

283141

Archives

Closed

LD

175

.A40K

Th

271

AN EVALUATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School
Appalachian State University

In Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Thomas Eugene Carden

May 1973

AN ABSTRACT OF
AN EVALUATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH CAROLINA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Over the past seventy years (1900 to 1970), the community/junior college has become an established element of the American system of education. In accordance with this fact, the State of North Carolina has taken the initiative in establishing a system of community colleges and technical institutes. During the period of 1950 to 1970, a number of studies were conducted to make recommendations concerning the establishment, organization, and operation of a system of community colleges. It was the purpose of this study to compare what was suggested and recommended in these studies with the law, policies, and administrative memoranda which govern the Community College System.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

In light of the historical development of the North Carolina Community College System, to what degree did this development follow major study recommendations?

HYPOTHESIS

The North Carolina Community College System has generally followed major study recommendations.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In order to adequately study the aforementioned problem, the writer examined the following: (1) the history of the community college concept in the United States, (2) the history of the community college system in North Carolina, (3) a comparison of the major study recommendations with the law and policies and relative to location, tuition, admissions, state and local administration, finance, curriculum, and personnel, and (4) two evaluations which were based on criteria developed by the writer and Kenneth Brunner.

CONCLUSIONS

The following is a generalization of the forty-four conclusions which were formulated from this study: (1) the historical development of the North Carolina Community College System was influenced by the need for more education, an increase in the population, and the rise of the cost of higher education; (2) there were no differences among what was recommended and what was implemented in the areas named above; and (3) the Department of Community Colleges generally met all of the writer's criteria, but did not meet all of Brunner's criteria.

Thomas Eugene Carden

AN EVALUATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM

by

Thomas Eugene Carden

Approved by

Frank W. McLeod

Chairman, Thesis Committee

Leland Cooper

Professor of Education

Ben F. Strickland

Professor of Education

Sandra Gruetter

Assistant Professor of Education

Mathaniel H. Slope

Chairman, Department of Administration
and Higher Education

B. F. Strickland

Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer would like to thank the members of his thesis committee, Dr. Ben F. Strickland, Dr. Leland R. Cooper, and Mrs. Sandra Gruetter, for their assistance and guidance in pursuance of this study. The writer would especially like to express appreciation to his advisor, Dr. Marshall W. McLeod, who, as a friend, teacher, and critic, guided the development of this study.

The writer would also like to express his appreciation to the many others that have helped him in obtaining materials and information and that have served as unofficial advisors. Lastly, the writer would like to thank his wife, Nardy, for her continuous faith and love during the work of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	5
HYPOTHESIS	5
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	5
DEFINITIONS AND DELIMITATIONS	6
METHODS AND PROCEDURES	9
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
3. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NORTH CAROLINA AND NATIONWIDE	23
COMMUNITY COLLEGES NATIONWIDE	23
The Evolution of the Junior College, 1850-1920.	23
The Expansion of Occupation Programs, 1920-1945.	25
The Community College Concept, 1945-1965	27
The Period of Consolidation, 1965 to the Present.	27
THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM IN NORTH CAROLINA	28
The Period from 1927 to 1963	29
Buncombe County Junior College	29

Chapter	Page
College Centers	30
The Community College Study	31
The Community College Act	33
The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School	34
Chapter 115A of the General Statutes of North Carolina	37
The Period from 1963 to 1970	38
4. A COMPARISON OF THE MAJOR STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS WITH THE LAW, POLICIES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDA	41
LOCATION OF INSTITUTIONS	42
TUITION	45
ADMISSIONS POLICY	46
LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL	47
STATE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL	50
FINANCE	53
CURRICULUM	55
TEACHING PERSONNEL	56
CONCLUSIONS	58
5. THE EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO THE WRITER'S AND BRUNNER'S CRITERIA	59
EVALUATION ACCORDING TO THE WRITER'S CRITERIA	59
Criteria for Evaluation	60
Rating Scale	61
Interviews	61
The Evaluation	62
Summary	63

Chapter	Page
EVALUATION ACCORDING TO BRUNNER'S CRITERIA	64
Criteria for Evaluation	64
Rating Scale	67
Information	67
The Evaluation	67
Summary	69
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	71
CONCLUSIONS	71
VALIDATION OF HYPOTHESIS	77
RECOMMENDATIONS	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79
APPENDIX	84

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the past seventy years (1900 to 1970), the community/junior college has become an "established element of the American system of education."¹ Within the last fifteen years (1955 to 1970), over five hundred new community colleges have sprung up all across the country.² In California, Florida, and Mississippi more students begin their college work in community colleges than in any other institution, and, furthermore, in New York state, California, Florida, and North Carolina, there is a community college within commuting distance of almost every resident.³ This tremendous growth has been attributed at least in part to--(1) the idea of community-centered institutions proposed in the nineteenth century by a succession of university deans and presidents, (2) the economic wealth of the United States, and (3) the social phenomemon known as the "American dream."⁴ However, a number of factors have been responsible for this rapid growth and acceptance by the public. Among these are--(1) the population growth, (2) changes in technology, (3) changes in attitude toward education, (4) accessibility

¹James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (New York: James Wiley and Sons, 1972), p. 46.

²Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., This Is the Community College (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), p. 4.

³Ibid.

⁴Thornton, op. cit., p. 47.

of the local college, (5) low tuition, and (6) the variety of transfer and vocational courses.⁵

An overview of community college activity throughout the nation shows the various states using a variety of ways to organize and finance community college services. Although no national consensus is apparent, there is enough agreement to suggest a general profile of these institutions. A national overview would see the community colleges as--(1) being a part of higher education in a state plan, (2) receiving an increasing proportion of financing from the state, (3) being established and operated under standards set at the state level, (4) admitting all students who can benefit by the program, (5) charging little or no tuition, (6) being a commuter school, (7) increasing the number and variety of technical and semi-professional programs, (8) being comprehensive in its programs, (9) providing services to aid under-educated students of post-secondary age, (10) looking to a state-level community college board for coordination of planning programs and services, and for state aid, (11) being represented in a state board for coordination with other institutions of higher education, (12) having a separate and distinct board of trustees, facilities, and budget, and (13) being locally initiated and controlled with sufficient state participation to maintain standards.⁶

⁵Harold F. Landrith, Introduction to the Community Junior College (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1971), pp. 39-43.

⁶Gleazer, op. cit., pp. 36-37.

With this profile in mind, several authors have listed purposes and characteristics of the community college. Ferris N. Crawford stated that the purpose of a community college is

. . . to provide, for all persons above the twelfth grade age level, education consistent with the purposes of the individual and the society of which they are a part, . . . the educational needs appropriate for community colleges to fulfill . . . include:

1. the need for programs of liberal arts and science courses . . . ,
2. the need for vocational and technical programs in the trades, industrial, agricultural, and semi-professional fields,
3. the need for programs of courses for adults and other community college students, for which credit may or may not be given, designed to provide general education . . . , and to facilitate occupational advancement.
4. the need for individual services to students . . . ,
5. the need for programs and services for individuals and groups interested in cultural, civic, recreational, or other community betterment projects.⁷

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson listed the purposes of the community college as follows:

1. . . . to provide educational services for young people who will eventually transfer to four-year colleges as well as for those who will terminate their formal studies at the end of one course, one semester, or the two-year period . . . ,
2. . . . to make available various adaptations of standard courses and sequences of study for specific individuals or needs. These adaptations include seminars, conferences, short courses, or occasional meetings and programs which contribute to the general welfare and improvements of the entire community.⁸

Fields summed up the purposes of the community college as follows:

- (1) preparation for advanced study, (2) vocational education, (3) general education, and (4) community services.⁹

⁷Ferris N. Crawford, "A Twentieth Century Institution: The Community College," Address delivered at Southwestern College Agreement Conference, Battle Creek, Michigan, November 16, 1961.

⁸Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 34.

⁹Ralph R. Fields, The Community College Movement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 61.

With regard to characteristics of the community college, Blocker Plummer, and Richardson listed the following:

1. The two-year college is probably more diverse in defined function, programs, clientele, and philosophy than any other educational institution in existence.

2. Its services are not confined to the traditional functions of the four-year college, but include activities which contribute to the general upgrading of society as a whole. In essence, it provides those services which are not made available by the high school or by other institutions of higher education.¹⁰

Fields presented the characteristics of the community colleges in a more precise manner. These were--(1) democratic, (2) comprehensive, (3) community-centered, (4) dedication to life-long education, and (5) adaptable.¹¹

The State of North Carolina has taken the initiative in establishing a system of community colleges and technical institutes. The purpose of these institutions is ". . . to fill the broad gap in educational opportunity existing between high school and the senior college and university."¹² These institutions have grown in number as well as in student enrollments. In 1963, there were four community colleges and twenty Industrial Education Centers. In 1972, there was a total of fifty-six institutions--fifteen community colleges and forty-one technical institutes. During the period of 1950 to 1970, a number of studies and reports were conducted. In these documents, a number of

¹⁰Blocker, op. cit., p. 35.

¹¹Fields, op. cit., pp. 63-95.

¹²North Carolina, State Board of Education, North Carolina Community College System Report, 1963-70 ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1970), p. 1.

recommendations were suggested. It will be the purpose of this study to compare what was suggested and recommended with the law, policies, and administrative memoranda which govern the Community College System.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

In light of the historical development of the North Carolina Community College System, to what degree did this development follow major study recommendations?

HYPOTHESIS

The North Carolina Community College System has generally followed major study recommendations.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges has completed its first decade at the time of this writing. This was an appropriate time for an evaluation of the Department and its institutions. In order to be more useful and informative, two evaluations were used. The first evaluation was based on how well the law, policies, and administrative memoranda which followed the major study recommendations were implemented. The second evaluation was based on selected criteria from Brunner.¹³ It was felt that these evaluations would be useful to the Community College System and to students of Community College Administration.

¹³Kenneth A. Brunner, "Criteria for Evaluating A State's Legislative and Administrative Programs for Community-Junior College Education" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1956).

DEFINITIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

Because of various meanings in the literature of such terms as junior college, community college, technical institute, industrial education center, and community college system, it was necessary to define these terms in a more precise manner.

These terms were defined as follows:

1. The Junior College is defined as ". . . an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly college grade."¹⁴

2. Community College is defined as

an educational institution . . .

a. which offers the freshman and sophomore courses of a college of arts and sciences,

b. which must offer organized curriculum for the training of technicians,

c. which must offer vocational, trade, and technical specialty courses and programs, and

d. which must offer courses in general adult education.¹⁵

3. Industrial Education Center is defined as

an educational institution . . .

a. which offers vocational, trade, and technical specialty courses and programs, and

b. which must offer courses in general adult education.¹⁶

4. Technical Institute is defined as

an educational institution . . .

a. which offers organized curricula for the training of technicians,

b. which must offer vocational, trade, and technical specialty courses and programs, and

c. which must offer courses in general adult education.¹⁷

¹⁴Thornton, op. cit., p. 52.

¹⁵North Carolina, General Statutes, Ch. 115A (1963), as amended (1969).

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ibid.

5. Community College System is defined as the Department of Community Colleges, the community colleges, and the technical institutes as they now exist in North Carolina under the North Carolina State Board of Education.

This study was delimited in several ways. It was limited to the geographic boundaries of the State of North Carolina. It was limited to a study of the North Carolina Community College System. It was further delimited in that the major recommendations, mentioned in the Statement of Problem, are limited to the following studies and reports--

(1) Community College Study,¹⁸ (2) The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School,¹⁹ (3) Community Colleges for North Carolina; Study of Need, Locations, and Service Areas,²⁰ and (4)

A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina.²¹ It was limited in comparing the major study recommendations

with the following documents--(1) Chapter 115A of the General Statutes of North Carolina,²² (2) Policy Manual for the System of Community

¹⁸North Carolina, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Community College Study, [by Allan S. Hurlburt] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1952).

¹⁹North Carolina, The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, [by Irving Carlyle] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962).

²⁰North Carolina, Board of Higher Education, Community Colleges for North Carolina; Study of Needs, Locations, and Service Areas, [by Charles Horace Hamilton] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962).

²¹North Carolina, State Board of Education, A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1963).

²²North Carolina, General Statutes, Ch. 115A (1963), as amended (1969).

Colleges,²³ and (3) The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges Administrative Memoranda.²⁴

It was also limited in using the following areas as criteria for comparison--(1) location of institutions, (2) tuition (according to the percentage of operating cost), (3) admission policies, (4) local administrative control, (5) state administrative control, (6) the amount and type of financing by the State and the local community, (7) curriculum, and (8) the qualifications and preparation of faculty members.

The first evaluation of this study was limited in using criteria based on the above areas, and on a rating scale of from one to five. The information and references for this evaluation were based on interviews and observations.

The second evaluation of this study was limited to the selected criteria from Brunner's dissertation, "Criteria for Evaluating A State's Legislative and Administrative Programs for Community-Junior College Education."²⁵ These criteria fell into the following categories-- (1) general legislative provisions, (2) powers of state and local authorities, (3) state and local financing, (4) state agency leadership, (5) a state's policy of accreditation, and (6) certification of personnel.

²³North Carolina, State Board of Education, Policy Manual for the System of Community Colleges ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1967).

²⁴North Carolina, State Board of Education, North Carolina Department of Community Colleges Administrative Memoranda ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1968).

²⁵Brunner, loc. cit.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study used the following procedures:

1. A careful review was made of all related literature with special emphasis on the following the above documents and relative to the criteria for comparison.
2. A historical overview of the community college movement in the United States and of the forces and individuals influential in the development of the community college system in North Carolina was presented.
3. The four specified publications' major recommendations were discussed in relation to the above criteria for comparison.
4. The provisions of the law, policy manual, and administrative memoranda were presented relative to the above criteria for comparison.
5. The major study recommendations were compared with the provisions of the law and policies.
6. An evaluation of the System was made based on the above criteria. The purpose of this evaluation was to examine the degree of acceptance and implementation of the law, policies, and memoranda which govern the System.
7. A second evaluation of the Community College System in North Carolina using selected criteria from Brunner was used.
8. Conclusions and recommendations were developed.

The following methods were used in studying the problem:

1. A review was made of all primary sources.
2. A review of selected secondary sources was made.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There was an abundance of material relative to the community colleges in North Carolina, as well as in the United States. The major areas of concern for the community colleges in North Carolina were--(1) a study of the historical development, (2) an in-depth look at the suggestions and recommendations of the major studies, and (3) a study of the law, policies, and memoranda that govern the System. The major areas of concern for the community/junior college in the United States were--(1) a study of the evolutionary stages of their development, and (2) a study of the purposes, functions, and characteristics.

The historical development, major study recommendations, the law, and the policies of the North Carolina Community College System were partially traced through a series of studies and reports published by the State of North Carolina. The first document published in North Carolina dealing solely with the community colleges was the Community College Study, under the directorship of Professor Allan S. Hurlburt of East Carolina Teachers College. This study, known as the Hurlburt Study, was published in 1952. It was authorized by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Clyde Erwin. Its purposes were--(1) to make a study of the need for publicly supported community colleges in the State, (2) to project a basic plan for the development of community

colleges in the State, and (3) to propose some basic legislation necessary to implement the program.¹

The study discussed the characteristics of the community college, the need for such institutions, criteria for location and physical plants, and plans for organization and finance. It concluded with the following recommendation: ". . . that there be developed . . . a state system of community colleges."² It listed the things that should be done to accomplish this goal and recommended legislation. The final portion of the Community College Study was an in-depth study of the Goldsboro area and its need. The Study also recommended segregated community colleges. It stated that ". . . consideration must be made for the possibilities of establishing branch or parallel facilities for Negroes."³

The next major document published by North Carolina was The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, directed by Attorney Irving Carlyle of Winston-Salem, in 1962. This report dealt with the whole aspect of higher education in North Carolina. In Chapter VIII, the report dealt specifically with the community colleges. The report listed two factors that pointed to the expansion of the community college system as the best means of meeting the large enrollments that were expected. They were--(1) the need to increase the geographical availability of college education on a commuting basis, and (2) the preponderant need for such opportunities at the freshman and sophomore

¹North Carolina, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Community College Study, [by Allan S. Hurlburt] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1952), pp. 3-5.

²Ibid., p. 32.

³Ibid., p. 17.

level.⁴ The report went on to discuss the types of institutions needed, the organization of the community college system, plans for financing, the criteria for establishing a community college, and admissions policies. The report concluded Chapter VIII with the following recommendations:

1. That a minimum of fifteen comprehensive community colleges be built by 1965 in top priority areas.

2. That an adequate appropriation for this purpose be made.

Finally, the report stated that

. . . a comprehensive community college system such as that recommended in this report, open to all qualified students without regard to race, will do much to democratize educational opportunities in North Carolina, and will be vital assistance to existing institutions, public and private, in meeting the post-high school education demands of the future.⁵

Community Colleges for North Carolina; Study of Need, Locations, and Service Areas was also published in 1962. Written and directed by Dr. Charles Horace Hamilton, Professor of Rural Sociology at North Carolina State College, the report's major objectives were--(1) to determine possible locations, (2) to determine service areas, and (3) to determine potential enrollments.⁶ Hamilton studied various aspects of the objectives. In doing so, he made projections of the college age population and high school graduates for both counties and community college areas. He also analyzed the enrollment of North Carolina college

⁴North Carolina, The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, [by Irving Carlyle] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962), p. 66.

⁵Ibid., p. 76.

⁶North Carolina, Board of Higher Education, Community Colleges for North Carolina; Study of Needs, Locations, and Service Areas, [by Charles Horace Hamilton] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962), p. 3.

students by county of residence and location of college attendance. Hamilton analyzed the relationship of income, urban residence, college location, and type of college to the percentage of North Carolina high school graduates who entered college. Finally, he made an appraisal of the effects of the establishment of community colleges on enrollment in public and private colleges. Hamilton concluded that there was a need for additional college facilities.⁷ He gave three reasons to support this conclusion--(1) the current and projected rise in the college age population, (2) the current and projected rise in the number of high school graduates, and (3) the current and projected trends in the enrollments in colleges and universities.⁸

The North Carolina General Assembly passed the Omnibus Higher Education Act of 1963 which embodied the recommendations of the Carlyle Commission's report. A portion of this bill concerned community colleges, and when enacted into law was codified in Chapter 115A of the General Statutes of North Carolina. This legislation contained four major provisions concerning the community colleges. They were--(1) state administration, (2) local administration, (3) financial support, and (4) budget accounting and fiscal management.⁹ This law, in effect, authorized the establishment of a system of community colleges in North Carolina.

⁷Ibid., p. 17.

⁸Ibid.

⁹North Carolina, General Statutes, Ch. 115A (1963), amended (1969).

After the passage of General Statute 115A, the State Board of Education published A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina. The purpose of this 1963 bulletin was ". . . to help the people of a community make a survey of the need for a comprehensive community college in their area."¹⁰ It attempted to accomplish this by justifying the reason and needs for community colleges, by explaining whom the institutions would serve, by explaining the programs, and by explaining, in detail, how the system and individual colleges would be financed. The publication went on to explain how the community colleges would be organized and administered, how they would be located, and what would happen to the existing community colleges and Industrial Education Centers. A Guide concluded by explaining how a community could establish a community college and the steps to be taken.

In 1966, the State Board of Education published The Comprehensive Community College System in North Carolina.¹¹ This pamphlet was in the form of a description of the organization, fiscal policies, and criteria for establishing a community college.

In 1969, the State Board of Education published Progress Report Report of the Comprehensive Community College System of North Carolina; First Five Years, 1963-1968.¹² In this document the background and

¹⁰North Carolina, State Board of Education, A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1963), p. 1.

¹¹North Carolina, State Board of Education, The Comprehensive Community College System in North Carolina ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1966).

¹²North Carolina, State Board of Education, Progress Report of the Comprehensive Community College System of North Carolina; First Five Years, 1963-1968 ([Raleigh, N.C.]:n.n., 1969).

experience of the System's first five years, 1963-1968, were presented. In 1970, the Board published North Carolina Community College System Report 1963-1970.¹³ This volume gives information based on the experience in the other publication plus two additional years, 1968-1970. While this publication was designed to be used independently, a fuller understanding of the North Carolina Community College System was gained by using the two volumes together. In Part III of the Report a long range plan for 1970-1980 was presented.

A review was made by the writer of the current catalogs from each of the fifty-six institutions in the State System. Rather than describing each one individually, it was felt that a collective review would serve the purpose since they are all of similiar format. This format usually consists of an introduction, a discussion of administrative concerns, courses and programs, and student services.

The Policy Manual for the System of Community Colleges was also reviewed. This document contains both the policies of the State Board of Education and administrative regulations of the Department of Community Colleges. Codification of existing policies and regulations was completed in February, 1967. Subsequent changes and additions to the Manual are provided monthly as they occur. Each codified classification is subordinate to the one preceding it above; chapters are thus divided into sub-chapters; sub-chapters are divided into topics. The Manual

¹³North Carolina, State Board of Education, North Carolina Community College System Report, 1963-1970 ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1970).

was divided into the following major headings--(1) the Comprehensive Community College System, (2) Institutions--Organization and Operation, (3) Institutions--Fiscal Affairs, and (4) Education Programs.¹⁴

The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges Administrative Memoranda was established for the dissemination of the operating instructions required to implement the policies, regulations, and standards adopted by the State Board of Education for the administration of the North Carolina Community College System.¹⁵ Sixteen functional areas were established to indicate Departmental staff responsibilities for the preparing, revising, and supervising of the Memoranda. They were--(1) general administration, (2) budgeting, (3) construction, (4) equipment, (5) federal-state relations, (6) library services, (7) statistics, (8) institutional standards, (9) adult education, (10) learning laboratory, (11) student personnel affairs, (12) college transfer education, (13) industrial services, (14) occupational education, (15) curriculum materials, and (16) special education.

The aforementioned documents gave a look at what was being done officially in the development of recommendations, policies, and regulations. However, a more thorough understanding of the historical development was obtained by the use of the secondary sources which placed the preceding documents into a historical context.

¹⁴North Carolina, State Board of Education, Policy Manual for the System of Community Colleges ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1967).

¹⁵North Carolina, State Board of Education, North Carolina Department of Community Colleges Administrative Memoranda, No. 1-1, July, 1968, p. 1.

There was a wealth of resources concerning the community colleges nationwide; however, the following books were chosen because of their sections on the historical development of the community college concept in the United States, and because of their sections on the purposes and characteristics of the community college.

In 1957, Jesse Parker Bogue published The Development of the

Community Colleges. This book gave a running account of the history

of the community college from its start in the late nineteenth century with the junior colleges to the modern product--the comprehensive

community college. Bogue listed the reasons for this evolution as

follows: "The multipurpose or comprehensive community college has

appeared as a result of changing economic, technical, and social

conditions of the present century."¹⁶

Similar to Bogue's work was a book by Ralph R. Fields, The

Community College Movement, published in 1962. Fields discussed the

community college idea, community colleges in action, and the issues

and future of the community colleges. As was stated above, this study

was concerned with the purposes and characteristics of community colleges;

therefore, Chapters 2 and 3 were examined. Chapter 2, "The Junior

College Movement," concerned the early beginnings of the junior college

to the development of the community college. Chapter 3, "Characteristics

of the Community College," concerned the major characteristics.¹⁷

¹⁶Jesse Parker Bogue, The Development of the Community Colleges (Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1957), p. 4.

¹⁷Ralph R. Fields, The Community College Movement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

Several other books were also used as supplementary sources. They were--This is the Community College,¹⁸ The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis,¹⁹ Introduction to the Community Junior College,²⁰ and A Day at Santa Fe (the article by Edmund Gleazer).²¹

The preceding publications were used only as supplementary resources. The major source used concerning the historical development of the community colleges nationwide was The Community Junior College by James W. Thornton, Jr. This book has been used over the last decade as a college text for studying the community college. Chapter 4 of Thornton dealt specifically with historical development of the community junior college. Thornton listed the following reasons for the growth of the community colleges: (1) the idea proposed by a succession of university deans and presidents, (2) the increase of economic wealth, and (3) the social phenomemon known as the "American dream."²² He also listed four evolutionary stages of the modern community college. Thornton concluded with the promises of the community colleges that had been broken and the ones that had been fulfilled.

Two sources were found that really dealt with the North Carolina Community College System in a critical manner. The first of these was

¹⁸Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., This is the Community College (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968).

¹⁹Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965).

²⁰Harold F. Landrith, Introduction to the Community Junior College (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1971).

²¹Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "To Deliver on the Promise," A Day at Santa Fe (Gainesville, Fla.: n.n., 1971), pp. 3-15.

²²James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972), p. 47.

an article in the Junior College Journal by H. R. Boozer entitled, "North Carolina is Counting on Community Colleges."²³ This article was published in December of 1963, just six months after the General Assembly had enacted the Omnibus Higher Education Act. The article was a description of the efforts in North Carolina to establish a system of community colleges. It began with the Hurlburt Study of 1952 and ended with the report by the Carlyle Commission and the provisions of the law. Boozer was not critical of those efforts, but gave a good historical description of what had happened.

The best historical account of the community college system that has been done to date was an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Kenyon Bertel Segner, III, entitled "A History of the Community College Movement in North Carolina, 1927-1963."²⁴ Segner discussed the very beginnings of community colleges. Segner's discussion included historical accounts of Buncombe County Junior College in 1927, the Community College Act of 1957, the superintendency of Clyde Erwin, the Hurlburt Study and the Carlyle Commission, and finally the enactment of the Omnibus Higher Education Act. Segner did a very thorough job of searching all sources, which included interviews with most of the living participants in the historical development of the System in North Carolina. He was particularly good at finding often forgotten facts.

²³H. R. Boozer, "North Carolina Is Counting on Community Colleges," Junior College Journal, 34:8-11, December, 1963.

²⁴Kenyon Bertel Segner, III, "A History of the Community College Movement in North Carolina, 1927-1963," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966).

The remaining sources were not as likely to be as critical as the first two were. The reason for this was that they were published in either the North Carolina Education Association's journal, the Community College System's journal, The Open Door, or state newspapers. With this in mind, an article was investigated in The Open Door entitled "Education Has Acquired New Dimensions." This article was written by Nancy L. Duckett, who was editor of The Open Door at the time. The piece was mainly concerned with the change in North Carolina since the 1963 legislation. Duckett listed enrollment figures for 1963 through 1967, wrote about the new types of institutions, and gave a short historical background of the system.²⁵ Although this article was not very critical, it did give a good history of the system between 1963 and 1967.

An article similar to Duckett's was printed in North Carolina Education by B. E. Fountain in 1968. (Fountain succeeded Dr. I. E. Ready in 1971 as president of the Department of Community Colleges.) Fountain's article, "The Citizen and his Community College," was similar to Duckett's in that it had a short section on the background; however, its major emphasis was on explaining the various programs offered, on how institutions and state system are governed, and on the issues that were prominent at the time.²⁶ Fountain concluded by saying: "The central concept of the community college system is the opening of new and manifold educational opportunities for all North Carolinians."²⁷

²⁵Nancy L. Duckett, "Education Has Acquired New Dimensions," The Open Door, 3:3, March-May, 1967.

²⁶B. E. Fountain, "The Citizen and his Community College," North Carolina Education, 35:12-13, September, 1968.

²⁷Ibid.

The final article in this series of "progress reports" was published in the Winter of 1971 in The Open Door. This unsigned work entitled "Community Colleges-Technical Institutes Grow Under the Directorship of Dr. Ready" was similar to the works of Boozer and Duckett, but brought the information more up to date. This article was written at the time of Dr. Ready's retirement as director of the Department of Community Colleges, and recounted the accomplishment of his tenure in office.²⁸

As was mentioned above, the preceding publications were used to study the purposes, characteristics, and historical development of the community college nationwide and in North Carolina. One other publication was consulted, "Criteria for Evaluating A State's Legislative and Administrative Programs for Community-Junior College Education," by Kenneth A. Brunner.²⁹ This was an unpublished doctoral dissertation completed at the University of Florida in 1956. Selected criteria were chosen from this work to evaluate the Community College System in North Carolina.

²⁸"Community Colleges-Technical Institutes Grow Under the Directorship of Dr. Ready," The Open Door, 7:4-7, Winter, 1971.

²⁹Kenneth August Brunner, "Criteria for Evaluating A State's Legislative and Administrative Programs for Community-Junior College Education" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1956).

Chapter 3

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NORTH CAROLINA AND NATIONWIDE

The evolution of the Community College System in North Carolina has followed closely the evolution of community colleges nationwide. The purpose of this chapter is to describe this evolution and to provide a historical overview of the community college movement in the United States and of the forces and individuals influential in the development of the Community College System in North Carolina

COMMUNITY COLLEGES NATIONWIDE

The historical evolution of the community college nationwide may be viewed in several ways; however, Thornton's four stages were chosen. They were--(1) the evolution of the junior college, 1850-1920, (2) the expansion of occupational programs, 1920-1945, (3) the community college concept, 1945-1965, and (4) the period of consolidation, 1965 to the present.¹

The Evolution of the Junior College, 1850-1920

The history of the junior college began in the 1850's. It was during this time that the idea of the junior college was conceived

¹James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972), pp. 47-58.

and became a practical reality.² The term "junior college" was probably first used in 1896 by the president of the University of Chicago, W. R. Harper.³ In 1892, Harper had separated the first two years of higher education into "the academic college" and "the university college." He later changed these into "the junior college" and "the senior college." President Harper was credited with influencing the foundation of several public and private junior colleges, one of which was Joliet (Illinois) Junior College in 1901. (Joliet Junior College is regarded by most authorities as being the oldest public junior college still in existence.)⁴ The idea of a two-year college offering strictly college level courses caught on quickly. There were six to eight two-year colleges organized before 1900.⁵ Other advocates of two-year colleges, besides Harper, were William Watts Folwell, President of the University of Minnesota, and Henry R. Tappan, President of the University of Michigan. Because of the efforts of these three men and others like them, there were at least seventy-five junior colleges by 1915.⁶ In 1922, there were 207 junior colleges; seventy of them were public and 137 were private. Prior to this in 1920, the American Association of Junior Colleges was formed. Its purpose was as follows:

²Ibid., p. 47.

³Ibid., p. 48.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Jesse Parker Bogue, The Development of Community Colleges (Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1957), p. 2.

⁶North Carolina, State Board of Education, A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina (Raleigh, N.C.: n.n., 1963), p. 4.

. . . to define the junior college by creating standards and curricula, thus determining its position structurally in relation to other posts of the school system; and to study the junior college in all its types in order to make a genuine contribution to the work of education.⁷

The new organization defined the junior college as ". . . an institution offering two years of strictly college grade."⁸

This was the beginning of the community college concept. Thornton quoted a 1919 dissertation by F. M. McDowell as to three main influences that furthered the idea of the junior college. They were--(1) the influence and favorable attitudes of the large university, (2) the extension of the high school, and (3) the weakness of particular four-year colleges which were forced to concentrate their efforts on attainable objectives.⁹

The Expansion of Occupational Programs, 1920-1945

In the early 1920's the leaders in the junior colleges realized that there was a need for vocational and technical education. This feeling was best expounded by David MacKenzie in 1920. MacKenzie, the Dean of Detroit Junior College, made the following statement at the National Conference of Junior Colleges.

I think that it is a great mistake to limit the scope of the junior college. The gentleman from Texas has referred to two forms of college, the academic and the vocational, one preparing for the school of agriculture and the other for the university; but I think the junior college should occupy a much larger field than that. If democracy is to be preserved by education, it will be by bringing education down to the masses. There are many

⁷Thornton, op. cit., p. 58.

⁸Ibid., p. 52.

⁹Ibid.

intelligent people in large communities who are capable of profiting by college work but who are in no way fitted for college according to the typical entrance examination. The junior college ought to offer a large number of courses that will appeal to such persons. The community as a whole supports the junior college. Is it justifiable, then to give only those courses which appeal to those who are going on to a larger college, or should the community be helped by raising the general intelligence?¹⁰

Because of the increasing need felt by the junior college leaders and the fact that the California junior colleges had already started technical and vocational training, the American Association of Junior Colleges felt impelled to offer a new definition in 1925.

The junior college is an institution offering two years of strictly collegiate grade, . . . however the junior college may, and is likely to, develop a different type of curriculum suited to the larger and ever changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs for the entire community in which the college is located. It is understood that in this case also the work shall be on level appropriate for high school graduates.¹¹

From these early beginnings, Thornton listed several reasons for the rise of occupational education in the junior colleges. These were-- (1) the leadership of state agencies for vocational education, (2) the widespread unemployment during the Depression years, (3) the need for new technicians after World War II, and (4) the Vocational Education Act of 1963.¹² The idea of occupational education in junior colleges caused an increase in the number of institutions by 1945 to over six hundred.¹³

¹⁰Ralph R. Fields, The Community College Movement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), pp. 34-35.

¹¹Thornton, op. cit. p. 53.

¹²Ibid., p. 54.

¹³North Carolina, loc. cit.

The Community College Concept, 1945-1965

After World War II, many of the public junior colleges had succeeded in adding occupational education to their programs, but were not yet fully evolved as "community colleges." The realization of this concept was to come in the late 1940's and early 1950's when the junior colleges began to offer adult education and comprehensive services to their local communities. These services came about during World War II. Because of the lack of students, and emphasis on technical training for defense work, there was a need present. The institutions, however, took on the job of community services as a temporary measure.¹⁴ However, the colleges retained and developed these services after the war. Thus with the offering of college parallel, vocational, technical, adult education programs, and the extension of services to the community, the development of the community college concept was completed.¹⁵

The Period of Consolidation, 1965 to the Present

Although the idea or concept of the community college was now completed and accepted, the community colleges were not living up to all of their promises. Although there was an "open door" admissions policy, a lot of people were not interested. Other criticism included the fact that three-fourths of the students stated transfer goals, yet less than half actually transferred; there was poor counseling and guidance; and there was a poor quality of instruction.¹⁶

¹⁴Thornton, op. cit., p. 55.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁶Ibid.

Recently, however, there has been an emphasis on improvement of performance by community college leaders. Some events that have pointed to this were--(1) recognition of community colleges by the federal government by way of more funds, (2) the location of facilities nearer the people to be served, (3) the recruitment of minority students, (4) the modernization of occupational education, (5) the increased status of transfer students in four-year institution, (6) relevancy of curriculums, and (7) the increased emphasis on guidance and counseling.¹⁷ In effect, it is possible to suggest that history has developed a workable concept of the true community college--a non-residential, multi-purpose, and community-centered institution that offers to high school graduates and those older than the normal high school age opportunities for college parallel, vocational-technical, and adult education instruction.¹⁸

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM IN NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina was slow to develop public community colleges. One reason for this appeared to be the large number of private church related junior colleges in the State. In order to study the historical development of the Community College System in North Carolina, the history was divided into two parts. They were--(1) the period from 1927 up to the enactment of the Omnibus Higher Education Act in 1963, and (2) the period following the enactment of the law from 1963 to 1970.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 57-58.

¹⁸North Carolina, op. cit., p. 4.

The Period from 1927 to 1963

Public junior colleges got off to a slow and singular start in North Carolina. As previously stated, the reason for this was the large number of church related private junior colleges. The State's first and only public junior college until the late 1940's was Buncombe County Junior College in Asheville.

Buncombe County Junior College. Buncombe County Junior College was established in Asheville in 1927. The institution changed its name several times. Among these names were Asheville-Biltmore Junior College, Asheville Junior College, and finally, when it was made a four-year institution, The University of North Carolina at Asheville. The Asheville junior college, whatever the name might have been at the time, was never a large institution, but it had a impact which overshadowed its limited enrollment. As was previously stated, it was the only public junior college in the state until 1947. It pioneered such community college concepts as low tuition and the comprehensive curriculum. The college offered ". . . such terminal programs as pre-nursing, industrial arts, secretarial science, home economics, and pre-aviation."¹⁹ The issue of the school district's right to tax itself for the support of the Asheville junior college led to a nationally acclaimed legal decision. In the case of Zimmerman v. The Board of Education (of Buncombe County), the state supreme court reversed the lower court decision by

¹⁹Kenyon Bertel Segner, III, "A History of the Community College Movement in North Carolina, 1927-1963," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966), pp. 1-2.

stating, in effect, that the local Board had the power to operate the junior college as a part of an ". . . adequate and sufficient system of public schools."²⁰ The Zimmerman case set a precedent in declaring the legal right of a school district to establish the thirteenth and fourteenth grades within its scheme of tax supported public education. It has been referred to as a judicial landmark in the fight for acceptance for the public junior colleges.²¹

College Centers. As previously stated, the Asheville junior college was the only public junior college in the State until 1947. The new institution set up at that time resulted from the increased enrollment in 1946 by the influx of G. I.'s after World War II. During that year Governor Cherry set up a committee to handle the problems of overcrowdedness. The committee decided the best way to handle this situation was to set up a group of off-campus university extension centers at the freshman level. Twelve of these "college centers" were opened up in 1946. In 1947, the sophomore year was added. By 1949, it appeared that the purposes of the college centers had been served and they were discontinued, with the exception of the centers at Charlotte, Wilmington, and Greensboro, which were made public junior colleges.²² It should be noted that these three institutions, as well as the one at Asheville, were locally supported until 1955.

²⁰Zimmerman v. Board of Education, "North Carolina Reports, Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme Court of North Carolina, (1930)" 199 (Raleigh, N.C.: Bynum Printing Co., 1931), pp. 259-264, (154 S.E. 397).

²¹Segner, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

²²*Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

The Community College Study. Clyde Erwin, state superintendent from 1934 to 1952, had been a strong advocate of the comprehensive community college concept since 1946, in sharp contrast to the majority of the members of the State Board of Higher Education. After failing to secure some type of community college legislation during the 1949 General Assembly, he appointed a study committee to make recommendations to the 1953 General Assembly. This committee, headed by Dr. Allan S. Hurlburt of East Carolina Teachers College, published its report, Community College Study, in 1952.

The Community College Study, or Hurlburt Study as it was usually called, has as its purposes the following: (1) to make a study of the need in North Carolina for state supported community colleges, (2) to project a basic plan for the development of community college services and facilities in the state, (3) to recommend standards and criteria for community colleges, and (4) to propose basic principles of legislation necessary to implement such a program.²³ The Hurlburt Study listed the following as characteristics of the community college: (1) low cost to pupils, (2) a location within commuting distance of pupils, (3) curriculum offerings that would include college parallel, technical-vocational and adult education, and (4) local control.²⁴

In fulfilling its purposes, the Hurlburt Study came up with the following reasons for community colleges in North Carolina--(1) North

²³North Carolina, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Community College Study, [by Allan S. Hurlburt] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1952), p. 5.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 7-9

Carolina's youth were educationally underdeveloped, (2) the increasing demands placed on senior colleges, and (3) the need for vocational-technical education.²⁵ The study also listed the criteria to be applied in location of the institutions, minimum standards for physical facilities, and how the college should be organized and financed. The Hurlburt Study made one recommendation: that a system of community colleges be established. It then listed several things that should be done in order to establish community colleges and what legislation should be enacted in order to implement the recommendation. The remainder of the study was an in-depth analysis of the Goldsboro area and its educational needs. This was done to serve as an example of how local needs should be surveyed. In conclusion, the Hurlburt Study recommended that the State adopt a system of comprehensive community colleges. These were to be low tuition and "open door" colleges that followed the suggested patterns which had been recommended in the Report of the President's Committee on Higher Education (1947).²⁶

The recommendations of the Hurlburt Study became known as the Taylor Bill (H.B. 579) in the General Assembly of 1953. After a prolonged debate the bill was defeated by the vote of sixty-two to forty-two.²⁷ Segner listed the following five reasons for the failure of the Taylor Bill: (1) the lack of support by the rural counties, (2) the lack of educational leadership (caused by the death of Erwin in 1952), (3) the

²⁵Ibid., pp. 11-14.

²⁶Kenyon Bertel Segner, III, "A History of the Community College Movement in North Carolina, 1927-1963," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966), pp. 130-131.

²⁷Ibid., p. 44.

lack of gubernatorial support, (4) a fear of hurting the private church related junior colleges, and (5) the feeling that the State could not afford it.²⁸ It should be noted that Representative Roger Kiser of Scotland County, the leader of the opposition, was able to use the racial issue in conjunction with last reason. It was obvious to anyone in 1952 that if a college were built, branching or parallel facilities would have to be built for Negroes. This, of course, doubled the costs of any proposed institutions.

If the Taylor Bill had passed, North Carolina would have developed a state-wide system of community colleges that would have had a considerable effect upon lessening the enrollment crisis that was looming on the horizon.

The Community College Act. In 1957, the Community College Act was enacted by the General Assembly. Under this legislation, the junior colleges in the aforementioned cities came under the control of the Board of Higher Education. This legislation gave the four institutions more state aid, but it also required them to break their bonds with the local boards. It also tended to confine the institutions to college parallel offerings because state financial assistance was not offered for the technical-vocational and adult programs.²⁹ The Board of Higher Education controlled the State's junior colleges between 1957 and 1963. Despite the fact that the 1957 act provided for new institutions to be chartered, only two new ones (Elizabeth City and Gastonia) opened

²⁸Ibid., p. 53.

²⁹Ibid., pp. 21-26.

their doors during this period. Segner listed two factors that inhibited the state system of junior colleges: (1) a stipulation that a district could be made up of only one county, and (2) the lack of desire on the part of the State Board of Higher Education for an accelerated program of expansion.³⁰

Also, in 1957, the General Assembly appropriated five hundred thousand dollars to set up a program known as the "Industrial Education Movement" to study the need for Industrial Education Centers in the State. As a result of this study, the General Assembly appropriated a substantial amount of money in 1959 for the establishment of the Industrial Education Centers (IEC's).³¹ These institutions were placed under the control of the State Board of Education. Twenty IEC's were established by 1963.

The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School. Soon after he was elected in 1960, Governor Terry Sanford began to express apprehension over various aspects of the State's system of higher education. Among his concerns were the low percentage attending college and the apparent lack of coordination among the state's two types of non-degree post high school institutions--the public junior colleges and the industrial education centers. In September, 1961, the Governor announced the appointment of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School. The commission was charged with responsibility of studying the

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Nancy L. Duckett, "Education Has Acquired New Dimensions," The Open Door, 3:3, March-May, 1967.

whole spectrum of the State's system of higher education, and to make recommendations to the 1963 General Assembly. Attorney Irving Carlyle of Winston-Salem was named chairman of this committee, which was commonly referred to as the Carlyle Commission. The two most influential members appeared to be Dallas Herring, chairman of the State Board of Education and member of the Board of Higher Education, and President William Friday of the University of North Carolina.³²

The commission consulted a number of experts during the course of its study. One of these was Dr. Hurlburt, who had been chairman of Superintendent Erwin's Community College Study committee. The Hurlburt recommendations evidently influenced the Carlyle Commission because the community college section (Chapter VIII) of its final report closely resembled the suggestions of the Community College Study.³³ The Carlyle Commission also relied heavily upon the work of Dr. Charles Horace Hamilton, professor of rural sociology at North Carolina State College in Raleigh.

Dr. Hamilton furnished a report for the Commission, entitled Community Colleges for North Carolina: Study of Need, Locations, and Service Areas. This report had the following major objectives: (1) to determine possible locations, (2) to determine service areas, and (3) to determine enrollment potential.³⁴ Hamilton followed through with these objectives by--(1) projecting the college age population and high school

³²Ibid., pp. 132-133.

³³Ibid., p. 133.

³⁴North Carolina, Board of Higher Education, Community Colleges for North Carolina: Study of Need, Locations, and Service Areas, [By Charles Horace Hamilton] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962), p. 3.

graduates for both counties and community college areas, (2) analyzing the enrollment of North Carolina college students by county of residence and location of college attendance, (3) analyzing the relation of income, urban residence, college location, and type of college to the percentage of North Carolina graduates who enter college, and (4) appraising the probable effect of the establishment of community colleges on enrollment in public and private colleges.³⁵ He concluded that there was a need for additional college facilities in North Carolina. Hamilton gave the following reasons for reaching this conclusion--(1) the current and projected rise in college age population, (2) the current and projected number of high school graduates, and (3) the enrollment trends in colleges and universities.³⁶ A layman's explanation of this process was given in The Charlotte Observer on June 28, 1962. It was a sample of the study made in the Morganton-Burke County area to determine the area's educational needs.³⁷

By early 1962, it was evident that the Carlyle Commission would recommend that the 1963 General Assembly enact a statute for a state system of community colleges. There was general support for this from the state press and politicians; however, there was some opposition from church groups who were afraid that the low tuition would hurt their own colleges and universities.³⁸

³⁵Ibid., p. 3.

³⁶Ibid., p. 17.

³⁷Charles Horace Hamilton, "Data for Decision: The Morganton, Burke County Area," The Charlotte Observer, June 28, 1963, p. 22-C.

³⁸Segner, loc. cit.

The Carlyle Commission published its final report, The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, in 1962.³⁹

This document included recommendations concerning the entire sphere of the state's higher education structure; however, Chapter VIII dealt specifically with the community college. (Recommendations made by the Carlyle Commission concerning community colleges may be found in Chapter 4 of this study.) The Carlyle Commission concluded its report on the community colleges by saying,

A comprehensive community college system such as that recommended in this report, open to all qualified students without regard to race, will do much to democratize educational opportunities in North Carolina, and will be of vital assistance to existing institutions, public and private, in meeting the post high school educational demands of the future.⁴⁰

Chapter 115A of the General Statutes of North Carolina. In May, 1963, the General Assembly enacted the Omnibus Higher Education Act, which became law in July, 1963; and included the community college recommendations of the Carlyle Commission. Chapter 115A of the General Statutes of North Carolina authorized the establishment of the community college system in North Carolina. This law included the following areas-- (1) state administration, (2) local administration, (3) financial support, and (4) budget accounting and fiscal management.⁴¹

³⁹North Carolina, The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, [by Irving Carlyle] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962).

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 76.

⁴¹North Carolina, General Statutes, Ch. 115A (1963), as amended (1969).

The Period from 1963 to 1970

In late 1963, the Department of Community Colleges of the State Board of Education published a bulletin. The purpose of which was ". . . to help the people of a community make a survey of the need for a comprehensive community college in their area."⁴² This bulletin was entitled A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina, and told of the advantages to be gained by the institutions, what groups would be served, what programs would be offered, how the colleges would be financed, and what steps should be taken by a community interested in establishing a community college. At this point, the Community College System in North Carolina was on its way to providing education to all of the State.

The Department of Community Colleges inherited the junior colleges at Elizabeth City and Gastonia and twenty IEC's, and Dr. I. E. Ready was made president of the Department. (All the IEC's were later made into Technical Institutes.) The system offered the following programs-- (1) adult basic education, (2) vocational education, (3) technical education leading to an associate degree, (4) non-credit and enrichment courses, and (5) freshman and sophomore years of college transfer study. The community colleges were authorized to offer all five, and the technical institutes were authorized to offer all but the college transfer programs. The primary missions of the system were teaching, learning, and community service.⁴³

⁴²North Carolina, State Board of Education, A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1963), p. 1.

⁴³B. E. Fountain, "The Citizen and his Community College," North Carolina Education, 35:12-13, September, 1968.

The growth of the enrollment of the system was larger than had been predicted. In an article in The Open Door, in 1967, Nancy Duckett, the editor, offered a chart to show the growth of the System from the 1963-1964 school year to the 1966-1967 school year. In 1963-1964, there were 8,588 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) students enrolled in the state's institutions. By 1966-1967, there were 33,653 FTE.⁴⁴ Of course, these figures show not only an increase in students but also an increase in the number of institutions, from twenty-two in 1963 to forty-three in 1967.

In an unsigned article in 1971, The Open Door offered the following facts concerning the system and some of its major accomplishments: (1) the system enrolled one-third of a million people each school year, or six percent of the population of North Carolina, and (2) in 1963, there were only eight curriculums offered in the occupational areas, but by 1971 there were one hundred and fifty offered.⁴⁵ The biggest achievement was "the tremendous acceptance of the program by the people of the State."⁴⁶

Nevertheless, the task at hand was not yet complete. In his article, Fountain listed the following things that needed to be done: (1) an awareness by the people of the institutions and their missions, (2) the unfinished task of developing the system so that every individual

⁴⁴Nancy L. Duckett, "Education Has Acquired New Dimensions," The Open Door, 3:3, March-May, 1967.

⁴⁵"Community Colleges-Technical Institutes Grow Under the Directorship of Dr. Ready," The Open Door, 7:4-7, Winter, 1971.

⁴⁶Ibid.

in North Carolina can have access to a school, (3) the offerings and strengths of the programs should be broadened, and (4) the principles of sound scholarship and responsible freedom of learning and teaching should be protected.⁴⁷

As was stated in the Review of the Literature, the State Board of Education published three documents concerning the community colleges during the period from 1963 to 1970. These were--The Comprehensive Community College System in North Carolina in 1966, Progress Report of the Comprehensive Community College System of North Carolina; First Five Years, 1963-1968 in 1969, and North Carolina Community College System Report, 1963-1970 in 1970. All three gave the curriculums offered, a progress report to date, and a general explanation of the structure and organization of the system.

Since 1970, the system has continued to grow. By 1972, there were fifty-six institutions in the community college system, fifteen community colleges and forty-one technical institutes. (Dr. I. E. Ready resigned as director of the Department in December of 1970, and was replaced by Dr. B. E. Fountain.) There seems to be an increased emphasis now on the quality of the programs rather than on the further creation of new institutions. There is now a community college or technical institute within the commuting distance of all but five percent of the residents of North Carolina.⁴⁸

⁴⁷Fountain, loc. cit.

⁴⁸Ibid.

Chapter 4

A COMPARISON OF THE MAJOR STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS WITH THE LAW, POLICIES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDA

The purpose of this study was determine the degree of implementation of major study recommendations in the law, policies, regulations, and standards of the North Carolina Community College System. In order to do this, it was necessary to compare the two--what was recommended versus what was implemented. The following areas were chosen as criteria for comparison because they were thought to be the most significant in evaluating the State's Community College System. The criteria chosen were--(1) location of institutions, (2) tuition (according to the percentage of operating cost), (3) admission policies, (4) local administrative control, (6) amount and type of financial support by the State and the local community, (7) curriculum, and (8) the qualifications and preparation of teaching personnel.

The major study recommendations were found in the following publications--(1) Community College Study, (2) The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, (3) Community Colleges for North Carolina; Study of Need, Locations, and Service Areas, and (4) A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community in North Carolina. These were compared to Chapter 115A of the General Statutes of North Carolina, Policy Manual for the System of Community Colleges, and The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges Administrative Memoranda.

LOCATION OF INSTITUTIONS

In examining the four specified documents, it was noted that three of these listed at least four criteria necessary for the location of a community college. These were the Hurlburt Study, the Carlyle Report, and A Guide. The Hamilton Study did not list any criteria; however, it did furnish a map with fifty-five service areas. Hamilton concluded that these areas were the most logical because of the following factors--(1) distance for students, (2) enrollment potential, (3) population growth, (4) absence of other post-secondary institutions, and (5) income of the community.¹

The Hurlburt Study listed six criteria for the location of an institution. These were--(1) a minimum enrollment of three hundred students (FTE), (2) a commuting distance of no more than twenty-five miles, (3) sufficient local income and facilities to support day and evening classes, (4) local initiative, (5) curriculum adequacy (the area must be able to justify a broad curriculum of vocational, technical, semi-professional, academic, and recreational education), and (6) population density.²

The Carlyle Report listed four criteria for the establishment of a community college. They were--(1) a minimum enrollment of four

¹North Carolina, Board of Higher Education, Community Colleges for North Carolina: Study of Need, Locations, and Service Areas, [by Charles Horace Hamilton] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962), p. 7.

²North Carolina, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Community College Study, [by Allan S. Hurlburt] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1952), pp. 16-17.

hundred to five hundred (FTE) within five years, (2) a commuting distance of no more than forty-five minutes or thirty miles one way, (3) due consideration of the proximity and curriculum of other institutions, and of local needs, and (4) local interest and initiative.³ The Report also recommended that a survey should be made of the following factors--(1) educational needs of the area, (2) future high school and college enrollments, (3) current and anticipated industrial development, and (4) plans of high school seniors.⁴

A Guide listed three things that must be done to establish a community college. These were as follows:

1. A survey must be made of the local community that includes--
 (a) community attitudes, (b) maps of the area, (c) student potential, (d) educational programs beyond high school, (e) plans for the site and plant, and (f) the ability of the local community to support a community college.

2. The following criteria must be met--(a) educational need is present, (b) there is adequate local support and resources, (c) other institutions, public and private, will not be adversely affected, and (d) there are sufficient funds available for state support.

3. There is local interest and initiative.⁵

³North Carolina, The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School, [by Irving Carlyle] ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962), pp. 76-77.

⁴Ibid.

⁵North Carolina, State Board of Education, A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina ([Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1963), pp. 22-24.

With regard to what was implemented the law proclaims six criteria. They are--(1) a genuine educational need exists, (2) the need is not being met by existing post-secondary institutions, (3) there is adequate local financial support, (4) the public schools will not be adversely affected by the financial support, (5) there is adequate state funding available, and (6) approval by the State Board of Education.⁶

The Policy Manual did not list any criteria. The Administrative Memoranda lists three steps necessary for the establishment and location of an institution.

1. An application must be submitted to the State Board of Education by the county Board of Education for a new area.
2. A survey must then be conducted to determine the following:
 - a. Does the educational need of the area justify the educational services proposed?
 - b. Can the existing public and private post-high school institutions in the area meet the needs demonstrated?
 - c. If unmet educational needs exist that could be met by proposed institution, will the projected student enrollment justify the proposed institution?
 - d. Can adequate local financial current expense be supplied without undue burden on local taxpayers, and authorization required will be approved by the people?
 - e. The extent to which adequate local tax support is provided public schools, and would the local public schools' tax support be affected adversely by the local support required for the proposed institution?
 - f. To what extent do the Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education in the area support the application?
 - g. What is the adequacy of the buildings proposed to house the new institution?
 - h. Does the application fit the policy of reasonable geographic distribution in order to meet state-wide needs?
 - i. Are adequate state funds available in the present biennium to support the proposed new institution?
3. The Board must then act on the application in light of the findings of the above survey.⁷

⁶North Carolina, General Statutes, Ch. 115A (1963), as amended (1969).

⁷North Carolina, State Board of Education, North Carolina Department of Community Colleges Administrative Memoranda, No. 1-8.

A comparison of the recommendations and law and policies concerning the location of institutions showed that they have the following criteria in common--(1) a survey must be made of the proposed area, (2) there must be local initiative and interest, (3) there must be an educational need present, (4) there must be adequate local financial support, (5) other institutions will not be adversely affected, and (6) there must be an adequate enrollment potential. Therefore, it was concluded that there were no major differences in the criteria that were recommended and those that were implemented.

TUITION

In the area of tuition according to the percentage of operating cost, there was some diversity. The Hamilton Study made no mention of tuition at all. The Hurlburt Study suggested that there be no tuition, but if it were necessary to have tuition it should be no more than fifty dollars a year (in 1950 dollar values).⁸ The Carlyle Report and A Guide both recommended that the student should have to pay twenty percent of the operating cost.⁹ However, it went on to recommend that this should not entail more than one-hundred and twenty dollars a year.¹⁰

There is no mention of any percentages in the law, policies, or administrative memoranda. The law states that "the State Board of

⁸North Carolina, Community College Study, op. cit., p. 8.

⁹North Carolina, Report of the Governor's Commission, op. cit., p. 72.

¹⁰North Carolina, A Guide, op. cit., p. 19.

Education may fix and regulate all tuition and fees charged to students" ¹¹ The Policy Manual lists the maximum tuition that can be charged. This is--(1) for college parallel--forty-two dollars per quarter, and (2) for technical-vocational--thirty-two dollars per quarter. ¹² Therefore, it was concluded that tuition is not planned to be more than twenty percent of the operating costs.

ADMISSIONS POLICY

There was quite a shift in the philosophy and definition of an "open door" admissions policy from 1952 to 1963. In 1952, the Hurlburt Study recommended an "open door" policy; however, their definition of "open door" was to admit any high school graduates. ¹³ (The Study did recommend that non-graduates be considered on an individual basis.) This definition was also found in the Carlyle Report. ¹⁴ By 1963, however, the definition was changed. In A Guide, "open door" meant admission of " . . . high school graduates, and others who are not high school graduates but are older than the normal high school age." ¹⁵ This also marked a change in philosophy.

The law, Policy Manual, and Administrative Memoranda are basically the same in regards to admissions policy. The law states that the community colleges are

¹¹ North Carolina, General Statute 115A, op. cit., Sec. 2.

¹² North Carolina, Policy Manual, op. cit., No. 3.0211 (January, 1969).

¹³ North Carolina, Community College Study, op. cit., p. 28.

¹⁴ North Carolina, Report of the Governor's Commission, op. cit., p. 74.

¹⁵ North Carolina, A Guide, op. cit., p. 2.

. . . for students who are high school graduates or who are beyond the compulsory age limit of the public school system and who have left the public schools.¹⁶

The Policy Manual states that the doors are open ". . . for all applicants who are high school graduates or are school leavers eighteen years old or older . . ." ¹⁷ The Administrative Memoranda states that there was ". . . admission of both high school graduates and others who are eighteen years old or older but are not high school graduates."¹⁸

From these examples, it is obvious that the Community College System of North Carolina is committed to an "open door" admissions policy in the true sense of the definition.

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL

In the area of local administrative control, three things were examined--(1) the Board of Trustees, (2) the president of the institution, and (3) the respective powers, duties, and responsibilities of each. The Hurlburt Study recommended that the Board of Trustees should have control of the general governance of the college. It further recommended that the Board have the following authorities and powers--(1) the levying of taxes, (2) the selection of the college executive, and (3) other duties usually assigned to such a body. The Hurlburt Study listed the following powers and duties of the executive of the institution--

¹⁶North Carolina, General Statutes 115A, op. cit., Sec. 1.

¹⁷North Carolina, Policy Manual, op. cit., No. 2.0411 (September, 1970).

¹⁸North Carolina, Administrative Memoranda, loc. cit.

(1) administrative head of the institution, (2) responsible for hiring all staff members, (3) responsible for the management of the college's physical properties, and (4) responsible for making up the budget.¹⁹

The Hamilton Study made no mention of local control. However, the Carlyle Report and A Guide recommended basically the same thing. Concerning the Board, the Carlyle Report suggested that it be made up of twelve members serving terms of six years each. The members should be chosen in the following manner: (1) four appointed by the governor, (2) four appointed by the county commissioners, and (3) four appointed by the local board of education. The Carlyle Report recommended that the Board have the following powers and authorities (subject to the State Board of Education)--(1) selection of personnel, (2) establishment of college policies, procedures, and curricula, and (3) the location, design, and construction of the physical plant. Concerning the president, the Report merely stated that he was responsible only to his local Board of Trustees and the State Board of Education.²⁰ A Guide recommended the same things in almost the same words. It did, however, add that the Board was a corporate body.

The law fails to mention the president; however, it states that the Board of Trustees should be made up of twelve members serving terms of eight years each. They are to be chosen in the following manner-- (1) four appointed by the governor, (2) four appointed by the local

¹⁹North Carolina, Community College Study, op. cit., p. 25.

²⁰North Carolina, The Report of the Governor's Commission, op. cit. p. 70.

Board of Education, and (3) four appointed by the local Board of Commissioners.²¹ It further states that the Board of Trustees is a corporate body with the following powers and duties--(1) elect the president, (2) employ all personnel, (3) purchase all property, (4) apply standards for admission and graduation established by the State Board of Education, (5) receive donations, and (6) provide all or part of the instructional services.²²

The Policy Manual also fails to mention the presidents, but it grants the Board of Trustees of Community Colleges and Technical Institutes the authority

. . . to do all things necessary and proper to comply with any conditions which may be prescribed by the State of North Carolina or the Federal government.²³

The Administrative Memoranda lists the following powers and duties of the Board of Trustees:

1. The Board of Trustees establishes the policy for the institutions within the laws of the State of North Carolina and policies of the the State Board of Education.
2. The Board of Trustees normally adopts a constitution and by-laws to guide its efforts and appoints the necessary committees to carry on its work²⁴

The Administrative Memoranda lists the duties of the president as follows:

The president is responsible for the entire operation of the institution within the policies, procedures, and by the direction of the Trustees, the Department of Community Colleges, and the State Board of Education.²⁵

²¹North Carolina, General Statutes 115A, loc. cit.

²²Ibid.

²³North Carolina, Policy Manual, op. cit., No. 2.011 (June, 1969).

²⁴North Carolina, Administrative Memoranda, loc. cit.

²⁵Ibid.

A comparison of the recommendations, laws, and policies concerning the Board of Trustees revealed the following elements--(1) The Board should be made up of twelve members, four appointed by the governor, four appointed by the local Board of Commissioners, and four appointed by the local Board of Education; (2) the Board should have the authority to elect the president, employ personnel, purchase property, and establish policies, regulations, and curricula; and (3) the Board of Trustees is a corporate body.

An analysis of the president's powers and duties revealed the following--the president is responsible for carrying out the policies and regulations of the Board of Trustees, the Department of Community Colleges, and the State Board of Education. Therefore, it was concluded that there were no major differences concerning the powers and duties of the Board of Trustees and the president.

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL

In reference to state administrative control, the powers and duties of the State and its representative, the State Board of Education, were examined. The Hurlburt Study recommended that the following powers and duties be vested in the State.

1. The State should assume a great measure of responsibility. It should offer leadership, enough supervision to guarantee programs of quality, and it should assume approximately half the cost.²⁶

2. The State Board of Education should be given the authority to set up rules, regulations, and standards for the community colleges.²⁷

²⁶North Carolina, Community College Study, op. cit., p. 9.

²⁷Ibid., p. 27.

The Hamilton Study, again, did not mention this area. The Carlyle Report, however, suggested that the following powers and duties be vested in the State.

1. The State Board of Education should supervise and administer the community colleges and make all rules and regulations with respect to the System.
2. The State Board of Education should set up the Department of Community Colleges and the Community College Advisory Council.
3. The Community Colleges and Technical Institutes should be under the State Board of Education.²⁸

A Guide made the following recommendations concerning the State's administrative control.

1. Responsibility for state-level administration should be vested in the State Board of Education. The Department of Community Colleges should provide supervision in accordance with the regulations and policies of the State Board. The Advisory Council should make recommendations concerning the community college programs.
2. The State Board should adopt such policies, regulations and standards as are deemed necessary to insure the quality of educational needs of the State, and to provide for equitable distribution of funds to the various institutions.²⁹

The law lists three areas in which the State Board of Education has authority.

1. The State Board of Education is authorized
 - a. to establish and organize a department to provide state-level administration,
 - b. to adopt and administer all policies, regulations, and standards, and
 - c. to appoint an advisory council, whose duty it is to advise on matters of personnel, curricula, finance, and articulation.
2. The State Board of Education may adopt and execute such policies, regulations, and standards concerning the establishment and operation of institutions

²⁸North Carolina, The Report of the Governor's Commission, loc. cit.

²⁹North Carolina, A Guide, op. cit., p. 20.

- a. to insure the quality of programs,
 - b. to meet educational needs, and
 - c. to distribute state funds.
3. The Board shall have authority with respect to the individual institutions
- a. to approve sites, buildings, plans, and budgets,
 - b. to approve of the selection of the president,
 - c. to establish and administer standards for professional personnel, curricula, admissions, and graduations,
 - d. to regulate the awarding of degrees, diplomas, and certificates, and
 - e. to establish and regulate student tuition and fees and financial accounting procedures.³⁰

The Policy Manual does not state any of the powers and duties of the State Board. It does, however, refer to the law. The Administrative Memoranda states that the State Board of Education should

. . . provide state-level guidance to the system. The Board will fulfill its authority through policies, regulations, and standards adopted for the organization and administration of the system. It is assisted by--(1) the Community College Advisory Council, (2) the controller of the State Board of Education, (3) the Department of Community Colleges, and (4) the institutions.³¹

A comparison revealed the following elements in common--(1) the power to organize and administer the community colleges should be vested in the State Board of Education, and (2) the State Board of Education should set up a Department of Community Colleges, an Advisory Council, and administer policies, regulations, and standards, maintain quality in programs, and distribute state funds. The law further grants the State Board has the authority to approve certain actions of the local Boards of Trustees. It was therefore concluded that there were no differences.

³⁰ North Carolina, General Statutes 115A, op. cit., Sec. 1.

³¹ North Carolina, Administrative Memoranda, op. cit., No. 1-4.

FINANCE

The purpose of this section is a comparison of the amounts and types of financial support provided by the State and the local community. The Hurlburt Study only casually mentioned financing. However, it did recommend that there be four hundred dollars per student per year for operating cost (1950 dollar values). The student should assume fifty dollars of this amount, and the State and the local community should equally share the remainder. It also recommended that capital outlay should be the joint responsibility of the State and the local community.³² Again, the Hamilton Study did not mention this area.

The Carlyle Report made the following recommendations concerning the State and the local community's responsibility.

1. The acquisition of land, construction of buildings, and maintenance should be local responsibilities.
2. The cost of equipment, furnishings, and library acquisitions should be provided from state and federal funds.
3. The cost of operation should be divided as follows:

State and Federal.	65%
Local.	15%
Student	20%
4. State appropriations should be made through the State Board of Education.³³

A Guide also suggest three methods of financing. They were-- (1) non-tax revenues, (2) special tax levies, and (3) bond issuance (capital outlay only).³⁴

³²North Carolina, Community College Study, op. cit., p. 25.

³³North Carolina, The Report of the Governor's Commission, op. cit., p. 72.

³⁴North Carolina, A Guide, op. cit., pp. 17-20.

In the law, the State is authorized to provide the financial support for:

1. Capital Outlay: furniture and equipment for administrative and instructional purposes, new library books, and other approved items.
2. Current Expenses: salaries of professional staff, office and instructional supplies, commencement, maintenance, replacement of furniture and equipment furnished by the state, certain fixed charges, and certain auxiliary services.³⁵

The law also states that the local community will provide the financial support for:

1. Capital Outlay: acquisition of land, buildings, motor vehicles, equipment necessary for the maintenance of the above, all furniture and equipment not furnished by the State.
2. Current Expenses: bonding, auditing, elections, legal fees, salaries of non-professional personnel, power and fuel, operation of motor vehicles, maintenance and replacement of equipment and furniture from local funds, and certain fixed charges.³⁶

The law approves three methods of financing--(1) non-tax revenue, (2) tax levy, and (3) issuance of bonds (for capital outlay only).

Neither the Policy Manual nor the Administrative Memoranda states any policies or regulations concerning the general amount and type of financing. However, both do list such specific details as budgeting, expenditures of state funds, and capital construction.

A comparison of what was recommended and what was implemented revealed the following similarities:

1. Capital outlay is a joint responsibility of the State and the local community.

³⁵North Carolina, General Statute 115A, op. cit., Sec. 3.

³⁶Ibid.

2. The local community provides the site, buildings, and maintenance costs.
3. The State provides equipment, furniture, library acquisitions, and instructional costs.
4. There are three methods of financing:
 - a. non-tax revenue
 - b. tax levy
 - c. bond issue.

Therefore, it was concluded that there were no differences in the amount or type of financing provided by the State and the local community, between what was recommended and what was implemented.

CURRICULUM

The Hurlburt Study recommended the following curriculum--(1) academic and pre-professional preparatory, (2) vocational-technical and semi-professional offered on collegiate level, and (3) general education.³⁷ The Hamilton Study did not mention curriculum. The Carlyle Report made the following recommendations concerning curriculum in the community college.

. . . the community college should be comprehensive, incorporating in one institution appropriate technical-vocational, college transfer, and adult education curricula responsive to needs of the area³⁸

³⁷North Carolina, Community College Study, op. cit., p. 28.

³⁸North Carolina, The Report of the Governor's Commission, op. cit., p. 72.

The comprehensive curriculum that was recommended in A Guide included the following--(1) college parallel education, (2) occupational education, (3) technical programs, (4) vocational programs, and (5) adult education and community services.³⁹

The law, Policy Manual, and Administrative Memoranda list the following as the minimum curriculum to be offered in a community college-- (1) college transfer, (2) technical education, (3) vocational and trade training, and (4) adult education and community services. (Technical institutes are authorized to offer all but the college transfer.)

It was, therefore, concluded that there was no difference in the type of curriculum which was recommended and that which was implemented.

TEACHING PERSONNEL

With regard to the qualifications and preparation of faculty members in the community college, the Hurlburt Study recommended the following as minimum qualifications and preparation for faculty members.

1. In the case of an academic instructor, the faculty member should have a Master's degree in his field, some teaching experience, and a knowledge of the community college.

2. In the case of an occupational instructor, the faculty member should have completed some type of training, some type of work experience, and have some knowledge of the community college.⁴⁰

³⁹North Carolina, A Guide, op. cit., pp. 9-14.

⁴⁰North Carolina, Community College Study, op. cit., p. 29.

The Hamilton Study and the Carlyle Report made no recommendations concerning the qualifications or preparation of faculty members in the community college. A Guide recommended that these be established by the State Board of Education.

The Policy Manual lists the following as qualifications and preparations for faculty members.

1. In the case of an academic instructor, the faculty member must--(1) meet the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities, and (2) hold a Master's degree in his field.

2. In the case of an occupational instructor, the faculty member must have--(1) work experience, and (2) an Associate degree (preferably a Bachelors degree).⁴¹

According to the Administrative Memoranda, all faculty members should be versatile, should be knowledgable of community colleges, and should be skilled in the art of teaching. The academic instructor should have at least a Master's degree, and occupational instructor should have at least satisfactory training and work experience.⁴²

A consensus of the qualifications and preparations for the teaching personnel in a community college includes--(1) versatility, (2) satisfactory training, (3) the ability to handle more than one area, (4) a knowledge of the community college, and (5) skills in teaching. The academic instructor should have a Master's degree and meet the

⁴¹North Carolina, Policy Manual, op. cit., No. 2.04.

⁴²North Carolina, Administrative Memoranda, op. cit., No. 1-8.

standards of the Southern Association. The occupational instructor should have satisfactory training, work experience, and preferably a Bachelor's degree.

CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing comparison, it may be concluded that the major study recommendations were generally followed in the law, policies, and administrative memoranda of the North Carolina Community College System in the areas of location of institutions, tuition, admissions policy, local administrative control, state administrative control, the amount and type of financial support, the curriculum, and the qualifications and preparation of the teaching personnel. Therefore, the Hypothesis is accepted as being valid.

Chapter 5

THE EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO THE WRITER'S AND BRUNNER'S CRITERIA

In previous chapters a comparison was drawn between major study recommendations and the law, policies, and memoranda which govern the North Carolina Community College System. This chapter has as its purposes two evaluations of the North Carolina Community College System. These evaluations were based on two sets of criteria--(1) one set devised by the writer, and (2) one set devised by Brunner.¹

EVALUATION ACCORDING TO THE WRITER'S CRITERIA

The purpose of the writer's evaluation was examine the degree of acceptance and implementation of the law, policies, and memoranda which govern the System on the part of the Department of Community Colleges and its institutions. This evaluation was based on the eight criteria for comparison--location of institutions, tuition, admissions policy, local administrative control, state administrative control, finance, curriculum, and teaching personnel. This evaluation was composed of three components--(1) the eight criteria listed above,

¹Kenneth A. Brunner, "Criteria for Evaluating a State's Legislative and Administrative Programs for Community-Junior College Education," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1956), pp. 81-94.

(2) a rating scale of one to five, and (3) interviews with staff members of the Department of Community Colleges and its institutions.

Criteria for Evaluation

The following eight criteria were based on the major study recommendations that were implemented into the law, policies, and memoranda of the North Carolina Community College System.

1. Is the location of an institution based on the following factors--(a) an application must be submitted to the State Board of Education by the local Board of Education, (b) a survey must be conducted to determine educational need, potential enrollment, adequacy of local financial support, adverse effects to other institutions, adequacy of buildings, availability of state funds, and whether the area fits the policy of state-wide geographic distribution, and (c) rejection or acceptance of the application based solely on the results of the survey?

2. Is tuition less than twenty percent of the operating cost?

3. Is there an "open door" admissions policy to all who are eighteen years old or older?

4. Do the powers and duties of the Board of Trustees and the president follow the letter of the law and policies?

5. Does the State Board of Education exceed the powers and duties authorized it by law in relation to the Community College System?

6. Are capital outlay and current expenses generally shared equally by the State and the local community?

7. Are the Department of Community Colleges and its institutions committed to the concept of a comprehensive curriculum including college parallel, vocational, technical, and general education?

8. Do faculty members meet the standards of the Southern Association and the Department of Community Colleges?

Rating Scale

In order to determine how the North Carolina Community College System has followed the major study recommendations that were implemented into law and administrative policies, the following rating scale was adapted from Brunner.²

5.--Excellent: the provisions or conditions are extensive and are functioning excellently.

4.--Very Good:

a. the provisions or conditions are extensive and are functioning well, or

b. the provisions or conditions are moderately extensive but are functioning excellently.

3.--Good: the provisions or conditions are moderately extensive and are functioning well.

2.--Fair:

a. the provisions or conditions are moderately extensive but are functioning poorly, or

b. the provisions or conditions are limited in extent but are functioning well.

1.--Poor: the provisions or conditions are limited in extent and are functioning poorly.

M.--Missing: the provisions or conditions are missing and needed.

N.--Does Not Apply: the provisions or conditions are missing but do not apply

Interviews

Interviews were held with staff members of the Department of Community Colleges and with the presidents of four institutions. These

²Ibid., p. 95.

institutions were located on the coast, Piedmont, mountain, and urban areas. The interviewees were questioned on the degree of implementation in the System in relation to the criteria mentioned above. (Transcripts of the interviews may be found in the Appendix.) Information from these interviews and personal observations was used in the evaluation.

The Evaluation

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Comment</u>
1. Location of institutions	5	There are also other considerations including approval by the governor and the legislature.
2. Tuition	5	All figures show this to be less than twenty percent.
3. Admissions Policy	5	Anyone over 18 years of age must be admitted by law.
4. Local Administrative control	5	Only one case was found where the Board tried to exceed its powers.
5. State Administrative control	5	All responded that the State does not try to exceed its authority, and allows institution a great deal of autonomy.
6. State and local financing	4	Financing is not shared. The State assumes the greater burden.
7. Comprehensive curriculum	4	There is a commitment to occupational and adult programs, but not to college transfer.
8. Teaching personnel	5	They do generally meet all the requirements.

Summary

The purpose of this evaluation was to examine the degree of acceptance and implementation of the law, policies, and memoranda which govern the System on the part of the Department of Community Colleges and its institutions. For the most part, they were accepted and implemented completely. However, in the areas of State and local financial support and the comprehensive curriculum, the provisions were being implemented but not accepted.

These areas need some explanation. With regard to State and local financial support, the criterion stated that there must be an equally shared responsibility. From the writer's research, however, it appears that it is not shared. It is known that the State assumes at least sixty-five percent of current expense and that the local community is responsible for fifteen percent of current expense and most of capital outlay. This may not be an equal sharing on a dollar for dollar basis; however, there is a shared financial responsibility. A rating of four was given because in a lot of cases the local community was not meeting its responsibility in the area of capital outlay.

Concerning the comprehensive curriculum, the criterion stated that there must be a full commitment to a college parallel, vocational, technical and general education curriculum. Contrary to popular opinion, there is less emphasis on college parallel than on the occupational programs. This statement is validated by two facts--(1) there are only fifteen institutions out of fifty-six offering college parallel, and

(2) funding is weighted towards occupational and general education programs. College parallel programs are being implemented; however, at least at the State level, they are not fully accepted.

EVALUATION ACCORDING TO BRUNNER'S CRITERIA

The first part of this chapter is concerned with an evaluation of the North Carolina Community College System using the criteria established by the writer. The purpose of this section is to evaluate the North Carolina Community College System using selected criteria from Brunner. It was felt that this evidence would support the writer's evaluation. This second evaluation was based on three components--(1) selected criteria from Brunner's dissertation, (2) a rating scale from one to five based on Brunner's scale, and (3) information gathered from the law and policies of the System and interviews with staff members of the Department of Community Colleges and its institutions.

Criteria for Evaluation

The following criteria were selected from Brunner's dissertation. Selection was based on conditions as they exist in North Carolina.

1. Current legislation should make it possible for collegiate education to be obtained within any county or its adjoining county.
2. Current legislation should make it possible for persons past the compulsory attendance age who desire to resume their education to take elementary and secondary level courses in an adult environment.
3. Current legislation should make it possible for a community to organize a community-junior college if it wishes to do so.
4. Current legislation should recognize that community-junior colleges should offer programs which: (1) prepare the students for transfer to senior institutions, (2) cater to terminal students by offering courses in general education along with semi-professional or vocational preparation, and (3) offer adults in the community

chances to advance their educational level, progress in their competence as citizens, take short courses to meet special interests and learn how to utilize their leisure time.

5. Current legislation should recognize the necessity for an adequate social, educational, and vocational guidance programs in the junior colleges.

6. Current legislation should permit junior colleges to carry on experimental or innovative programs as well as the traditional ones. Included in this would be new methods of teaching, curriculum construction, administration, and student personnel work.

7. Legislation should be clear in stating that community-junior colleges are not permitted to charge tuition to students from the district which aids in supporting the institution.

8. In the case of students who are required to leave their own community college districts to go to a community college somewhere else in the state in order to train to meet specific occupational needs of the state, legislation should be made to enable the state to reimburse these students for expenses over and above those they would normally incur in their home communities.

9. In computing the state financial support to be given to community junior colleges, provision should be made for sufficient personnel, space, and equipment to man an adequate social, educational, and vocational guidance program.

10. In computing the state financial support to be given to community colleges, provisions should be made in such manner that no class in a community college need exceed twenty-five students.

11. The legislation should recognize that the community college is community-oriented rather than state-oriented.

12. The legislation pertaining to community colleges should make it probable that members of the community will take part in planning course offerings, building programs, guidance activities, and other phases of the community college program.

13. In computing the state financial support to be given to community colleges, provisions should be made so that students at these institutions will normally spend less money for their education than lower division students at four-year colleges and universities.

14. The state agency should encourage community colleges to offer courses accepted as satisfactory preparation for upper division work, and in other ways serve to ease the articulation of students from the community colleges to the senior colleges.

15. The state agency should conduct or assist in conducting surveys among the graduating high school seniors in a county to find out from those who are planning to attend a community college if one were located in or adjacent to their county.

16. The state agency should assist the local boards in conducting surveys to determine the semi-professional, sub-professional, and vocational needs of the community.

17. The state agency should encourage community colleges to offer courses at the sub-college level for those who are past the compulsory attendance age and who wish to resume their education without being put into an elementary or secondary environment.

18. The state agency should encourage the community college to offer courses aimed at the student who is interested in making better use of his leisure time.

19. The state agency should provide suggestions of extra-curricular activities which the junior college can provide to permit a student to push his exploration of interests and abilities beyond the classroom or work situation.

20. The state agency should provide suggestions to the local boards of education as to how the community college can function in harmony with the community rather than apart from it.

21. The state agency should either tacitly or openly encourage its community-junior colleges to try new methods of curriculum, teaching, administration, and student personnel work.

22. The state should recognize as fully accredited a community college which is accredited by the regional association.

23. The state agency should recognize the importance of staying power, upper division grades, and achievement of honors, in setting its accreditation policy for community colleges.

24. In determining its accreditation policy, the state agency should take into consideration the proportion of the total program offerings by the community college which is devoted to the objectives of general education as well as the aims of semi-professional, vocational, or sub-professional training in the terminal programs.

25. In determining its accreditation policy, the state agency should take into consideration the proportion of the total program of offerings by the community college which is aimed at preparing students for transfer to four-year colleges and professional schools.

26. Certification requirements should permit certification for community college teachers in one or more of these areas: (1) college parallel, (2) terminal, general, (3) terminal, vocational or sub-professional, and (4) special courses. In the latter category certificates would be offered to instructors of short courses aimed at leisure-time education as well as at elementary and secondary education for adults.

27. A course in the responsibilities and opportunities of American citizenship should be prerequisite to certification at the community college level.

28. Certification requirements should be specifically aimed at getting professionally trained personnel to operate guidance programs at the community college.

29. To be certified as a community college instructor or administrator, the applicant should have received either course training or practical experience in extra-class programs.

30. To be certified as a community college instructor or administrator, the applicant should have received either course training or practical experience in individual differences of students.⁴

⁴Ibid., pp. 81-94.

Rating Scale

In order to determine how the North Carolina Community College System has followed the criteria devised by Brunner, his rating scale has been used. (This scale may be found on page 61 of this study.)

Information

The information for this evaluation was derived from a careful analysis of the law, policies, and administrative memoranda of the Department of Community Colleges. It was also derived from interviews with staff members of the Department and the presidents of four institutions.

The Evaluation

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Comment</u>
1. College education in any county or adjoining county	M	There is no mention of this in the law.
2. General education for those over 18	5	This is one of the major purposes of the law.
3. Community can establish an institution if it so wishes	5	This is possible only with state approval.
4. Comprehensive curriculum	5	This is clearly spelled out in the law.
5. Adequate social, educational, and vocational guidance programs	M	There is no mention of this in the law.
6. Allows innovative programs	M	There is no mention of this in the law.
7. No tuition charged to residents who live in the district	N	Most agree that tuition should be minimal.
8. Reimbursement of students who leave their district	M	This would be desirable.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Comment</u>
9. Adequate provisions for financial support for social, educational, and vocational guidance programs	2b	The law does not specifically mention this.
10. No class over twenty-five students	M	There is no mention of this in the law.
11. Recognition that institutions are community oriented.	4b	Although there is no specific passage that states this, it is the spirit of the law.
12. Community involvement in planning, buildings, and guidance	M	There is no mention of local involvement; however, there is an Advisory Council on the state level.
13. Students should spend less than they would at a four-year institution	M	There is no mention of this in the law.
14. Eased articulation between four-year institutions and community colleges	2b	There is a need for legislation.
15. Aspiration surveys of high school seniors	2b	The Department does not assist, but does supply the instruments.
16. Survey of local vocational needs	2b	Same as 15
17. General Education for adults	5	This is encouraged.
18. Courses for leisure time	3	This is left to the institution.
19. Suggestions for community relations	3	Same as 18.
20. Suggestions for extra-curricular activities	3	Same as 18.
21. Suggestions for new teaching methods	5	This is encouraged by workshops, meetings, and research.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Comment</u>
22. Regional accreditation means automatic state accreditation	4b	State accreditation is not automatic, but is virtually assured.
23. Importance of staying power, grades.	3	This is not an intregal part of accreditation.
24. Consideration of the proportion of programs	N	This is not done.
25. Consideration of the proportion of college transfers	N	This is not done.
26. Certification areas	N	There is no certification of community college personnel in the State.
27. Courses for certification	N	Same as 26.
28. Certification for counselors	N	Same as 26.
29. Courses for certification	N	Same as 26.
30. Courses for certification	N	Same as 26.

Summary

The purpose of this section was evaluate the North Carolina Community College System using selected criteria from Brunner. This list of criteria was based on the Florida System of Community/Junior Colleges and, therefore did not always apply to the North Carolina System.

Because of this, some of the ratings in particular areas were low. These ratings should not be construed to imply that the North Carolina System was (or is) inferior. For example, in Criteria 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, Brunner stated that the Department or "state agency" should "encourage," "assist," or "suggest" specific action for the institution.

The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges does not stipulate, ask, tell, or encourage the institutions to offer certain courses, programs, or activities. It does provide overall guidance and direction under the State Board's policies. The local institutions are given enough autonomy to decide what will be given priority, because it can best assess its own needs.

This is not to say, however, that there is not some room for improvement, especially in the areas of articulation, reimbursement of students who must leave their home district, and local advisory councils.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the previous chapters, the major components of the development of the North Carolina Community College System were discussed. They were--(1) the evolution of the community college concept in the United States, (2) the historical development of the North Carolina Community College System, (3) the major study recommendations, the law, and the policies of the North Carolina System, and (4) a comparison of the recommendations with the law and policies. Two evaluations were also conducted to examine the degree of implementation and the administrative and legislative programs of the North Carolina Community College System.

CONCLUSIONS

From these findings, the following conclusions were formulated.

1. The historical development of the North Carolina Community College System has followed closely the evolution of the community college concept in the United States.
2. There were several forces influential in the historical development of the North Carolina Community College System. Among these were--(a) an increasing emphasis on post-baccalureate education in North Carolina, (b) an increase in the number of college age individuals, (c) an increase in college enrollments, (d) the increased cost of public

and private residence colleges, (e) the increased need for more technical and vocational training, (f) the Hurlburt Study and the Carlyle Report, (g) the enactment of the Omnibus Higher Education Act of 1963, and (h) the case of Zimmerman v. Board of Education.

3. There were several individuals influential in the historical development of the North Carolina Community College System. Among these were--(a) Clyde Erwin, (b) Allan S. Hurlburt, (c) Charles Horace Hamilton, (d) Luther Hodges, (e) Terry Sanford, (f) Dallas Herring, and (g) I. E. Ready.

4. Concerning the location of institutions, it was concluded that there were no major differences in the criteria that were recommended in the major studies and the criteria that were set down in law and policy.

5. The law states that tuition shall be set by the State Board of Education.

6. There was a shift in philosophy concerning the definition of an "open door" admissions policy. It is now defined as admittance of anyone eighteen or older, regardless of whether they are a high school graduate.

7. With regard to local administrative control, it was concluded that there were no major differences in the major study recommendations, and the powers and responsibilities granted in the law and policies.

8. It was concluded that there were no major differences in the powers and duties of the State concerning community colleges, between that which was recommended and that which was implemented.

9. Concerning the types and amounts of financing provided by the State and local community, there were no major differences between what was implemented and what was recommended.

10. A comprehensive curriculum is and always has been the essence of the North Carolina Community College System.

11. There were no differences in the recommended and implemented criteria for the qualifications and preparation of faculty members in academic or occupational areas.

12. The location of institutions is based on the criteria listed on page 60 of this study. However, for a new institution to be established it must also be approved by the Governor, the Advisory Budget Commission, and the General Assembly.

13. Tuition does not exceed more than twenty percent of the operating cost.

14. The "open door" admissions policy as defined in Conclusion 6 has been fully implemented and accepted in the institutions and at the state level.

15. It was concluded that in most cases the local Board of Trustees does not try to exceed the powers or authority granted by the law and the policies.

16. It was concluded that the State Board of Education and the Department of Community Colleges do not attempt to exceed their powers or authority.

17. It was concluded that the Community College System is committed to a comprehensive curriculum, but there is a greater emphasis placed on occupational and general education programs.

18. It was concluded that some local communities are not meeting their commitment on financial support for the community colleges.

19. It was concluded that faculty members in community colleges and technical institutes generally meet the standards of the Southern Association and the Department of Community Colleges.

20. There is no mention in the law that college education should be obtained within any county or its adjoining county.

21. Current legislation makes it possible for persons past the compulsory attendance age to resume their education in an adult environment.

22. Current legislation makes it possible for a community to establish an institution as long as it follows certain steps and meets certain criteria.

23. Current legislation clearly states that a comprehensive curriculum must be offered in community colleges.

24. There is no mention of adequate social, educational, and vocational guidance programs in the institutions in the current legislation.

25. There are no provisions in the current legislation to permit experimental or innovative programs.

26. There is no provision in the current legislation concerning free tuition for students.

27. There is no provision in the current legislation which would allow the state to reimburse students who are required to leave their own community college district in order to train for specific occupations not offered in their home district.

28. There is no provision in the current legislation which would provide financial support for sufficient personnel, space, and equipment to man an adequate social, educational, and vocational guidance program.

29. There is no provision in current legislation that limits class size to twenty-five students.

30. Although there is no specific passage in current legislation, it has been the spirit of the law that institutions are community-oriented.

31. There is no provision in the current legislation which would make it probable that members of the community would take part in planning course offerings, building programs, guidance activities, and other phases of the community college program.

32. There is no provision in current legislation to insure that community college students will spend less money for their education than lower division students at four-year institutions.

33. Provisions by the Department of Community Colleges for easing articulation between community colleges and four-year institutions are limited in extent.

34. The Department of Community Colleges offers no assistance to institutions in conducting aspiration surveys of local high school seniors, with the exception of supplying instruments for this purpose.

35. The Department of Community Colleges offers no assistance to institutions in conducting surveys of local semi-professional, sub-professional, and vocation needs, with the exception of supplying instruments for this purpose.

36. The Department of Community Colleges encourages and the legislation demands that institutions offer general adult education.

37. The Department of Community Colleges only moderately encourages institutions to offer leisure time courses.

38. The Department of Community Colleges offers moderate suggestions for extra-curricular activities.

39. The Department of Community Colleges offers moderate suggestions for community-college relations.

40. The Department of Community Colleges extensively encourages new methods of curriculum, teaching, and administration by the use of frequent meetings, research studies, consulting services, state-wide workshops, and visitations.

41. The State does not accept regional accreditation as an automatic state accreditation, but state accreditation is virtually assured.

42. The Department of Community Colleges recognizes the importance of staying power, upper division grades, and achievement of honors, but they are not an integral part of the accreditation process.

43. The Department of Community Colleges does not consider the percentage or proportion of students in certain programs in accrediting institutions.

44. The Department of Community Colleges has no formal certification of professional staff members in its institutions.

VALIDATION OF HYPOTHESIS

In Chapter 1, it was hypothesized that the North Carolina Community College System generally followed the major study recommendations. Therefore, based upon the above conclusions, the hypothesis is validated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the above conclusions, the following recommendations were developed.

1. Policy should be enacted that would insure that tuition be kept at a minimum and feasible amount, and that this amount will never exceed twenty percent of the operating cost.

2. Policy should be enacted which will provide direction and financial support for a more unified approach to in-service education for faculty members, administrators, trustees, and legislators.

3. Policy should be enacted which will provide both direction and financial support for experimental and innovative programs of instruction, administration, and student services.

4. Policy should be enacted which will provide both direction and financial support for sufficient personnel, space, and equipment to man an adequate social, educational, and vocational guidance program in each institution.

5. Policy should be enacted which will set up guidelines for local advisory councils which will take an active part in curriculum planning, building programs, guidance activities, and other phases of the local program.

6. A study should be made to explore the possibilities of permitting the State to supplement the living expenses of students who must leave their home district to receive specific training not offered in their home district.

7. Legislation should be enacted which will ease articulation between community colleges and public four-year institutions in the state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anson Technical Institute. General Catalog 1972-73, 1973-74. Ansonville, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute. Catalog of Courses, Day and Evening School. Asheville, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Beaufort County Technical Institute. Catalogue 1971-1972. Washington, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Bladen Technical Institute. General Catalogue 1970-2. Elizabethtown, N.C.: n.n., 1970.
- Blocker, Clyde E., Robert Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Blue Ridge Technical Institute. General Catalog, 1971-72, 1972-73. Hendersonville, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Bogue, Jesse Parker. The Development of Community Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1957.
- Boozer, H. R. "North Carolina Is Counting on Community Colleges," Junior College Journal, 34:8-11, December, 1963.
- Brunner, Kenneth August. "Criteria for Evaluating A State's Legislative and Administrative Programs for Community-Junior College Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1956.
- Cape Fear Technical Institute. Catalogue 1972-1973. Wilmington, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Carteret Technical Institute. General Catalog 1972-1973. Morehead, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Catawaba Valley Technical Institute. Bulletin 1971-1973. Hickory, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Central Carolina Technical Institute. Catalog 1972-74. Sanford, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Central Piedmont Community College. General Catalog 1972-1974. Charlotte, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Cleveland County Technical Institute. General Catalog 1972-73. Shelby, N.C.: n.n., 1971.

"Community Colleges-Technical Institutes Grow Under the Directorship of Dr. Ready," The Open Door, 7:4-7, Winter, 1971.

Coastal Carolina Community College. Announcement of Courses and Programs for 1972-1973. Jacksonville, N.C.: n.n., 1972.

College of the Albemarle. Bulletin. Elizabeth City, N.C.: n.n., 1971.

Craven Technical Institute. 1971-1973 Catalog. New Bern, N.C.: n.n., 1971.

Crawford, Ferris N. "A Twentieth Century Institution: The Community College." Address delivered at Southwestern College Agreement Conference, Battle Creek, Michigan, November 16, 1961.

Davidson County Community College. General Catalog 1972-73. Lexington, N.C.: n.n., 1972.

Duckett, Nancy L. "Education Has Acquired New Dimensions," The Open Door, 3:3, March-May, 1967.

Durham Technical Institute. Catalog Announcements 1972-73. Durham, N.C.: n.n., 1972.

Edgecombe Technical Institute. General Catalog 1972-1974. Tarboro, N.C.: n.n., 1972.

Fayetteville Technical Institute. 1970-72 Catalog. Fayetteville, N.C.: n.n., 1970.

Fields, Ralph R. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Forsyth Technical Institute. General Catalog 1971-1973. Winston-Salem, N.C.: n.n., 1971.

Fountain, B. E. "The Citizen and his Community College," North Carolina Education, 35:12-13, September, 1968.

Gaston College. 1972-1973 General Catalog. Dallas, N.C.: n.n., 1972.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. This Is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

_____. "To Deliver on the Promise," A Day at Santa Fe. Gainesville, Fla.: n.n., 1971, pp. 3-13.

Guilford Technical Institute. 1972-1974. Jamestown, N.C.: n.n., 1972.

Halifax County Technical Institute. Catalog of Information 1972-1973. Weldon, N.C.: n.n., 1972.

- Haywood Technical Institute. 1971-1973 Catalog Issue. Clyde, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Isothermal Community College. General Catalog 1972-1974. Spindale, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- James Sprunt Technical Institute. Catalog 1971-1973. Kenansville, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Johnston Technical Institute. Announcement of Programs for 1972-74. Smithfield, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Landrith, Harold F. Introduction to the Community Junior College. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1971.
- Lenior Community College. Catalog 1972-1973. Kinston, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Martin Technical Institute. General Catalog 1972-1974. Williamston, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Mayland Technical Institute. Catalog 1972-1973. Spruce Pine, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Montgomery Technical Institute. 1971-1973. Troy, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- McDowell Technical Institute. General Catalog 1971-73. Marion, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Nash Technical Institute. General Catalog. Rocky Mount, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- North Carolina. Board of Higher Education. Community Colleges for North Carolina; Study of Need, Locations, and Service Areas, [by Charles Horace Hamilton]. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1962.
- _____. General Statutes, Ch. 115A (1963). As amended (1969).
- _____. The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School. The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School. [by Irving Carlyle]. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1963.
- _____. Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Community College Study, [by Allan S. Hurlburt]. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1952.
- _____. State Board of Education. The Comprehensive Community College System in North Carolina. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1966.
- _____. State Board of Education. A Guide for the Establishment of Comprehensive Community Colleges in North Carolina. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1963.
- _____. State Board of Education. North Carolina Community College System Report 1963-70. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1970.

- _____. State Board of Education. The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges Administrative Memoranda. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1968.
- _____. State Board of Education. Policy Manual for the System of Community Colleges. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1967.
- _____. State Board of Education. Progress Report of the Comprehensive Community College System of North Carolina, First Five Years, 1963-1968. [Raleigh, N.C.]: n.n., 1969.
- Pamlico Technical Institute. Pamlico Tech. Alliance, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Piedmont Technical Institute. 72-74 Catalog. Roxboro, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Pitt Technical Institute. General Catalog 1970-72. Greenville, N.C.: n.n., 1970.
- Randolph Technical Institute. Catalog. Asheboro, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Richmond Technical Institute. General Catalog 1972-1974. Hamlet, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Robeson Technical Institute. Bulletin. St. Pauls, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Rockingham Community College. 1972-1973 Catalog. Wentworth, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Rowan Technical Institute. 1971-1973 Catalog. Salisbury, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Sampson Technical Institute. Bulletin 1972-73. Clinton, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Sandhills Community College. Catalog 1971. Southern Pines, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Segner, Kenyon Bertel, III. "A History of the Community College Movement Movement in North Carolina, 1927-1963." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966.
- Southeastern Community College. Bulletin. Whiteville, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Southwestern Technical Institute. Catalog 1971-73. Sylva, N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Surry Community College. Catalog 1972-1974. Dobson, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Technical Institute of Alamance. General Catalog 1971-1973. Burlington, N.C.: n.n., 1971.

- Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College. New York:
John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
- Tri-County Technical Institute. Catalog. Murphy, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Vance County Technical Institute. Bulletin 1971-1973. Henderson,
N.C.: n.n., 1971.
- Wayne Community College. General Catalog 1972-1973. Goldsboro, N.C.:
n.n., 1972.
- Western Piedmont Community College. General Catalog 1972-1973.
Morganton, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Wilkes Community College. Student Bulletin. Wilkesboro, N.C.: n.n., 1972.
- Wilson County Technical Institute. General Catalog 1971-73. Wilson, N.C.:
n.n., 1971.
- Zimmerman v. Board of Education. "North Carolina Reports, Cases Argued
and Determined in the Supreme Court of North Carolina, (1930)" 199.
Raleigh, N.C.: Bynum Printing Co., 1931.

APPENDIX

A COMPOSITE TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEWS

Seven interviews were held with staff members of the Department of Community Colleges and presidents of community colleges and technical institutes. Because of the abundance of material, the redundancy of most answers, and the lack of space, the answers to the questions were combined into a composite form. (However, differences of opinion were pointed out.) The questions and composite answers follow.

1. In your opinion have the policies of geographic distribution of institutions to meet state-wide needs been followed?

In answering this question, there was a difference of opinion. The majority felt that they have been changed or disregarded for educational and political reasons; however, one person felt that they had been met.

2. In your opinion has the concept of contracted Technical Institutes been used to circumvent the law requiring a vote of the people before an institution can be established?

This question is no longer applicable since the law has been changed to allow the establishment without a vote.

3. In his 1962 study, Hamilton suggest fifty-five community college areas. Have these been followed?

These suggestions have not been followed. Hamilton's study was based on present needs. Needs change; they are not the same now as they were in 1962 when Hamilton made his study. Hamilton did not visualize technical institutes either. He visualized only comprehensive community colleges.

4. Is the location of an institution based on the following factors--(1) an application must be submitted to the State Board of Education by the local Board of Education, (2) a survey must be conducted to determine educational need, potential enrollment, adequacy of local financial support, adverse effects to other institutions, adequacy of buildings, availability of state funds, and if the area fits the policy of geographic distribution state-wide, and (3) the application is accepted solely on the results of the survey?

The location of institutions is based on the above criteria. However, other things are also considered. They are--(1) approval by the governor, (2) approval by the Advisory Budget Commission, and (3) the approval of the General Assembly. The two basic criteria are population and local interest.

5. Do you feel that tuition in the community colleges and technical institutes should be free?

In answering this question, there was a difference of opinion. The majority agreed that there should be minimal tuition; however, one person felt it should be free. The majority stated that people do not value anything that is free.

6. Is tuition less than twenty percent of the operating cost?

In all cases, tuition is less than twenty percent.

7. Why has there been a shift in admissions policy from allowing only high school graduates in to allowing anyone eighteen years old or older?

The shift in admissions policy came about because there was a need to serve a larger group of people. There was a need to increase

opportunities for people who have not completed high school. This was a basic shift from the academic orientation of the 1950's to an occupational orientation in the 1960's.

8. Has there been any deviation, in your opinion, from the suggestions of the Carlyle Report and the law in regards to local administrative control? State administrative control? Finance? Curriculum?

In the opinion of the interviewees there has been no deviation from the suggestions of the Carlyle Commission and the law.

9. Do the powers and duties of the Board of Trustees and president follow the letter of the law and administrative policies?

Concerning the powers of the Board of Trustees, all but one of the presidents stated that the Board did not try to exceed its powers. In one case, the president stated that he was having problems with the Board trying to exceed its powers.

10. Does the State Board of Education exceed the powers and duties authorized it by the law in relation to the Community College System?

All interviewees responded that the State does not try to exceed its powers, and the institutions are given a large amount of autonomy.

11. Does the Department of Community Colleges encourage community colleges to offer courses accepted as satisfactory preparation for upper division work, and in other ways serve to ease the articulation of students from the community colleges the senior institutions?

In answering this question, the people at the state level felt that there is a very strong articulation program with senior institutions.

On the other hand, at the local level it was felt that there needs to be a stronger emphasis on articulation with four-year institutions. One president suggested that a law needs to be enacted to ease articulation between community colleges and four-year institutions.

12. Does the Department conduct or assist in conducting surveys among the graduating high school seniors in a county to find out from those who are planning to attend a college or university whether they would attend a community college if one were located in or adjacent to their county?

All agreed that the Department does not assist local institutions in conducting such surveys. However, the Department does supply sample instruments for such surveys.

13. Does the Department assist the local boards in conducting surveys to determine the semi-professional, sub-professional, and vocational needs of the community?

All agreed that the Department does not assist local institutions in conducting such surveys. However, the Department does supply sample instruments for such surveys.

14. Does the Department encourage community colleges to offer courses at the sub-college level for those persons who are past the compulsory attendance age and who wish to resume their education without being put into a secondary or elementary school environment?

The Department does not assist but it does encourage the institutions to offer courses that will meet the needs of the locale.

15. Does the Department encourage the community colleges to offer courses that will meet the needs of students who are interested in making better use of their leisure time?

The Department does not stipulate, ask, tell, or encourage the college to offer certain courses. It does provide overall guidance and direction under the State Board's policies. The local institution must decide what will be given priority.

16. Does the Department provide suggestions of extra-curricular activities which the community college can provide to permit a student to push his exploration of interests and abilities beyond the classroom or work situations?

Again, the Department allows the institutions a great deal of autonomy.

17. Does the Department provide suggestions to the local boards of education as to how the community college can function in harmony with the community rather than apart from it?

Again, the Department allows the institutions a great deal of autonomy.

18. Does the Department either tacitly or openly encourage its community colleges to try new methods of curriculum, teaching, administration, and student personnel work?

The Department does encourage the use of new methods. It accomplishes this by frequent meetings, research studies, consulting services, state-wide workshops, and visitations.

19. Are capital outlay and current expenses shared equally by the state and the local community?

In answering this question, it was generally agreed that capital outlay was a local responsibility and current expense was a state responsibility. However, some interesting points were brought out--(1) over ninety-two million dollars was spent on capital outlay from 1957 to 1972

and less than thirteen million came from state appropriations; (2) in some areas, the community has contributed nothing to capital outlay; (3) the financial burden is partially based on the amount of construction; and (4) although the state has contributed more dollars, it also has the greater ability to pay; therefore, the greater burden is on the local community.

20. Are the Department of Community Colleges and its institutions committed to the concept of a comprehensive curriculum including college parallel, vocational, technical, and general adult education?

The Department and its institutions are committed to a comprehensive curriculum. However, the interviewees agreed that there was more of an occupational education emphasis at the state level.

21. Do faculty members meet the standards of the Southern Association and the Department of Community Colleges?

In general, it was concluded that faculty members meet these standards. There seems to be more emphasis on meeting these standards with the academic instructors; however, in the occupational areas most institutions take the best they can get.

22. What importance do you place on certification of faculty? Are there any qualifications or characteristics you look for?

All the interviewees felt that certification of community college personnel is neither necessary or desirable. Qualifications and characteristics that are looked on as most desirable were--(1) understanding of and subscription to the philosophy of an "open door" institution, (2) skill in the arts and science of teaching, (3) a Master's degree, (4) vocational experience, (5) open-mindedness, (6) enthusiasm, and (7) an appropriate model for young people.

23. Do certification requirements permit certification for community college teaching in one or more of these areas: (1) college parallel, (2) general education, (3) vocational or semi-professional education, and (4) special education?

Since there is no formal certification of community college personnel in North Carolina, this question was not relevant.

24. Is a course in the responsibilities and opportunities of American citizenship a prerequisite to certification at the community college level?

Since there is no formal certification of community college personnel in North Carolina, this question was not relevant.

25. Are certification requirements specifically aimed at getting professionally trained personnel to operate guidance programs at the community college level?

Since there is no formal certification of community college personnel in North Carolina, this question was not relevant.

26. In order to be certified as a community college instructor or administrator, are applicants required to have received either course training or practical experience in extra-class programs?

Since there is no formal certification of community college personnel in North Carolina, this question was not relevant.

27. In order to be certified as a community college instructor or administrator, are applicants required to have received either course training or practical experience in individual differences of students?

Since there is no formal certification of community college personnel in North Carolina, this question was not relevant.

28. What importance do you place on accreditation of institutions?

All considered accreditation very important because it gives the personnel of the institution a chance to look at themselves and discover their weaknesses and strengths.

29. Does the state recognize as fully accredited a community college which is accredited by the regional association?

In answering this question, there was some degree of difference. All agreed that it is not automatic, but most agreed that once an institution is accredited by the Southern Association; state accreditation is virtually assured.

30. Does the Department recognize the importance of staying power, upper division grades, and achievement of honors and awards, in setting its accreditation policy for community colleges?

The Department does recognize the importance of these things, but they are not an integral basis for accreditation.

31. In determining its accreditation policy, does the Department take into consideration the proportion of the total program of offerings by the community college which is devoted to the objectives of general education as well as to the aims of semi-professional, vocational, or sub-professional training in terminal programs?

There has been no consideration of proportions of various programs.

32. In determining its accreditation policy, does the Department take into consideration the proportion of the total program of offerings by the community college which is aimed at preparing students for transfer to four-year colleges or professional schools?

There has been no consideration of proportion of various programs.