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The Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development is an entity created in the Dallas County Community College District to serve the community in workforce and economic development. The history of the Priest Institute over the last ten years parallels and illustrates the commitment of community colleges nationally to workforce and economic development. The history also reflects similar goals and trends within the state of Texas and, particularly, in the city of Dallas.

The Priest Institute is made up of three distinct entities. One entity is the Edmund J. Kahn Job Training Center; another is the Business and Professional Institute, which provides consulting and training services to business clients. The final service area is the complex made up of the regional North Texas Small Business Development Center and its several related local service operations.

This study provides an analytical history of each of these components and the process by which they came together in a model facility in Dallas. This study also describes perceptions of persons within the Institute
regarding its present mission and purposes and the efficacy of the current organizational structure both internally and within the district operation as an appropriate structure enabling the Institute to meet its goals.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On May 4, 1989, the Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD) held a dedication ceremony for a dramatic new facility located in South Dallas; this stunning new complex was the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development (Dedication 1989).

A DCCCD press release announced the central mission of the organization housed at the Institute: "... a 'brokerage house' that will administrate and market the DCCCD's multi-faceted services to business and industry, ... the District's answer to what it can do for the economic development of Dallas County" (The DCCCD: Coming of Age 1989). The Dallas Morning News focused on another aspect of the Institute's unique mission: "As a symbol of public commitment to a struggling urban area, the Priest Institute is enormously important; as a catalyst for change and renewal, it could be even more significant" (Dillon 1989).

That moment of clarity of hope and vision and purpose has not been typical of the history of the initiatives that were brought together in the Institute. Furthermore, the leadership role ascribed to the Institute within the
district organization has not been fully realized. Nevertheless, the Institute is a viable entity and a valuable resource in the DCCCD, and the vision articulated in May of 1989 is still one of vital importance to the district.

The leaders of the Priest Institute face the task of defining their mission for the last years of this decade and for clarifying their service role for the new century. Their analysis must take into account complex factors ranging from national and state priorities for the expenditures of public money for the public good to the realities of organizational protocols among the colleges and other organizations of the DCCCD. Their analysis must also take into account the peculiarities of their own institutional history.

This study examined and analyzed the events that have brought the Priest Institute to its present situation; it viewed the history in both the larger contexts of economic and workforce development and in the narrower light of the issues of DCCCD purposes and protocols. The study can have implications in the broad education community regarding the roles of community colleges in workforce education and economic development. It can also have specific significance for the professionals at the Priest Institute. A more thorough understanding of their institutional
history may better inform their deliberations as they plan their future service.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study concerned the history of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development of the Dallas County Community College District.

Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of the study was to provide an analytical history of the current organization operating as the Priest Institute. A second purpose was to describe the perceptions of the current staff regarding the present mission and role of the Institute. A third purpose was to describe the perceptions of the staff regarding the likelihood that the Institute can fulfill its mission and role within the current organizational structure. Underlying these specific purpose statements was a thematic assumption that an understanding of an organization's past, both the factual record and the perceptions of the participants, is essential to effective planning for the future.

Research Questions

The primary research questions examined issues of fact and analysis in establishing the historical record. However, other questions addressed perceptions of
appropriate role and function as well as aspirations for
continuing and expanding service. The major research areas
which were examined can be articulated as follows:

1. What events, decision-making processes, organizational trends, and individual leadership actions over the last eight years account for the current organizational configuration and programs of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development?

2. What are perceived to be the principal areas of opportunity for the various entities of the Institute, both in terms of the importance of the service being offered and in terms of growth potential for Institute programs?

3. What are perceived to be the primary inhibiting factors facing the Institute as it attempts to serve the community?

Background of the Study

The subject of this study was the Priest Institute, and a review of the literature indicated that only limited research has been conducted about this particular institution. No references were found in ERIC documents, and only three dissertations appeared to have addressed Institute concerns. A 1992 study by Jeanne Gerlach focused on the experience of the Business and Professional Institute of North Lake College, an office/service that predated and was absorbed by the district entity that became the Priest Institute. This study yielded historical data and valuable insights into the issue of central control versus college authority (Gerlach 1992). A second
study, conducted by Rafael Diaz, focused on the business
and industry training function of the Institute and on
criteria for success developed by Institute personnel and
by employers who used their services (Diaz 1992). The
third study, done by Janis Gayle Kutilek, focused generally
on community college collaboration with business and
industry, but it included examples from the DCCCD Business
and Professional Institute which were pertinent to this
study. One other dissertation influenced this study. John
Neal produced a history of the R. Jan LeCroy Center for
Telecommunications, which, like the Priest Institute, is a
distinct district operation in the Dallas County Community
College District. His methodology and his insights into
the significance of such studies in the college district
have been helpful (Neal 1992).

This study incorporated a general review of literature
relating to the broad topic of business and industry
training, community colleges and economic development, and
college industry partnerships.

Community colleges have recognized this mission of
service to business and industry for more than a decade.
In 1985, the American Association of Community and Junior
Colleges published the results of a major study describing
the widespread phenomena of services and partnerships
already in operation (Day 1985). A 1993 status report
released by the League for Innovation in the Community
College updated the same general categories of activity and accomplishment (Doucette 1993). A second category of resource material revealed various collections of articles describing models of good practice or experiments in limited areas of partnership development; an example of such a study is the collection found in the *New Directions for Community Colleges* series (Waddell 1991). Much collaborative activity among colleges currently takes the form of presentations and roundtable discussions at national meetings such as the League for Innovation 1994 Workforce 2000 Conference (League for Innovation 1994).

Attention was given in the study to the current legal and political status of community colleges and workforce development in Texas. "Senate Bill 642," passed by the Texas Legislature in 1993, substantially changed the way federal and state funds for workforce development and training will be allocated within the state of Texas (*Workforce and Economic Competitiveness Act* 1993). Moreover, in the same session, the legislature also recognized the role of the community colleges of Texas by approving the expansion of the community college legislated mission to include workforce development (Texas Education Code 1994). Such expectations at the political and governmental level have been echoed at the national level in a speech by the Secretary of Labor in which he called on community colleges to be the key players in the
implementation of the Clinton Administration's workforce development initiatives (Reich 1994). While the changes in law and policy priorities are still too new to have occasioned major analysis in the literature, the primary documents themselves were an essential resource in studying and understanding the opportunities and obligations for service that are evolving.

Similar attention was given to certain documents and reports related to the aspirations of the leaders of the city of Dallas and of Dallas County that impact the opportunities available to the Priest Institute, such as the report from the Central Dallas Association (A Future Vision for Downtown Dallas 1993).

The Dallas County Community College District has been sensitive to these trends. In 1985 and 1986, the DCCCD made plans for a centralized and concerted effort to offer contract educational services to the business and industry community. In 1986, the district also became the headquarters of the North Texas Small Business Development Center. By 1989, these programs, as well as some additional workforce training programs previously administered through El Centro College, had been brought together in the new facility in South Dallas.

As the Priest Institute begins its ninth year of existence (counting from its beginnings as the BPI), it may well be the component of the DCCCD most ideally suited to
respond to these recognized needs and trends. It boasts an extensive physical plant, a multidimensional organizational structure, and high apparent congruence between available services and known community needs. The practical issues of focused mission and implementation strategies must be addressed.

In summary, a general review of the related literature established a national, state, and local context for the study of the primary documents that have impact on the immediate situation of the Priest Institute.

Significance of the Study

The training and retraining of persons already in the workforce is an area of potential growth in service for community colleges. The DCCCD recognized this opportunity early in the evolution of such programs and organized to meet the need. The concept was explored, and as already noted, the Business and Professional Institute was created as a central entity to provide the service. However, as the study of the history of the Priest Institute unfolded, it became clear that the Institute has reached its present status not through growth as a planned complete entity comprised of logically interrelated component parts, but, rather, through a series of evolutionary events leading to an aggregation of somewhat dissimilar operations under the common goal of service to business and industry.
Furthermore, another issue was voiced by the leaders of the Institute, noting that the role and mission of the Institute in relation to the roles and missions of the colleges has not always been clearly defined or, when defined, honored in practice. A clearly delineated history of the development of the Institute should be of value in illuminating the current situation.

This historical study produced information and analyses that may inform decision-makers within the Institute. Also, with a better understanding of all the factors, there should be a more cogent basis for decisions made in the larger district context that will impact the Institute. Furthermore, the DCCCD is only one of many multi-college or multi-campus districts providing training to business and industry. No district seems to have a perfect model for organization and delivery of services; a thorough study of the issues underlying decisions and results in the DCCCD model could have wider applicability in the community college world.

**Definition of Terms**

Partnerships between colleges and business and industry are taking increasingly varied forms. Unless otherwise specified, references in this paper dealing with the Business and Professional Institute are to contract training and related services designed for business and
industry clients and delivered by the Institute or its agents. The services of the Small Business Development Center are offered to small businesses or to individual business persons. The Job Training Center serves individuals.

Procedures

This research study was approved by the Chancellor's Cabinet of the Dallas County Community College District (Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting Summary 1994, 16 May). The Provost of the Priest Institute granted the researcher full access to all archives, files, and related records in the various offices of the institute (Bounds 1994a).

In addition to the primary documents, primary sources of information were interviews with DCCCD personnel involved in the history of the Institute. A key resource person has been Glen Bounds, who has led the BPI/Priest Institute project from the time he was the single individual researching the original proposal, through the era of the single-purpose Business and Professional Institute, and to his present role as Provost of the complex Priest Institute. Other interviews represented a range of current and former staff members. Interviews were also conducted with selected clients of Institute services.

It should be noted that the researcher served an internship with the Provost of the Business and Professional
Institute during its first semester of operation. This experience and familiarity with the early history, as well as professional relationships with the early participants, served the researcher well in soliciting information and opinions through interviews. It should also be noted, however, that the researcher now holds a position in the DCCCD outside the Institute, providing for a measure of objectivity in evaluation and analysis.

**Methodology**

The methodology was that of analytical historical research. Allegiance was given to the testimony of the participants in the events and to the extant primary records of the events in producing the actual account of the history of the Institute. The researcher pursued such traditional themes of historical analysis as: the impact of individual personalities in influencing decisions and events; the influence of external events on internal developments; and the phenomena of chains of causation.

**Delimitations**

This study produced a narrative, descriptive and analytical history of the development of the Priest Institute. The study also implemented a focus on issues of mission and organization for service as a valuable source of information for future Institute planning. This study did not directly address quantitative outcomes such as
volume of business or economic impact on the community. The document produced by this study does not suggest a particular solution for future Institute planning; rather, it provides a basis of historical fact and analysis to inform further research and strategic planning activities by the leaders of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development is a part of the Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD), an institution that has evolved in a quarter of a century into one of the major community college systems in the country. The DCCCD has both led and reflected major trends in the national community college movement.

The Development of the Dallas County Community College District

While junior colleges have provided important educational opportunities throughout the twentieth century, the tremendous growth came with the development of public community colleges in the 1960's and 1970's. As noted in one fifty-year comparative study, from 1936-37 to 1986-87, the number of two-year colleges more than doubled (553 to 1,222), and the percent which were public increased 43 percent (44 percent to 87 percent). Forty-seven percent of that increase in the total number of colleges occurred in the decade from 1966-67 to 1976-77 (El-Khawas 1988, 7).

It was in this significant decade that the Dallas County Community College District grew to maturity. The voters of Dallas County created the Dallas County Junior
College District in May, 1965 and approved a $41.5 million bond issue to fund the building of the colleges. El Centro, the downtown college, opened in 1966, and Mountain View College and Eastfield College first admitted students in 1970. Richland College opened in 1972. In that same year, Dallas County voters approved a bond issue for $85 million providing for the expansion of the existing colleges and the opening of three more: Cedar Valley College and North Lake College in 1977 and Brookhaven College in 1978. Brookhaven is the last college in the current master plan (Dallas County Community College District Catalog 1994-95 1994, 5).

The founding Chancellor of the DCCCD was Bill J. Priest, who came to Dallas as the founding Chancellor for the Dallas County Junior College District. Priest served the district in the years of building the system and became Chancellor Emeritus in 1980. The DCCCD's Vice Chancellor of Educational Affairs, R. Jan LeCroy, was named Chancellor of the DCCCD that same year (Milestones of the Dallas County Community College District 1977, with updates). Following LeCroy's retirement in 1988, Lawrence Tyree joined the district as Chancellor (DCCCD Board Names Tyree New Chancellor 1988). Following Tyree's departure in 1990, the district's Vice Chancellor of Business Services, Ted B. Hughes, served as Interim Chancellor (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1990, 6 March). The present Chancellor,
J. William Wenrich, came to Dallas from the Chancellorship of the San Diego Community College District in October of 1990 (DCCCD Board Confirms New Chancellor 1990).

Each college of the DCCCD is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The accreditation of all seven colleges was most recently reaffirmed at the 1993 national meeting of the Commission (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools 1994, 45). The individual colleges also hold program related credentials; records of these are held at each college (Dallas County Community College District Catalog 1994-95 1994, 7).

Throughout the history of the DCCCD, the colleges have offered the traditional services of the comprehensive community college: transfer education, technical/occupational education and training, developmental education, community service and non-credit programs, and a full range of student support and development services. However, in recent years, there has been an increasing emphasis on the direct relationship of the services of the college to the economic welfare of the community. The current DCCCD mission statement reflects this emphasis:

The mission of the DCCCD is to equip students for successful living and responsible citizenship in a rapidly-changing local, national and world community. We do this by providing accessible, accredited, affordable,
cost-effective, quality educational opportunities for development of intellectual skills, job skills, personal growth and/or transfer to a baccalaureate program. In fulfilling our purpose, we further cultural, economic and workforce development in the communities we serve (Dallas County Community College District Catalog 1994-95 1994, 5).

This evolving emphasis reflects a similar trend in the national community college movement.

Community Colleges and Workforce and Economic Development as a National Trend

Following the decade of incredible growth in the number of community colleges, the number of colleges stabilized in the 1980s (El-Khawas 1988, 7). The 1980s became a decade of evaluation, reflection, and study as community colleges examined their mission and attempted to position themselves for service in the 1990s and beyond.

Community colleges measured themselves and their purposes in a context of tremendous social and economic uncertainty. Rapidly changing political climates, upheavals in the national and world economies, and ambiguities in social mores provided a background for more focused awareness of national educational underachievement, a workforce less than well-prepared for world competition, and a potential college student population in which "non-traditional" was becoming the norm.

Community colleges affirmed their commitment to respond positively across all the traditional mission roles
in meeting the new realities facing the nation and the world. One comprehensive response is found in the report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges entitled Building Communities: A Vision For A New Century, prepared under the sponsorship of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges 1988).

Included in that report are themes related to economic and workforce development. In reference to communities beyond the college, the commission members recognize the importance of alliances with employers. They recognize "the mismatch between poorly or narrowly skilled workers and present and future work place requirements" (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges 1988, 38). And they recommend "partnerships with employers for the training and retraining of the community's work force" as an important role for community colleges (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges 1988, 39). The work had already begun.

One of the earliest inventories of partnership programs was compiled by Dorothy Fenwick, who observed, "Broad agreement exists that education and the workplace have too long been strangers to each other" (Fenwick 1983, vii). While the majority of the listings in her report are universities, community colleges are well represented.
In 1984, the series New Directions for Community Colleges published an edition titled *Customized Job Training for Business and Industry*. The authors offered a group of articles to support their contention that "customized training for business and industry is a significant new program occurring at community colleges" (Kopecek and Clarke 1984, 1).

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), now called the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), played a major role in facilitating the discussion of the workforce and economic development issue in community colleges throughout this period. The President of the Association, Dale Parnell, writing in 1985, helped community colleges focus on a critical audience of students. Parnell pointed out the fallacy of defining high school requirements by the standards of baccalaureate-degree standards. While these standards may be appropriate for the top quartile of high school students, they are not what is needed by the middle quartiles, the "neglected majority" who will be the heart of the nation's workforce. As the nation continues to experience the evolution of the worker "from farmer to laborer to clerk to technician," the education of this large student group must incorporate new thinking about preparation for work (Parnell 1985, 16, 17). Parnell said community colleges have a critical role to play in
developing the programs that will provide the excellence in education that is essential in the larger issue of national human-resource development (Parnell 1985, 175).

While Parnell's Neglected Majority focused on solutions in the curriculum, his association assumed a leadership role in the development of community college and business and industry partnerships. One important initiative was the Keep America Working Project (KAW), jointly sponsored by AACJC and the Association of Community College Trustees and described as "a community, technical, and junior college response to the forces transforming the American economy" (Day 1985, 51). The KAW has a number of programs to recognize exemplary practices; however, in the eighties, it made a major contribution through a series of monographs.

The task force issued its original concept paper, "Putting America Back to Work" in 1982 and published a monograph, Putting America Back to Work--The Kellogg Leadership Initiative in 1984 (Mahoney 1984). Parnell explained the importance of the project. He noted that community colleges have not always been recognized for the economic development role they have quietly played. However, he stated, "To pull out of the sequence of recessions of the late 1970's and the early 1980's, all national resource systems had to be energized and put to work" (Day 1985, 2). The KAW project and its publications
have helped bring community colleges and their business and industry partners into that national prominence.

In 1985, the KAW project sponsored a survey of community, technical, and junior colleges. Seven hundred seventy colleges responded to the survey which elicited information about associations with business and industry groups, about training conducted for clients outside the college, and for specific economic development roles and initiatives (Day 1985, 4-6). The data that were reported provide valuable baseline information for that time when community colleges were just moving vigorously into these new relationships.

In analyzing the results of his study, Day noted that there was "still a great deal of room for expansion and improvement" (Day 1985, 31). He also made one key observation regarding an obstacle faced by community colleges: an image problem. He noted the position in the marketplace of business and industry education already held by universities and private consulting firms; executives are inclined, because of personal ties and perceptions of an "academic aura," to turn to these suppliers. Community colleges must work all the harder to develop relationships (Day 1985, 33).

A companion volume to the survey report is the Directory of Business/Industry Coordinators, a listing of more than 200 college administrators or offices
representing programs with business and industry. The final volume in this series in *Keeping America Working: Profiles in Partnership*, a collection of fifty accounts of exemplary practice in business and industry partnerships.

In *Profiles in Partnership*, Day and Rajasekhara surveyed sample colleges to determine their full business and industry training programs, that is, their on-campus degrees and certificates as well as their contract training for business and industry (Day and Rajasekhara 1988, 1). However, they also asked respondents to list specific courses taught on contract, and that list is long and varied (Day and Rajasekhara 1988, 77ff).


The summary of the discussion in that report contained the basic themes being reiterated throughout the community college movement: community colleges have a key role to play in economic development; the challenge is great for serving students with more diverse levels of preparation; colleges must serve not only training but also retraining
needs. Certain phrases bear noting. One prediction stated community colleges will be "in the role of 'convener' and 'broker,' serving as key institutions in marshalling the assets of the community in the service of human resource renewal" (National Roundtable on Economic Development 1987, 67). There was also the recognition that the colleges are "the logical delivery system for technology transfer activities, for technical training, for literacy training, for customized training—for whatever training industry needs its work force to have" (National Roundtable for Economic Development 1987, 67). And finally, there was the statement that "the 'nontraditional' student became the traditional student at community, technical, and junior colleges a long time ago" (National Roundtable on Economic Development 1987, 67).

These efforts in the national community college movement to focus on the role of the colleges in responding specifically to the need for a well-trained and educated workforce took place within the context of continuing general concern about the educational status of the American worker.

In 1987 a report was issued that was commissioned by the United States Department of Labor and prepared by the Hudson Institute. The focus of the report was an analysis of the American economy in a global marketplace and an assessment of the necessary developments that would have to
occur for the country to have the workforce in place that would make the nation competitive.

While the solutions proposed in this report reflect a partisan political position, certain conclusions of the analysis seem unarguable. The report affirmed that a more complex society requires more education for its citizens if those citizens are to be productive. The report stated: "Between now and the year 2000, for the first time in history, a majority of all new jobs will require postsecondary education" (Johnston and Packer 1987, 116). The report also affirmed the need to respond positively to major demographic shifts: to accommodate the retraining of an aging workforce, to continue to integrate women into the workforce with effective support for resulting needs of families, and to provide greater opportunities for underserved minorities to move up the skill and employment ladder (Johnston and Packer 1987, 112-115). The authors also recognized the potential and the importance of "second chance" educational systems which will be developed at the worksite (Johnston and Packer 1987, 115).

In a study of higher education and industry partnerships published in 1988, David Powers and others saw one particular advantage offered by community colleges. The greatest training need of companies involving large numbers of employees is the need for highly trained technicians; however, this employee group is not seen as
mobile. Therefore, community colleges play a vital role in training the local workforce (Powers et al. 1988, 12).

In *Education and U. S. Competitiveness: The Community College Role*, Mary Ann Roe explored the role of community colleges in technology transfer and the renewal of the nation's manufacturing capacity. She focused on the role of the community college as both partner and facilitator in the process. Her concept of the "Education Continuum" provided the framework for her deliberations (Roe 1989, 7ff). She articulated the unique role of the community college:

> This ability of the community college to teach basic skills to those who are underprepared, educate those who may have been denied admission to four year institutions for the first two years of a baccalaureate degree, and develop training to meet worker and industry needs for technology commercialization fills a massive void in the higher education component of the Education Continuum (Roe 1989, 20).

Roe also highlighted the convening, linkage, and networking roles regularly played by community colleges with other educational institutions, community groups and organizations, and businesses (Roe 1989, 67).

Other writers have recognized the roles of community colleges. James S. Fairweather in *Entrepreneurship and Higher Education: Lessons for Colleges, Universities, and Industry* noted the value of the traditional relationships which community colleges have formed with business through
advisory committees (Fairweather 1988, 30). He noted further that "job training and retraining appear most compatible with the mission of the community college" (Fairweather 1988, 69).

In 1990, Dale Parnell once again gave major focus to the issues facing the nation in general and community colleges in particular. In Dateline 2000: The New Higher Education Agenda, he explored the major challenges facing the nation and offered forecasts of potential solutions. He recognized the growing at-risk population in the United States and noted the risk not only for those individuals themselves but also for society at large. He stated, "Two converging forces, a skilled worker shortage and the development of a permanent underclass, are bearing down upon the United States" (Parnell 1990, 103). He recognized the problems of poverty, crime, illiteracy, and the persistent underrepresentation of minority students at the higher levels of educational achievement (Parnell 1990, 107-121). He also reiterated the role that community colleges must play in finding solutions. Ultimately, any solution must be grounded in "systematic attention to human resource development" (Parnell 1990, 37). One aspect of that systematic response must be the development of what Parnell calls the New Economic Development Triangle. This represents the commitment and cooperation of three separate groups: Community, Technical, Junior Colleges and
Vocational Schools; State Colleges, Research Universities and Organizations; and Public-Private Employers and Labor Groups. Parnell emphasized, "And a strengthened relationship between the employer community and the college community will be at the center of new initiatives to meet the challenges of the coming decade" (Parnell 1990, 59).

Jeffrey Cantor also looked at interorganizational initiatives. Cantor studied five model programs in which a community college serves as the hub of a system which combines community college education, government-funded job training, and community economic development activities. Cantor found this arrangement especially valuable in smaller population centers (Cantor 1991, 131).

Positive relationships and innovative programs were well in place by the end of the eighties. The work of the KAW had illustrated early programs, and programs continued to grow. Recognition of the positive relationships began to be reflected in the community college literature. An article by the President of GTE California illustrated the new awareness. David Anderson wrote about a number of partnerships in California, many started through community college collaboration with Chambers of Commerce. He commented, "We have grown to depend on them (community colleges)--or, speaking on behalf of the business community, perhaps I should say that we have grown to depend on each other" (Anderson 1988, 77). Such is the
synergy created among partners envisioned by community college leaders.

A major report published in 1991 stated, "The need to build effective links among schooling, training and the workplace has never been more urgent" (Gold 1991, 5). The report, States and Communities on the Move: Policy Initiatives to Create a World-Class Workforce, provided sketches of successful programs throughout the nation. These programs reflected public sector commitments through local, state or national programs. While the emphasis was on K-12, recognition of the role of community colleges in workforce preparation occurred frequently.

The growing awareness of issues in educational underpreparedness and the need for a globally competitive workforce, as well as the increasing commitment of public policy initiatives in response, called for data to inform decisions. In 1991, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education published Indicators of Education and the Economy, funded by The Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U. S. Department of Education. In this paper, the authors "have assembled a set of eighteen indicators that represent important considerations for discussions about education and the economy and strategies for public policy" (Hoachlander 1991, 1) The data reinforced the general perceptions that serious challenges face the nation in workforce preparation and that "we could be much better
prepared to compete in the 'global village'" (Hoachlander 1991, 7).

By 1991, the idea that community colleges should be partners in economic development was thoroughly assimilated in the movement. A volume in the New Directions for Community Colleges series entitled Economic and Work Force Development included articles on topics ranging from issues of public policy and program development to applications in rural business incubators, distance learning centers in the workplace, and trade in the global economy (Waddell 1991).

An AACC publication issued in 1993 provided a similar collection of descriptions of exemplary practice. It is significant that two of the articles in Partners in Economic Development: Community College Strategies for Collaboration deal with issues of funding (Ryan 1993). As colleges and their business and industry partners become attuned to the incredible need for basic education as well as job skills training, limited resources present a growing challenge.

By 1993, the popular press had recognized the role of community colleges in workforce development. Business Week featured an article titled "Retooling American Workers" and including a subheading "Community colleges are now a key to corporate retraining efforts" (Therrien 1993, 76).

Leaders in business and industry have continued to try to quantify and describe the scope of workforce training. A
A survey conducted by the American Society for Training and Development was reported in 1991 indicating the percentages and costs and subject areas of employer-based training (American Society for Training and Development Industry Report 1991). One particular detail of that report was the notation that 23% of the organizations surveyed said they provide remediation in "the 3 R's" as part of their workforce development training. The figure represents a substantial increase from the comparable remediation figure of 11% in the 1989 survey results (American Society for Training and Development Industry Report 1991, 32, 52).

A series of reports by The Southport Institute for Policy Analysis addressed the incidence of workplace education and training (Dilcher 1993, 1). Of particular interest is the report Learning that Works: The Provision of Workplace Education by Community Colleges. This report was produced in cooperation with AACC. Dilcher's methodology was to conduct "a series of linked national mail and telephone surveys of businesses" (Dilcher 1993, 2). Following that process, she worked with AACC to survey colleges. This report reflected the college survey; however, Dilcher noted that in her survey of small to medium-sized businesses, she found that the firms chose community colleges, vocational schools, or technical institutes first as suppliers of information and technical assistance on workplace education (Dilcher 1993, 2).
The League for Innovation in the Community College also published the results of a major national survey of all two-year colleges in the United States: *Community College Workforce Training Programs for Employees of Business, Industry, Labor, and Government.* (Doucette 1993). The data reflected in the report show that almost all community colleges are now involved in some degree of training for employees of business, industry, labor, and government; however, for most institutions, that training is modest in size. Lack of funding, both for colleges and in company training budgets, was often cited as the cause (Doucette 1993, iv). The report also included a position paper proposing an agenda for action to enhance the role of community colleges as the nation's providers of workforce training. In relation to the funding issue, the author suggested, "Partnerships that would use modest investments of public funds to leverage much larger amounts of private capital to support workforce training appear to be a key to future expansion of the activity" (Doucette 1993, 22).

A report from the Economic Policy Institute also recognized a potential role for community colleges. In *A National Policy for Workplace Training: Lessons from State and Local Experiments*, the authors recommended that "the federal government should fund a national training effort aimed at enhancing the skills of incumbent workers" (Batt and Osterman 1993, 3). Further, they observed that two
viable administrative models exist within which to implement a program: stand-alone agencies and community colleges (Batt and Osterman 1993, 3). While they documented concerns with a blanket national endorsement of all community colleges, they did state, "Where well developed community college systems exist, they represent a very attractive delivery vehicle for expanding support for further training to adults (Batt and Osterman 1993, 40).

In September, 1993, AACC published a document reflecting the analyses made through these various national initiatives: The Workforce Training Imperative: Meeting the Training Needs of the Nation, A Policy Paper on the Role of Community Colleges in Providing Workforce Training (The Workforce Training Imperative 1993). First, this paper articulated a very specific definition of workforce training. The focus was on training for the already employed. While the authors acknowledged the critical role of community colleges in preparing individuals for the workforce, the current "imperative" is for training in which the employer is the customer, and the training is "customer-driven, involves payment by the customer to the training entity, and is usually linked to some economic development strategy of the employer" (The Workforce Training Imperative 1993, 1). The paper outlined specific roles to be played by community colleges, by business and industry, and by local, state and federal
governments to effect the development of a world-class workforce (The Workforce Training Imperative 1993, 9-12).

Also during 1993, AACC, with funding from the U.S. Department of Labor, conducted the Workplace Development Project which resulted in the publication in 1994 of The Critical Link: Community Colleges and the Workforce. The project included a national Workplace Development Institute, a Workplace Development Institute Survey, and a series of regional forums. The survey results provided an additional information base for comparisons regarding workplace training, and the report on the forums included a reiteration of key issues: funding, illiteracy levels in the workplace, community college image, and the need to train and retrain workers for real and future jobs (Falcone 1994, 1-10). The report also included examples of exemplary practice from individuals who participated in the project (Falcone 1994, 13-50). The report also included a list of "new work" occupations designed to address the concern that community colleges train for jobs that will be available when workers are trained (Falcone 1994, 57-83). The report also contains excerpts from The Workforce Training Imperative (Falcone 1994, 51-56).

Support of another sort from the Department of Labor occurred when Secretary of Labor Robert Reich gave a videotaped address to a national League for Innovation conference in New Orleans. His message was that community
colleges can and must play a major role in responding to the needs and in providing workforce education and training (Reich 1994).

These national concerns about an underprepared and undertrained workforce in an increasingly competitive world economy have been reflected in developments in recent years in the state of Texas. As is the case in the national movement, community colleges may offer the most promising solutions to the citizens of Texas.

Community Colleges and Workforce and Economic Development in Texas

The development of community colleges in Texas in the twentieth century reflected the trends at the national level, and by the 1980's, the comprehensive community colleges, especially in urban areas, offered wide ranges of the traditional technical/vocational education programs and non-credit courses in work-related skills development. As the issue of workforce training became more focused on the national level, the same trends were evident in Texas.

Several recent developments illustrate the position of Texas community colleges in relation to workforce development. In 1992 the Governor's Task Force on Strategic Planning for Public Community and Technical Colleges issued a report titled Texas Tomorrow: A Pro Active Agenda for Public Community and Technical Colleges. This report included recommendations to the governor for
policy initiatives to improve the community and technical college systems. While the report was broad in scope, its authors recognized a fundamental reality familiar in the discussion of workforce training: "Demographers tell us that by the year 2000 there will be a significant shortage of qualified people to fill the available jobs, and many of the individuals who should fill these jobs will be unmotivated, undereducated, and underhoused--a permanent underclass" (Governor's Task Force 1992, 1). Among the responses suggested in the report was a call for public policy support in "emphasizing the role of community and technical colleges as regional learning centers, technology transfer agencies, and as regional economic development organizations" (Governor's Task Force 1992, 4).

The importance of workforce education in Texas was underscored by a major change in state-level administration of workforce training as a result of Senate Bill 642, passed by the 73rd Texas Legislative Session in 1993 (Workforce and Economic Competitiveness Act 1993). While the full implications of administration and funding under the new program are not yet clear, major strides have been made toward the recognition of the problems and the structuring of a system for response.

The bill, passed as the Workforce and Economic Competitiveness Act, has resulted in the convening of the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness,
the group that will have oversight of workforce education and training in the state. That group has issued a Strategic Plan (Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness 1994). In the "Preamble" to that plan, they issued a statement of the challenges facing the state in its desire to develop an education and training system that will produce a world-class workforce:

The central problem is that growing segments of the population are not being well-served by the current system. Evidence for the problem exists in a myriad of statistics revealing increasing poverty rates, declining wages, and unacceptable rates of long-term unemployment, school attrition, and adult illiteracy. These conditions exist amidst evidence that success in the labor market of the future will depend upon more education and training, higher-level general and technical skills, and greater flexibility and adaptability on the part of every worker. This new environment requires nothing less than a world-class workforce capable of competing successfully in the global economy (Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness 1994, 1).

The Council continued with program goals and objectives which define the workforce development ideal for the state (Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness 1994, 2-5).

While the Council itself did not address the issue of who or what institutions are best able to further their goals (and, by the provisions of the Act, many of those decisions will be made by local Councils), community colleges stand ready. In a memorandum to community college administrators regarding the Strategic Plan, Bob
Lahti, Assistant Commissioner (Acting), Community and Technical Colleges Division, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, stated: "Texas community and technical colleges are key providers of workforce education and training, and the Coordinating Board encourages your continued good work to meet the needs of Texas students and employers" (Lahti 1994).

The role of Texas community colleges in responding to the need to develop a world-class workforce was, in fact, addressed by the 73rd Texas Legislative Session. Legislation was passed that added two provisions to the list of stated purposes for public community colleges. These areas of responsibility were added:

(7) work force development programs designed to meet local and statewide needs;

(8) adult literacy and other basic skills programs for adults; (Texas Education Code 1994).

One individual who was a leader in the effort to add these statements to the legislated purpose statements for community colleges was the Chancellor of the DCCCD, J. William Wenrich. Wenrich served as chair of a Task Force convened by the Texas Association of Community Colleges to consider the issue of mission expansion, and these added components in the legislated mission statement reflect their work (Caswell 1994).

Wenrich has publicly expressed concern about the nation's "bifurcated society" in which there are, on one
hand, highly educated people who live very well and, on the other hand, large numbers of the disenfranchised who cannot compete (Wenrich 1993, 1). Furthermore, he notes the importance of "smart jobs" equal to the competition of a global economy and asks, "how do we get to the 25 percent who do not finish high school and the additional 25 percent who graduate without the requisite skills to be competitive" (Wenrich 1993, 2). Wenrich asserts that "people who currently are left out or rejected from the technical jobs in our society can perform them if trained in the context of work requirements" (Wenrich 1993, 2), and he provides guidance for a solution:

The imperative is clear: We must bring our bifurcated society back together, must extend the franchise to those who are now disenfranchised, must reintegrate those who have been cast off. If not the community college, then who? If not now, when? (Wenrich 1993, 3).

In Dallas, the community college has been called to action to respond particularly to needs in the Southern Dallas sector of the city and county. In 1993, a study commissioned by city leaders, "The Pierce Report," was published. It specified the developments that would have to take place for downtown Dallas to become a viable economic center. Included in its vision of a successful central business district was the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development, "...a one-stop center to support development of new businesses and help existing
ones overcome all manners of technical and management problems" (Pierce and Johnson 1991, 9)

The Southern Dallas Initiative is a project of the Dallas Citizens Council in cooperation with the DCCCD. This project embodies a commitment to provide educational opportunities, especially in such areas as technician training, in that part of the city (Stone 1993). The Priest Institute is also addressed in a more recent published vision of downtown Dallas. Although the Institute is located geographically in the southern sector, it is also in one of the neighborhoods contiguous to downtown Dallas and, as such, is targeted for enhanced development in A Future Vision for Downtown Dallas (A Future Vision for Downtown Dallas 1993).

The themes in this review are clear and consistent. Across the community college movement nationally, at the state and local levels, and within the DCCCD, there are concerns about an underprepared workforce, both for the cost in individual lives and for the loss of global competitiveness. The literature indicates it is the role of the community college to respond, to develop the programs, the partnerships, and the implementation processes that will create the workforce education and training systems that will empower individuals and strengthen the nation. In this context the history of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development becomes particularly significant.
CHAPTER III

EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE SEPARATE COMPONENTS OF THE BILL J. PRIEST INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

When the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic development was dedicated in 1989, it did not mark the beginning of a new educational endeavor in the Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD). Nor did it celebrate a new location for an established cohesive operation of the DCCCD. Rather, it represented a decision to bring several disparate operations together in a single location under a single administration. To analyze the results of that decision, it is necessary to understand the histories of the separate operations: the Job Training Center, the Business and Professional Institute, and the various components of the Small Business Development Center. There is also a complex story in the evolution of plans for the building itself.

The Development of the Job Training Center

In 1982, the Citizens Council of Dallas began talking with the DCCCD about the development of a skills center for "short-term, fast-track, competency-based, entry-level skills training for adults" (O'Banion 1982a). At that time, the Skills Center, a federal and state grant-funded
training program, was operated by the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) through a contract issued by the city of Dallas. In 1982, the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and the Citizens Council requested that the Dallas County Community College District take over the program and offered assistance in the transition (O'Banion 1982b). The DCCCD Board of Trustees authorized the Chancellor to enter into a contract with the DISD to take over the Skills Center and to notify the City of Dallas that the district would also be taking over the funding which supported it. At the same time, the DCCCD issued contracts to the instructors at the Skills Center, bringing them into the DCCCD as Special Program Instructors (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1982, 17 August). Administratively, the Job Training Center became a part of El Centro College, the downtown campus closest in proximity to the Job Training Center site.

The Job Training Center continued to operate in the same DISD facility on Corinth Street. An additional facility owned by an individual was leased by the DCCCD to house the Auto Body Shop, as it had been under the DISD (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1982, 5 October). The staff who had worked for the DISD, in large part, came to the DCCCD as grant-funded employees. This program shift reflected a change in philosophy in the Board of Trustees for the Dallas Independent School District who decided DISD
should focus on the education of youth and children and let the community colleges take over the adult education. The instructional programs themselves remained essentially the same: beginning accounting, word processing, data entry, production machine class, air conditioning and refrigeration, basic auto mechanics, and an automobile paint and body shop as well as remediation classes that would prepare students for the skills areas (Teter 1994).

The primary purpose of the Job Training Center was to train the hard-core unemployed (Dallas County Community College District Foundation 1987, 1). Most of the students were adults (over the age of 18), many from the Dallas inner city, who had limited academic and job skills who also qualified for individual financial assistance to participate in the program (Teter 1994).

While the JTC was administratively a part of El Centro College, it continued to function as an almost independent operation. With the off-campus location, it was difficult for the JTC to be absorbed into the El Centro College culture. There were also indications of district administrative support for strengthening the management of the Center and El Centro was encouraged to play a strong role in that process (Stone 1986b).

Although some basic and essential maintenance was done at the JTC site, there was a growing awareness of the need for a new facility. In 1984, the DCCCD Board of Trustees
made a major commitment toward that eventual goal; they purchased land on Corinth Street across from the facility then in use and began making plans for a new Center (Dallas County Community College District Foundation 1987, 1).

As plans for the new facility began to unfold, the staff at the Job Training Center were delighted. They watched and participated with interest as plans for their new home began to develop. But it would not be theirs alone.

By early 1987, plans for the new El Centro College Job Training Center were well under way; however, other events had also taken place in the mid-1980's that would impact the design and use of that center.

The Development of the Business and Professional Institute

While the DCCCD colleges had, from the beginning, offered job-related courses on campus, by the early 1980's, they were beginning to look toward targeting training for business and industry. The colleges, some more than others, began to follow the national trend toward offering customized training, often at the business or industry worksite. This kind of activity required new administrative initiatives and structures.

One of the earliest colleges to experiment with a new system was North Lake College. In the Fall of 1984, under the leadership of the President's Advisory Council, which
included Vice President of Instruction Joel Vela, North Lake College first opened the Business and Industry Training Center (BITC). The Center was operational by February 1, 1985 (Gerlach 1992, 52, 53). The college organized a separate administrative office reporting to the Vice President. College officials appointed a director, Shirley Farrow, and hired two account executives, Janice Downey and Rebecca Bartel. The new staff began a vigorous program of marketing instructional programs to area businesses. Courses or classes were supplied through the Continuing Education office of the college or through the Academic Divisions if the client wanted college credit classes. Customized training was also developed by the account executives themselves through consultants whom they would hire.

The North Lake College program was highly defined in regard to personnel roles and functions and administrative operating protocols. Shirley Farrow prepared a detailed manual explaining those procedures (Farrow 1985). Jeanne Gerlach's doctoral dissertation explores in great detail these operating procedures and their applications in the North Lake experience.

Plans for the BITC had begun when Glen Bounds was Vice President of Instruction at North Lake College and Joel Vela was on his staff; Bounds maintained contact with the North Lake staff as the program developed (Bounds 1994b).
In the meantime similar operations were begun at Eastfield College and at Richland College where the administrative leaders also developed procedures to function as college operations (Gerlach 1992, 66, 67). By 1985, district officials were well aware of the trend in training partnerships; however, there was no real mechanism for planning or coordinating or implementing a major institutional effort.

It should be noted that the DCCCD did have major interest in workforce training in traditional technical/occupational education in the seven colleges. Naturally, each of those colleges had extensive contacts with business and industry through their advisory committees. There was also a district Office of Career and Continuing Education that provided leadership and service to these college programs. However, the new idea and the new community college trend was for customized training for business and industry and for contract arrangements for general education and training specifically for business and industry. These areas of emphasis were not fully recognized and staffed at the district level. It seems significant that Fenwick's 1983 Directory of cooperative programs between colleges and business and industry has only one listing for the DCCCD; it is an optical technology program created in partnership with Texas Instruments at North Lake College (Fenwick 1983, 129). This was certainly
not the only program in the district at the time that would have merited inclusion in the Directory; it speaks more directly to the lack of a common district voice to speak on the subject.

By 1985, the Chancellor of the DCCCD, Jan LeCroy, and the Vice Chancellor of Educational Affairs, Jack Stone, initiated an effort to explore how the DCCCD might better respond to the growing need for workforce training and its corollary, community economic development. As a first step, they turned for leadership to the District Director of Career and Continuing Education, Ted Martinez, to convene a Task Force to explore the issue. The Task Force was officially established by the Executive Council on August 31, 1984 (Martinez 1984). Among other recommendations, the Task Force called for the appointment of a District Manager of Business and Industry Relations (Martinez 1985). As the district leaders began to implement the suggestions of the Task Force, Glen Bounds was designated as the individual to head the new effort (Stone 1985a).

Glen Bounds was a logical choice for the leadership role. Not only had he pioneered in the North Lake College business and industry training model, but he also had business experience as well as a long record of academic experience. He was transferred from North Lake College to his new assignment in the office of the Vice Chancellor of
Educational Affairs in August, 1985 (Stone 1985b) and was confirmed in his new position by the DCCCD Board of Trustees that same month (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1985, 6 August).

Bounds' first task was to look at similar programs elsewhere in the country and to prepare an analysis of exemplary practices that would result in a proposal for the DCCCD. Bounds visited a number of community colleges around the United States that were well established in business and industry partnerships. The selection of colleges represented an effort to review the full range of existing and developing organizational structures and services.

Bounds visited several colleges in the Chicago area: College of DuPage, Moraine Valley Community College, the City Colleges of Chicago, and Triton College. He went to Maricopa Community College in Phoenix and Johnson County Community College in Kansas. He attended two national conferences on Business and Industry services where he met with representatives of other colleges, most notably, Lane Community College, located in Oregon (Bounds 1994b).

One question was of particular interest to Bounds in his consultations: is it better to have one separate college doing all business and industry training (and perhaps other non-traditional programs), or is it better to have a central office offering programs through the
existing college programs? The colleges of the DCCCD had been operating in a decentralized mode for contract training; based on the work of the Task Force as well as the inclinations of the district leaders, it was assumed that some centralized program would exist.

After several months of study and on-site analyses across the country, Bounds prepared his report. His final recommendation, made in consultation with the Vice Chancellor and the Chancellor, was for the creation of a central Business and Professional Institute (BPI) which would absorb the related offices and personnel already located at the colleges. This model was approved by Stone and LeCroy, and Bounds began making plans for implementation (Stone 1994). By December, 1985, Shirley Farrow joined Bounds in the BPI program as Program Coordinator (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1985, 3 December).

By December, Bounds also asked the college presidents to designate a college liaison to work with the BPI. As plans were outlined for the BPI to assume leadership over all contract instruction, the presidents began to express reservations and request guidelines for reviewing their large contract programs for possible exclusion (Executive Cabinet Summary 1985, 3 December).

The official date of transfer of budget and operating costs was January 2, 1986. During the Fall semester, 1985,
the Vice President of Business Services at Richland College, Lee Bacon, had served as an administrative intern with Bounds to assist in the development of the model for the BPI. During the Spring semester of 1986, this author served as an administrative intern with the Provost, working primarily on organizational issues (BPI Staff Meeting Minutes 1985, 2 December).

The individuals who had been designated business and industry program development staff at North Lake College, Eastfield College, and Richland College became staff members of the BPI. Other individuals were hired to provide service across the district. The original account executives and their assignments were these: Brookhaven College—Kathleen Whitson; Eastfield College—Duane Penny; El Centro College—Rebecca Bartel; North Lake College—Janice Downey, Janet McDonald, and Robert Peterson; and Richland College—Roseanne Uhlarik and Debbi Harwood (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1986, January 13; DCCCD Board Minutes 1986, January 15). During the spring of 1986, considerable attention was given to issues of marketing, development of training and instruction, general operating procedures, and business procedures.

Among the major projects for the spring was the preparation of a BPI Manual; Shirley Farrow responded with a detailed procedures manual based on the pattern established with the North Lake College BITC (Farrow 1986).
The routine processing of forms among the colleges, the BPI, and the district business office, with all the varied requirements for approval, proved a much greater challenge than working within one college. One response made by the management team was the preparation of a document that illustrated the complexity of the processes as well as providing step-by-step information and directions. This was the booklet prepared by a systems analyst consultant called "Business and Professional Institute Management Information System Data Flow Diagrams" (Schwab 1986).

Bounds also began having meetings with the group of college liaisons, persons who had been appointed to bridge any communications gaps between BPI and college staff.

From the beginning, issues of budget were a source of concern and contention. In the earliest stages of planning a response to the Task Force recommendations, the vision was simply for a manager in the district Educational Affairs office. Such a position would have been a district-funded position. However, as the plans for the district BPI unfolded, the assumption was made that the BPI would be self-supporting. The Chancellor's Cabinet endorsed this mandate that the BPI should cover its own costs, and the district officials agreed (Stone 1994). The district provided start-up funding, but projections called for the BPI to be self-sufficient, repaying the initial district contribution after five years (Bounds 1986a).
Considerable effort was put into decisions about pricing BPI education services, and standard formulas were developed. There was considerable discussion over exactly who was incurring costs in the delivery of the services. The BPI staff members, including account executives and secretaries, were charged to the BPI budget; however, instruction could not be delivered without college support. Continuing Education Office or academic division office staff had to set up classes and carry on routine paper work even if the account executive handled all matters related to finding an instructor and working with the instructor in the design of the instructional program. The original model called for a rather complex formula that accounted for payment of all direct expenses and a portion of indirect expenses to the college, and for the expenses of the BPI operation, and provided that the rest of the revenue would be assigned to indirect expenses for the district. Optimistic production estimates were established, and the projection was made that the district would recover its initial start-up investment and the colleges would be enjoying significant contribution to indirect expenses after five years of operation (Bounds 1986a).

It had been clear from the beginning that it would take a long time for the BPI to become solvent if it had to rely solely on new business. It had originally been planned that since the BPI was to be the marketing arm for
business and industry training and economic development for the entire district, all programs fitting that category should come under its banner. In fact, the plan had been that BPI would "take over" all existing contracts at the moment they took over staff responsibility, January 2, 1986. Since many programs across the district were fully staffed and operational, this change would be made originally only in accounting for the programs financially; however, future contacts with the business and industry partner would be under the management of the BPI. The basic premise would continue that the colleges would deliver service with the BPI account executives located at the college campuses marketing programs and facilitating delivery (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1985, 2 December). Even in this early stage of the history of the BPI, consideration was given to bringing the account executives together in a central location to provide that service. However, when the Provost sought input on the suggestion from his account executives, their reaction was against leaving their college locations (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1986, 7 April).

As it happened, not all programs in service to business and industry and programs involving contract training shifted to the BPI. The colleges were reluctant to give up programs of long-standing that were both lucrative and embodied considerable pride of ownership by
college staff. In a memorandum to the Presidents in March, 1986, the Vice Chancellor sought help from the colleges in getting programs transferred to the BPI. He asked the Presidents to list and transfer to the BPI all courses that were either offered on-site for a client or were offered in a situation in which the client controlled the enrollment (Stone 1986a). Nevertheless, by April, 1986, exemptions were being made; a college had the option of appealing to the Vice Chancellor, and if the college staff could demonstrate that the program and the client would be best served by staying under the exclusive authority of the college, then with the approval of the Vice Chancellor, the program would remain totally with the college (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1986, 7 April). College by college, case by case, major partnership programs were exempted from the new alignment. By June of 1986, the decision had been made by the DCCCD Executive Cabinet that the colleges would retain all contracts with public schools, with associations related to their instructional programs, and with community-based organizations in their service areas (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1986, 7 July).

In the summer of 1986, a major change in the financial plans was made. A proposal was made that most business-related functions be returned to the college business offices; the BPI indirect expenses would be funded by charge-backs to the colleges. Furthermore, the BPI would
receive no financial reward when it contracted for credit instruction (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1986, 6 June). The new financial model was developed and went into effect September 1, 1986. Once the colleges were in control of the budget, new issues arose for the BPI. The BPI was still held accountable for contract production levels through the system of charge-backs for BPI expenses, but since it did not input the contracts into the district system, it did not always get credit. BPI staff called for a system of marking courses that would insure BPI credit (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1986, 15 December).

There was some concern over the decision to have charge-backs to the colleges. Bounds proposed that funding for the BPI come out of district funds prior to allocations to the colleges and suggested that the BPI could be held accountable through tracking of BPI income and expenses. He stated in a memo: "I had no objections to the direct charge-back process in theory, but in practice, it was destined not to work. . ." (Bounds 1986b). He concludes, "With the charge-back process. . ., we would continually have colleges trying to work around the BPI process" (Bounds 1986b). Nevertheless, the new funding model was put into operation and continued with some refinements (Hughes 1986).

The problem of identifying the courses that should be properly credited to the BPI was not easily solved. The
suggestion to use unique section numbers to identify BPI courses was rejected by the college registrars; however, the district Business Affairs office pursued adding fields to flag courses in the course schedule data base (Hughes 1986).

There were also concerns because the BPI account executives were frequently offering essentially the same programs as the college Continuing Education division. There were problems with pricing differentials as well as territorial issues. Soon there was an proposal to attempt to produce a document that would clarify the respective roles (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1986, 15 September). Actually, two documents resulted (Division of Responsibility Between BPI and Colleges for Credit Courses 1986; Division of Responsibility Between BPI and Colleges for Non-Credit Courses 1986). Bounds shared copies of these documents with the Executive Cabinet in October (Executive Cabinet Meeting Summary 1986, 17 October). Discussions of the rules with the district Career and Continuing Education Deans continued (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1987, 9 January).

As the BPI began operations, the need for office space grew quickly. By November, 1986, Bounds requested that the district rent office space for the BPI, including the account executives, reflecting his desire to bring the whole BPI operation together in one place. (Bounds, 1986c).
By March, 1987, the DCCCD rented space for the staff of the BPI, not including the account executives, in the Moline Building, an office building one block from the District Office. That space was renovated and furnished and housed the Provost and the Program Director, as well as support persons. Account executives and secretaries continued their work at the college campuses. In September of 1987, the BPI added a full-time business officer. This was the former Vice President of Business Affairs at North Lake College, Mike Howard (BPI Staff Meeting Minutes 1987, 21 September). In 1987, the BPI was also joined by another program in their Moline Building Offices.

The Development of the North Texas Small Business Development Center

When Glen Bounds made his national study of business and industry training centers, one college program had been particularly interesting. Lane College, he learned, was the home of the regional Small Business Development Center, a program funded by the Small Business Administration. This service seemed particularly appropriate for a community college interested in economic development. Some time later, the administrators of the North Texas Small Business Administration decided to move their program out of the University of Texas at Arlington and contacted Bounds regarding his possible interest in taking over the regional initiative (Bounds 1994b).
In April, 1986, Bounds shared with his staff the news that the DCCCD, and specifically the Business and Professional Institute, might become the new grant manager for the major programs of the North Texas Small Business Development Center (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1986, 7 April). By the end of the year, Bounds announced the receipt of the grant from the Small Business Administration to develop the program (Executive Cabinet Meeting Minutes 1985, 2 December). This role was, in fact, assumed by the district at the beginning of 1987, and the initial Small Business Development Center staff members joined the BPI group. Norb Dettman was approved as the first SBDC Regional Director in January, 1987 (DCCCD Board Minutes 1987, 14 January), and he was joined in the Moline Building in February by Assistant Director, Joan Hassenflu (Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes 1987, 3 February). In January, Bounds briefed his staff on the SBDC and encouraged the BPI account executives to market the services of the SBDC. At that same meeting, Dettman announced that Eastfield College and North Lake College would each become a Small Business Development Center Counseling site (BPI/BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1987, 19 January).

From the beginning, two distinct SBDC operational levels were in place. The North Texas regional office was created with oversight of a large geographic area
supporting work in 49 counties. Much of the original energy in the SBDC office was used to set up the subcenters. Certain of those subcenters would provide the second level of service in Dallas.

As plans began to be made for a new building, the opportunity evolved for the SBDC to create in its local organization several significant and distinct support services through subcenters to serve Dallas small businesses.

Each of these three entities--the Job Training Center, the Business and Professional Institute, and the North Texas Small Business Development Center--would share the new facility being built on Corinth Street. But that new facility itself had a rather complicated path of development.

The Building of a New Facility

As is true of much of the history of the Bill J. Priest Institute of Economic Development, there was not an original moment when someone conceived a single idea that reached fruition in the dedication of the new facility. Rather, the new facility evolved out of a series of commitments and values reflected in separate DCCCD plans.

From the time the DCCCD and El Centro College assumed administrative control of the Job Training Center, the issue of a suitable facility was under discussion. Minimal
upgrades were made to the properties in use at the time of the transition; however, there was a strong feeling that the District and the community would be well served with the construction of a single new center. As noted earlier, land was purchased on Corinth Street, and plans were formulated for a new facility to house the JTC programs.

In the meantime, there was strong sentiment in the city of Dallas for supporting the economic survival of Bishop College, an Historically Black College located in the southern section of the city. Bishop College had a portion of land and a building which they proposed to sell to the DCCCD; the DCCCD would renovate and convert that building into a center for job training. This project would provide significant workforce development opportunities in an underserved area of the city. Not only would it house the programs of the Job Training Center; it would also house a Business Incubator and counseling for small businesses (Dallas County Community College District Foundation 1987, 2). The DCCCD Board approved the purchase of property from Bishop College in August, 1985 (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1985, 6 August). Cedar Valley College began to work on curriculum and educational specifications for programs at the new site. Plans were made to emphasize business/office occupations, engineering technology with an emphasis in electronics, and the construction trades. A new building would be added to
house this last program (Executive Cabinet Meeting Minutes 1985, 20 September). This new facility would be called the Dallas County Technical Institute (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1986, 6 February). However, as plans were pursued for renovation of the existing building and for construction of the additional building, it became evident that costs would be more than anticipated; furthermore, hard times had begun to settle on the Dallas area, and the ability of Bishop College itself to survive financially became questionable (Stone 1994). The DCCCD Board of Trustees put the project on an indefinite postponement in 1987 (Dallas County Community College District Foundation 1987, 2).

One other significant thread of planning would find its way into the fabric of the Priest Institute. In the original Master Plan conceived for the Dallas County Junior College District in 1966, a Conference Center had been included along with the seven colleges; however, no definite date had been specified for its completion (Dallas County Community College District Foundation 1987, 2). In the heady days of the eighties economic boom in the Dallas area, exploration of construction of such a center began. The decision was made to name the Conference Center in honor of Bill J. Priest, the founding Chancellor of the DCCCD, and a campaign for fundraising was begun. In the meantime, the Las Colinas Corporation contacted North Lake
College about the use of a portion of their property for a golf course. By December, 1982, these plans came together. A lease agreement was signed that would allow the construction of the golf course on property belonging to North Lake College; furthermore, this arrangement would facilitate and help underwrite a Conference Center which would also be built on the property and would be named the Bill J. Priest Conference and Retreat Center. This facility would be able to serve the dynamic business community of the Las Colinas area. With its location in the heart of the Sunbelt and easy access to the Dallas-Fort Worth airport, it would become a national center for conferences that would serve the national education community as well as the business sector. And it would be a laboratory for the hospitality and food service programs in the DCCCD. Contributions from the private sector for the Priest Conference Center totaled $257,000 by 1984 (Dallas County Community College District Foundation 1987, 2). In 1986, architect and construction documents for the Bill J. Priest Conference Center were prepared and reviewed by the Board of Trustees; however, by July, the documents were put on hold for bidding in 1987 (Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes 1986, February 6-July 1). Unfortunately, this developing scenario was not to come to fruition.

Even as architectural and construction plans were being drawn up for the Conference Center, the feasibility of the
concept began to fade. The Dallas area economy began a serious downturn, and, in time, it no longer seemed that the Conference Center could be an economically viable plan. However, DCCCD Foundation Executive Director Carole Schlipak found that donors were still willing to have their contributions used in support of another facility named in Priest's honor should such a plan emerge (Shlipak 1994).

Finally, the BPI and the SBDC were continuing to grow in function and in staff. The rental of space at the Moline Building had never been seen as a permanent solution; finding a permanent office and service home became a high priority.

By 1987, these various threads began to come together to form a new plan. The idea of building a Job Training facility at Bishop College was on an indefinite hold. The decision was made to expand the plans for the new facility on the land the district had purchased on Corinth Street. Such a location would honor the value of providing service to South Dallas, one of the motivations behind the plans for a Bishop College facility. With the plans for a national Conference Center on the North Lake College campus on hold, in April, the DCCCD Board voted to make a major commitment to the community in the new Corinth Street facility and to name it in honor of Bill J. Priest (Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes 1987, 7 April). The major fundraising effort in support of the new facility was conducted by the
Executive Director of the DCCCD Foundation, Carole Shlipak. This proposal to honor Bill J. Priest with a center dedicated to economic development for Dallas was very well received, and appeals to the Foundation directors and the corporate community were answered enthusiastically. A major gift in excess of one million dollars was made by Mrs. Edmund G. Kahn (Shlipak 1994). Contributions for the project totaled more than two million dollars (DCCCD Foundation Director Retires 1994, 2). The major gift from Mrs. Kahn was made in memory of her husband, one of the founding fathers of the DCCCD, and was designated specifically for the Job Training Center (Priest Institute for Economic Development 1989).

Another major shift in emphasis was having an impact on planning for this building. In February, references were still being made to the assumption that the new facility should be clearly identified as an adjunct of El Centro College, the administrative overseer of the Job Training Center (Stone 1987a). However, by late summer, Stone was advising the JTC staff of a major change. Administrative responsibility for the JTC staff and programs was being shifted from El Centro College to the Provost of the Business and Professional Institute. Furthermore, the vision for the scope of the programs in the building itself was expanding. The facility would not only house the Job Training Center, the original purpose behind the building
project; it would also house the Business and Professional Institute and the Small Business Development Center. This change in administrative management of the Job Training Center would not only relieve El Centro College of the financial demands and uncertainties of a major grant-funded program, it would also provide on-site management and support for the Job Training Center (Stone 1994).

Even as plans were being made for the North Texas Small Business Development Center to move to the new building on Corinth Street, plans were begun for a related operation. Even before the construction of the Institute for Economic development was complete, plans were made for an expansion. The new operation was to be a Business Incubation Center (BIC). The BIC was built in a location attached to the back of the original building. It featured numerous small, private spaces where new companies could establish an office; it also provided for shared support services such as telephone answering and message service, secretarial service, access to office equipment, and other features a new company could not support alone. Occupants of the BIC would pay for these services, and the BIC was envisioned as an operation that could cover its own costs and perhaps offer support for the general overhead costs of the Priest Institute (Howard 1994a). This Business Incubator is also unusual in that it is one of the few non-profit incubators in existence; furthermore, of all
incubators, only four percent are operated by community colleges (Kent 1991, 34).

The formal groundbreaking for the Bill J. Priest Career Training Complex took place on December 10, 1987. According to an account of the event in a staff newsletter, the basic purpose of the facility was clearly stated at the groundbreaking: "The Career Training Complex . . . will house, under one roof, all of the DCCCD's outreach services dedicated to business development and training" (Business and Professional Newsline 1988). Newspaper coverage took note of the extent of contract training in the district: "Since the Institute was founded in January 1986 the district has entered into 370 contracts with 200 companies" (New Center to Offer Business Training 1987, H-2). The staff paper noted that Dallas Mayor Annette Strauss had offered a hopeful message: "Mayor Strauss also commented that the presence of the complex in South Dallas would contribute to the economic health of that area" (Business and Professional Newsline 1988).

In the months between the groundbreaking and the dedication of the new facility in May, 1989, the programs of the Institute continued to develop in their separate locations, with the BPI, in particular, still trying to clarify its avenues of economic development services to the community and its relationship to the other colleges of the district.
Development Under a Single Administration

The three entities that would share the facility on Corinth Street continued to mature. There were significant developments regarding the Job Training Center. Soon after the transition to administration under the BPI, a new director, Baltazar Acevedo, Jr. was appointed. A very welcome change occurred when the Special Program Instructors were granted a Council (Stone 1988c). This group of teaching professionals had felt unrepresented in the district structure; they did not consider themselves appropriately grouped with support personnel; however, they were not accorded faculty status. This new Council recognition provided a formal voice in the district decision-making processes.

This period was a time for significant reflection by the Business and Professional Institute. With Shirley Farrow's retirement, Bounds announced his intention to eliminate the position of Program Director. Instead, he would create a position of Director of Marketing and Contracted Sales (Bounds 1989). Gerardo Moreno was named to that position officially as Director of Marketing and Contract Instruction; Moreno's background reflected business and sales experience (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1989, 10 January). When Moreno joined the BPI, he announced two thrusts in his efforts: market penetration
and training account executives in planning and time management (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1989, 23 January).

Also during this period, the Provost initiated a significant study of the Business and Professional Institute. Susan Muha, a Richland College administrator, was serving an internship in the spring semester of 1988 with the BPI (BPI Staff Meeting Minutes 1987, 10 December). At Bounds request, Muha conducted a survey, questioning both college presidents and BPI account executives. She asked fifteen questions, covering a full range of specific BPI activities, procedures, and relationships. She also conducted interviews with the presidents and, at times, was given opportunities by those presidents to interview other staff.

Muha's report included all survey responses, either as the participants' written comments or as Muha's notes on interviews. Muha also provided her own summary comments and observations. As she noted, one response to the survey produced almost universal agreement. In response to a question regarding bringing account executives into a central location, there was virtual unanimity in the response that the account executives must be located on the college campus. There were, however, concerns about their roles. One of the first concerns had to do with areas of emphasis in the account executive's job. While they
recognized that they were primarily marketing people, they felt a need for more training as educators. In other words, they expressed a desire to develop not only sales abilities but also product competence. Survey responses also reflected tension based on a dual identity: the account executives were central BPI employees and responsible to direction from that office; however, they were under pressure to be college people and develop college loyalties. They also felt like outsiders when there was a necessity to get something done by someone else at the college. Their final area of major concern was the issue of financial accountability. Neither the presidents nor the account executives were satisfied with the structures for reporting and being held accountable for income. Respondents pointed out a number of disincentives working in the system in place at that time (Muha 1988). This review of perceptions that were held in early 1988 is valuable. These are precisely the issues that continued to occupy much of the time and energy of the leaders of the BPI initiatives once they settled in their new Institute.

One other anomaly reflects the lack of recognition within the DCCCD of the central role played by the BPI in business and industry training. In 1988, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges sponsored a survey of business and industry training. The response for the DCCCD was supplied by a staff member in the district
Office of Career and Continuing Education. In the section identified as a listing of all courses taught to business and industry by the responding colleges, no courses or programs are included for the DCCCD (Day and Rajasekhara 1988).

The Small Business Development Center expanded its programs in the DCCCD. By the time of the groundbreaking, ten subcenters had been established in the North Texas region (BPI Staff Meeting Minutes 1987, 15 December). Bounds and Dettman presented an update to the Executive Cabinet early in 1988. Dettman noted that the Counseling Centers created at North Lake College and at Eastfield College were to serve as information resource centers for small businesses and that similar centers could be established at any college that could provide space. Bounds provided an overview of the proposed Incubator Program (Executive Cabinet Meeting Minutes 1988, 19 February). The SBDC also created a new program, originally called the Bid Assistance Center, later renamed the Center for Government Contracting. The director for that center was David Lee Sprague (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1989, 10 January). Although the Small Business Incubator, later the Business Incubation Center, would not open formally until 1990, a director was named during the critical planning phase. The new director was Bonnie Franke-Hill (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1989, 10
January. Another important subcenter had been created called the International Center. Plans were being made for this operation, under the leadership of Beth Huddleston, to locate in the World Trade Center. However, until that plan came to fruition, that operation would remain in the Moline Building and not make the move to the Priest Center (BPI Staff Meeting Minutes 1989, 3 March).

Another opportunity emerged in the economic development arena during this period. Bounds was approached by the director of the Center for Occupational Research and Development (CORD) about the possibility of setting up an Advanced Technology Center in the DCCCD (Stone 1988a). While the nature of the DCCCD project would evolve over some time, this contact did produce membership for the DCCCD in a new organization, the National Coalition of Advanced Technology Centers (NCATC), which is an affiliate organization of the American Association for Community Colleges which operates under the leadership of CORD (Stone 1988b).

There was also considerable discussion during the construction phase of the facility about its eventual and official name. At the groundbreaking, the name in use had been the Bill J. Priest Career Training Complex. While that name made sense when the facility was envisioned primarily as an expanded Job Training Center, it did not seem to encompass fully the work of the SBDC and the BPI.
In a memorandum to the Chancellor, Bounds made a request to change the name of the facility to the Bill J. Priest Economic Development Complex (Bounds 1988). Bounds explained this to his own staff saying that the old name "does not convey what we really do, and with the recent economic condition of Texas, economic development should be emphasized" (BJP Staff Meeting Minutes 1989, 3 January). The name change was finalized by the DCCCD Board as the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development in time to prepare appropriate materials for the dedication (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1989, 10 January).

The construction of the building continued on schedule. The planning for the Priest Career Training Complex included one feature that represented a first in Dallas. The City of Dallas had authorized a fund to underwrite art projects for public areas. The DCCCD issued a Prospectus calling for applications from artists to create artworks for both interior and exterior sites at the Complex (Prospectus 1988). Contracts for artworks were issued to three artists by early 1989 in anticipation of completion for the dedication (Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 1989, 10 January).

The new Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development was finally dedicated on May 4, 1989. An elaborate ceremony was held to mark the occasion. A proclamation from the Mayor of Dallas extolled this
"partnership role in helping to promote long-term economic growth" (Dedication 1989). The Vice Chancellor added his comment, "We're here to put education to work for business" (The New Frontier 1989). The major press release for the dedication featured the key elements of service which were envisioned. The Institute was identified as "a 'brokerage house' that will administrate and market the DCCCD's multi-faceted services to business and industry" and as "the District's answer to what it can do for the economic development of Dallas County." Further, the release stated in reference to the students at the Job Training Center: "It was the District's strong commitment to this student population that prompted the decision to locate the new facility in one of the city's south Dallas 'enterprise zones.'" Finally, the press release emphasized: "The Institute will serve the entire Dallas business community, yet the District plans to work diligently to encourage minorities in particular to make use of the resources available through the facility" (The DCCCD: Coming of Age 1989).

As a fitting end to the day, the Priest Institute was honored in the evening at the annual Chancellor's Council Dinner (Dedication 1989). In a permanent home at last, the staff of the various offices and services of the Priest Institute could continue with their business.
CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BILL J. PRIEST INSTITUTE
FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The dedication of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development marked an important point in the history of the Priest Institute, as much for what was said about the role and mission of the Institute as for what it meant for the occupants organizationally. As was recounted in Chapter III, this dedication marked a moment of great hope. The city of Dallas was in a severe economic depression; much of the distress was in the industries of real estate development and banking, industries of major importance in Dallas. The idea that the community college district, with help from a significant number of community donors, had stepped forward to demonstrate a major commitment to job training and economic development, was met with exhilaration.

The building itself was seen as a beautiful, state-of-the-art facility in an area of town that had not benefited from the boom of the eighties and had not seen much hope for the future. However, the Priest Center symbolized new hope and a new commitment to the economic redevelopment of the southern Dallas area. The building itself was dramatic; the landscaping was elaborate, and the building
exhibited another first for Dallas. The artists who had been selected in competition and contracted by the DCCCD Board had put in place the art works representing the first implementation of a contribution from the new fund for art for public buildings. These were featured at the dedication (At a glance 1989). A Dallas Morning News report published some months after the dedication reinforced the theme: "Some buildings are more important for where they are than for how they look, and the new Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development is one of them . . . as a symbol of public commitment to a struggling urban area, the Priest Institute is enormously important; as a catalyst for change and renewal, it could be even more significant" (Dillon 1989, 1C).

At the Dedication ceremony, Provost Glen Bounds proudly introduced the chief administrators for the various component programs of the Priest Institute. These first leaders would make up the team that would take on the responsibility of the administration of the district's efforts in workforce training and economic development. Those original leaders were: Baltazar Acevedo, Jr., Director, Edmund J. Kahn Job Training Center; Norbert R. Dettmann, Regional Director, North Texas Small Business Development Center; Bonny Franke-Hill, Director, Business Incubation Center; Gerardo Moreno, Director, Business and Professional Institute; and David L. Sprague, Director,
The concept of a leadership team for the Institute as a whole is an elusive one. While there was a sense of common ground in training people for work, either as individuals in the Job Training Center or through business contacts and contracts, there was also a great of autonomy in the separate functions. Again, it is instructive to look at the history of the component parts of the Priest Institute.

The Growth and Development of the Job Training Center

The Job Training Center moved from the old DISD building into the Priest Institute with its programs essentially intact. Most of the programs moved to the new center: air conditioning/heating and refrigeration and basic automobile service moved; the automobile body shop did not. Other programs in operation at the new Center included data entry, basic accounting, secretarial word processing, and beginning clerical skills as well as remediation classes. There were also classes to prepare students to test for the GED credential (Teter 1994).

The Job Training Center at the Priest Institute also featured fine new support systems. In addition to well-equipped classrooms and laboratories, the new building had a library and media center and comfortable areas for
staff and for student-staff interactions. Staff members of the Job Training Center were much involved in the planning of the new facility and felt a sense of ownership and involvement from the opening of the new Center (Teter 1994). The Priest Institute also included a child-care facility. The DCCCD Foundation acquired funds which made it possible to open the center in the fall of 1989 (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1989, 17 October). The Center opened under a contract with Child Care Dallas on April 12, 1990 with eleven children (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1990, 3 April). This was an important benefit for students in the classes at the JTC, many of whom were single parents. Unfortunately, the capacity of the facility was quite limited, and Child Care Dallas was unable to make the operation financially viable, and the childcare facility is currently not in use. Fortunately, other child care centers are located close to the Institute (Bounds 1994b).

The Job Training Center continued to offer a wide range of job-skills development programs to equip the students for employment. Not all the original programs survived. The air conditioning program and the basic automobile service program both closed due to lack of employment opportunities for graduates. However, the variety of office skills programs increased. Many students also took advantage of basic remediation in reading, writing, and mathematical skills (Teter 1994).
In addition to training in basic job skills, students received training on the norms of the workplace—dress, language, general behaviors. Staff at the Center developed innovative programs to better prepare the students to make the transition into the workplace. Sharon Beauchamp developed a program to use JTC students as hosts and hostesses for the seminars and conferences held by the Business and Professional Institute and the various components of the Small Business Development Center. She coaches the students on the dress, the manners, and the protocols of the meeting. These experiences allow students to interact positively with persons in a professional setting and activity (Beauchamp 1994).

Another well-publicized endeavor at the JTC is the Unique Boutique. One of the JTC Special Program Instructors, Juanita Marquez, developed a collection of clothing appropriate for job interviews and for work in an office setting. She has encouraged employees of the District and others to contribute appropriate clothing. In addition to providing a prospective new member of the workforce with a basic outfit in which to go out to meet the world, Marquez offers advice on general appearance and accessorizing as well. This has been one of the most popular programs of the Center (The unique boutique 1991).

The Job Training Center is essentially grant-supported. Although individuals who are not eligible for
financial support may attend the classes at a market price, such enrollments are unusual. Most students receive support from the Job Training Partnership Act or similar programs.

In the 1980's, the El Centro College Job Training Center was recognized as the primary deliverer of government-funded training in Dallas. At the time of the conversion from DISD management to El Centro College management, the funding was a federal grant administered by the city of Dallas; however, responsibility for the government programs passed to the Private Industry Councils (PIC's) of the city of Dallas and Dallas County in 1989. As the Job Training Center became operational at the Priest Institute, funding was distributed through both Councils, and the results for the Job Training Center were less than satisfactory. Internal difficulties in the PIC organizations created delays and funding cuts that hampered the operations of the JTC and other providers (DCCCD/JTPA Program Status 1989). Problems were resolved, however, and by June of 1990, the JTC was able to report closing out its best year on record with the largest number of students and the largest number of placements (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1990, 5 June). In April, 1991, the Private Industry Councils were combined to provide better service (Larrea 1991). Under the leadership of Laurie Larrea, the Private Industry Council (PIC) for Dallas County continued
awarding major funding to the Job Training Center, but it also began to support a variety of providers in the county through its system of competitive bidding.

There was also erosion of the idea that the Job Training Center was the primary deliverer of job skills training within the the DCCCD. Although several of the district colleges had received small amounts of PIC funding for unique programs for several years, it was only in the 1990s that major funding applications began to be developed by the colleges. With the decentralization of authority in the DCCCD and with the recognition that each college could pursue its own best efforts in developing programs to meet its unique community’s needs, these applications multiplied (McClure 1994).

A significant organizational shift affecting the continuity of the JTC operation needs to be acknowledged. In 1990, the Provost of the Priest Institute reported to the Vice Chancellor of Educational Affairs. In July of that year, the Vice Chancellor transferred the Career and Continuing Education Office from the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor of Educational Affairs to the Office of the Provost of the Priest Institute. This move was made in the interest of a better balance in work load in the whole Educational Affairs operation (Stone 1990, 23 May). The new structure also allowed for cooperative work between the JTC and Career and Continuing Education Offices.
in planning for workforce training and development initiatives. However, in the new organization developed by Chancellor Bill Wenrich, the Provost began to report directly to the Chancellor, and plans were made for the Career and Continuing Education office to return to the Educational Affairs area in July, 1991. However, during the year, Baltazar Acevedo left the DCCCD to assume a college presidency in the Houston Community College District, and the Career and Continuing Education Director, Ted Martinez, stayed at the Priest Institute as head of the JTC when the rest of the Career and Continuing Education staff returned to the district office. (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1991, 18 June).

A major crisis occurred in May, 1994 when the initial awards recommended by the staff of the Private Industry Council provided funding for none of the grant applications submitted by the Job Training Center at the Priest Institute. Investigation of the process led Institute officials to conclude that they should appeal that funding decision to the PIC board. They made the appeal, and ultimately were awarded three contracts; however, the funding level was far below that of the request and below that of previous years. At the end of June, the Provost notified a substantial number of staff members that their positions were terminated. The DCCCD agreed to provide ninety days employment to support these persons in seeking
other positions in the DCCCD or elsewhere. The JTC will continue to offer remediation, counseling, and GED preparation, but the only specific job skills program at this time will be in computer applications, the program with the best placement of graduates (Bounds 1994b).

The Job Training Center was not the only Institute program to face challenges. The Business and Professional Institute also underwent major changes.

The Growth and Development of the Business and Professional Institute

The rhetoric of the day of dedication of the Priest Institute that it would be the administrative arm of workforce and economic development failed to acknowledge the fact that the pendulum had already begun to swing in another direction.

As noted earlier, the original concept that all college contracts with business and industry would be transferred to the administrative control of the district Business and Professional Institute simply did not happen.

In an attempt to clarify the situation, a renewed emphasis was placed on the description that said the BPI was the marketing arm for the district and the colleges were the service delivers. This statement was not fully descriptive either. While BPI account executives were working at the colleges and with the colleges, the colleges did not give them exclusive marketing rights in the college
service area. And although the BPI continued to develop its own instructional programs, Continuing Education program developers continued independent operations working with external clients as well.

Furthermore, the discussions continued about a fair and equitable financial model. The Business and Professional Institute was still expected to cover its own expenses and provide revenue to the colleges. The matters of identifying and accurately accounting for the revenue and expenses became a matter of extensive debate, and various proposals were put forth to the district leadership.

Some of the issues of frustration on the part of Account Executives concerning the time demands of course delivery were positively addressed at North Lake College. The North Lake president appointed Gary Bacon, a former division chair, to serve full time on program delivery, freeing the account executives for more effecting marketing (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1990, 3 July).

The major issues, both real and perceived, regarding the Business and Professional Institute are clearly articulated in a document distributed in January, 1991. This document was prepared by Glen Bounds in response to an operational audit report prepared by the DCCCD Internal Audit staff and issued on December 19, 1990. In his reply, Bounds listed each item in the Internal Audit document and
made his refutation or defense. This is a remarkable document in that it reflects clearly and thoroughly the two sides of the issue of financial survival and accountability of the BPI within the district structure. Only the primary points are cited here.

The first point cited from the Internal Audit report is a rather remarkable recommendation:

...The current management and operating structure of the BPI does not enhance, but rather restricts, the colleges' ability to serve the business community. Instead of working in conjunction with the existing resources at the schools, the BPI has evolved into a separate entity in direct competition with the schools. Therefore, responsibility and accountability for BPI activities should be returned to the schools (Response to Internal Audit Report 1991, 1).

Bounds' response was to disagree and to remind the audience of the reasons the BPI was set up as it was in the first place. In further response, Bounds articulated what was perhaps the underlying reality as he saw it: "There does not exist now, nor has there in the past, a firm and documented commitment from the Chancellor's Cabinet to ensure the partnership between BPI and the campuses will be emphasized (Response to Internal Audit Report 1991, 2)

The Audit Report made another remarkable statement: "For the five years of its existence, there is no reliable evidence that the BPI has achieved any measure of profitability" (Response to Internal Audit Report 1991, 7). The Audit report explained the issue as the lack of
evidence, not an assumption of non-profitability. However, in this and other items, the auditors cited numerous instances of unclear or incomplete financial reporting. Bounds' response to the several items addressing reporting issues sounded the familiar theme: the BPI has been unable to get the colleges and the District Service Center to work together to create a viable system for financial reporting to which everyone will adhere. One particular response was especially succinct: "Until the District adopts and uses the processes already in place, it is beyond the scope of the BPI to mandate this action to the colleges" (Response to Internal Audit Report 1991, 8).

The notations of the Auditors and the responses of the Provost touched on most of the issues that had been considered critical throughout the history of the Institute. There was the issue of who really deserves the credit for developing the business and industry accounts that are in operation--BPI or the colleges. There was the issue of mixed loyalties and demands on Account Executives from the district BPI and the colleges as well as comments on communications difficulties among all parties. Included were the problems in pricing instructional services and in properly flagging courses. The Provost reiterated the suggestion that the BPI be funded directly by the District and then held accountable, rather than being funded through assessments to the colleges.
The Provost suggested that the Audit Report could be summarized around three issues:

1. Historical BPI perspectives that have not been fully endorsed by the campuses.
2. Reconciliation of BPI reports that are jointly developed and acceptable by the DSC.
3. Through the Chancellor’s Cabinet, instill a higher level of integration of the BPI in district-wide systems and operations.

Bounds concluded: "When agreement can be reached on these issues, then the BPI will be positioned as the model envisioned and expected" (Response to Internal Audit Report 1991, 10).

It is apparent that the issues identified in the Muha report in early 1988 had not been resolved by the beginning of 1991.

One other small item in the Response merits mentioning. In his preface to the Response, Bounds notes:

The operational audit fails to consider the primary beneficiary of BPI services, the customer/client. If the total issue of quality service is to be reviewed, modified, or enhanced, then this cannot be done unless the product delivered, in this case contract training, is examined from the customers point of view (Response to Internal Audit 1991, 1).

It is unfortunate that Bounds himself did not offer evidence of customer satisfaction in his response. Rather, he confined himself to responding to challenges. This emphasis persists in the documents throughout the history of the BPI. The emphasis is on refining processes or identifying new areas for possible growth. There is very little in the record documenting the business that was done.
By March of 1991, a BPI Task Force had been created to address the various issues of concern. The group did not have a free hand, however, in making whatever recommendations they thought appropriate (Dale, 1994). In fact, the charge to the group from the Chancellor's Cabinet was clarified to note that a central BPI structure would stay in place and that the Account Executives would continue to report to the District BPI Director; a major directive was to deal with the issues of financial reports and incentives for the colleges (Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting Summary 1991, 11 March).

In June, Bounds shared with the Cabinet news of a contract signed with Gold Coast Technology Exchange Center (TEC), a group specializing in Total Quality Management/Process Improvement. The BPI would market continuous improvement training to Dallas clients, and TEC would deliver the training (Letter of Understanding 1991).

In July, Bounds proposed an ambitious new program to the Cabinet. The need for a DCCCD Advanced (Applied) Technology Center (ATC) had been widely discussed. A recommendation had been made by the DCCCD Career and Continuing Education Deans that the South Dallas ATC be established at the Priest Institute. This proposal dovetailed as well with an initiative of the Dallas Citizens Council's Committee on Southern Dallas Technician Training. The plan called for offering a credit program in
Electronics Technology (through Eastfield College) and incorporating an "Adult Tech-Prep" curriculum, the "Transformation Program" developed by the Center for Occupational Research and Development (CORD) (Proposal for Offering Credit Courses 1991). The Cabinet asked for more information and time for review (Expanded Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting Summary 1991, 1 July). At about this same time, at the initiative of the new Chancellor, Bill Wenrich, the colleges were developing plans for major building renovations throughout the district, and Bounds proposed a major renovation of space at the Institute to accommodate this program (Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development Renovation Projects 1991, 8 July).

In the meantime, the BPI task force, formally styled the Technical Resource and Master Planning Committee for Contract Training and Education, completed its report and presented it to the Chancellor's Cabinet on July 29, 1991. First, the report suggested several new procedures to address communication issues. It called for expanding the role of the College BPI liaison; it suggested that the Career and Continuing Education Deans Council assume the charge for coordinating the college/BPI interface (the BPI Director sat with that group); it called for extensive circulation of agendas for the CCE Deans meetings and the BPI meetings; and, finally, it called for college involvement in BPI long-range planning. In addition, the
report called for a new financial model, based on the creation and use of a separate accounting mechanism, Fund 7. It was anticipated that this fund would produce accurate records of expenses and income so that there would be clear recognition of income in excess of expenses. It was further suggested that ten percent of this excess income be given to the BPI for development and that ninety percent go to the colleges who were encouraged to use it to benefit those college areas which supported the generation of the BPI revenue (Report from the Technical Resource and Master Planning Committee for Contract Training and Education 1991). This proposal was adopted by the Chancellor's Cabinet with the division of excess income changed to twenty-five percent for the BPI and seventy-five percent for the colleges (Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting Summary 1991, 12 August). In a report to his committee, Jerry Moreno clarified the change in the funding plan. The twenty-five/seventy-five split would be made after taking out direct costs rather than before; the BPI and the colleges would make their own determination of overhead from their separate shares (Moreno 1991a).

It was suggested that Account Executives would report directly to the college presidents as well as to the BPI (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1991, 21 August).

The BPI leaders were also addressing other issues. They proposed increasing the dollar limits for
authorizations to sign contracts in which the BPI was providing services, in other words, contract for revenue to the district, not for expenditures. Increasing the levels which could be signed by account executives, the Provost, and the Chancellor would facilitate the timely processing of contracts (Moreno 1991b). This suggestion was approved by the Chancellor's Cabinet (Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting Summary 1991, 16 September).

The BPI was also asked to work with the Career and Continuing Education Deans to develop a statement of principles that would be a guide for program development and service delivery across college service area lines. The BPI representatives were reminded of the importance of the role of the college presidents in negotiations involving crossing service area lines (Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting Summary 1991, 16 September).

At the next meeting, the discussion of the BPI was reopened. The Cabinet confirmed the twenty-five/seventy-five split; and Moreno and Vice Chancellor Ted Hughes expressed confidence that the new Fund 7 accounting system would provide clear and adequate financial information. Moreno stressed the importance of a marketing plan for the BPI and asked each college to provide its own BPI marketing plan through its Account Executive by December 1, 1991. In return, the Presidents asked Moreno to prepare a monthly report, showing all new contracts with descriptors of time,
money, and client status (Chancellor’s Cabinet Meeting Summary 1991, 21 October).

Finally, the BPI Director Jerry Moreno convened a committee with district-wide representation to consider the issue of compensation for BPI Account Executives and Continuing Education Program Directors. This committee met six times from October, 1991 through April, 1992, and Moreno made a report in May. Their recommendation was that there not be special monetary compensation for these positions; they did call for non-monetary incentives and for position reevaluations within established DCCCD guidelines (Compensation Committee Report 1992).

In March, Glen Bounds informed the Cabinet that he had been asked by Terry O'Banion to represent the DCCCD as a member of a Task Force to explore the formation of a Community College Business and Industry Alliance under the sponsorship of the League for Innovation (Bounds 1992, 4 March). Such leadership opportunities were not unusual; however, while Bounds as leader of the Business and Professional Institute enjoyed recognition outside the district, even nationally, as the DCCCD spokesperson for business and industry training, his organization was not accorded that same status within the district. The college investment in and ownership of business and industry training predated the BPI, and six years of BPI history had not loosened the hold. In some ways, it seemed that
certain obstacles were being overcome; for example, the Fund 7 accounting system was implemented, and BPI staff believed that, for the first time, they would be able to demonstrate their sound financial standing (Blackwood 1994). During 1991, the BPI was reporting encouraging sales figures, announcing at one point that sales were up 40% from the previous year (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1991, 17 September). However, events were turning against them. Later that fall, Rafael Diaz, an intern with the DCCCD, ran an analysis and projections and disputed the claims of the BPI that it would reach sales of twenty million in five years (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1991, 19 November).

The studies done by Jeanne Gerlach and Janis Kutilek provide information relevant to this period in the development of business and industry marketing and delivery strategies in the DCCCD. Gerlach focuses her study on the BPI experience at North Lake College both during its independent operation and through its identity as part of the central BPI. It is clear that the persons with whom she talked had concerns with the centralized system and favored decentralization (Gerlach 1992, 119). Kutilek's study of specific college literacy programs with businesses in metropolitan areas also provides general comment on the confusion existing in the BPI programs at North Lake College, Brookhaven College, and Richland College (Kutilek
1992, 54). Even more telling is the fact that she described in detail the relationships developed in the literacy partnerships. In the North Lake and Richland models, credit for developing the programs is given to non-BPI staff, and, in the case of Richland, the BPI is cited as being inadequate for the job (Kutilek 1992, 77, 78, 92.

It should not have been surprising that the colleges moved to take control of what they perceived to be their own business. In a crucial meeting of the Chancellor's Cabinet in July, 1992, the BPI was once again conceptually reorganized. The Chancellor's Cabinet held a special meeting conducted in the format of a TQM decision-making model. The result of that day of decision was the dismantling of the district-wide BPI. The decision was made that the colleges would once again take over the responsibility for marketing and delivering programs to business and industry in their service areas. Those individuals who had been BPI account executives would have the choice of becoming college employees doing essentially the same work they had been doing with clients in the college service area, or they could move to the Priest Institute as members of the district BPI (Arnold 1994).

Four account executives joined the BPI office at the Institute: Janice Downey, who had already moved to the central office as the TQM specialist; Bob Arnold from North Lake College, Larry Johnson from El Centro College,
and Maryann Miller from Richland College. They changed their titles to Training Consultants but maintained the name of the Business and Professional Institute. All others and all support staff who were located on a college campus became college employees.

Furthermore, the determination was made that the BPI would market no credit courses. There was initially some understanding that the BPI would limit its non-credit marketing to programs in Total Quality Management and Workplace Literacy training programs. Furthermore, the colleges would recognize the Priest Institute as the exclusive purveyors of programs in these two areas. The recognition of exclusive program areas for marketing training was quickly modified, however, and both the BPI and the colleges now cross these subject area lines (Picquet 1994).

As a result of that same reorganizational meeting, a Task Force was appointed with representatives from the District Business Office, the college Vice Presidents of Business Services, and the BPI. This group defined the financial aspects of the reorganization. The primary point was to dissolve any connection or obligation between the district BPI and the colleges. The Fund 7 account became irrelevant and was closed out; the restructuring became effective September 1, 1992 (Business and Professional Institute Contract Training Accounting 1992).
Some other efforts were made at coordination of the district's response to the training needs of business and industry. A district-wide group was organized with representatives from each college as well as the Vice-Provost of Instructional Programs at the Priest Institute. However, this group exists for discussion only and has no approval or disapproval authority. Furthermore, it has not met in more than a year (Farrow 1994).

There were also efforts to provide accurate accounting for contract instruction. In the early years of the BPI, the BPI contracts were reported each month as a discrete agenda item in meetings of the Board of Trustees. Later, reports were made according to the standard business procedures practices based on amount and other factors of the contract. There is currently a coordinated program for reporting all contract instruction across the district. It must be noted, however, that there is little value in comparing figures over time. Since each college now gets full credit for all its own programs when they are incorporated into the total report, each college will naturally report all its contracts. When the college had to report programs it delivered as BPI contracts, the college tended not to include in the report contracts in those programs which it had gained permission to maintain as its own. In other words, contract totals reported by BPI for years prior to 1992 and district-wide contract
totals reported now are not based on comparable lists of programs (Blackwood 1994).

While the colleges have established service areas, the BPI has no unique territory and, therefore, no resident population to call its own. Since it is also true that it has no exclusive programs, it operates at a considerable disadvantage in trying to develop a clientele. One area where the BPI has experienced success is in partnership with the Greater Dallas Chamber. The BPI has co-sponsored a number of social events, achievement recognition events, and seminars for small business with the Chamber. These occasions give the BPI staff opportunities to develop business relationships. Also, the BPI is recognized by the Chamber as the entity to represent education in those activities in which the Chamber works with companies considering relocation in Dallas. The BPI has the opportunity of first exposure to these potential clients of business and industry training and has provided significant service to such companies as Greyhound Bus Lines (Piquet 1994). The BPI has also been active in working with companies to apply for "Smart Jobs" grants from the state of Texas. They are partners in such a grant with Booth-Crystal Tips and are working on several others (Arnold 1994). While the rate of financial reward is not as great to the BPI on the Smart Jobs contracts as it would be on a standard business or industry contract, partnerships with
these new or growing companies represent an important service for economic development (Picquet 1994).

The BPI has tried to realize its fullest potential as a supplier of training in Total Quality Management. It is a member of the Supplier Training Consortium, a group of training providers and major industries such as Texas Instruments, Texaco, and Motorola. The training consortium is designed to offer TQM training and other specialized categories of training to companies who are the suppliers to these major companies. The BPI has offered classes under this Consortium, but none have had sufficient enrollment to be taught. The difficulty lies in identifying and marketing to the supplier companies. The BPI Training Consultants are currently addressing this issue with their Consortium partners (Picquet 1994). In support of this and other TQM training initiatives, the Institute carried out the major renovation alluded to previously, taking space that had been originally allocated to the Job Training Center automobile body shop but never fully built out. On the second floor of the space created, they built a large conference room, a smaller conference room, computer laboratories, and offices (Bounds 1994b).

The Business and Professional Institute has placed a high value on developing expertise in special programs to market to business and industry. TQM is only one such effort. The members of the BPI staff have also been
trained and certified as delivers of Six Sigma training, Statistical Process Control, and other specialties. Recently, the BPI purchased a computer program called the Work Profiling System. This program will enable businesses to assess work skills needed by employees throughout their companies. BPI will serve as consultants and sales representatives for the software and then will offer training on its use. By working with a company to help its people learn to utilize TQM skills and then training the company staff in the use of the Work Profiling System, the BPI Training Consultants will be offering an attractive integrated business package (Arnold).

The full budget costs of the Business and Professional Institute are supposed to be covered by the revenue of the BPI. Any costs that are not covered internally must now be covered out of the general Institute budget, and the BPI is currently "in debt" to the Institute. The present BPI staff anticipate that they will soon be in a self-funded position so that subsidies will no longer be necessary and they can begin to repay the start-up and sustaining investments.

The Growth and Development of the Small Business Development Center

The Small Business Development Center continued to grow and prosper after moving to the new Priest Institute. The regional office continued to administer the work of the
North Texas area, and the subcenters continued to expand. By the end of 1989, Cedar Valley College had found a location for a Southern Dallas County SBDC (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1989, 19 December). SBDC leaders also began making plans for a Technology Transfer Center (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1990, 20 February). The Business Incubation Center (BIC) opened its new facility at the Institute with a formal dedication in May (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1990, 1 May).

Very early, the leaders of the SBDC realized that international business was a major area of opportunity for the Dallas area, and the SBDC opened an International Business Center. This center was moved from the Moline Building to the World Trade Center where space is provided by the city of Dallas and where it functions as a partner in the total services offered to businesses wanting to engage in international trade (Huddleston 1994). Its speciality is support for individuals wishing to enter the import/export business and seminars on trade-related issues (Harris 1994).

The Dallas SBDC that provides service to small businesses in Dallas County has a full range of programs. They offer informative seminars and individual counseling to persons hoping to start a small business and to small business owners. They also have a strong community development component in which they make speeches and give
mini-seminars to groups both for general support of the program and to locate potential clients (Blatt 1994).

By the fall of 1990, a major reorganization took place. Bonnie Franke-Hill assumed a new position overseeing a cluster made up of the SBDC, the Center for Government Contracting (CGC), and the BIC, which by this time was at fifty percent occupancy. One goal for this initiative was to explore the development of a "technical literacy curriculum" for adults in the JTC (Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development Briefing Report 1990). Norb Dettmann continued to work with the subcenters in the North Texas area (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1990, 2 October), and Marty Jones was brought in to fill the position of the Regional Director for the SBDC soon after that (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1991, 17 December).

The Government Contracting Center operated as a separate office in the cluster until May, 1994, providing guidance to small businesses on how to bid for and win government contracts as well as serving as a source of information about government requests for bid in appropriate areas for each business. That Center is now administratively combined with the Technology Transfer Center under Director Pam Speraw. The TTC advises persons with new products on a full range of concerns ranging from patents, to development of prototypes, to going into business (Speraw 1994). There is cooperation and synergy
among the entities of the SBDC. For example, when it appears that a person with a new product has a viable opportunity to develop it, the TTC staff will send that person to the SBDC for seminars and individual counseling.

The Dallas Small Business Development Center and the Technology Assistance Center/Center for Government Contracting benefitted from the same renovation discussed earlier. The ground floor of the former automobile body shop space was renovated into a center for these SBDC services (Bounds 1994b).

The Business Incubation Center is technically a separate entity and reports to the Vice Provost of Business Services; however, it operates in close relationship with the SBDC. The BIC offers a potential starter "home" for businesses such as one envisioned by a person with a new invention. The occupants of the BIC are prime clients for counseling through the SBDC. It is also noteworthy that the BIC has surpassed "break-even" and is beginning to repay its start-up subsidies (Bill J. Priest Institute of Economic Development 1994-95 Budget Initiatives 1994).

The leaders of the DCCCD and the Priest Institute faced a major challenge in relation to the SBDC in 1992. The grant given to the District by the Small Business Administration (SBA) was up for renewal, and preliminary word came from the regional SBA office that the grant would not be renewed. The DCCCD had established the program in
1986, but there seemed to be some inclination at the regional SBA office to take the grant away and give it to the University of North Texas. There were questions about the management of the grant, particularly about the timely submission of reports. After extensive discussion and written communication about the obligations of all parties under the grant, the Institute leaders were able to answer the concerns (BJPIED Directors Meeting 1992, 15 December). The SBA renewed the grant, and the Institute brought in a new regional manager, Liz Klimback. Under her leadership, the Dallas regional operation and the Dallas subcenter, now under the direction of Al Salgado, have continued to prosper (Bounds 1994b).

A Broader View of Institute Programs

While the three entities comprise the programatic identity of the Priest Institute, some mention is merited of the role of the Institute aside from these historical descriptions. The Priest Institute has come to serve the district as a prime location for district-wide meetings. It is centrally located; it offers free, secured parking, and it generally has available rooms for meetings of any size under one hundred persons.

Special programs take over major allocations of space at particular times. The Mobil "Green Team" represents a summer youth program which began in 1989 that provides
summer income for disadvantaged students (BJPIED Directors Meeting Minutes 1989, 22 May). The students receive training in basic skills for part of the time and work on projects for the city of Dallas the balance of the time. The classroom work takes place at the Priest Institute.

The Institute has also entered into some partnerships with colleges for facility use. Eastfield College has been the primary contact for this kind of operation. In fact, Eastfield has moved an entire program in printing to the Priest Center where students are able to benefit from the employment opportunities in that area. Eastfield has also equipped an electronics laboratory and taught various electronics classes at the Priest Institute including those in a special articulation program with Paul Quinn College. The current efforts of the Institute staff reflect a commitment to developing other partnerships and opportunities.

In summary, the programs of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development are still in operation in the summer of 1994, but their continuing success cannot be merely assumed. The Institute is heavily dependent on grant funding, and even in the area where it seems to control its own destiny--the BPI--it operates under considerable constraints. Nevertheless, the community needs that inspired the audience present for the Dedication on May 4, 1989 have not been mitigated. The
DCCCD is still committed to service in workforce and economic development. The Priest Institute still offers a facility, a staff, and zeal for service. An assessment of the current status with an eye to future service is in order.
CHAPTER V

MAJOR ISSUES IN THE CURRENT STATUS
OF THE INSTITUTE

The Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development is at a turning point in the summer of 1994 that may well be as much a watershed as the moment of the dedication of the facility in May of 1989.

In Chapters III and IV of this study, the first research question was addressed, and the historical development of the Institute was described. Chapter V addresses the second and third research questions, those dealing with opportunities available to the Institute as well as the inhibiting factors or challenges that are present. These opportunities and these challenges must be viewed in the context of national, state, and local trends as well as the particulars of the Institute's historical development.

Opportunities for Service

As the review of the literature indicated, the national trend toward the leadership of community colleges in the areas of workforce education and training and community economic development is even stronger in 1994 than it was when the precursors of the Bill J. Priest...
Institute for Economic Development were formed in the Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD) in the mid-1980s.

The national agenda still resonates with the two primary issues: an educationally underprepared population and an economy that must have a highly-skilled workforce if it is to prosper in a competitive world economy. The priorities of the state of Texas still reflect the values of preparing its citizens for productive and remunerative work. The community of Dallas still places a high value on economic development, particularly in the southern Dallas area. There are a number of examples of areas of opportunity that can be cited.

The physical area where the Institute is located has experienced positive development in the last five years. The building across Corinth from the Priest Institute that was formerly occupied by the Job Training Center has been renovated by the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) and is now a very attractive specialized high school whose students occasionally enjoy taking advantage of the cafeteria at the Priest Institute (Teter 1994). The business property across a side street from the Institute has been renovated by Sears and will be a major central employment location for the administrative functions of the company (Blackwood 1994). The warehouse and distribution business area behind the Institute has expanded its
operations considerably. A station on the new Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) system is being built one block from the Institute and will be a convenient and functional asset for the Institute's clientele.

Development in this area is fostered by the city of Dallas through the work of the Southern Dallas Development Corporation and through such means as tax abatements and other incentives. The Southern Dallas Development Corporation is currently in negotiations in consideration of moving their offices to the Institute. The Institute is currently a partner with the City of Dallas in a major grant proposal to create a significant Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Zone project in the area of Southern Dallas which would include a One Stop Capital Shop in the Institute. The Institute's share of this grant would be six million dollars (Bounds 1994b). As the Dallas economy continues to rebound and growth in the southern Dallas area increases, the various offices and programs of the Small Business Development Center should be ideally suited to service in this developing economic center.

The procedures for funding of programs made possible by federal and state support may change with the development of the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness. However, the priorities of the state should continue to be those of basic skills development; training for high skill, technical jobs; and those which
prepare underrepresented groups for employment or displaced workers for reemployment. Dallas certainly has individuals in need of these services. From high school drop-outs to recent immigrants with little command of English to displaced defense workers, the potential clients are there; and all of these areas have been successfully addressed by the programs of the Institute. The Private Industry Council is negotiating with the Institute to locate an Intake Center at the Institute; such a center would conduct assessments for potential JTPA students; the Center would also include staff from the Texas Employment Commission (Bounds 1994b). A major county-wide model for adult literacy training is under development with the DCCCD as a major partner, and the Priest Institute in envisioned as a key service delivery center for workplace readiness training (Stone 1994).

The climate for cooperation between the DCCCD and the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) is very positive. Recently, in a meeting involving the Chancellor of the DCCCD, the Vice Chancellor of Educational Affairs, the Provost of the Priest Institute and other DCCCD staff with the Superintendent of the DISD and his key staff members, the foundations were laid for a number of cooperative programs. Primary areas of opportunity identified included: shared programming for teacher training and development in the new Dallas Education Center; Total
Quality Management training for DISD personnel; an expanded role for the DCCCD in adult basic education, especially in the areas of basic skill development and training in English as a Second Language (ESL); and shared initiatives in seeking outside funding for programs that would enhance the success of students making the transition from the public schools to post-secondary education and training.

The DCCCD is a partner with the DISD and with the University of North Texas and the Greater Dallas Chamber in a major national program, the K-16 Initiative, which will give leadership to the development of opportunities through the whole educational continuum and into the workforce. The Priest Institute has the programs to have a significant impact in a number of these areas (Stone 1994).

The Priest Institute has established a positive relationship with the Greater Dallas Chamber. The Small Business Division of the Greater Dallas Chamber calls on the Priest Institute for two primary services. First, the Institute provides seminars and other types of training that are open to Chamber members as well as other businesses. Second, the Institute is a referral source for the Chamber. Many small Dallas businesses are unable to afford membership in the Greater Dallas Chamber in their early stages of development. However, they often call the Chamber for assistance. The Chamber is able to give a positive referral to the Small Business Development Center
at the Institute. Chamber staff find these services extremely valuable (Hardy 1994.) As noted earlier, the Chamber also calls on the Priest Institute to describe education and training opportunities in Dallas to companies considering relocation to the area. Chamber officials feel that the work of the Institute in these meetings is extremely valuable. They also speak highly of the work done to benefit relocating companies, citing specifically consultations in relation to applications for "Smart Jobs" training funds (Floeter 1994). The opportunities for shared programming should only increase as the Dallas economy continues to recover, especially as relocations and expansions in the downtown area become a reality.

Programming in the arena of international trade, a real specialty of the SBDC, should be an area of major growth as opportunities for business in Mexico increase through the North American Free Trade Agreement (Wenrich 1994).

The Business and Professional Institute staff have placed a high priority on earning credentials that will allow them to conduct a number of specialized training programs. Many of these are train-the-trainer programs. The Training Consultants of the BPI no longer see themselves simply as developers and deliverers of training, even customized training. Rather, they see themselves as consultants who work with business to determine their organizational needs. The BPI consultants use such methods
as TQM tools and the Work Profiling System to determine the needs of the business which then can be met through a custom designed program that includes training. These BPI Consultants may play an active role in the training or they may broker training from a number of sources throughout the county. As one Training Consultant explained, the BPI Consultants are in marketing. They have a range of products that enable them to be effective business consultants. They no longer see themselves primarily as educators, the role that was cultivated in the college BPI offices (Arnold 1994).

This new role is illustrated in the experience of the Connor Manufacturing Company with the Priest Institute. Connor sought the help of the Institute in strengthening their own internal training efforts. They called on the Training Consultants to do a job task analysis and to write a curriculum; the Consultants also did assessment tests for individual employees. Connor training staff found the Priest Institute staff to be well ahead of the market place in the services offered and provided; they were especially appreciative of the helpful, supportive personal attitudes of the Consultants (Tucker 1994).

The current practice of the BPI consultants is not unlike that originally envisioned for the Account Executives. They are marketing to businesses all over the county, with each account executive specializing in his or
her primary interest area in the inventory of BPI skills and services. They even make referrals to the colleges; however, they primarily deliver service through their own consultants if no college academic credit is involved. The current practice produces a competitive climate between the BPI and the colleges; however, BPI consultants feel that there is enough business for everyone (Arnold 1994). The targeted initiatives such as helping companies relocate to Dallas and take advantage of "Smart Jobs" state funds for training local workers offer significant hope. Also, the increasing technical capabilities of the DCCCD can be utilized to offer a wide range of distance learning opportunities to these corporate clients both during relocation activities and in training a local workforce (Wenrich 1994).

One of the largest relocation projects involved the Greyhound Bus Company. Consultants from the Institute worked with Greyhound officials long before the company moved; the goal was to have a trained local workforce in place by the time the move occurred. The Consultants helped the company with a needs assessment; they visited the previous work site to do job analyses in preparation for developing training, and they helped in the development of the actual training materials. Finally, they accommodated the training in the Institute, providing all necessary instructional support. The company was extremely
pleased with the results, noting that they had experienced very little turnover with the employees trained under the Priest Institute contract (Matthews 1994).

Finally, it must be reiterated that the Priest Institute is a large and versatile facility. While it has on occasion been fairly full, that situation has occurred when there was a training opportunity such as the one in which the Greyhound Bus Company used the Priest Institute for training when their own facility was not yet ready. Generally, the facility offers significant advantages for programming opportunities, both in establishing on-going programs responding to local needs and in maintaining the flexibility for intensive short-term training.

**Challenge Factors**

A number of issues have emerged in the study of the history of the Institute which may pose challenges in the continuing growth and development and general success of the Institute. Some of these have been illustrated in the history drawn from archives; others reflect personal impressions shared in interviews. These are offered as issues which merit further examination and study.

There seems to be very little sense of an identity for the Priest Institute as a whole. While there are frequent references and reports in Board minutes and Chancellor’s Cabinet minutes related to the Business and Professional
Institute and occasional references to the Job Training Center and the Small Business Development Center, there are seldom any to the Priest Institute as a meaningful entity other than references to use of the building. While there is a single mission statement for the Priest Institute, that statement lists three services, one reflecting each of the three operations in the Institute (Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development Staff Directory/Planning Calendar 1993).

Staff members report very little cohesion among the various operations within the Institute. Some of the staff call for more interaction. They have identified areas where the three entities could assist and support each other's programs and clients, and they feel a need for a structure that would facilitate such shared effort. However, for other individuals, this separateness is not regarded as something that ought to be corrected; rather, they are comfortable with the acknowledgement that there are three essential entities with very different goals and tasks under the common umbrella of economic development.

While there is not a widely-reported need for integration of the entities, there is some tension related to the image created in the facility. Programs at the Institute can be divided into two distinct types: that which brings established or aspiring business persons into the building for counseling or for seminars and that which
is designed to help individuals prepare themselves for what may well be their first skilled jobs. The simple observation is that these two groups are not perceived to look or act the same. A contrast is noted between the rather formal "business" atmosphere engendered in the SBDC and BPI programs and the more casual style and "college" culture of the JTC.

This discomfort expressed over the mixed message of "dress vs. casual" may relate to another concern: that of location. In the early years of the Priest Institute on Corinth Street, concern was expressed about issues of safety and about a general lack of interest in coming to an area with no other attractions for business. This concern seems to have been mitigated by two factors. First is the general business development and infrastructure improvement that has taken place in the area. Second is the fact that experience has shown the Institute to be a safe place. A more recent concern expressed relates to the fact that the Institute is not in the main stream of business traffic. It is perceived as no accident that the International SBDC is so successful; it is located with related programs in the one building in the city, the World Trade Center, where its prospective clients are most likely to be. It does seem to be a valid observation that the BPI and the SBDC will not get the "walk-by" exposure and the "drop-in" traffic that they might have in a location like the Dallas Infomart.
Economic survival is perhaps the most basic challenge for the programs of the Institute. The SBDC depends on government funding; its survival depends on maintaining its identity as the home of the Regional SBDC. The SBDC has come through one experience of facing the possible loss of funding and now seems on firm ground. Unless the program falls out of favor with the Small Business Administration or unless another institution makes a major play to take over the whole operation, and assuming it continues to be successful in meeting its objectives, its continued existence seems fairly secure. The fact that funding for the Small Business Development Center increased by almost a million dollars in the last year lends assurance to that assumption of continuing support (The Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development Summary of 1994-95 Budget Initiatives 1994).

The funding success of the Job Training Center is a bit more problematical. As noted earlier, the center is dependent on grant funding, primarily through the funds of the Job Training Partnership Act, currently administered through the Private Industry Council. Bidding for those funds has become considerably more competitive, and to depend on those entirely puts the JTC strictly on a year-to-year basis for its existence. The JTC is exploring other funding sources but will continue to be in a mode of competitive bidding. Programs that are funded through the
higher education funding mechanisms, that is, reimbursement for credit or adult education courses, can only be awarded to accredited colleges. One solution would be the creation of a separate accredited college at the Institute. There is no evidence of support for this alternative in the DCCCD. There would also be the possibility of seeking accreditation as a district rather than as a single college. The colleges have been separately accredited through the whole history of the DCCCD, and they just received ten-year affirmation of their accreditation in 1993; therefore, the district-as-a-whole accreditation scenario does not seem likely either.

The JTC and the BPI have both utilized partnerships with El Centro college for offering Institute programs through El Centro's authority and academic accountability; if financially beneficial models can be developed, college partnerships such as these should offer viable alternatives.

There is some concern by the BPI over the issue of credit courses. BPI staff have referred a number of leads to colleges from businesses interested in credit opportunities; the record of college follow-up has been discouraging (Picquet 1994). The strongest area of business and industry training for the colleges has been in non-credit programming, just as it has been for the BPI. However, one of the issues in workforce development is the development of appropriate credentials; college credit is
certainly an established and viable option. It is important that the DCCCD not fail to respond to this opportunity. Partnerships with colleges that would enable both the BPI and the colleges to respond to the needs of the workplace must be developed.

The issue of BPI funding was delineated in the description of its history. The underlying issue is not just that of generating enough money in contracts to cover the cost of marketing and servicing those contracts; the issue is also that of funding the basic costs of the Institute facility and administration. These funding issues as well as other issues among the challenges identified seem to be embedded in issues of organization.

Organizational Structures

Both opportunities and challenges are reflected in the organizational issues of the Priest Institute. The history of the Institute reflects continuity in certain key offices. The office of the Provost has had only one incumbent. As noted, Glen Bounds has held that position since the early planning stages of the BPI. Furthermore, the same Vice-Provost of Business Services has been in his position since the time the BPI was located in the Moline Building. The same Executive Secretary has managed the office since its inception, a fact that is reflected in the continuity and completeness of the records.
Outside these key positions, there has been considerable turnover of leadership personnel. None of the five directors who were in place at the time of the 1989 Dedication of the Institute are still in position. Some leadership positions have had a series of incumbents. A number of individuals found promotions into higher positions outside the DCCCD; others left for a variety of personal reasons. There have been some separation situations that created tension and absorbed administrative time and energy. Often, personnel changes have resulted in administrative reorganizations. While it would be difficult to weigh the costs or benefits of each of these changes over the last five years, the experiences have been wearing, but there is now hope for stability. There seems to be general satisfaction with the current internal organizational structure and hope that it will not be dramatically altered. There have also been a number of remodeling projects and moves by programs within the building. Hope was also voiced that programs will now settle in and become established in place. As one staff member noted, it is as though the Institute has had a sometimes difficult adolescence, but it now seems to be achieving a level of adult maturity (Salgado 1994).

Persons interviewed reported that the "umbrella" of management is in place and effective. While the perception was pervasive that the separate entities of the Institute
are almost independent, there was also the assertion that there is access to a common point of leadership and that the leaders of the separate entities have the structure, leadership, and inclination to function as a team when necessary. There was also testimony that the general atmosphere has become somewhat friendlier in recent times; this improvement seems to correlate with some of the Institute-wide TQM efforts. One result has been increasing numbers of activities designed to engage the whole Institute staff in various sorts of celebrations of key occasions (Day 1994).

The more threatening organizational issues have historically involved the status of the Institute within the structures of the DCCCD. The Institute was established to be the administrative arm of the business and industry programs of the DCCCD. However, it was never able to establish the identity of all the programs for monitoring purposes, much less to exercise any administrative direction or control over them. And yet, as late as 1991, the public position was still the same, as reported in an article by a DCCCD staff member in the Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal: "In the sprawling Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex, the Dallas County Community College District has taken a centralized approach to business boosting, by locating all its economic development and training programs in a single facility" (Kent 1991, 32).
The decentralization of 1992 made it clear that the colleges were free to conduct business and industry training and economic development initiatives in their service areas as they saw fit. The agreement also clarified the related activities allowed for the BPI and the other entities at the Priest Institute. However, it did not make as clear the role of the Priest Institute within the total DCCCD organization. The old rhetoric is no longer accurate; a new identity is needed.

The Institute exists somewhat in the model of a college; that is, it was established with a chief executive officer, the Provost, at the position level of a college President, and it has been able to add college-parallel positions such as a Vice-Provost of Business Services and a Vice-Provost of Instructional Programs as well as such traditional college positions as those for specialists in human services, public information, and resource development.

However, the Priest Institute lacks some of the most basic elements that enable a college to prosper. It cannot offer, on its own authority, either college credit or recognized Continuing Education Units (CEU's) for its educational programs. It has no unique service area, and therefore, no community and no population for whom it is the primary DCCCD educational provider. Finally, there are no exclusive program areas that the Institute alone can
offer. This last point is reflective of the major organizational shift to a decentralized model that has been mentioned previously.

Although the DCCCD was organized with separately accredited colleges, rather than as a single college with multiple campuses, in its early years it featured rather strong centralized control. By the time the BPI was created, that control was institutionalized in the fact that all college presidents (and the Provost of the BPI) reported to the Vice Chancellor of Educational Affairs. This reporting relationship was supported by numerous district councils made up of college staff in parallel positions. This created a matrix of discussion, recommendation, and decision-making that provided administrative oversight and facilitated the day to day operations of the DCCCD.

When Bill Wenrich became Chancellor of the DCCCD, he put in place a system reflecting a different management philosophy. The new system was one of decentralized management, recognizing a great deal of autonomy for the colleges, enabling college leaders to respond in the ways they found most effective to the needs of their separate, local and unique communities. It was only natural that the colleges would see this mandate for service to their own constituents as highly inclusive. It was in this spirit that they took the college-based BPI initiatives back into
the college organizations in 1992; it was in this spirit that they felt free to market whatever programs they chose to their own community clients. They saw no problem of conflict with the Dallas Small Business Development Center at the Priest Institute if they developed their own clientele among small businesses seeking counsel and appropriate classes and seminars in the college service areas. It was in this same spirit that the colleges looked at their own communities to see who might benefit from JTPA-funded programs and then submitted grant applications that competed with those from the Job Training Center.

While this organizational change certainly seemed to be energizing and successful for the colleges, it seemed to amplify the disadvantages facing the Priest Institute, an entity with no separate, local and unique community to serve.

This analysis of the current status of the Priest Institute suggests the need for continuing review by the Institute staff. What must not be lost in the discussion is the inherent value of the current staff, programs, and facility and the moral imperative for service in an area of critical demand in the community.

There is already, in this critical summer of 1994, evidence of innovative organizational strategies. As noted, many initiatives are in place developing external partnerships. The adjustments that have been made in
funding and staffing in the Job Training Center may lead to further reorganization. The staff of the JTC may be utilized to do more training for BPI clients as well as continuing to serve JTPA students. In fact, an organizational blending of these areas of educational services for individual and corporate-based workforce development is being considered (Bounds 1994b). While funding issues will continue to be a challenge, the opportunities for workforce development support are increasing. A primary part of the identity and service of the Priest Institute will be reflected in programs providing integrated training with indirect money (Wenrich 1994). A number of funding applications have been made with the City of Dallas as well as national educational networks that will, hopefully, support this new trend (Mancillas 1994). In summary, the staff of the Priest Institute are aware of both the challenges and the opportunities and are exploring an increasingly wide range of support possibilities for service to individuals, small businesses and corporate clients.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By one of those coincidences that seem to have been so much a part of the history of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development, this study is being concluded in the midst of a time of major upheaval for the Institute. While it is not the purpose of this study to pose solutions, it is appropriate to make some summary comments and recommendations.

Summary

The primary research questions posed for this study have been addressed. The history of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development has been written based on archival evidence and personal recollection and analysis from the participants in the events. Both the areas of opportunity for service and growth and the challenges have been explored.

The purposes of this study, however, went beyond the mere recording of the history. The study, particularly in the interviews, addressed the issue of perception of mission underlying those opportunities and challenges and the perception of the ability of the Institute, in its present organizational form, to fulfill the mission.
The concept of a mission for the Priest Institute itself was expressed by the people who are a part of that organization by stating the obvious. They consistently stated that the purpose of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development is to help economic development in Dallas. One concludes, however, that the question was not perceived as particularly meaningful. The concept and image of the Institute as an entity, as noted earlier, is simply not a strong one. However, when the researcher asked about a person's perception about the mission of that person's own part of the Institute, in other words, if the question asked for the mission of the Job Training Center, or the mission of the Small Business Development Center or one of its components, or the mission of the Business and Professional Institute, then the responses were thoughtful, insightful, and reflective of the mission of the DCCCD as a whole.

All of the programs of the Institute are clearly aligned with the expressed national, state, and local missions of service to underprepared and underrepresented individuals and to the development of the highly-skilled workforce that is necessary for a globally-competitive economy.

Moreover, the perceptions of the Institute staff regarding the internal organization of the Institute do not reflect any serious concerns. Again, the strongest sense
of management and organization exists within the separate identities of the component parts of the Institute. There is, however, a clear sense that the Provost provides overall direction and coordination for the whole. That overall management is perceived as effective, but not intrusive.

The members of the Small Business Development Center and the other SBDC-related programs express very little concern over organizational issues at all. They feel that they are meeting the needs of their clients, and their own needs are being met within the Institute and DCCCD organization.

The members of the staff of the Job Training Center were interviewed in a time of unusual stress, a time when their funding position has been drastically altered. The loss of JTPA funding has required considerable adjustment in staff and programming. Outside this most critical issue however, the JTC staff have been positive about their mission of preparing the unemployed to join the workforce.

The staff of the Business and Professional Institute are really quite positive about their opportunity to fulfill their mission of providing education and training to the business community. They are excited about the new areas of expertise they are adding to their inventory; they are excited about their chances to serve businesses relocating to Dallas. They are optimistic that their
present rate of production will soon have them operating in a mode that more than covers their costs.

Quite naturally, it is the Provost who expresses the greatest concern on behalf of his organization. While he shares the feeling of his staff that the internal organization is generally effective and meeting the needs of the organization, he is acutely aware of the constraints of those external factors over which he has no direct control.

As noted frequently in the historical narrative, issues outside the primary tasks of delivering service to students and clients have consistently dominated the attention of the Provost and his staff. Certainly, one most significant issue revealed by this study seems to be the operational difficulties of the Priest Institute vis-a-vis the colleges. Whether the discussion is territorial prerogative, client ownership, or funding, the issue is the same. And the issue has been there from the earliest history of the organization.

A model was created in 1985-86. This model called for a modified centralized system for delivering educational services to business and industry in Dallas County. The decision was made not to create a separate, accredited eighth college; rather, this eighth entity would serve as the administrative and marketing arm for a system of programs delivered by the colleges. However, as has been
established in the historical narrative, circumstances changed over the years, and the model was modified in various ways.

The DCCCD currently operates in a decentralized system that allows a significant amount of autonomy in college operations; that autonomy results in a certain amount of competition among the colleges. The Provost of the Priest Institute has suggested that he could compete if only the playing field were leveled. One of the first areas of perceived inequality has to do with territorial assignments. One might suggest that a basic problem lies in the fact that the service areas of the seven colleges completely cover the county; there is no room for an eighth competitor. Although the Institute is not geographically restricted as it develops unique programs and partnerships, it cannot "protect" programs against replication and implementation by a college.

The original model suggested that all business and industry clients would formally and officially be clients of the BPI; of course, at that time, the BPI had a presence on the college campuses. The model suggested that the colleges would assume a very natural role as partners in delivery. From the beginning, however, colleges retained certain clients, and the questions of "who is allowed to contact whom" and "who gets credit for what contracts" became major issues. Since each college now has its own
internal operation delivering services to business and industry, and since every potential client in Dallas County is, by virtue of its location, in a college service area, issues of "ownership" and the continuing development of successful contracts may still create tension.

The funding issue has also persisted as an area of conflict. The original model suggested not only that the BPI would be self-supporting, but also that it would ultimately provide significant new revenue to the colleges. Not only has there never been significant recognition of the BPI as a generator of new funds, there has never even been a formula for comparative data that all parties could agree was valid. While the BPI staff contend that the financial model was never given a fair chance, that funding question actually seems moot in the current decentralized situation. Funding as an issue with the Job Training Center has also changed over time. Early in the history of the JTC, there was general consensus that the JTC was the arm of the DCCCD charged with providing JTPA-funded training. In the decentralized mode, each college has looked at its own community for populations to serve under JTPA program guidelines, and the competition for funds has become intense. However, if the JTC tries to market its programs to a traditional population that can pay for the service, it will be "pirating" some college's service area population. Again, unique programs tied to economic and
workforce development would seem to be critical areas of opportunity for the Institute, but the negative positioning of the Institute in relation to the colleges must be mitigated.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The organizational model envisioned with the creation of the Business and Professional Institute in 1986 was discarded in 1992; the central leadership role of the Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development as it was described at the moment of its dedication in 1989 is no longer recognized. In the decentralization process, the pendulum has swung to the opposite extreme where the Institute is concerned. The college economic development programs are operating in a mode that is conspicuously independent of the Institute. Given such an analysis, this researcher will presume to make two recommendations regarding the position of the Priest Institute as an entity within the DCCCD organization.

The first recommendation is that the leaders of the Institute formulate a model for a new, non-competitive organizational identity and position for the Institute within the organizational structure of the DCCCD. A second recommendation is that the new model include cooperation and partnerships with one or more colleges in selected areas of mutual benefit.
Beyond these recommendations, this researcher would only suggest to those leaders that this documented history of the Institute is offered for their review and for their consideration in hope that it may inform their deliberations and their decision making.

**Recommendation for Future Study**

This study suggests several areas of further research. The issue of centralized versus decentralized control in an organization is one meriting focused study, and the situation of the Institute provides a case study with implications beyond the detail provided here. The move toward decentralization, toward moving responsibility and accountability down in the organization, toward empowering workgroups and individuals to be creative—these are at the heart of much current writing in organizational management and leadership. A study that expanded the research of this study by looking at the implications of the decentralized model from the perspectives of all parties in the DCCCD organization would be valuable.

Since this study has focused on historical and organizational issues, the researcher has only briefly addressed service and impact issues. A study is currently being done by Jessie Hill attempting to develop means of determining the economic impact of the institute on the community (Picquet 1994).
As noted earlier, this study was inspired in part by a similar study of the R. Jan LeCroy Center for Educational Telecommunications written by John Neal. In the years since his study was completed, the leaders of the LeCroy Center have encountered many of the same issues faced by the Priest Institute as they have been operating in the new decentralized management mode. There is one critical organizational difference; the LeCroy Center has a managerial affiliation with one of the DCCCD colleges. A study of their experience or a comparative study of both of these district operations might yield significant information.

Finally the whole issue of community colleges as a leading force in workforce education and training and economic development will continue to produce research. The history of the model that evolved over the years in the DCCCD may be a valuable basis for comparison or contrast with other programs.
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What role did you play in the major events related to the history of the Priest Institute for Economic Development from the inception of the Business and Professional Institute in 1986 to the present time?

2. Regarding major events or decision points in the history, who or what most influenced the decision? In what ways were the results positive? In what way were they negative?

3. In your opinion, what program is currently the strongest/most successful at the BJPIED? Explain your choice. If you have chosen a program in your own area, what program outside your area do you perceive to be the strongest? Explain.

4. Is the mix of programs and services appropriate given the physical location of the Institute and the needs of the community, defined both as the Institute's "neighborhood" and the wider community of the county and the region?

5. In your own words, what is the mission of the Dallas County Community College District? What three programs, services, or activities of the Priest Institute do you think best fulfill the mission of the DCCCD?

6. Do the staff of the Institute share a clear sense of a common mission or purpose to be served by all the components of the BJPIED? If so, is there also a sense of a shared plan of action?

7. What effect does the South Dallas location of the Priest Institute have on its programs? Is the location an asset for some programs and a liability for others?

8. Describe the relationship, as you understand it, between the BJPIED and the seven colleges of the DCCCD. What is the Institute's position in relation to the district offices? Does the Institute's position in the District structure provide advantages or disadvantages?

9. Is the organizational structure appropriate for the effective administration of the Center's program? Are staff and physical and fiscal resources
appropriately allocated? NOTE: This question solicits perceptions about the organizational design; it does not seek comment on the effectiveness of individual performance.
PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Selected Staff, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

Arnold, Bob. Senior Training Consultant, Business and Professional Institute

Beauchamp, Sharon. Counselor, Job Training Center

Blackwood, Jim. Assistant Director, Business and Professional Institute

Blatt, Jeff. Coordinator of Training, Dallas Small Business Development Center

Bounds, Glen. Provost, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

Day, Kristi. Director of Public Information, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

Harris, Elizabeth. Coordinator of Training, International Business Center, Small Business Development Center

Howard, Mike. Vice Provost of Business Services, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

Huddleston, Elizabeth. Director, International Business Center, Small Business Development Center

Mancillas, Daniel. Director of Resource Development, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

Picquet, James. Vice Provost of Instructional Services, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

Salgado, Al. Director, Dallas Small Business Development Center, Small Business Development Center

Speraw, Pam. Director, Technology Assistance Center/Center for Government Contracting, Small Business Development Center

Woelfle, Shirley. Executive Secretary to the Provost, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development
Others Interviewed

Caswell, Jackie. Executive Assistant to the Chancellor for Governmental Relations, Dallas County Community College District

Dale, Charles. Professor of Electronics Technology, Eastfield College, Dallas County Community College District

Farrow, Rebecca. Former Senior Training Consultant for the Business and Professional Institute, currently, Director of Business and Industry Services, Richland College, Dallas County Community College District

Floeter, John. Staff, Greater Dallas Chamber. Client, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

Hardy, Carolyn. Staff, Greater Dallas Chamber. Client, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

Hughes, Ted. Vice Chancellor of Business Affairs, Dallas County Community College District; former Acting Chancellor, Dallas County Community College District

Matthews, Jeff. Greyhound Bus Company. Client, Bill J. Priest Institute for Economic Development

McClure, Lyndon. Director of Resource Development, Dallas County Community College District

Shlipak, Carole. Director of Development, Dallas County Community College District and Executive Vice President, Dallas County Community College District Foundation

Stone, Jack. Vice Chancellor of Educational Affairs, Dallas County Community College District


Wenrich, J. William. Chancellor, Dallas County Community College District
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