (8, p. 533)

The matter of the place and function of the junior college in American education seemed to begin in earnest at that 1920 conference and has persisted to the present time. In order to establish the place and function of the junior college, it was decided at the St. Louis conference to meet the following year to organize a national junior college association. Meeting in Chicago in 1921, the American Association of Junior Colleges was organized and adopted a constitution which included the following statement of purpose for the Association:

To define the junior college by creating standards and curricula, thus determining its position structurally in relation to other parts of the school system; and to
study the junior college in all of its types (endowed, municipal, and state) in order to make a genuine contribution to the work of education. (8, p. 533)

True to the charge given by its newly adopted constitution, a very simple definition of the junior college was adopted by the American Association of Junior Colleges at its second annual meeting at Memphis, Tennessee, in 1922: "The junior college is an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade." (24, p. 3) Although this definition appeared to be somewhat inadequate and perhaps too sketchy from which meaningful inferences about purpose could be drawn, it seemed to be an effort to establish the junior college as an institution which offered work beyond the high school level. At the fifth annual meeting in 1925, an amended definition was adopted which greatly broadened the possible role of the junior college:

The junior college is an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade. This curriculum may include those courses usually offered in the first two years of the four-year college; in which case these courses must be identical, in scope and thoroughness, with corresponding courses of the standard four-year college. The junior college may, and is likely to, develop a different type of curriculum suited to the larger and ever changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs of the entire community in which the college is located. It is understood that in this case also the work offered shall be on a level appropriate for high school graduates. (24, pp. 167-68)
Although this definition seemed to indicate the junior college should always offer standard college work, it seemed to imply strongly that the junior college should also offer courses to high school graduates which might be considered something other than standard. The above definition seemed typical of many attempts to establish the place of the junior college in American education. Each definition identified the junior college with traditional higher education while at the same time indicating that the junior college was something in addition to a standard college.

Harbeson in 1923 surveyed the literature of the junior college, including reports of administrators, and devised eight reasons for the organization of the junior college as a local project under public boards of education "rather than as standard colleges and universities."

1. The junior college "is a logical part" of secondary education, "rather than of the standard college or university."

2. The university cannot absorb large numbers wanting to go to college; many failures, "with adequate supervision, would develop into good students."

3. The junior college "would result in an economic saving to the community."

4. The junior college "would result in moral and social betterment for the community."

5. The junior college "would bring a well-rounded education to the masses."
6. Adequate vocational guidance would be possible at an age when students "naturally face the problem of a life work."

7. The junior college "would result in a higher type of scholarship through closer supervision of student activities."

8. The junior college "would provide greater moral safe-guards for the pupil through a postponement of the break from church, home, and community influences." (33, pp. 187-188)

Harbeson's article and his proposals concerning the organization and the role of the public junior college in American education seem to have reflected the sentiments of a significant portion of those interested in the junior college in the years following World War I. It is perhaps reasonable to assume that Harbeson was not the only one who advocated that the junior college:

... by virtue of its position as finishing school for the great majority of secondary students, must place the emphasis on the vocational aim. No pupil should be permitted to leave its walls without, first, having surveyed the various fields of life work; secondly, without having discovered his particular vocational adaptability in so far as such information can be secured through physical and mental examinations, vocational tests, rating scales, vocational counseling, etc.; and thirdly, without having made a tentative definite decision upon some vocation to which he believes himself naturally adapted. (33, pp. 188-189)

In summary, Harbeson quite strongly restates his opinion that the junior college should be a part of the public high school so that it could complete the formal
education of many students while placing proper emphasis on the vocational aims of students. "Having brought the student to a discovery of himself," Harbeson concludes, "it becomes the obligation of the junior college to train him in his chosen vocation or refer him to other institutions where such training can be more advantageously secured."

(33, p. 189)

Harbeson's article advocated that the junior college consider itself a part of secondary education rather than a part of the standard college and university. The tone of the piece seemed to imply that philosophically and organizationally the junior college should associate itself with local needs and the local high school rather than standard colleges.

In 1924, the American Council on Education adopted a definition which has been quoted in the literature for many years and seemed to indicate in no uncertain terms that the junior college should associate itself with standard colleges and universities:

The junior college is an institution of higher education which gives two years of work equivalent in prerequisite, scope and thoroughness to the work done in the first two years of a college as defined elsewhere by the American Council on Education.(24, p. 161)
The definition of the American Council seemingly indicated that a junior college was merely a slice of a four-year college. However, the definition adopted by the North Central Association in 1917 and affirmed in 1927 seemed to suggest that the junior college should be a part of higher education while at the same time resting immediately above the high school in a contiguous position:

A standard junior college is an institution of higher education with a curriculum covering two years of college work which is based upon and continues or supplements the work of secondary instruction as given in any accredited four-year school. (24, p. 161)

P. P. Claxton, when he was United States Commissioner of Education, seemed to pull the definitions of the American Council and the North Central Association together when he declared:

A junior college is a college which requires for admission four full years of high school education or its equivalent, and gives only two years of college work, centering all of its energies and means on doing the best possible work in these two lower classes. (24, p. 161)

An amended definition of the junior college was adopted at the ninth annual meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1929 seemed to indicate that the junior college could be associated with either the secondary school or with standard colleges:
The junior college as at present constituted, comprises several different forms of organizations; first, a two-year institution embracing two years of collegiate work in advance of completion of what is ordinarily termed the twelfth grade of an accredited secondary school; secondly, the institution embracing two years of standard collegiate work integrated with one or more contiguous years of fully accredited high school work administered as a single unit.

The aims of the curriculum in either case are to meet the needs of the student for maximum growth and development, to further his social maturity, and to enable him to make his greatest contribution as a member of society. (24, pp. 167-168)

Another approach may be cited in the effort to determine the place and function of the junior college as conceived in the 1920's. Two rather detailed studies published in the mid-1920's, one by Leonard V. Koos and the other by Frank W. Thomas, brought into focus the generally accepted purposes of the junior college during this period. These stated purposes, particularly those summarized by Thomas, have persisted to the present time and probably should be considered definitive.

In his book published in 1925, Leonard V. Koos studied the special purposes for the existence of junior colleges as inferred from two different sources: (1) an analysis of the reasons given in twenty-two published articles and addresses which had appeared within the previous decade, and (2) an analysis of statements found in the catalogs or
bulletins of 56 junior colleges. Some fifty different reasons were condensed into twenty-one more or less distinct purposes which were presented in five groups:

I. Purposes related to education in the two years following high school graduation.
1. Offering two years of work acceptable to colleges and universities.
2. Completing education of students not going on.
3. Providing occupational training of junior college level.
4. Popularizing of higher education.
5. Continuing home influence during immaturity.
6. Affording attention to the individual student.
7. Offering opportunities for training in leadership.
8. Offering better instruction in these school years.

II. Purposes affecting the organization of the school system.
10. Placing in the secondary school all work appropriate to it.
11. Making the secondary school period coincide with adolescence.
12. Fostering the evolution of the system of education.
13. Economizing time and expense by avoiding duplication.
14. Assigning a function to the small college.

III. Purposes affecting the university.
15. Relieving the university.
16. Making possible real university functioning.
17. Assuring better preparation for university work.

IV. Purposes affecting instruction in the high school.
18. Improving high school instruction.
19. Caring better for brighter high school students.
V. Purposes affecting the community of location.
20. Offering work meeting local needs.
21. Affecting the cultural tone of the community.

Koos concluded that:

These aspirations outline an ambitious program for this new unit—so ambitious, indeed, that the special purposes as catalogued cannot be accepted forthwith. However, they furnish a cross-section of the educational consciousness which has given rise to the movement, and at the same time they supply a set of tentative criteria. (44, p. 28)

In 1926, Frank W. Thomas systematically determined four basic functions of the junior college, and established the terminology which has been rather generally accepted and frequently quoted in the literature. According to Thomas, the four basic functions are:

1. **Popularizing function.** To give the advantages of college education of a general nature to secondary school graduates who could not otherwise secure it for geographical or economic reasons; and to give similar benefits to mature residents of a community.

2. **Preparatory function.** To give two years of work locally equivalent to that given during the freshman and sophomore years of standard universities, which will adequately prepare students for upper-division specialization in the university.

3. **Terminal function.** To give specific preparations by vocational courses for occupations on the semi-professional level, qualifying students who finish them for immediate places in specific life occupations; and to give general education for citizenship for other students who cannot continue their formal education beyond the junior college.
4. Guidance function. To take a scientific interest in the individual traits and abilities and in the personal welfare of the student, in training him to think, in helping him to organize his studies effectively, in making his college experience profitable to him to an optimum degree, and in assisting him to fit into his place after leaving the junior college, whether in a higher educational institution or in a life occupation.

Thomas' four functions are still very much in evidence in contemporary junior college literature, although the terminology has changed. The popularizing function has become in much of the recent literature adult and continuing education. The guidance function has been broadened to include an ever-widening area, student personnel services.

Another extensive survey of junior college purposes was conducted during this period by Campbell (12). Utilizing catalogues of 343 junior colleges in the nation for the years 1927-28 or 1928-29, Campbell studied stated purposes and curricula. Types of junior colleges were 116 public, 22 state, 65 private, and 140 denominational. Compiling a list of 35 purposes which he found during the course of his investigation, Campbell noted that no "new or additional statements of purpose appear in the recent literature."

Although Campbell listed 22 purposes in his study and tabulated the frequency each was mentioned, he reduced the varied purposes to four functions:
1. Preparation for college or university.

2. Providing terminal education, both vocational and cultural.

3. Providing a completion unit of secondary education.

4. Effecting economy of time and expense.

Campbell concluded that the preparatory function "greatly predominates" in junior college curriculum offerings and catalogue statements of purposes and that the function was being satisfactorily performed by the junior college.

Efforts in the terminal category as a whole had been confined largely to "teacher-training," and as a completion unit he said the junior college

... is still a two-year institution attempting to meet the standards which apply to the first two years of the four-year liberal arts college. There is little evidence of constructive attempts at an integrated program of secondary education through the junior college, but rather the mechanical adjustment of administrative machinery to already existing educational practice. (12, p. 81)

Based on his research findings, Campbell attempted to formulate a "restatement of the purposes of the junior college:"

1. To place in a secondary school unit by means of a properly integrated curriculum, that training which has hitherto been done by the high school and the first two years of the college.
2. To localize the work of junior college grade so that the opportunity for the completion of general or secondary education may be placed within the reach of American youth who might otherwise be deprived of it.

3. To provide vocational training at levels above the trades but below the professional and technological schools of university grade.

4. To effect such economy of time as will be made possible by an integrated curriculum constructed upon the assumption that education is a continuous process.

5. To effect such economy of expense as may result from a reorganized curriculum which would eliminate useless duplication and overlapping courses. (12, pp. 82-83)

Campbell thus joined a number of his predecessors in the advocacy of a "reorganization" of secondary education through the vehicle of the junior college. Campbell's study and restatement of purposes also focused upon the duality problem in which the junior college had seemingly become enmeshed. It should be noted that Campbell's 1930 concern about the uncertain role of the junior college appears to be a present concern of junior college leaders. Writing in the 1969 edition of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Leland W. Medsker indicates that the junior college still suffers from a split personality when he states in an article which appears under the title "Community College Education:"
The increasing tendency for the community college to be identified with higher education makes more difficult the fulfillment of its commitments to those purposes and functions not generally regarded as being related to college work.

Many junior college leaders agree with the executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., that the goal should be to conceive of the junior college neither as a post-high school nor as a pre-college institution but as a new kind of college, integrated into the pattern of higher education, and offering broad programs, valuable in themselves. (22, p. 182)

Medsker concludes that "the identity problem is still the overriding problem which the junior college faces in the mid-1960's." (22, p. 182)

In the late 1920's the "chief objectives" of the junior college as distinguished from the "general objectives" of secondary education were determined from statements of 53 administrators. The five most frequently mentioned were:

1. Terminal education for those who cannot or should not go on to higher levels of training.
   a. Vocational or semiprofessional courses.
   b. Cultural training.

2. Take care of needs of the adolescent student during this transitional period.
   a. Individual attention.
   b. Training which will enable the student to orient himself with reference to vocational and the whole body of knowledge.
3. Prepare students for the upper division of colleges and for the professional schools.

4. Enable students to remain at home longer.

5. Complete secondary education by placing it—high school and early college—in a single institution.

To these public school administrators, the junior college belonged with the secondary school to enable the student to remain home longer while providing vocational education, personal guidance, and to those students who desired them, senior college transfer programs. (19, pp. 302-303)

In 1931 Eells named 42 "reasons" for the existence of the junior college and organized his purposes under the same functional headings devised by Thomas. The specific "reasons" were collected from the literature on the junior college, including the previous works of Koos, Thomas, and Campbell. Eells' grouping follows:

**Popularizing**

1. Democratization of college education (opportunity for all)

2. University opportunity denied in some states.

3. Geographical

4. Financial saving

5. State obligation

6. Adult education
7. Citizenship
8. An economic asset
9. Cultural asset
10. Local adjustment possible to special needs of the community.
11. Proportion of high school students desiring college education increasing.

Preparatory

1. General nature of lower division work
2. Furnish a broad cultural foundation
3. Free the limited resources of the university for advance work.
4. University preparation at home
5. Relief to the university
6. Preprofessional courses
7. As a "shock absorber"
8. Reduce student mortality
9. Decapitated four-year colleges
10. Savings at junior college applied for four-year education
11. Reduce duplication of courses
12. A salvaging institution
13. Superior instruction
14. Superior instructors
Terminal

1. Need for semiprofessional training
2. Gap in the education ladder--semi-professional
3. Cooperative education possibilities
4. Preparation for teaching
5. Occupation extension courses
6. Opportunities for girls
7. Nonprofessional terminal courses
8. Need for more than technical training

Guidance

1. Home influence
2. Dormitory supervision
3. Guidance and understanding
4. College and home cooperation
5. Religious training
6. Personal contacts with faculty
7. Development of leadership
8. Try-out for university
9. A transition institution

Eells thus endorsed Thomas's four functions and expanded them slightly. In addition, Eells discussed four additional functions: instructional, cultural, research, and reorganizational. In discussing the reorganizational function of the
junior college, Eells declared himself to be strongly against the 6-4-4 plan which was "advocated by many leaders of the junior college movement" of that day. Instead he definitely endorsed and defended the "existing 6-3-3-2 arrangement with the junior college a separate unit and a part of higher education."(24, pp. 192-209)

In 1935 Noffsinger reviewed the progress of the junior college during the twentieth century in an article in the Junior College Journal and restated seven of the functions or purposes of the public junior college:

1. Popularization of higher education
2. Continuation of home influences during immaturity
3. Semiprofessional training
4. Terminal education
5. Preparatory work acceptable to colleges and universities.
6. Improving of instruction in the junior college years
7. Offering work meeting local needs.(52, p. 401)

In summary, during the period 1920 to 1940, the junior college appeared to be extensively engaged in a search to find its place and function in American education. There appeared to be some disagreement about whether or not the junior college should be a part of the high-school or associated
with standard colleges. Although various writers listed the functions of the junior college in various ways, none seemed to be in serious disagreement with those four identified by Thomas in 1926: Popularizing, Preparatory, Terminal, and Guidance. Also, there appeared to be little disagreement with Zook's statement about the vocational function of the junior college which also appeared in 1926:

I know of no fundamental reason why there should not be two types of junior college work operated side by side, namely the first two years of the four-year college curriculum and completion courses of one and two years, just as vocational work is now conducted alongside the general work in the high schools, and just as in the university technical and professional curricula are offered alongside the courses in the liberal arts.(76, pp. 167-168)

Occupational Programs in Business 1920-40

In the period following World War I, the obligation of the junior college to offer two years of work acceptable on transfer to four-year colleges and universities was well established as a primary junior college purpose. Departments of business in the four-year colleges and universities during the 1920's were generally classified as upper division and graduate level, so that the junior college provided very few transfer courses in business. Since it was generally believed that vocational and liberal education
were two separate and distinct kinds of education, business courses in the junior college were classified as non-academic. Identified as "commercial courses," the offerings in business during the 1920's were typically limited to business English, accounting, typewriting, shorthand, and business law.

Surveys by Koos in 1921 and Whitney in 1928 found that, on the average, only five to ten percent of the semester hours offered by junior colleges were in commercial subjects, which would seem to indicate that general education was stressed and that a high degree of specialization in business was not possible. (24, p. 485) These findings would seem to confirm that most junior colleges were emphasizing the first two of Thomas' identified functions: popularizing and preparatory.

A more comprehensive study by Hollingsworth and Eells in 1930 confirmed the percent of commercial offerings found in the earlier curriculum studies. While noting a slight over-all increase of non-academic courses offered by junior colleges over the nine-year period from 1921-1930, the study by Hollingsworth and Eells found the average curricular offerings by commercial departments in 279 junior colleges to be 5.8 percent of the total offerings. (24, p. 488)
During the 1930's, business curriculum offerings in the four-year colleges increased rather dramatically to provide greater specialization for those seeking the baccalaureate degree in business administration. Many of these four-year colleges required additional business courses in the freshman and sophomore years which generated pressure on the junior college to offer additional business courses, not as terminal education, but as a part of its transfer function. The addition of business courses for transfer students had the side-effect of offering greater flexibility for non-transfer students in that a larger selection of specialized (non-academic) courses were now available.

During the depression years of the 1930's, the public junior college, whether a separate entity or a part of a high-school district, attempted to offer as many business courses as their resources would permit in order to give local students the skill training needed to prepare for immediate employment. General office occupations programs for male students, and secretarial programs for female students were formed by removing as many general education courses as possible from the transfer programs and adding as many business courses as college resources would permit in order to provide a terminal occupational program.
Frequently this amounted to grouping the total business offerings of the transfer curricula in the first year and presenting it as a terminal program. If the student decided to continue to the second year, the great majority of his courses would then be in general education in order to round-out his program. The procedure of rearranging transfer courses to form terminal occupational courses, which was begun in the 1930's, extended into the 1940's and 1950's, and even through the 1960's. The primary point to be noted here is that very few non-transfer business courses were offered by the junior college, and academic transfer courses were used as fillers in the terminal occupational programs offered. Special non-transfer academic courses designed for terminal occupational students were rarely offered despite the junior college claim of readiness to offer courses specifically designed to meet the local needs of its students.

Junior College Philosophy 1940 to 1960

In 1931 and again in 1941, Eells observed that Thomas' four identified purposes remained the "most widely recognized functions of the junior college."(9, p. 59) In the 1952 edition of the American Junior College, edited by Jesse Bogue, then executive secretary of the American Association
of Junior Colleges, Thomas' four basic purposes were reaffirmed as those typically guiding junior college curricula.

In 1958, Brunner surveyed the literature and classified the goals of junior college education under five headings which turn out to be only a slight variation of Thomas' four functions. Brunner's classification of goals are: (1) Those related to transfer students (2) Those related to terminal students (3) Those related to adult students (4) Those related to all types of students, and (5) Those of concern in the community-at-large or the state.

For the thirty-year period beginning in the early 1930's through the early 1960's, the junior college curriculum in business was essentially the same for both transfer and non-transfer students with the needs of the transfer student largely determining the courses to be offered. This was particularly true of the public junior colleges in Texas.

Development of the Public Junior College in Texas

The earliest public junior colleges in Texas had no state legislative recognition and no state financial support. From 1920, when the first public junior college was established in El Paso, until 1928, eighteen junior colleges were created by independent school districts. In 1929 the first
legislative recognition came when the junior college work of the independent school districts was recognized by a validating act passed by the Forty-First Legislature. The same act also provided for creation of other junior colleges as separate entities. By 1940, Texas had twenty-two public junior colleges in operation, all of which were financed entirely from local funds. (41, p. 123)

With finances limited to local funds, with increasing enrollment, with greater expectations of services, with multiple roles to perform, with the constant struggle for status, recognition, and accreditation the public junior colleges of Texas seemed unable to finance two separate curriculums with two sets of courses—one set for transfer students, the other for terminal occupational students. Since the two most popular terminal programs were those in general education and those in business, the existing transfer courses were simply rearranged and manipulated to serve non-transfer students. Perhaps a more direct way of evaluating the relationship of these two programs would be to observe that the terminal student completed a terminal program simply because he did not transfer after completing two years of junior college work.
State aid to the public junior colleges of Texas came in 1941 and has continued at a slowly increasing rate to the present. With the coming of state aid, the junior college curriculum was channeled with even greater narrowness toward the transfer function. First, state funds could be used only for direct instructional costs, with other costs such as facilities and equipment, maintenance of plant, and non-instructional salaries funded through tuition and local taxes. Secondly, state aid was restricted to instructional costs for courses offered by the junior college which were parallel to and offered by a state supported four-year college in the freshman and sophomore years of the senior college. Thus, non-transfer courses were not eligible for state aid and, therefore, the cost of courses especially designed for the terminal student had to be financed from local funds already heavily committed for other purposes. Since most of the public junior colleges in operation before 1960 were located in the less populated areas of the state, very few of the junior college districts were able to finance even token terminal programs in business consisting entirely of non-transfer courses.
Occupational Programs in Business 1940-1960

During the period of 1940-1960, the public junior colleges in Texas were able to use one set of courses for both the transfer programs in business and the two-year occupational programs designed for non-transfer students. The use by the junior college of one set of courses in business partially to fulfill two of its stated purposes was made possible by the wide variety of business courses offered by the several state-supported senior colleges. Since the public junior colleges perhaps did not have the finances to offer courses which were not supported by state funds and since only courses parallel to senior college offerings were eligible for state aid, the variety of senior college courses in business enabled the junior college to offer many business courses which they perhaps would not have been able to finance otherwise. This wide variety of offerings in business seemed to permit the junior college curriculum maker to offer a student either a concentration of business courses for immediate job entry or a more general program for transfer purposes. All of the offerings were standard college courses for which full college credit was granted. For all practical purposes, the two-year occupational programs in business seemingly were the first two years of
college required for the bachelor of business administration degree by Texas senior colleges.

A representative program suggested for junior college students who planned to transfer to senior college for completion of the requirements for the bachelor of business administration degree during the 1940 to 1960 period is presented in Table I. Although this is a composite program drawn from many junior college catalogs of the period, it may be considered typical of those offered for transfer students. All of the programs surveyed listed twelve semester hours of English which was to be completed in the freshman and sophomore years, six to eight semester hours of natural science, six hours of United States history, six hours of United States government, and three to six hours of mathematics. Nearly every program listed at least three semester hours of public speaking. In the area of business, every program listed six to eight hours of accounting and six hours of economics. Nearly every program listed a three-hour course entitled "Introduction to Business" or "Business Principles," which was the survey course intended to give the beginning student an orientation of the field of business administration. The program presented in Table I might differ from those presented in junior college catalogues of the
period only in the area of suggested electives which varied from one college to another depending on local availability.

### TABLE I

A REPRESENTATIVE JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER PROGRAM TO MEET REQUIREMENTS OF THE BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DEGREE FOR THE PERIOD 1940 TO 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Year</th>
<th>Hours Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English-Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States History</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics-Algebra</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Mathematics or Mathematics of Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Principles and Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophomore Year</th>
<th>Hours Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English-Literature</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Business Electives--Typewriting, Shorthand, Office Skills, Office Machines, Secretarial Practices, Business Communication, (Correspondence), Banking and Finance, Business Law.

Other Electives--Psychology, Plane Trigonometry, Foreign Language, Natural Science.
The program presented in Table II is representative of the programs suggested for occupational students who did not plan to transfer to a senior college during the period between 1940 and 1960. While it is a composite program drawn from many junior college catalogs, the program in Table II may be

**TABLE II**

A REPRESENTATIVE TWO-YEAR JUNIOR COLLEGE OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM IN BUSINESS SUGGESTED FOR NON-TRANSFER STUDENTS FOR THE PERIOD 1940 TO 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English-Rhetoric and Composition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Machines</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Mathematics or Mathematics of Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Principles and Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for Freshman Year: 31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophomore Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking and Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Correspondence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for Sophomore Year: 32**

*Electives--Shorthand, Office Skills, Secretarial Practice, Bookkeeping, Algebra, English Literature, United States History, Psychology, Public Speaking.
considered typical of those offered to non-transfer students. It may be noted that many of the same courses are listed in both Table I and Table II. The primary differences between the two programs were the omission of natural science and sophomore English from the non-transfer program in Table II and the substitution of business courses listed as electives in the transfer program of Table I. The twelve semester hours of United States history and government became legislative requirements placed on all state-supported colleges as degree requirements and could not be eliminated from the non-transfer programs if the associate degree was to be awarded by the junior college. Otherwise, the typical non-transfer program as represented by Table II was simply a concentration of business courses eligible for transfer credit plus freshman English.

Junior College Philosophy During the 1960's

Much of the literature concerning the junior college which appeared in the 1960's made some reference to the increasing importance of the role of the junior college in American education. Because of the increased number of junior colleges in the various states and the rapidly increasing enrollments, many writers observed that the junior
college had now come of age, that its adolescence was over and that around 1960 it became a strong young adult.

The 1967 edition of *American Junior Colleges*, using somewhat different terminology, holds to a three-category classification in its description of programs of study in junior colleges, but still reflects the flavor of Thomas' four basic functions. When discussing curricula offered by junior colleges, this publication uses three symbols: (t) for transfer, (o) for occupational, and (c) for comprehensive, which indicates that the curricula may be used for either transfer or occupational.

In his recent comprehensive appraisal of the junior college, *This Is the Community College*, Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., seems to reflect a strong area of thought in literature concerning the junior college when he makes a distinction between the definition of a junior college and that of a community college.

Questions are often asked about the differences between a community college and a junior college. "Junior college," the older term, describes an institution which offers the first two years of college. Preparation of students who transfer to the four-year college or university is usually one of its major functions. There is general recognition now that the community college is a kind of junior college but with broader educational functions and most often supported by public funds. (31, p. 28)
Gleazer ends the above statement with a footnote which cites the definition of a community college taken from the Handbook of Data and Definitions in Higher Education, a publication sponsored by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers in 1962:

COMMUNITY COLLEGE. A two-year institution of higher education, generally public, offering instruction adapted in content, level, and schedule to the needs of the community in which it is located. Offerings usually included a transfer curriculum (credits transferable toward a bachelor's degree), occupational (or terminal) curriculums, general education, and adult education. (31, pp. 41-42)

In the effort to distinguish between a "junior college" and a "community college," Gleazer points out yet another dimension of the identity problem confronting these two-year institutions since they are alternately referred to as first one, then the other. The two terms, community college and junior college, are often used interchangeably in the literature with individual writers making individual distinctions between the two. It is noteworthy that Gleazer seems to indicate that if there is a distinction between the two institutions, the definition adopted in the 1925 meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges seems to be closer to that now used to define the community college, while the definition of the junior college seems now to be more restrictive and narrower in purpose and function.
In describing the primary task of the junior college, Gleazer states: "The major assignment of the community college is to extend educational opportunity." Expanding on this statement, Gleazer indicates the breadth of the task:

The commitment made by elementary and secondary schools to the entire cross section of American youth is to be required now of the nation's colleges and universities, at least through the fourteenth year. Taking its place in the educational scheme, the junior college is to meet innumerable needs that other higher institutions cannot or will not meet. (31, p. 48)

The junior college is to meet these innumerable needs by making itself readily accessible to students, keeping tuition fees low, having an open-door admissions policy, and offering a wide variety of programs including university parallel, occupational terminal, and those designed to meet the problems of insufficient educational background of adults in the community regardless of age.

It is perhaps pertinent to observe that Gleazer's remarks about the philosophy and purposes of the junior college stress that it has become a comprehensive institution with a great variety of programs to match the cross section of the community represented in its students. In many important respects, contemporary junior college philosophy as reflected by Gleazer seems to vary very little from the
earliest formal definitions of the junior college and its function as reported by McDowell, Koos, Thomas, Bells, and others.

**Occupational Programs in Business During the 1960's**

The use of one set of courses for both transfer and non-transfer business students in the junior college came under heavy pressure during the 1960's because of three separate developments affecting the public junior colleges of Texas: (1) Changing patterns of senior college requirements for the bachelor of business administration degree, (2) The Technical-Vocational Acts of 1963 and 1968, and (3) The establishment of the Coordinating Board of Texas Colleges and Universities by the state legislature.

First, the structure of senior college Bachelor of Business Administration degree programs began to change in the early 1960's, complicating the offering of preparatory courses for business students in the junior college. Following the publication of two studies of business education in American colleges and universities in 1959, member institutions of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business began a period of self study and curriculum revision which vitally affected the business curricula in the public junior
college. These studies by Pierson, *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration*, and Gordon and Howell, *Higher Education for Business*, suggested that a number of business degree programs which seemed to be over specialized should be eliminated from the business curriculum, that business courses should be essentially upper division and graduate level, and that more general education courses should be required of all business students, particularly in the freshman and sophomore years. The acceptance and implementation of these and similar recommendations by many Texas senior colleges seems to have resulted in considerable incompatibility between transfer and non-transfer programs in the public junior colleges of Texas.

The implementation of the above suggestions by many Texas senior colleges resulted in a bachelor's degree program which required that nearly all business courses be completed above the sophomore year. The junior college could not offer these courses for transfer students, and this limitation very seriously restricted the number of business courses which might have been offered on the freshman and sophomore level. These and other restrictions made it rather difficult for junior colleges to offer non-transfer programs in business.
Since funding of courses from state sources required that junior college courses be parallel to freshman and sophomore level programs offered in senior colleges, the movement of business courses to the upper division by state senior colleges left only a limited number of parallel courses on the freshman and sophomore level. In addition most junior college students seemed to be reluctant to enroll in programs which were labeled "non-transfer" even though they might have considered themselves to be terminal students at the time. Thus, the lack of funding and the lack of student interest in non-transfer courses seemed to present a problem to junior college curriculum makers in the area of business.

The second development of note in the early 1960's which affected the public junior college business curricula was the enactment by the Congress of the United States of the Technical-Vocational Act of 1963. This act suddenly provided funds and support for separate and distinct programs in certain technical areas including business administration. To be eligible for these funds, the act required that occupational programs be specifically designed to prepare students for immediate job entry. Although college credit might be granted and a degree or certificate awarded upon successful completion, these considerations were considered
to be of secondary importance to the development of entry-
level occupational proficiency. Since the primary curricular
guideline for these programs was occupational proficiency,
transferability of individual courses and programs was
completely incidental.

Many of the public junior colleges in Texas requested
and were approved to receive funds under the 1963 Act, and
seemed to have visualized these funds as an opportunity to
finance two-year occupational programs in business and
other technical areas. The design of these new occupational
programs in business curricula to be financed by these
federal funds was the primary concern which prompted this
study. The impact of funding guidelines under the Technical-
Vocational Act of 1963 and the 1968 amendments upon junior
college business curricula will be presented in a later
section of this study.

The third development of the 1960's was the establishment
of the Coordinating Board of Texas Colleges and Universities.
The legislative act establishing this board proclaimed that
all public junior and senior colleges in the state would
be under the jurisdiction of this agency. One of the first
duties of the new board under the enabling act was the
assignment of roles to all segments of higher education in
Texas. The public junior colleges of the state were specifically assigned two of the primary roles long associated with the junior college: (1) college preparatory, and (2) terminal occupational programs. The college transfer programs offered by the junior college were to be approved by the Coordinating Board, and if approved, were to be accepted upon transfer to any state supported senior college at face value. The terminal occupational programs were to be approved by the Texas Education Agency with the stipulation that no course or program would be funded by both bodies and that all credit courses would be identified as either transfer courses approved by the Coordinating Board or technical-vocational courses approved by the Texas Education Agency.

The transfer program in business administration which has been adopted by the Coordinating Board is shown in Table III. The policy proclaimed by the Coordinating Board stipulated that if a student completed the courses shown in Table III in a public junior college in Texas, all state-supported senior colleges were obligated to accept these courses at face value to meet bachelor degree requirements. Perhaps it should be noted that the core curriculum for business presented in Table III seemed to be in keeping with
the recommendations by the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business which were discussed earlier. The adopted core curriculum listed only one specialized course in business--Principles of Accounting--while the remainder of the program was non-specialized and of a general nature.

**TABLE III**

**CORE CURRICULUM IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FOR PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES IN TEXAS AS APPROVED BY THE COORDINATING BOARD, TEXAS COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM, SEPTEMBER, 1968**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman English</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States History (to meet state statute requirement)</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (collegiate level)</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Electives</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30-32</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophomore Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (to meet state statute requirement)</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Electives</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The impact of the guidelines developed from the Technical-Vocational Acts of 1963 and 1968 on the two-year occupational programs in public junior college business curricula might
be noted in the programs presented in Tables IV, V, and VI. The Preface and Introduction of these guidelines published by the Texas Education Agency entitled Guide For Planning Post-Secondary Occupational Education and Technology Programs in Texas are presented in Appendix A of this study. The Introduction states in part that "the department has developed standards of excellence which all programs must meet." A summation of these standards is as follows:

(1) The program of instruction will develop skills and knowledge required for entry into the occupation for which instruction is being provided.

(2) The program of instruction will be developed and conducted in consultation with potential employers and other individuals having skills in and substantive knowledge of the occupation which are in keeping with the educational program objective.

(3) The program of instruction will include the most up-to-date knowledge, skills, and competencies required for entering the occupation or occupational field for which the individual is being prepared.

(4) The program of instruction will be sufficiently extensive in content and in duration to enable the student to develop competencies necessary for employment in the occupation for which he is being trained.

The Guide summarized four additional standards after the four quoted above. All eight summarized standards seem to emphasize the "skills and competencies required for entering the occupation or occupational field for which the
TABLE IV

A REPRESENTATIVE TWO-YEAR JUNIOR COLLEGE OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM IN DATA PROCESSING SUGGESTED FOR NON-TRANSFER STUDENTS FOR THE PERIOD 1960 TO 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Data Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Math I and II</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Accounting I and II</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills I and II</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophomore Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Development and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Experience and Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggested curriculum along with others, was developed in a workshop sponsored by Region VII, U. S. Office of Education, Los Alamos, New Mexico in the summer of 1967. Region VII included five states: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. Junior colleges participating in funds provided by the Technical-Vocational Acts of 1963 and 1968 are not required to adopt the above suggested curriculum, but it is typical of the guidelines suggested for two-year occupational curricula in business.
### TABLE V

**A REPRESENTATIVE TWO-YEAR JUNIOR COLLEGE OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM IN ACCOUNTING SUGGESTED FOR NON-TRANSFER STUDENTS FOR THE PERIOD 1960 TO 1970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Communications I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Machines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Accounting I and II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophomore Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Accounting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Professional Speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements for an Associate in Applied Science Degree. This is a typical two-year occupational program in business designed to prepare students for occupational proficiency under the Technical-Vocational Acts of 1963 and 1968.
### TABLE VI

A REPRESENTATIVE TWO-YEAR JUNIOR COLLEGE OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM IN SECRETARIAL SCIENCE SUGGESTED FOR NON-TRANSFER STUDENTS FOR THE PERIOD 1960 TO 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Communications I and II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Machines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Data Processing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophomore Year</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Practices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Shorthand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Professional Speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements for an Associate in Applied Science Degree. This is a typical two-year occupational program in business designed to prepare students for occupational proficiency under the Technical-Vocational Acts of 1963 and 1968.
individual is being prepared." Perhaps it may be noted that the programs presented in Tables IV, V, and VI seem to be rather highly specialized and seem to provide only a minimum of exposure to non-technical subject matter areas.

A comparison of the Coordinating Board transfer program (Table III) and the Texas Education Agency technical programs (Tables IV, V, and VI) immediately reveals their lack of similarity. All of these programs are designed for junior college business students, but it would seem that a student who would meet the requirements of either program would be required to start over should he desire the other program. The conclusion of the matter seems to be that in the area of business administration, the public junior college seems no longer to be able to fulfill two of its traditional purposes with one set of courses.

The lack of similarity between the transfer programs and the occupational programs presents something of a dilemma to the public junior college curriculum maker in the area of business administration. It would appear that some sort of multiple track system may be in order, but would such a system best serve the needs of students? Traditionally, junior college students have been reluctant to enroll for non-transfer courses and programs even though their immediate
plans might classify them as terminal students. And yet, many studies indicate that well over fifty per cent of junior college students do not transfer to senior colleges regardless of the junior college program for which they initially enroll. It would seem that non-transfer programs may be desirable for these students, but, to be successful, the student would be required to make his choice at the time of initial enrollment. In the present academic environment, students may be reluctant to make the decision when they realize that they will have little or no credit toward a bachelor's degree after they have completed a two-year non-transfer program.

Assessment of Junior College Performance

How well has the public junior college been able to implement the philosophy it has proclaimed or which has been proclaimed for it? How effective has the junior college been in translating its statements of purpose into effective programs of instruction? How consistent has been junior college philosophy with junior college practice in providing two-year occupational programs in business curricula? What does the literature reveal about the junior college's ability to extend opportunities in general education while
providing needed terminal occupational programs in response to local community needs? Recent studies of the junior college have been made by the National Society for the Study of Education (37) in 1956, by Medsker (50) in 1960, by Reynolds (56) in 1965, by Thornton (67) in 1966, and by Gleazer (31) in 1968. Each of these studies seems to indicate that generally the junior college has devoted most of its attention and resources to just one of its several stated purposes: college transfer programs. These studies indicate that the published statements of junior college philosophy and purposes continually affirm the various educational roles attributed to the junior college, but that the junior colleges seem to have offered very little to implement effectively its programs in two other proclaimed areas: (1) general education, and (2) non-transfer occupational programs. Another important observation noted in these studies seems to be that while the junior college claimed to be responsive to local societal needs, there seems to be but limited evidence to support this claim since most of their resources seem to have been devoted to transfer programs. A predictive note seems to be common to all studies: in the future the junior college will make an important contribution by providing technical-vocational education in response to local needs.
The fifty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, entitled *The Public Junior College*, was a comprehensive study of the junior college in the United States as of its date of publication in 1956. This study presented the junior college as an emerging institution responding to the changing demands of society and therefore sensitive of and responsive to ever-changing societal needs.

In commenting on the basic purposes of the public junior college, the Yearbook Committee stated:

> Valid purposes of the public junior college can emerge only from the characteristics of society and the needs of individuals. The demands of society and the needs of youth unite in requiring a post-high-school education (a) which prepared youth for effective living as persons, citizens, and members of a family and (b) which prepares them for vocations in which they can make their optimum contribution to society and, likewise, gain personal satisfaction essential in day-to-day living. (37, p. 68)

In the chapter on vocational education in the junior college, the Yearbook Committee presented the following conclusion:

> Vocational education now looms as a rapidly growing feature of community junior colleges. This is a natural result of rapid developments in mechanization and new ways of living. With increased mechanization comes the need for new and higher skills. We live in an age when all men and women are expected to make productive contributions to our total society. They must have preparation for this productivity.
The junior college may well be identified as the institution to plan the types of vocational programs that are most appropriate to specific communities. This may well be a period that will provide the best opportunity in the history of higher education for the development of realistic and practical programs of instruction geared to the needs and desires of the people of each community. (37, p. 117)

The Yearbook Committee seems to have correctly predicted the assignment of developing programs of occupational education for the public junior colleges of Texas.

The Coordinating Board of Texas Colleges and Universities, in keeping with the legislation which created it, has designated the public junior colleges of the state as the institutions which should provide post-high school programs in technical-vocational education. Both the challenge and the opportunities seem to focus on the kinds of the programs which should be developed and implemented. As if anticipating one important difficulty in the development of these programs, the National Society Yearbook Committee further concluded that

One of the continually perplexing problems in American education is that of the proper relationship between the specialized education which prepares the student to earn a living and the general education which enables him to profit from his life in other ways. The rapid increase in scientific and technological knowledge has demanded the expansion of specialized training for work at all levels of abstraction. The very same developments, however, have freed more and
more of man's time from labor and have underscored his need for an education broader than the vocational. The result of these economic trends too often has been that general and specialized education have seemed to be in opposition to each other, that their proponents have engaged in unseemly contest for larger portions of the student's time.

Such contention betrays a lack of true awareness of the purpose of all education. Both general education and specialized education serve students and serve society. Each portion of the student's education complements and enriches the others. The two types are concurrent, sometimes intermingled, often even indistinguishable. (37, pp. 121-122)

In noting some of the deficiencies in junior college programs, the Yearbook Committee indicated that

... some junior colleges are developing fresh and creative approaches to the problems of course organization and presentation. On the other hand, there is ample evidence to indicate that too often the programs of general education offered in the junior colleges are partial or nonexistent; that the content and organization is uncritically imitative; that only a minority of the students are exposed to general-education courses; and that evaluation is inadequate. (37, pp. 135-136)

The Committee seems to make a rather direct and pointed recommendation to public junior colleges when it stated

In the field of general education, the fundamental recommendation must be that the junior colleges realize that they have attained adulthood in the family of American higher education and begin to accept the responsibilities for leadership that their stature implies. As America moves into a period of very rapid growth in numbers of college-age youth and, at the same time, into a period when increasing proportions of youth need a post-secondary education, the junior
colleges will inevitably exhibit very rapid expansion. At the same time, they must realize that they have emerged into full partnership with the "senior" institutions; they must cease to be so largely imitative and begin to make decisions for themselves about the nature and the quality of the education they provide for their several clienteles. (37, pp. 137-138)

That the public junior colleges in Texas have exhibited the very rapid expansion predicted above is a matter of record; that they have ceased to be "largely imitative" and have begun "to make decisions for themselves" about the nature of their programs appears to be somewhat doubtful.

Medsker (50) studied the junior college with three specific objectives in mind: (1) To observe and report on the patterns of control, finance, and administration of the two-year college in different states, and its relationship to other segments of higher education (2) To describe the functions of the two-year college as they are actually discharged, with an attempt to compare the functions performed with the claims commonly made by this institution, and (3) To make such evaluations of the two-year institutions as are possible within the limitations of the study and to identify some of the problems which they must face in the immediate years ahead. Medsker studied 342 junior colleges in 15 states which accounted for 58 percent of two-year colleges in the United States at the time of his study.
Texas, which ranked third among the states in the number of junior colleges, received much attention. Medsker's study appears to be rather comprehensive, and was presented in considerable depth. In summarizing the junior college claim of serving both transfer and terminal students, Medsker observed that

It is obvious from the data presented that the two-year college in America is focused more on the transfer than the terminal student. If, then, the institution is adjudged solely on the basis of its special services to students who do not transfer, it fails to measure up. It is paradoxical that, in the institutions studied, about two-thirds of the students prepared to transfer, yet from a given entering class, only a third of them actually went beyond the junior college. Conversely, only a third of the students were enrolled in courses which ostensibly prepared them for employment, yet two-thirds of them went into some type of life activity without further college experience.

The evidence indicating the relatively light emphasis by the two-year college on the terminal function calls for some analysis of the situation and some reevaluation either of the curricula offered or of the claims made for the two-year college. (50, p. 112)

Medsker made what seems to be another pertinent observation when he concluded that

A fundamental question is what the junior college should do for the students who do not transfer. On this point the matter is not simplified by a value judgment that the two-year college falls short of its obligation by not offering more work of an occupational nature, however true that may be in certain instances. Rather, the inquiry leads to a consideration of (i)
values placed by students and parents on types of college education and (2) the type of education that has the greatest value for the terminal student.

A major difficulty in planning technical-vocational programs in the future may be related to some of the reasons for the decline of vocational education at the secondary level. Rapidly increasing mechanization and automation demand much more than mechanical skills. Further, they make it impossible for an educational institution of any kind to duplicate the costly and highly intricate machines and techniques of a rapidly changing industry. Without doubt vocational-technical education of the future must provide for broad backgrounds in applied mathematics and science, the art of communication, and an understanding of people. (50, pp. 113-115)

In commenting about the future role of the junior college in higher education, Reynolds predicted that

The junior college of the future will continue to exercise the transfer function, as it has done in the past. At the same time, however, there will be a sharp increase in programs of technical education for so-called terminal students. Many junior colleges have already entered this curricular field; many, many more will do so. (56, p. 102)

The latest definitive study of the junior college is titled This Is the Community College by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director, American Association of Junior Colleges. Gleazer characterized the junior college as the segment of American education most active in the extension of educational opportunities to an ever increasing portion of American citizens. Since education may be considered vital to the well-being of an individual and his family,
people began to insist that college doors not be closed to them. Education beyond the high school may be viewed as the route to individual achievement, the "open sesame" to economic and social advancement, the way to get ahead. 

(31, p. 6) In addition to these concepts, Gleazer states some means may be required for people to have available throughout their lives educational services appropriate to their interests. If additional educational opportunities are to be available to all citizens, the junior college must open its doors for all those who would desire to take advantage of its varied program offerings.

In discussing the wide variety of programs offered by the junior college, Gleazer stated:

The educational role of the community college is much broader than that of preparing the student for the upper division of a four-year institution. This is not, in fact, its chief assignment. Its major task is to provide those learning experiences commonly needed as the level of educational effort in each community rises two years beyond the high school.

For more than half of the students the community college will represent final formal educational activity before they assume responsibilities of citizenship, family, and occupation. This means that their educational experiences, to be of greatest benefit, must have value in and of themselves, not just as preparation for either job or transfer. To offer only courses preparatory to other courses possible to be taken at some dim future date is a fraud, even if accompanied by the best of intentions.
Gleazer then indicated that the junior college has over-emphasized the transfer function at the expense of terminal occupational programs. His indictment may have implications beyond even this pointed criticism, however:

Right here is the crucial point in understanding the community college. For various reasons (among them some antipathy toward identification with secondary education), and drawn by the prestige attached to the college stereotype in our culture, the community college has leaned in the direction of higher education with its symbols, procedures, folklore, and objectives. The status it seeks has to be won on another basis because, in breadth of educational services, its assignment is similar now to that given another institution—the secondary school—a generation or two ago: to extend educational opportunity to all of the population. This carries with it the obligation for suitable arrangements both in the range of knowledge and in methods of instruction. (31, p. 52)

Gleazer called for the junior college to win its status in breadth of educational services and seemed to indicate the need for either a restatement of traditional junior college purposes in contemporary terms, or perhaps some sort of break with tradition and the formulation of a new statement of philosophy.

Each of the comprehensive studies of the junior college presented in this paper indicated that the programs offered by junior colleges seem to fall short of their proclaimed purposes of providing general education for all students, transfer programs for some students, and terminal occupational
programs for non-transfer students. Each study seemed to indicate that transfer programs have dominated junior college resources, and that non-transfer programs may not be strong enough to meet contemporary needs. At least one facet of the problem seems to be brought into focus by Gleazer, as quoted above: "Educational experiences, to be of greatest benefit, must have value in and of themselves, not just as preparation for either job or transfer."

Summary

This chapter has presented a survey of the historical development of the significant statements of philosophy and purposes of the junior college together with the development of two-year occupational programs in business curricula which have been designed to implement appropriate portions of these philosophies. The comparison of these two elements, designed to support and complement each other, pose certain questions for those responsible for the development of two-year junior college programs in the current social setting.

The question of institutional identity in the hierarchy of educational institutions seems to be basic to all other considerations of the junior college. The junior college seems to be uncertain as to just what it is, just what its functions are, and just what its purposes should be.
The survey presented in this chapter seemed to indicate that the junior college has had only limited success in providing educational opportunities specifically designed to implement its many educational roles other than for senior college transfer students. Although the stated philosophies seemed adequate to support programs designed to respond to community needs and to extend or expand a student's general education while developing specific skills needed for occupational proficiency, it would appear that for one reason or another unique educational opportunities designed to accomplish these two objectives have not been widely provided. This situation seems to pose many questions concerning the nature of the educational experiences which should be provided to prepare post-high school adults for initial entry into an occupational specialty while providing opportunities for personal development.

Finally, the comparison of junior college statements of philosophy and purposes with junior college practices in the area of business education poses significant questions about the ability of the junior college to be as responsive to the changing needs of society as it proclaims itself to be. To which needs of society should the junior college respond? Is it possible for the junior college to respond
to the common interests of society without conflicting with the interests of the individual citizen? To what extent and in how many different areas does the junior college have responsibility to respond to the needs of society and the needs of the individual? Is it possible for the junior college to be all things to all men?

An attempt will be made in the following chapter to pose and discuss some of the significant questions which seem to be basic to any future consideration of the junior college's attempt to offer two-year occupational programs in business curricula.
CHAPTER III

QUESTIONS SIGNIFICANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A
PHILOSOPHY FOR TWO-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL
PROGRAMS IN BUSINESS

The comparison of junior college philosophy with the
two-year occupational programs in business together with
selected assessments of junior college performance by
several students of the movement as presented in Chapter
II, provides the background from which several basic questions
may be drawn for closer examination. Since the background
presented is rather extensive, the attempt was not made
to isolate every primary question which might be drawn from
it. Even though other questions might also have been raised,
the primary questions which have been identified and discussed
on the following pages were felt to be among those important
issues which should be considered in forming a philosophy
for the two-year occupational programs in business curricula.

What Should the Junior College Be?

One primary question which seemed to emerge from the
investigation concerned the identity of the institution
itself. What has the "junior college" actually been? In contemporary terms, perhaps it may be more pertinent to ask "What kind of educational institution is the junior college?" Where does the junior college fit in the hierarchy of educational institutions? Does it have an unique role and function to perform which makes it a peculiar institution? Is it just another college, or is it not a college at all? For further consideration, the question might become "What should the junior college be?"

The problem of a distinct educational identity for the junior college was determined to be a problem as early as the 1920's when a comprehensive definition was sought to determine eligibility for membership in the American Association of Junior Colleges. The problem seems yet to be settled. Since the junior college developed from at least four divergent sources while responding to constantly changing social conditions, the lack of a distinct identity may have been a rather natural result. The two-year college, despite a history of more than half a century, seems only within the last ten years to have emerged as a significant contributor to the educational process in the United States. The writers of one recent study of the junior college discussed the problem of identity in this manner:
If the two-year college appears new and unique, it is because at present it occupies the center of the educational stage, holding forth great promise while concealing its weaknesses behind unclear role definition.

When a new institution arises, it must find a place for itself in the total framework of its environment. Consequently, it is not uncommon for those whose interests are bound up in its development to make extravagant claims about the problems it plans to solve. They may even come to believe these claims, especially when the claims are legitimated by state or federal laws. In the final analysis, however, the new institution will not solve all problems; rather, it will gradually come to concentrate on areas in which it can most effectively function.

The question, then, is not really one of how the two-year college can solve all the problems currently facing undergraduate college education but, rather: Which among the multitude of problems can it most effectively resolve and what ought to be its role in the over-all framework of higher education?

The development and broadening of technical programs may very well be the two-year college's most significant single contribution to higher education.(7, pp. 286-287)

What should be the junior college's place in the total framework of its environment? If its claims of performing multiple roles should be legitimated by state or federal laws and if it should be able to offer all types of educational services in response to apparent or assumed community needs, will it then be able to realize an identity of its own?

Is it either possible or desirable that those responsible for the policies of a comprehensive community college will be able to identify their own institution as one uniquely
separated from established four-year colleges and universities as well as the secondary school? Is it possible that the two-year college may adopt a policy of adapting itself continually to changing societal conditions, and while thus changing its own nature continuously, still be able to assume a somewhat stable identity? Should it, or possibly will it in spite of itself, become a traditional and static institution with fixed and rather limited educational objectives? The writers of the above quotation also made the following observation concerning this point:

The history of American higher education is replete with examples of colleges originally organized for specific purposes and later transformed into more traditional institutions conforming rigidly to the accepted patterns of the university. For example, the land-grant colleges were originally intended to provide instruction in agriculture and mechanics, and did so until the mid-1920's. During the past forty years, however, these colleges have been transformed into universities serving the same educational functions as the public and private institutions founded earlier. The same transition has taken place in teachers' colleges within the last fifteen years. Having made the change from college to university status, their programs have come to mirror those typical of older universities. The two-year college confronts the same issue: Will it continue as an experimental college or will it, like many of its predecessors, adopt a more traditional pattern? (7, p. 15)

The confusion about identity seems to have focused on a point between the commitment by a two-year college to offer courses equivalent in every respect to those offered
in the first two years of a standard four-year college and the commitment to offer non-equivalent courses for use in terminal occupational or other programs in response to specific student or community needs. What may be at stake may be the academic respectability of programs and courses to be offered. In order to retain its identity as a college, the junior college seems to have been reluctant to offer courses generally considered to be high school level even though their students may have demonstrated a need for such courses. If identified as a college, the junior college seems to have been equally reluctant to offer courses or programs not offered by senior colleges even though the proposed course or program may have been above the high school level. In short, the junior college seems to have been reluctant to offer any course which might be suspect as not being of college grade in order to retain its identification as a college.

Some observers of the junior college seemingly express the philosophical opinion that the offering of courses peculiar to itself should not detract from the junior college's status among other educational institutions so long as such offerings are considered to be post-high school and of proper
college level. It is perhaps at this point that certain questions may be brought into focus:

1. What constitutes a proper college offering and what constitutes a proper high-school offering?

2. Is it possible that some course offerings may be considered to be neither college nor high school in nature?

3. Is it necessary that courses carry such labels as "high school" or "college" in order to be considered proper courses?

4. Should the junior college feel comfortable offering courses peculiar to itself if such courses seem to meet community needs?

5. Is it possible that a comprehensive community college may offer educational experiences based on local community needs without labeling these offerings either high school or college level?

6. Is it possible for the junior college to develop an identity and a self-concept which may be considered neither an extension of the high school nor the lower division of a senior college? And, if it is possible, should it do so?

Can the ideal of the comprehensive community college be realized through the continuation of all types of educational services provided in response
to apparent or assumed community, state and national needs?

Organizations, both public and private, are created to perform one or more services of value to those who bring the organization into being. Even large organizations find it necessary to differentiate functions in order to achieve the intermediate and long-range objectives sought. Otherwise, there is a constant danger that none of the diverse goals will be attained. Generally, two-year colleges are not yet plagued with the problem of size. The allocation of emphasis to various programs and functions does, however, raise some question as to whether it is possible for a single institution to serve effectively so many masters at one time. (7, p. 14)

It is possible that the question of identity may be a matter that overshadows all other considerations so long as this basic uncertainty remains unresolved. For upon the proposed answers to this single question may hinge what other questions should be asked. Questions about philosophy and purposes as well as inquiries concerning educational roles and functions may depend upon the identification and place of the junior college among other members of the educational family. How the junior college views itself, describes itself, and allows others to describe it may determine the kinds of expectations that society at large will hold for it. The self-concept assumed by the junior college may largely determine the questions asked of it and about it.
Primary question number one: What should the junior college be?

What Constitutes Entry-level Occupational Proficiency in Business?

Federal and state funding guidelines developed from the Technical-Vocational Acts of 1963 and 1968 emphasized that the primary task of two-year occupational programs in junior college business curricula was to help students achieve at least minimum entry-level occupational proficiency. These guidelines have been reproduced in part and have been included as Appendix A of this study. It may be noted from these guidelines that occupational proficiency meant that the student should be able to demonstrate enough skill in a specified area of specialization so that he may be initially employed with enough ability to perform on the job those tasks reasonably expected of one entering a specialized occupation. For example, an accounting student who has completed a two-year occupational program in accounting should be able to do accounting work on the job. A data-processing student who has completed a program in that area should be able to function in that specialized field, and so on. Before an educational institution offers programs designed to help students achieve occupational proficiency,
perhaps considerable thought should be first devoted to those attributes and skills which may be needed for entry-level occupational proficiency in business.

If it may be assumed that entry-level occupational proficiency may be acceptable as the primary goal of two-year occupational programs in business, certain questions relative to this primary goal may be raised:

1. Should the junior college concentrate its resources toward the design of programs for students to develop highly specialized occupational skills?

2. What contribution, if any, may non-specialized educational experiences make toward the development of occupational proficiency?

3. As defined in the guidelines presented in Appendix A, should all programs be a combination of core courses, related courses, and general courses?

4. Since the combination of the three types of courses listed in question 3 above appears to be somewhat optional with the curriculum designer, what mixture would seem to be most effective?

5. If it should be felt that general courses--the non-specialized education activities--make little or no contribution toward the achievement of occupational proficiency,
would the elimination of these activities conflict with traditional and contemporary statements of junior college philosophy and purposes?

From the survey of junior college philosophy and purposes, it would appear that one of the basic tenets upon which the junior college has been built is that any student should have the opportunity to extend his personal knowledge regardless of his occupational choice and regardless of his plans to continue his formal education beyond the junior college. Purpose Number Two shown on McDowell's 1919 summary of junior college offerings was "to provide a completion school for those who cannot go further." Purposes Two, Three and Four on Koos' 1925 summary indicated that among the basic purposes of the junior college should be the provision of opportunities for the student to round out his education. Thomas's four basic functions published in 1926 and still widely accepted and quoted in the literature advocated that the junior college should "give the advantages of college education of a general nature to secondary school graduates who could not otherwise secure it."

Traditionally, the philosophy of the junior college seemingly has indicated that all occupational programs as well as transfer programs should be a mixture of specialized and
non-specialized courses. But if the junior college is to respond to changing societal needs, is this traditional purpose still appropriate? Is it possible that the future needs of society may demand that occupational programs in business consist entirely of specialized training? Is it possible that the advanced skills demanded by an advancing technology may be so highly specialized that there may no longer be a need for non-specialized educational experiences in these programs? Of what does occupational proficiency consist?

Primary Question Number Two which perhaps should be considered in forming a philosophy for occupational programs in business curricula may be this: What constitutes entry-level occupational proficiency in business?

What Pattern of Educational Experiences Should the Junior College Provide?

Another primary question which emerges from the comparison made in Chapter II relates to that which is presently called a program. If the junior college is to offer programs designed to help students develop entry level occupational proficiency, perhaps several questions relating to that which is presently called a program should be considered:
1. When the educational experiences provided by that which is presently called a program has been offered, what has been offered?

2. Is a single prescribed pattern or configuration of educational experiences necessary for each individual student to achieve occupational proficiency?

3. Is it necessary that these experiences be so strictly prescribed that individual student needs are either sacrificed or ignored?

4. Is it possible that the educational experiences designed to help individuals develop occupational proficiency may be organized in some sort of informal configuration or pattern which will provide for special needs and individual differences of students?

5. Is it possible to group educational experiences in some sequence other than that which is presently called a course?

6. May a program be formally designed to include educational experiences other than those which are presently called courses?

7. Must the whole of the educational experiences provided in that which is called a program be the sum of its individual parts?
8. Is it possible to certify achievement in terms other than completion of a prescribed program?

9. Is it possible that the junior college may provide in some way other than the traditional teacher-student-classroom context a portion of the specialized and general educational experiences required for achievement of entry-level occupational proficiency?

10. If the premise is accepted that learning experiences may be formal or informal, and that they may be found in the classroom and out of it, may the junior college formally plan to provide informal experiences?

11. If there is some basis for the criticism that many students interrupt their education when they enter the classroom, may the junior college offer some pattern of educational experiences that will not interrupt?

Robert R. Wiegman's comment about the kinds of educational experiences needed for contemporary occupational students expresses one viewpoint:

Is it possible that any of us, living in this space age, can insist that the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed today and tomorrow are the same as they were yesterday?

If we believe that general education is dynamic, expanding, and constantly changing, how do we dare offer yesterday's program today? We must study our offerings in general education in occupational programs.
and compare them with a revised concept which sees the sum total of all learning experiences—formal and informal, in and out of the classroom—which prepares the learned to play his multiple role in life.

The revised concept of general education sees it as more than what is to be taught and how much; it is also concerned with how it is taught, by whom, for what purpose, and under what circumstances.

In my estimation, we would move ahead faster and farther if we could bring ourselves to omit the use of the terms "academic" and "occupational" as we speak of junior college curriculums. What we should be talking about is the total educational program for an individual.(75, p. 17)

Primary question Number Three which perhaps should be considered in forming a philosophy for occupational programs in business curricula may be this: What patterns of educational experiences should the junior college provide to help students develop occupational proficiency?

Summary

Although it may be possible to draw other basic questions from the material presented in Chapter II, this chapter has drawn three fundamental questions for further discussion. These three primary questions are

1. What should the junior college be?
2. What constitutes entry-level occupational proficiency in business?
3. What patterns of educational experiences should the junior college provide to help students develop occupational proficiency?
The attempted resolution of the three primary questions raised in the preceding chapter provided the salient points of a proposed philosophy for two-year occupational programs in junior college business curricula. The identity of the institution offering the programs, the educational experiences designed to help individuals develop occupational proficiency, and the pattern of the educational experiences to be provided by the institution seemed essential to any discussion of a proposed philosophy.

For purposes of this discussion, it was assumed that an advancing technological society such as that which exists in the United States will continue to need an ever increasing number of trained specialized workers for its labor force. It was further assumed that these specialized workers may receive their initial training through the provisions of planned educational experiences by an educational institution designed for post-high-school adults. It was further assumed
that it is in the best interests of society that these educational experiences be organized in some manner so that they may be made available to large numbers of individuals in order to conserve or maximize the use of limited natural resources. Based on these assumptions, it would seem that some sort of public educational institution should be established to respond to society's need for highly trained people.

At first glance, the public junior college may appear to be ideal for such a role. A survey of proclaimed junior college philosophy and purposes would seem to be adequate to support the kind of educational institution needed to respond to the changing needs of society by providing whatever educational opportunities a post-high school adult might need to develop entry-level occupational proficiency. As indicated in Chapter II, however, a survey of several definitive studies made of the junior college seemed to indicate that many junior colleges, despite their philosophical claims, have not always been able to provide the variety of programs presented in their statements of purpose. Rather, many junior colleges seem to have offered only programs essentially like the first two years of the traditional four-year college. Each study seemed to indicate that transfer
programs have so dominated curriculum development in the junior college that these institutions may have become simply abbreviated senior colleges, and that the few non-transfer programs provided may have been less than adequate to meet societal needs for trained workers.

Even though the public junior college seems to have proclaimed through many of its statements of philosophy and purposes the intent to offer multiple programs especially designed to meet the needs of people residing in a particular region of a state, their record of performance seemingly has indicated that for the most part only traditional senior college parallel courses have been offered to meet these needs. Even though some of the newer junior colleges which have been recently established in the larger cities throughout the state and nation seem to be promising to be more than junior colleges and are calling themselves "comprehensive community colleges," there seems to be little evidence as yet to support a contention that they have broken the domination of transfer courses in four-year curriculum programs.

The comprehensive community college is a new variety of junior college which began to receive some recognition in the early 1960's. It may seem ironic that the description
of this new kind of junior college sounds very much like the familiar statements used to describe the old junior college of the 1920's. The junior college philosophy of the 1920's seemingly described a comprehensive community college, but the institution that has emerged seems to have been unable to become comprehensive. Perhaps because of reasons beyond their control or perhaps by intent, the resources of these institutions seem to have been directed more toward the concepts of "college" than toward the needs of the "community." As cited earlier in this study, Medsker indicated that the problem of duality—whether the institution should associate itself with local public schools or standard traditional colleges—still plagues the junior college, even those that may call themselves "comprehensive community colleges." "The identity problem," Medsker concluded, "is still the overriding problem which the junior college faces." (50, p. 34)

What should the junior college be? The answer to this question seems to depend upon the references chosen to quote, and there seem to be many references. The contemporary junior college seems to be an agonizing figure caught between two compelling forces each pulling powerfully on an extended hand. One previously whispered force now seems to shout
loudly, "Serve the community, be done with uncertainty," while the other force pulls just as insistently with the stern warning, "Be a college, preserve traditional academic standards--don't become something less than a real college."

Perhaps a strong restatement and/or reaffirmation of junior college philosophy supporting a different kind of educational institution may be needed to help the junior college gain new self-respect and new confidence in its attempt to eliminate the question of uncertain identity. Perhaps the junior college should claim for itself freedom and independence and should establish for itself a distinct identity.

A Proposal for a New Kind of Junior College

The following proposal is for a new kind of junior college: the responsive community college. Borrowing heavily from historic junior college philosophy and building upon its sound foundations, the responsive community college should emphasize the words "responsive" and "community" rather than the word "college." This proposed responsive community college might be the kind of educational institution needed to offer the two-year occupational programs in business to be proposed in this study. The proposed responsive
community college may be partially described by the following proposals:

**Proposal Number 1.** It is proposed that the responsive community college should be an independent segment of American education, cooperating fully with all other segments, but separate and distinct.

The responsive community college should consider itself to be neither an extension of the secondary school nor simply the first two years of a standard college. While the responsive community college might resemble each of these established segments of American education in some respects, the responsive community college should be as independent as possible and should not be dominated by the demands of either. The responsive community college should separate itself philosophically from each of the other two segments and should not be concerned about whether or not it is like either of them in plan or purpose. Even though the responsive community college might accept students who may have completed the secondary school and might prepare some of them for transfer to standard colleges, the responsive community college should concern itself only with the needs of the students it admits to its various educational activities.
The responsive community college should be a public institution and readily accessible to all citizens residing in or near its area of local support so that its service may be utilized as fully as possible. The responsive community college should make every effort to articulate its activities with both the secondary school and the standard college, but it should make its own decisions concerning the educational activities to be provided. In articulating its activities, the responsive community college should avoid unnecessary duplication of services provided by other segments of the educational community, but if the need exists within its service area, the responsive community college should attempt to provide the service without speculating about the level of the need. Negatively, the responsive community college should not attempt to label its courses either secondary school or college level, but should simply provide educational activities in response to student needs.

The curricula should be under local control. Business, industry, labor, the professions, and educators together should define community needs in a regional area rather than having these needs defined for them by more distant decisions made at the state or national level.
Proposal Number 2. It is proposed that the responsive community college should have an open-door admission policy and that no student admitted should be considered expendable.

The responsive community college should have an open-door admission policy, admitting all high school graduates or other persons over eighteen years of age with an equivalent background. This college should admit any student to any educational experience offered so long as the student feels that such experiences will further his personal development. Every effort should be made by this college to make admission of students and their subsequent withdrawal as easy and simple as possible.

No student admitted to the responsive community college should be considered expendable. Every effort should be made to determine and serve the needs of individual students, and so long as these needs seem to be met, the student should be encouraged to continue.

Proposal Number 3. It is proposed that the responsive community college should be primarily concerned with the attempt to provide educational opportunities designed for the personal development of students toward individual goals.

This proposal recognizes a philosophy of education built upon two basic concepts: (1) there is an ideal of
mature selfhood, including occupational competence, toward which students may grow, and (2) the belief that students may progress toward this ideal through educational experiences in association with professional college teachers. The educational experiences which the responsive community college should provide should grow out of these two basic concepts.

What the educational experience should be to the individual student may elude even the best efforts of description. Perhaps it may be easier to point a direction the proposed experience should take by discussing the experience in terms of what it should not be, or perhaps in terms of what the experience should be more than. To assert that the educational experience should not be simply a matter of acquiring units of information or that the experience should be more than earning a degree or certificate, may not make a significant contribution toward describing what the experience should be like, but these observations may indicate something about the attitude which should be directed toward the proposed experiences to be provided.

If the responsive community college accepts the basic concept that there is an ideal of mature selfhood, including occupational competence, toward which students may grow, perhaps the primary task of the college should be to help
students develop readiness and openness to new learning experiences by helping students establish identity, a sense of purpose, and increased awareness of environmental influences including interpersonal relationships. Perhaps the subject matter which the student should study during his period of enrollment in the responsive community college should be himself. This is to suggest that perhaps the educational experience should improve the individual in the light of his own standards, that the experience should broaden his own horizons and liberate him from his own ignorance, and that the experience should increase his self-understanding and his sensitivity to himself as well as to others.

The responsive community college should create such an open educational environment that it may be characterized, at least in part, by the following terms: democratic, understanding, caring, approving, supporting, loving, non-judgmental. The responsive community college should create a climate of learning in which students have freedom to choose their own directions for learning and in which they may accept the responsibility for the choices they make. In short, the responsive community college should help each student discover and describe his own theory of the person he wants to be in the light of what he is so that his
educational experience will be guided by a theoretical framework of his own construction.

The responsive community college should not only encourage the student to discover and describe his own theory of person, but should provide appropriate opportunities for the student to do so. The intent of this self-developed theory of person should dramatize the distinction between using the educational experience to guide a student to fit into certain prescribed categories and the provision of educational opportunities to help a student toward becoming more distinctly himself. Development of person should not deny the need for a student to develop the ability to think, to become self-reliant, to apprehend a sound sense of moral values, to learn how to act responsibly; indeed, it should affirm these needs. Neither should development of person as an educational aim neglect training for a profession or a vocation; instead it should underscore the necessity of giving oneself in creative activity to realize self-actualization.

Perhaps a very important element in the student's description of his own theory of person should be the formulation of a statement reflecting a sense of purpose for the student's present and future activities. The concept of
value seems critical to any consideration of life purposes. Value may be defined as those elements that show how a person has decided to use his life. Perhaps the crucial test of a person's sense of values may be whether or not they provide him with a set of beliefs about himself in relation to his social and physical environment which are extensive in scope, dependable in action, and compatible with one another.

If the responsive community college is able to provide the educational experiences through which a student becomes aware of himself as a person with a distinct identity and with a mature value structure, perhaps his relationship with his social and physical environment should be a next logical concern. The student should be given the opportunity to examine his own abilities, attitudes, beliefs, and values, and should be given the opportunity to examine how these and other personal factors affect the quality of his relationships with others.

Perhaps another element of personal development which the responsive community college should foster, should be to help students develop confidence in their intellectual competence to cope with what comes to them in life and in their ability to do what they set out to do in their life's
work. The development and demonstration of a sense of competence, both intellectual and occupational, influences perhaps both the self-concept of a student and his relationships with others. The responsive community college should provide educational experiences to help students increase their abilities to understand written and oral communications, to relate symbols to real events, to deal with abstractions and concepts, and to think logically and independently.

Students who recognize their deficiencies in these areas should be given appropriate opportunities to overcome them. Every opportunity should be recognized to support the student's progress in these areas as he attempts to develop a sense of competence. Every demonstration of what he can do should be acknowledged with a minimum of notice accorded to what he cannot do. It is perhaps unlikely that a student with a sense of failure may be encouraged by another failure if the areas of even minimum achievement are not mentioned.

As the responsive community college helps the student develop intellectual confidence, his occupational alternatives should increase. As students establish their identity, articulate an awareness of purpose for their lives, increase their understanding of their social and physical environment, they should become better able to develop a sense of confidence
in their intellectual, occupational, and social competence to do what they set out to do in their life's work.

Proposal Number 3, as stated above, recognizes a philosophy of education built upon two basic concepts: (1) the ideal of mature selfhood, including occupational competence, toward which students may grow, and (2) the belief that students may progress toward this ideal through educational experiences in association with professional college teachers. The second of these basic concepts, that of the role of the teacher, will now be discussed.

Proposal Number 4. The role of the teacher in the responsive community college should be that of a mediator, that is, one who mediates.

The dictionary definition of mediate adds clarity: (1) to be in an intermediate position or location (2) to be an intermediary or conciliator between persons or sides (3) to bring about by intervention (4) to be the medium for bringing about a result, conveying an object (5) to communicate (6) to supply information.

Describing the teacher in the responsive community college as mediator is intended to emphasize his role as one who attempts to conciliate the student's need for learning with educational experiences to achieve the desired
learning. The role of the teacher should be intermediary, not superior; he should be simply the medium for bringing about a result; one person working with another person to achieve a mutual goal.

Perhaps the teacher's first task in his role as mediator in the responsive community college should be to allow the student to see the teacher as a person. William Arrowsmith expressed the idea very well:

It is men we need, not programs. It is possible for a student to go from kindergarten to graduate school without ever encountering a man—a man who might for the first time give him the only profound motivation for learning, the hope of becoming a better man. Learning matters, of course; but it is the means, not the end, and the end must always be either radiantly visible, or profoundly implied, in the means. It is only in the teacher that the end is apparent; he can humanize because he possesses the human skills which give him the power to humanize others. If that power is not felt, nothing of any educational value can occur. (2, p. 60)

The teacher in the responsive community college must not allow depersonalization to occur either in his relations with students or between students. The teacher should consistently strive to meet the student on a one to one basis and in the establishment of small groups of faculty and students who, by participating together in the learning process, come to know, care about and develop a sense of responsibility for one another. Every effort should be
made to individualize instruction even when dealing with large numbers of students.

The teacher in the responsive community college should view the teaching-learning sequence as a cooperative endeavor with the student as the primary actor while the teacher serves as mediator. Whatever media are used should be selected on the basis of potential to cause student learning, and teaching should be assumed to have occurred only in relation to the learning that has resulted.

One other dimension of the teacher's role as mediator should be mentioned. The teacher as mediator should continually seek to integrate all subject matter used so that all educational experiences are organized in such a way that their content flows into one another. The teacher as mediator should exercise every effort to eliminate departmentalization and fragmentation of subject matter.

In summary, the role of the teacher as mediator should mean that he is a real person acting as a medium to bring about a desired result. The student should be the primary actor as well as the primary concern of the teacher. Marshall McLuhan seems to have described the involvement of the teacher as mediator and the role of the student when he asserted:
Now, when I'm talking about involvement, I'm not talking about ideals. I think that sort of visualizing of distant goals belongs to a much earlier period. When you are deeply involved and participate in the life of your time, you don't have goals. The man who is involved doesn't have ideals. A mother does not have a job; she has a role, she has about forty jobs at once and she doesn't have any ideals whatever. She is thoroughly involved. It's like a man and his hobby; he doesn't have any ideals about his hobby; he is involved in it. Anybody who is involved in what he's doing doesn't have any goals or ideals whatever; he's just with it. He's doing something that takes every ounce of his energy.

Instead of a specialist job, people now have to go back to roles in depth in all levels of work and employment and study and knowledge. (49, p. 11)

Proposal Number 5. Specific behavioral objectives should be developed and stated for all educational experiences provided by the responsive community college.

All educational experiences provided by the responsive community college should state the specific behavioral objectives which the experience has been designed to develop. Each objective should state the expected student performance, the conditions under which the performance should be accomplished, and the minimal acceptable level of competency expected. Once these objectives have been clarified, the teacher as mediator may then design strategies and methods to help the student obtain the desired performance level. All educational experiences within the pattern--classroom, library, laboratory, community activities, individual study--
should be blended together with the real world of the student. Whatever media are used should be selected on the basis of potential to cause student learning. Typically, the teacher should identify the objective, pre-test the student to assess his needs, hypothesize a strategy, effect the learning experience, test the results to assess the effectiveness of the strategy, and then identify the objective to start the cycle again.

If the student is allowed to develop his own theory of the person he wishes to be, if he is allowed to identify his own educational needs, if he is permitted to participate in choosing his own educational experiences, and if he becomes a part of a cybernetic pattern of educational experiences provided by the responsive community college, then his education may be considered to be all his. The student should be the primary actor with the leading role and if he does not choose to act, nothing will happen.

Critical to the usefulness of the cybernetic pattern outlined above, may be the evaluation of student performance. The role of the teacher as mediator should be to support and encourage student progress in the student's efforts to improve his intellectual and occupational competencies. Negatively, the teacher as mediator should not injure students
in his attempts to help them toward their personal goals.
The teacher as mediator should be a critic of student performance, not a judge. Testing as a means of student performance should be used for assessment of the effectiveness of teaching strategy and to note students' progress toward their goals, not to pass judgment nor to record success or failure as if these were permanent characteristics. The teacher as mediator should certify only what a student can do, not what he attempted and failed or what he cannot do. If behavioral objectives and criteria for performance are well established, the teacher should simply certify that the minimum performance level has been achieved. Should the minimum performance level not be achieved, perhaps the teacher should develop a different hypothesis about his teaching strategy in order to effect a different learning experience.

Since performance of individual students under known conditions should be the objective of each learning experience, cooperation of students instead of competition should be encouraged. At every opportunity, students should be encouraged to work together so that all may reach the desired performance level. How students learn should not be as important, perhaps, as what students learn. The means
should be important, but the end result should be of paramount importance.

**Proposal Number 6.** The responsive community college should consider its institutional environment to be the entire community in which it is located.

The learning environment of the responsive community college should not be confined to a small campus area, but should permeate every part of its service responsibility. The posture of the responsive community college should be that of an institution that stands ready to participate in learning activities wherever they may exist and to expand in areas of learning not being dealt with by other institutions. Every segment of the community should be considered as a potential arena in which directed learning may occur. Negatively, the college should not isolate itself either physically or spiritually from any part of its community of service.

In extending its institutional environment to the entire community, the responsive community college should attempt to integrate its learning activities with community activities. The responsive community college should vigorously seek opportunities and occasions to mix faculty and student activities into the life stream of the community so that all
may benefit in the learning experience. Involvement of faculty and students in off-campus activities should not only be encouraged but should also receive a high priority of institutional interest.

Proposal Number 7. The curriculum of the responsive community college should be constructed and implemented on an integrated, interdisciplinary rationale.

The curriculum of the responsive community college should attempt to integrate knowledge in the thinking of students with a minimum of division among subject-matter disciplines. Departmentalization should be an organizational device designed to implement better the curricular offerings rather than a structure to determine various curricular designs. Instructional teams should be organized as flexible task forces to bring together specific interests and experiences to provide an appropriate blend of educational opportunities needed by individual groups of students. The title of the educational experience and whether preceded by one departmental prefix or another should not be considered as important as the effect of the offering on the lives of the students enrolled. The important questions about a particular curriculum offering should be whether or not students might learn the things they might expect to learn and what effect
the experiences might have on their progress toward their personal goals.

Proposal Number 8. The responsive community college should dedicate its resources to the responding of changing community needs, but it should limit its responses to those changing needs that will result in the greatest good for the greatest number of people within its service area.

This proposal should be considered as an attempt to define the areas in which the responsive community college should offer educational opportunities. The responsive community college should consider itself to be an institution which stands ready to change with changing community needs, but it should attempt to do only those things within its resources and which are not being done by some other institution. Negatively, this proposal attempts to emphasize that while the responsive community college should respond to community needs, it should be considered unlikely that the college will have such unlimited resources that it should be able to be all things for all people. The responsive community college should focus on those areas of educational services which seem within its province, and should concentrate on these.
What Constitutes Entry-level Occupational Proficiency in Business?

If an educational institution should attempt to provide learning experiences designed to develop entry-level occupational proficiency in business, it would seem prudent that some attempt be made to describe some of the facets of that which the experiences should be designed to develop. For purposes of this discussion, it would perhaps be useful to assume that it would be possible to design some experiences meant to develop only specialized occupational skills and other experiences meant to develop traits not directly related to any one specialized occupational area.

Perhaps by definition any description of entry-level occupational proficiency in business should include the development of some degree of skill in a specialized area of work. It would seem reasonable to assume that if a person is to warrant the label of "technician" he should be able to perform technical tasks. But is it equally reasonable to assume that any description of occupational proficiency should also include some reference to the development of non-specialized skills not directly related to any one specialized occupational area? When describing occupational proficiency for the purpose of program design, would it be
prudent to presume that the person to be helped by the educational experiences to be provided has already developed sufficient non-specialized skills at minimum acceptable levels to the extent that he should be able to function as a technician after he has acquired the necessary specialized skills?

Another approach to questions concerning any description of occupational proficiency would be to consider the possibility that personal traits are somehow distinct from specialized skills. Or perhaps the possibility that personal traits may be important to the development of specialized skills only to the extent that these traits contribute to aptitude for further specialized training. Or, in a related vein, might it be possible to consider that a technician may be developed without giving consideration to the personal traits of the individual other than certain general mechanical skills, aptitudes, and abilities in such areas as English, mathematics, science, and so forth?

The following proposals are presented for the purpose of forming at least a partial description of that to which the responsive community college should refer when considering the development of students to achieve entry-level occupational proficiency.
Proposal Number 9. Entry-level occupational proficiency should be described as an inseparable combination of the personal traits of an individual and the specialized skills he is able to perform in his chosen field of work.

The above proposal should be considered as an attempt to emphasize that the development of personal traits and the development of specialized occupational skills should receive equal attention in any attempt to define occupational proficiency. The proposal suggests that a specialty or a specialist may not exist apart from a person. The proposal postulates that the physical body, the intellect, the character, the reputation, the emotions—the whole person—is the vehicle for the specialist. It may be projected further to assume that the self-concepts, the values held, the sociability, the goals, the outlook on life—the total personal characteristics of the individual—influence job performance.

Proposal Number 10. It is proposed that any description of entry-level occupational proficiency should include references to the technical knowledges and skills an individual should need to function in specific assignments immediately upon employment.

This proposal should be considered as an attempt to recognize that any description of entry-level occupational
proficiency should contain an element which is task-oriented. This element in the description should attempt to state the specific kinds of tasks for which specific skills may be needed. Where appropriate, quantitative minimums should be stated.

The above proposal should be considered as an attempt to emphasize the need for the establishment of parameters concerning both the breadth and depth of the skills contained in the description. If the description is to have meaning in terms of the technician to be trained, the description should be specific about the tasks the technician should be expected to perform.

Proposal Number 11. It is proposed that any description of entry-level occupational proficiency should include references to the non-technical knowledges and skills an individual should need to function in specific assignments immediately upon employment.

This proposal should be considered as an attempt to recognize that any description of entry-level occupational proficiency should contain an element which refers to desirable personal traits. This element in the description should attempt to state specific personal characteristics which might contribute to the achievement of entry-level
occupational proficiency in business. Included in this element should be references to attitudes, values, human relations, personal aspirations, and the like.

This proposal should be considered an attempt to focus attention on that part of occupational proficiency which involves the non-specialized. That part which John Dewey seemed to sum up when he stated:

Restricted specialism is impossible; nothing could be more absurd than to try to educate individuals with an eye to only one line of activity. In the first place, each individual has of necessity a variety of callings, in each of which he should be intelligently effective; and in the second place any one occupation loses its meaning and becomes a routine keeping busy at something in the degree in which it is isolated from other interests. No one is just an artist and nothing else, and in so far as one approximates that condition, he is so much the less developed human being; he is a kind of monstrosity. (20, p. 307)

Any description of occupational proficiency should include an element which goes beyond restricted specialism to a more fully developed human being.

Proposal Number 12. It is proposed that any description of entry-level occupational proficiency in business should allude to the transient nature of technical skills.

This proposal should be considered as an attempt to focus attention upon the possibility that specialized information and education might become obsolete very quickly in a constantly changing world of technology. Any description
of occupational proficiency should include the possibility that continuous study may be necessary to maintain any skill level achieved. The individual who wishes to maintain occupational proficiency should be prepared for change, and should be prepared for flexibility rather than rigidity. The technician should not only be aware that changes might occur in occupational specialty but should also anticipate that they will likely occur.

Innovation and creativity should be recognized as elements of change intrinsic to a dynamic business environment, and if recognized as such, the technician should be prepared to change, to learn, and to participate creatively. This proposal, then, should be considered as an attempt to caution against any description of occupational proficiency which would advocate narrow occupational specialization without allowing for the inclusion of rather extended consideration of the technician's personal attitudes toward his occupational area and toward his job performance. Any description of occupational proficiency should include a place for an element of pride in the awareness of the technician that he has done his job well, that he has made a worthwhile contribution to the common good, and that there is dignity in his work.
Perhaps it may be hypothesized that attitudes toward change, toward the dignity of work and job satisfaction as well as attitudes toward innovation and creativity are more likely to be brought about by personal traits rather than specialized skills. It may be through his personal traits rather than specialized skill that the technician may become intimately involved with the essentials, the ultimates, the vitalities of living a life. Possibly Dewey said it best, "No one is just an artist and nothing else, and in so far as one approximates that condition, he is so much the less developed human being; he is a kind of monstrosity." (20, p. 307)

Pattern of Educational Experiences to be Provided to Develop Occupational Proficiency

The pattern of educational experiences to be provided by the responsive community college to help students develop entry-level occupational proficiency should be compatible with the proposals made earlier in this chapter. The descriptive statements of the responsive community college as presented in proposals one through eight, and the descriptions of those characteristics which may constitute entry-level occupational proficiency as presented in proposals nine through twelve, should serve as a ground from which
patterns of educational experiences may emerge to help students develop entry-level occupational competence in the field of business.

Any pattern which may emerge from this philosophical ground should assume that students may have many different needs and that perhaps relatively few of them will have identical needs. This assumption would seem to indicate that the responsive community college may likely be confronted with a wide variety of student needs. While considering the probability of infinite student needs, it should be assumed that the responsive community college will likely have only limited resources at its disposal. These two assumptions should emphasize that any pattern of experiences to be provided should be as flexible as possible. A flexible pattern seems consistent with the primary task of the responsive community college—to help each student discover his own theory of the person he wants to be in the light of what he is—as proposed earlier in this study.

The following proposals are presented for the purpose of giving some direction to those who may be responsible for establishing those flexible patterns which may be designed to help students develop some occupational competency.
Proposal Number 13. It is proposed that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula should provide each student with the opportunity to develop his own theory of person.

This proposal recognizes the need for each student to establish his own identity, his own sense of purposes, and the boundaries of his own life space so that some assessment may be made concerning his general educational needs as related to the development of occupational competency.

Perhaps in very general terms, this proposal should enable the student to discover some rather specific answers to some of the fundamental questions of life: Who am I? Where am I? Where am I going? How do I get there from here?

This proposal would seem to assume that as each student attempts to develop his own theory of the person he wants to be, an important dimension of such a theory should be the need for the development of occupational competence in some general or specific area of work. This proposal might also assume that should such a theory not include the establishment of a need for the development of occupational competency, any pattern of experiences provided to bring about increased occupational abilities may be less than successful.
The intent of this proposal should be to help each student discover and establish some compass point for his own life so that he may dedicate his own resources in the direction of his own choosing. Even though the compass point may change as the student begins to move through the educational experiences provided, this initial direction may serve as a reference from which future deviations may be made. In addition, the compass point chosen by the student may help determine how much assistance the responsive community college may provide with its limited pattern of educational experiences no matter how flexible these experiences may be.

Perhaps no other endeavor will prove to be more important to the student's achievement of occupational competency than the opportunity to develop his own theory of person.

Proposal Number 14. It is proposed that all educational experiences designed to help students achieve entry-level occupational proficiency be grouped into discrete units, courses, and programs with prescribed behavioral objectives.

This proposal should be considered as an attempt to identify the divisions of a program in terms other than periods of time. Whereas college courses and programs may be presently described in terms of semesters, semester hours,
freshman year, two-year programs and the like, this proposal suggests that completion of prescribed educational experiences be related to the achievement of behavioral objectives instead of to the passage of time. This would suggest that perhaps courses should be described in terms of rather specific objectives instead of in terms of one-semester or two-semester, and that programs should be described in terms of completed courses instead of one-year or two-year.

Perhaps the intent of this proposal may be clarified by describing briefly the concepts that the words unit, course, and program are meant to convey. A unit should be described as the smallest segment of educational experiences for which a student may receive notice when behavioral objectives have been successfully completed. Each unit should be complete in itself and should list significant behavioral objectives. A unit probably should contain more than one topic and could include more than one activity, but no notice of record should be made until the behavioral objectives for the entire unit have been achieved.

A course should be described in terms of the units grouped in it. Each course probably should contain two or more units of related objectives and some of the units probably should be completed in a prescribed sequence. But
the essential intent of this proposal should be considered as an attempt to describe a course in terms other than grade level or the mere passage of time.

A program should be described in terms of the courses contained in it. A program should contain those courses which the student, in counsel with his faculty advisor, wishes to complete in order to help the student progress toward his own personal goals. If the responsive community college desires to award a certificate or a degree when these student programs are successfully completed, college requirements may be established to guide students and counselors when programs are proposed and approved.

This proposal does not intend to suggest that units, courses, and programs should not be scheduled for certain clock times during the week nor any other time period. Nor is it intended to suggest that no consideration should be given to the length of time in which the average student might reasonably expect to complete any particular unit, course, or program. But the proposal should be considered to suggest that the passage of time or the reaching of a specific date does not signal the completion of a unit, course, or program. Only the performance of prescribed behavioral objectives should mark the completion of any of these segments of the curriculum.
Proposal Number 15. It is proposed that flexible patterns of educational experiences should be developed by the responsive community college and that each student should have the opportunity to complete programs, as described in Proposal 14, consistent with his individual needs.

This proposal suggests that after the period of assessment described in Proposal 13, the student should establish his own personal and occupational goals in keeping with his own theory of person. The responsive community college faculty and staff should make every effort to realistically support the establishment of these individual goals by students. It would seem to be essential that the faculty and staff establish themselves in the eyes of all students as those who are friendly, concerned about the welfare of students, and wishing only to help each student achieve his goal.

This proposal also suggests that programs should be flexible rather than rigidly prescribed. If students display individual differences and choose individual goals, it would seem that flexible programs would more likely serve their needs. While these flexible programs may present some certification problems, perhaps careful attention by
those in the responsive community college may enable these problems to be resolved.

Perhaps it should be noted at this point that one of the primary concerns of this study was the composition of the two-year occupational programs in junior college business curricula. While the above proposals may seem to eliminate the term "two-year" in connection with the term "program", proposals 13, 14 and 15 refer specifically to those areas of concern which have previously been referred to as the two-year occupational programs in public junior college business curricula. The proposals which follow also refer specifically to these "two-year programs."

Proposal Number 16. It is proposed that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula in the responsive community college should provide each student with the opportunity to develop confidence in his intellectual and social competence to adjust to ever changing patterns of life.

This proposal recognizes the need for each student to relate properly to his environment. While proposal number 13 should attempt to turn the student's attention inward to his own attributes, abilities, and goals, the intent of this proposal should be to turn the student's attention
outward. As each student's attention is turned away from himself, he should have the opportunity to relate himself to his physical and social environment.

Educational experiences should be provided to help students increase their awareness of the natural physical world of which each is a part, and in which each may have a role important to every other part. Such educational experiences should be essentially non-technical in nature and should be essentially complete in themselves. Such experiences should essentially be an introduction to certain specific portions of the natural world and the individual's relationship to that portion rather than an attempted survey of the entire field.

Not only should educational experiences be provided to increase the student's awareness of his relationship to his natural world, but also experiences designed to increase his awareness of his social world. Critical to increased understanding of his social world would seem to be the ability to communicate both orally and in writing. In the communications area, perhaps increased understanding should be considered more essential than correctness of mechanics. Basic to this area may be the need to understand the need to understand.
This proposal may be based on the assumption that as the student has the opportunity to develop confidence in his intellectual and social competence to adjust to changing conditions in his natural and social world, his occupational competence and alternatives should increase. It may also be based on the assumption that as these competencies are increased, dedication of personal resources toward the fulfillment of a chosen life's work may be expected. This dedication of resources may be the essential ingredient toward the development of occupational proficiency.

**Proposal Number 17.** It is proposed that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula in the responsive community college should provide each student with the opportunity to develop specialized skills sufficient for entry-level occupational proficiency.

This proposal should be considered as complimentary to the preceding proposal. Perhaps many students will need to devote as much as sixty per cent of their program to the development of desired specialized skills, while others may require less. Care should be exercised that students do not become either over-specialized or inadequately prepared. It would seem that over-specialization could result in some obsolescence of the acquired skill before
use, and that inadequate preparation could result in inadequate performance on the job.

Proposals 16 and 17 should be considered as suggestions that all occupational programs in business curricula should be a definite mixture of specialized and non-specialized educational experiences. Perhaps the ideal mixture would be fifty per cent of each with neither area going beyond sixty per cent. But whatever the mixture chosen, performance of behavioral objectives in both specialized and non-specialized areas should be the determining criteria for the mixture. Negatively, students should not be encouraged to complete educational experiences to help them perform tasks which they are presently able to perform.

Proposal Number 18. It is proposed that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula should attempt to integrate various disciplines.

This proposal should be considered as an attempt toward the integration of various subject matter fields to the fullest extent possible. Perhaps the goal of this proposal should be to narrow the distances which sometime seem to separate the various areas of specialized information and knowledge and which may appear to become compartmentalized and unrelated. Every attempt should be made to integrate,
harmonize, and relate information and knowledge so that through the various educational experiences provided the student will have the opportunity to develop himself without identifying with any particular discipline.

This proposal should not be interpreted as an attempt to eliminate the specialist since the proposal itself seems to indicate some degree of specialization in the area of business. Instead, the intent should be to eliminate the attitude that all knowledge and information should be studied separately and distinctly rather than approached as related parts of a unified whole. The intent should be to interweave the various disciplines in such a way that no single discipline is readily identifiable in the completed fabric.

Proposal Number 19. It is proposed that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula should attempt to utilize non-classroom experiences wherever possible.

This proposal should be considered as an attempt to integrate the educational experiences provided under the primary control of the college with experiences outside of this primary control. Such outside experiences might include occupational employment of any nature, on-the-job training,
or occupational cooperative work experience. In addition, such outside experiences may include participation in non-
occupational activities such as work in non-profit organiza-
tions, civic projects, and volunteer community groups.

This proposal should be considered as an attempt to make the college educational experiences simply a part of the student's life where he now lives rather than being considered to be preparation for life. Perhaps in this way the student may come to better understand that learning is a continuous way of life rather than something that should be done in some mysterious way apart from life; that learning should be for practical and future use rather than some impractical, retain-until-the-test, soon-to-be-forgotten way.

Every part, every institution, every resource of the community should be viewed as a possible educational opportunity which may be integrated into the pattern of educational experiences to be developed for business curricula.

A Comprehensive Statement of Philosophy for Two-Year Occupational Programs in Business Curricula

The proposals made in this chapter should be considered as an attempt to provide some of the salient points of a comprehensive statement of philosophy for two-year occupational
programs in business curricula. Perhaps it would now be useful to bring those points together in a rather brief summary of the proposed philosophy.

It is proposed that a new kind of junior college—perhaps described as a responsive community college—might be the kind of junior college which would be compatible with the proposed two-year occupational programs in junior college business curricula. The responsive community college is proposed to be a public institution established within a local community area to respond to community needs for post-high school educational experiences. The responsive community college should be an independent segment of American education, cooperating fully with all other segments, but separate and distinct from all other segments. This kind of college should be readily accessible to all citizens residing in or near its area of local support and should have an open-door admission policy. All students admitted to this kind of college should be considered to be important individuals and every effort should be made to help each student achieve his individual goal.

The responsive community college should recognize a philosophy of education built upon two basic concepts: (1) there is an ideal of mature selfhood, including occupational
competence, toward which students may grow, and (2) the belief that students may progress toward this ideal through educational experiences in association with professional college teachers. Complimenting these two basic concepts, the responsive community college should attempt to create such an open educational environment that it may be characterized, at least in part, by the following terms: democratic, understanding, caring, approving, supporting, loving, non-judgmental.

The responsive community college should encourage each student to discover and describe his own theory of the person he presently seems to be and the person he wishes to become. The responsive community college should use every community resource to provide opportunities for the student to relate himself to his physical and social environment. The role of the teacher in the responsive community college may be partially described by the term mediator. The teacher as mediator should attempt to conciliate the student's need for learning with educational experiences to achieve the desired learning.

Specific behavior objectives should be developed and stated for all educational experiences provided by the responsive community college. These defined outcomes should
be available to all students before, during, and after all educational experiences. Curricula, instruction, and all other college activities should be geared exclusively to student achievement. Inferences of learning should be made by assessing the student's capabilities before and after all educational experiences provided, and certification by the college should relate only to that which the student can do rather than that which was attempted and failed or that which the student cannot do.

It is proposed that the responsive community college should consider its institutional environment to be the entire community in which it is located, and that the college should dedicate all its resources to the responding of changing community needs. It is further proposed that the responsive community college should be organized in such a manner that would promote the integration of all disciplines. The organization should implement a curriculum that attempts to minimize the divisions and distinctions between subject-matter disciplines.

The responsive community college should describe occupational proficiency as an inseparable combination of the personal traits of an individual and the specialized skills he may be able to perform in his chosen field of work.
Such a description should include references to the technical knowledge and skills an individual should need to function in specific assignments immediately upon employment, but should also include references to the non-technical knowledges and skills an individual should need to function in these specific assignments. It is further proposed that any description of occupational proficiency should allude to the transient nature of technical skills and of the possible necessity of adjustment to changing conditions.

It is proposed that the term "two-year" should not be used in connection with those patterns of educational experiences which may be called occupational "programs" in junior college business curricula. It is proposed that these patterns be described in terms of expected performance with no specific reference to time. It should be assumed that when a student has demonstrated his ability to do accounting work he has completed an accounting "program" without reference to the time or places involved in his preparation.

It is proposed that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula should provide each student with the opportunity to develop his own theory of the person he presently believes himself to be and of the person he
wishes to become. It is further proposed that these patterns should be described in terms of defined outcomes expected and should be grouped into discrete units, courses, and programs. Flexible patterns of educational experiences should be developed so that each student may have the opportunity to develop confidence in his intellectual and social competence and to adjust to ever-changing patterns of life. Each pattern developed should be a mixture of specialized and non-specialized experiences so that each student may develop his personal traits along with his occupational skills. It is further proposed that all patterns of educational experiences should attempt to integrate the various subject matter disciplines as well as classroom and non-classroom activities.

It is proposed that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula should attempt to develop positive attitudes toward a chosen area of specialization and toward learning as a continuing pursuit in an ever-changing environment.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to present a philosophy which might support contemporary and future occupational programs in business curricula offered by the public junior colleges of Texas. This philosophy has been described in Chapter IV and a rather comprehensive statement of a proposed philosophy was given at the conclusion of that chapter.

At this point, perhaps a special word of explanation might be in order. The philosophy presented in Chapter IV may seem to be more of a philosophy for an institution than for the curricular area of business administration. The reason that the proposed philosophy was developed in this manner resulted from the research for this study. As the historical development of philosophy and purposes of the junior college was traced in the literature, the uncertain identity of the junior college as an educational institution seemed to emerge as a matter of major concern. Statements of philosophy and purposes of the junior college discerned from the literature seemed to reflect an uncertainty of
status with the American educational system, and it was felt that the proposed philosophy described in Chapter IV should be broad enough to support not only the two-year occupational programs in junior college business curricula but other curricular areas as well. Since institutional philosophy should firmly support all curricular areas offered by a junior college, and since each curricular area should compliment and be consistent with institutional philosophy, it seemed desirable to expand the philosophical coverage beyond that originally proposed when the study was undertaken.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the interrelationship of the philosophy developed and proposed at the conclusion of Chapter IV and the historic philosophy reviewed in Chapter II. In addition, recommendations concerning the possible use of the proposed statement of philosophy will be made in two general areas: (1) Experimental studies which may be made in the study of existing two-year occupational programs in business, and (2) New programs which might be offered to reflect the spirit of the philosophy proposed in this study.
Inter-relationship of Philosophies

A comparison of the proposed contemporary philosophy for the responsive community college presented in Chapter IV of this study and the historic statements of philosophy and purposes presented in Chapter II reveal many similarities. In general terms, the historic statements of philosophy proposed and developed during the 1920's seem adequate to support almost any program a public junior college might wish to offer, including the proposed occupational programs in business curricula. However, the assessment of junior college performance presented at the conclusion of Chapter II seemed to indicate that the junior college generally has been unable to implement the basic philosophy proclaimed. The studies surveyed seemed to affirm that the published statements of junior college philosophy and purposes continually confirmed the various educational roles attributed to the junior college, but that the record of performance indicated that most junior colleges implemented only transfer programs. It seems possible that transfer programs have so dominated junior college offerings over the years that philosophical statements made in the 1920's seem now to be inappropriate. Therefore, some restatement of those portions of the historic philosophy that have been rather sparingly implemented might be in order.
Without some restatement, it seems possible that the junior college may continue to be what it seems to have become: a two-year post-high school institution which emphasizes the first two years of a standard college program offered primarily for transfer students. Such a junior college limited to transfer offerings might then attempt to respond to the ever-widening needs of the community with a single curriculum composed of highly structured courses. It would seem that if the junior college is to respond to community needs, either a restatement of some parts of the historic philosophy seems in order or a new philosophy proposed.

Some of the more important similarities between historic junior college philosophy and the proposed philosophy are presented below, followed by those areas of historic philosophy for which some restatement or perhaps clarification seems to be needed in order to support the proposed two-year occupational programs in business curricula. First, the important similarities will be listed briefly:

1. Each seems to recognize that the public junior college should attempt to respond to the post-secondary educational needs of the community from which its support is drawn. In order to respond to these needs, each philosophy
seems to advocate that the public junior college should offer a wide variety of programs including transfer, occupational-terminal, and special courses for adult continuing education.

2. Each philosophy advocates that the junior college should have a strong guidance program to help students determine their post-high school needs.

3. Each philosophy advocates an open-door policy for the admission of students. The proposed philosophy emphasizes that admission and withdrawal of students should be as simple as possible to encourage students to enter, leave, and re-enter the responsive community college when the need arises in their adult lives.

4. Each philosophy indicates that the two-year college should always look to the needs of the community to develop different types of curricula suited to the larger and ever-changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs of the entire community the college attempts to serve.

Second, those areas which may need clarification. Several summary statements have been drawn from the survey of historic philosophy given in Chapter II and are discussed briefly; then portions of the proposed philosophy relating to these drawn areas are presented and explained for comparison, clarification, and/or consideration.
1. The survey of the historic development of junior college philosophy seemed to indicate that there might have been some disagreement about whether or not the junior college should be considered a part of the secondary school or associated closely with standard four-year colleges and universities.

Stated in more direct terms, the issue seemed to center around where the junior college should be placed in the American system of education. With the establishment of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1921, those concerned with the junior college attempted to establish in more formal terms the role of this segment of post-high school education within the total American system of education. During the period of 1920 to 1940, concerned junior college people appeared to have been extensively engaged in a serious search to find the place and function of that which was called the "junior college."

Due perhaps to the diverse sources of its development, there appeared to have been some natural disagreement about whether the junior college should continue as an integral part of the secondary school or whether it should separate itself from the high school and become closely associated with higher education. Early attempts to describe the junior
college and to state its philosophy and purposes seem to reflect these differences of opinion. Specifically, it would seem that one of the first problems faced by the American Association of Junior Colleges upon its establishment was to develop a description of the institutions which should be eligible for membership. The first description adopted in 1922 was amended in 1925 and again in 1929, but in each of these descriptions the junior college was described essentially as an institution offering college-level work to post-high school students. The 1925 and 1929 amendments seemingly indicated that there might have been those in the movement who felt that "college-level" might have been an incomplete description of that which was to be called a junior college.

2. During the disagreements about the description of the junior college after 1921, there were those who advocated that the junior college should be a finishing school for secondary-school graduates with emphasis on occupational training.

Those who advocated that the junior college should have been associated with the high school perhaps viewed the junior college as a finishing school whose primary task was student self-discovery and occupational training for use upon
termination of junior college study. Since some few students would be able to continue their study toward a higher degree, the junior college should have provided some transfer courses, but their primary concern should have been toward the student's need to complete his education and prepare himself for immediate employment.

Those who viewed the junior college primarily as a finishing school for the great majority of high school graduates may have agreed with Habeson's 1923 study in which he proposed that the junior college should place emphasis on the vocational aims of their students and that no student should be allowed to leave the junior college until he had received extensive guidance and counseling to determine the vocation to which he believed himself naturally adapted. Perhaps these also agreed with Habeson's further proposal that the junior college should give the student opportunity to "discover himself," and having brought the student to this discovery, it then became the obligation of the junior college to train the student in his chosen vocation or to refer him to other institutions where such training could be secured.

3. During the disagreements about the description of the junior college after 1921, there were those who
advocated that the junior college should separate itself from the secondary school and become a definite part of higher education.

Those who advocated that the junior college should have been closely associated with higher education perhaps felt that all students could benefit from that which was called "the college experience." Perhaps those who held this position viewed the junior college as a post-high school institution which should have emphasized offering the standard freshman and sophomore years of college work. Perhaps these felt that the junior college, due to their scattered locations in local communities, could provide the advantages of higher education to a larger segment of the population and then those who were able to do so could have transferred to a centrally located senior college to complete the appropriate degree program. In this way, the junior college should have been able to popularize higher education by allowing the student to take advantage of not only the economies of living at home, or close to home, but also the steadying influence which the home environment could provide during the difficult period of adjustment which confronted the student as he moved from an adolescent to a young adult.
Perhaps those who advocated this position also believed that the junior college could have determined by some sorting process those students who should have continued their studies toward a higher degree and those who should have terminated their post-high school studies in the junior college. In addition, perhaps some may have felt that the junior college should have assumed more responsibility for the first two years of college so that the senior colleges could have devoted more of their resources to advance studies and graduate work.

To those who advocated the association of the junior college more strictly to senior colleges, the guidance and counseling function in the junior college was related to the determination of whether or not the student should transfer to a senior college. Those students who demonstrated their ability to benefit from additional study could then have been encouraged to continue their college careers by transferring to a senior college. If, through guidance and counseling, students discovered that they should terminate their higher education in the junior college, these students would have benefited from the college experience and should have been better prepared to enter an occupation suited to their abilities. Since the transfer function seemed to be
the primary task, the resources of the junior college should have been directed toward this effort and close association sought with the institutions to which the junior college student should transfer. The terminal occupation function which resulted from two years of college would then be a by-product when the student terminated his college experience by not transferring to a senior college.

4. Those statements of historic junior college philosophy which have received the most support since the 1920's seem to have been a compromise attempt between the position that the junior college should be a finishing school closely associated with the secondary school and the position that the junior college should separate itself from the secondary school and associate itself with higher education.

Perhaps this compromise might have been reflected in Thomas's 1926 study of philosophy and purposes when he proposed that junior college purpose could be grouped under four headings: Popularizing, Preparatory, Terminal, and Guidance. A survey of the various proposals made in the literature which has appeared since 1926 are presented in Chapter II and do not seem to be in serious disagreement with Thomas position. An article which appeared in the April, 1970, issue of the Junior College Journal affirms by
name that Thomas's four basic purposes are still those which seem most widely held by American junior colleges. The survey also revealed that there does not seem to be serious disagreement with Zook's 1926 proposal that a junior college could well perform all four of these functions with transfer and terminal programs operated effectively side by side.

5. The survey of the development of historic junior college philosophy seems to indicate that there may be an identity problem among some present day junior colleges. The survey presented in Chapter II seems to indicate that the junior college has had only limited success in providing educational opportunities specifically designed to implement the various educational roles it proclaims other than for senior college transfer students. Each definitive study of the junior college surveyed seemed to indicate that the junior college has tended to dedicate the majority of its resources for the provision of transfer programs while providing only limited opportunities in the other roles it continues to proclaim.

The confusion about identity seems to focus on a point between the commitment by a two-year college to offer courses equivalent in every respect to those offered in the
first two years of a standard four-year college and the commitment to offer non-equivalent courses for use in terminal occupational or other programs in response to specific student or community needs. The designating of courses as either college level or non-college level as well as classifying courses by appropriate year level, freshman or sophomore, seems the principal source of junior college discomfort. The attempt to place appropriate labels on all its course offerings seems to force the junior college to continually ask itself whether or not it is really a college. Recent studies of the junior college seem to indicate that most junior colleges wish to affirm their collegiate status and seem rather reluctant to offer any course that might bring that status into question.

6. If the philosophy represented by Thomas's four functions and repeatedly affirmed in the literature of the junior college was an attempt to compromise two opposing positions, it seems possible that junior colleges attempting to implement these functions might suffer identity problems.

It seems possible that so long as junior colleges identify themselves strongly with traditional definitions of a standard four-year college they may suffer discomfort and identity problems when courses without college-level
labels are offered. If the junior college places emphasis on the word college in the present environment, it seems unlikely that the junior college will be able to fulfill its proclaimed role of offering multiple programs as proposed by Thomas and others.

Clarification of Proposed Philosophy

The six summary statements of historic philosophy presented above were intended to refer to the identity of the kind of institution felt to be needed in order to support the proposed two-year occupational programs in public junior college business curricula. The following summary statements of the proposed philosophy relate to the six summary statements listed above:

1. A new kind of post-high school institution to be called the responsive community college has been proposed as the kind of institution needed to support the proposed programs in business curricula. This new institution should be an independent segment of American education and should establish itself in the system of American education by the educational services it provides.

The responsive community college should cooperate in every conceivable way with all other segments of American education and should not seek to provide those services
which are provided by other institutions. The responsive community college should constantly seek to integrate its services with all other institutions, but establish a definite identity of its own.

2. The responsive community college should place more emphasis on the words "responsive" and "community" than on the word college. This proposed institution should attempt to respond to student and community needs without attempting to label by grade or year-level the educational experiences provided.

The responsive community college should offer educational experiences based on need and the experiences provided should be described in terms other than time and grade-level. Sufficient student ability and aptitude to profit from the provided experience should be the primary guide for participation in the experience and adequate performance of prescribed behavioral objectives or defined outcomes should signify completion.

3. The responsive community college should describe courses and programs in terms of student needs rather than the intended use which students might make of the educational experiences provided. Courses and programs consistent with this proposal would therefore not be described in terms
of transfer, occupational, terminal, and the like, but would simply be described in terms of student need for certain experiences.

4. The responsive community college should always describe and develop itself in terms of helping students develop themselves toward the achievement of student goals.

The responsive community college should establish itself as an institution which stands ready to respond to student needs to the full extent of its resources. Every effort should be made to maintain an open learning environment characterized by freedom, competence and trust. All teaching-learning relationships should be built on mutual respect in the absence of threat. The responsive community college should develop itself as an institution designed to help students; there should be no threat.

Modification of Existing Programs

Among the stated purposes of this study was to make recommendations concerning the possible modification of existing two-year occupational programs in business curricula which would seem to be in keeping with the proposed philosophy developed. The following recommendations are presented for consideration:
1. It is recommended that all two-year occupational programs in business designed to prepare students for entry-level occupational proficiency be based on a description of occupational proficiency similar to that which has been proposed in this study: Entry-level occupational proficiency should be described as an inseparable combination of the personal traits of an individual and the specialized skills he is to perform in his chosen work.

This recommendation attempts to emphasize that the development of personal traits and development of specialized occupational skills should receive equal attention in any attempt to define occupational proficiency.

2. It is recommended that any description of entry-level occupational proficiency in business should include specific references to the kinds of technical knowledge and skills an individual should need to function in certain occupational assignments immediately upon employment.

This recommendation attempts to recognize that any description of entry-level occupational proficiency should contain the specific kinds of behavioral skills which may be needed to perform the technical tasks for which educational experiences may be provided.
3. It is recommended that any description of entry-level occupational proficiency should include references to the non-technical knowledge and skills an individual should need to function in certain occupational assignments immediately upon employment.

This recommendation attempts to recognize that any descriptions of entry-level occupational proficiency should contain the specific kinds of behavioral skills which may be needed to perform the non-technical tasks for which educational experiences may be provided.

4. It is recommended that objectives of existing programs be carefully examined in the light of the above three recommendations to determine if some modification may be in order.

This recommendation attempts to identify the need for careful examination of course and program objectives in light of the proposed description of entry-level occupational proficiency and the specific behavioral skills for which training may be provided.

5. It is recommended that specific behavioral objectives be developed for each course listed in the prescribed two-year occupational programs in business curricula.
This recommendation attempts to identify the need to compare the specific behavioral objectives of each course with the behavioral skills believed to be needed for entry-level occupational proficiency.

6. It is recommended that existing two-year occupational programs in business curricula provide students the opportunity to engage in those educational activities which may be designed to enable each student to describe his own theory of the person he believes himself to be along with the theory of the person he wishes to become.

This recommendation should be an attempt to help students develop and sustain the personal motivation believed needed for the achievement of occupational proficiency; an attempt to help students provide their own reasons for completing the educational experiences to be provided.

7. It is recommended that existing programs be amended so that not more than sixty per cent of the prescribed program be devoted to the development of specialized skills and that not less than forty per cent of the prescribed program be devoted to the development of non-specialized skills. Perhaps the goal of the amendment should be for fifty per cent in each area.
This recommendation attempts to emphasize the equal need of both specialized and non-specialized educational experiences in the two-year occupational programs in business.

8. It is recommended that existing programs be examined to determine the feasibility of including independent study, work experience, and non-campus activities in the program.

This recommendation attempts to emphasize that the two-year programs should be blended as much as possible into the normal routines of students. All community resources should be viewed as potential educational opportunities, and continuing education should be promoted as a natural way of life.

9. It is recommended that new courses be developed when needed to meet certain desired behavioral needs without regard for grade level or academic label.

This recommendation attempts to emphasize that new courses should be developed as needed to meet specific student needs and that neither uncertain grade level nor indefinite academic label should prevent their being made available. The determining questions should be: (1) Will the course fill a student need, and (2) Should the resources of the college be used to provide the experience.
10. It is recommended that existing programs be amended to include as many interdisciplinary activities as possible.

This recommendation attempts to erase departmentalization as a strategy for offering prescribed courses and emphasizes the need to integrate subject matter wherever possible. Fragmentation and segregation of information and knowledge should be avoided, and proper educational experiences should be provided when needed and intentionally related throughout the prescribed program.

Proposed New Programs

Perhaps a new kind of college such as the proposed responsive community college may be needed to offer the proposed new occupational programs in business designed to prepare students for entry-level occupational proficiency. The recommendations which follow assume that the philosophy and organization of the college which attempts to implement these proposed new programs will be structured to support and complement them even though certain changes in traditional procedures may be required.

1. It is recommended that all curricula, instruction, and all other college activities be related exclusively to
student achievement and performance instead of to the passage of time.

2. It is recommended that all educational experiences provided for the development of occupational proficiency in business be described in terms of behavioral objectives and defined outcomes. These objectives and outcomes should be made available to students before, during, and after the educational experience is provided. These objectives and outcomes should include the details concerning the performance expected, the criteria against which performance will be criticized, and the conditions under which the performance will be made.

3. It is recommended that all educational experiences provided by the college be arranged in related patterns of self-contained units. For convenience, the patterned units may be grouped into that which is presently called a "course" or a "program."

4. It is recommended that no certification be made for the student's record until he is able to perform in a satisfactory manner prescribed behavioral objectives under predetermined conditions. The patterned unit is the minimum entity for which certification may be made.
5. It is recommended that the term "two-year" not be used to describe the pattern of educational experiences which may be prescribed to help students achieve entry level occupational proficiency. Although the term "two-year" may be used to give some indication of the average length of time which may be required for some students to complete a prescribed pattern of experiences, completion should be based on performance and students may spend more or less than two years before completing the prescribed experiences.

6. It is recommended that the student be permitted to develop his own theory of the person he believes himself to be and his own theory of the person he wishes to become. All prescribed patterns of educational experiences should provide the opportunity for the student to develop these theories with the help of an experienced mediator/counselor.

7. It is recommended that occupational proficiency be described as an inseparable combination of the personal traits of an individual and the specialized skills he is to perform in his chosen work.

8. It is recommended that each student should prescribe his own pattern of educational experiences with the help of an experienced mediator/counselor. This prescribed
pattern should help the student grow into his own ideal of mature selfhood, including occupational competence, consistent with his own theories of person.

9. It is recommended that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula should provide each student with opportunity to develop confidence in his intellectual and social competence to adjust to ever-changing patterns of life.

10. It is recommended that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula should attempt to integrate various subject matter disciplines. It is recommended that students be associated with teams of mediators drawn from appropriate disciplines and blended into task forces.

11. It is recommended that all patterns of educational experiences developed for business curricula should be integrated as naturally as possible with the lives of individual students. Work activities, civic responsibilities, social affairs, and personal interests should be blended wherever possible into the student's prescribed educational experiences. Continuous education and continuous change should become a natural part of life.
APPENDIX A

PREFACE

The 1963 Vocational Education Act with the 1968 Amendments have provided post-secondary institutions opportunity to develop and implement occupational programs. Historically, vocational education programs existed in a few post-secondary institutions before 1963 Act monies became available in 1964. For example, 13 out of 30 post-secondary institutions conducted 45 programs with 1,997 students enrolled during 1961-62. In contrast, 39 out of 42 post-secondary institutions have about 500 programs with over 40,000 enrolled students during 1969-70. This dramatic growth requires administrative and operational guidelines to be developed and disseminated.

The Guide for Planning Post-Secondary Occupational Education and Technology Programs in Texas was developed utilizing the recommendations of presidents and vocational directors of post-secondary institutions. The Guide provides a common basis for understanding between the Agency and post-secondary administrators. By using the procedures in this Guide as a planning reference, administrators may develop and implement occupational preparation programs. In addition, this publication contains provisions in the Texas State Plan for Vocational Education which apply to post-secondary institutions.

It is anticipated that the utilization of these guidelines will assist in the administration of all post-secondary programs. As changes become necessary, individual pages will be revised and distributed to administrators.

John R. Guemple, Associate Commissioner
for Occupational Education and Technology
INTRODUCTION

The Department of Occupational Education and Technology, in all its activities, has attempted to fulfill the purposes of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended: "It is the purpose of this title to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education . . . so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State . . . those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps . . . will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training."

Further, vocational education as defined in this Act is: "Vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes . . . and is conducted as part of a program designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers or technicians or sub-professionals in recognized occupations . . . but excluding any program to prepare individuals for employment in occupations generally considered to be professional or which requires a baccalaureate or higher degree."

Using this definition as a guide and giving proper consideration to additional requirements of the Act, the department has developed standards of excellence which all programs must meet.

A summation of these standards is as follows:

(1) The program of instruction will develop skills and knowledge required for entry into the occupation for which instruction is being provided.
(2) The program of instruction will be developed and conducted in consultation with potential employers and other individuals or groups of individuals having skills in and substantive knowledge of the occupation which are in keeping with the educational program objective.

(3) The program of instruction will include the most up-to-date knowledge, skills, and competencies required for entering the occupation or occupational field for which the individual is being prepared.

(4) The program of instruction will be sufficiently extensive in content and in duration to enable the student to develop the competencies necessary for employment in the occupation for which he is being trained.

(5) The program of instruction will combine and co-ordinate related instruction with field, shop, laboratory, cooperative work, or other occupational experience which is of sufficient duration to develop competencies for employment in the occupation for which he is being trained.

(6) Classrooms, libraries, shops, laboratories, instructional equipment, supplies, teaching aids, and other materials will be adequate in supply and quality to enable those who are to be trained to meet the occupational objective for which the education is intended.

(7) The instruction will be conducted and supervised by properly qualified teachers and supervisors.

(8) Evaluation of the program of instruction will be made periodically on the State level and continuously on the local level with the results being used for necessary change or improvement in the program.

In order to assure quality through maintenance of these standards a system of approval for the initial program, curriculum changes, qualifications of instructional personnel,
and equipment has been developed and is in use. Approval for a program includes a thorough study of the individual courses comprising the curriculum, the objectives, the job opportunities of those completing the program and the adequacy of faculty, facilities and equipment which will be made available. Finally, the program is reviewed and action recommended by a review committee. An approved program is, therefore, the product of local planning for an educational project or package with review at the State level of the process and product the proposal describes. It is more than a collection of approved courses.

DEFINITIONS

As used in this Guide the following definitions apply:

Course is an organization of subject matter and related learning experiences providing for the instruction of students on a regular or systematic basis for a predetermined period of time.

Curriculum is a series of courses, organized in sequential order, designed to lead the student toward the attainment of occupational aims and objectives.

Program is a planned sequence of study incorporating an appropriate curriculum and other learning, counseling and related activities to prepare students for immediate employment.

Occupational Education includes all students and teachers within identified and described vocational content instructional areas which constitute a program leading to employment in recognized occupations not requiring a baccalaureate degree. Occupational courses may be designed for persons in public schools; persons with socio-economic handicaps; persons who have mental, emotional, or physical handicaps. This term also includes supportive services such as vocational guidance and counseling; research and program development; teacher preparation and development; administrative and supervisory services; acquisition of instructional facilities, equipment,
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and supplies; exemplary programs and projects; and student
work-study programs.

Supervisor is a person who has supervisory responsibilities
for only one type of technical or vocational program.

Director, or other administrator, has administrative
responsibilities for two or more distinctly different types
of technical or vocational programs.

Equipment means any non-consumable device. Included are
publications, hand tools, and machines.

Major Equipment is defined as those fixed or movable articles
peculiarly designed and essential for use in an occupation,
or training for an occupation, which cost $100 or more per
unit.

Minor Equipment is defined as those fixed or movable articles
peculiarly designed and essential to the performance of work
in an occupation, or training for an occupation, which cost
less than $100 per unit.
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