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(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to assess
Building Communities' goals as these goals relate to
Virginia community colleges. Fifty-nine deans and 98
division chairpersons were asked whether a goal had been
implemented--existing status--and whether a goal should
be implemented--preferred status. Fifty-three deans and
84 chairpeople returned usable questionnaires.

Chi Square Tests of Independence (p<.05) were used
to compare deans' and chairpersons' responses on
existing and preferred goal status. Chi Square Goodness
of Fit Tests (p<.05) were used to examine the
relationship of existing goal status to preferred goal
status.

Deans and chairpeople agreed on the existing status
of 32 of the 38 goal statements. Deans and chairpeople
share the same beliefs on the existing status of a vast
majority of goal statements.
However, significant differences were identified between deans and chairpeople regarding the existing status of (1) outreaching to disadvantaged students, (2) outreaching to different adult populations, (3) renewing faculty, (4) insuring that full-time faculty teach the majority of credit-bearing courses, (5) using computer technology to integrate educational and administrative applications, and (6) placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs. Deans were more likely than chairpeople to view the six goals that lacked agreement as having been implemented.

Deans and chairpeople agreed on the preferred status of 36 of the 38 goal statements. Deans and chairpeople share the same vision as to the preferred status for a majority of goal statements.

However, significant differences were identified between deans and chairpeople regarding the preferred status of (1) setting aside two percent of the instructional budget for professional development and (2) limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty. Chairpeople were more likely than deans to support the use of the two goals that lacked agreement.

Statistically significant differences were identified between the existing status and preferred
status of (1) the student goal area as viewed by deans, (2) the faculty goal area as viewed by chairpersons, (3) the instruction goal area as viewed by both deans and chairpersons, and (4) the curriculum goal area as viewed by both deans and chairpeople.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Four decades have passed since the 1947 Truman Commission on Higher Education proposed ground-breaking recommendations for revamping the United States' community colleges. At that time, 640 junior colleges in the United States had an enrollment of approximately 500,000 college credit students (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges [AACJC], 1989a). In the 1988-89 academic year, approximately 5 million students were registered for college credit in community, technical and junior colleges (AACJC, 1989b). During that same academic year, it was estimated that an additional 4 million students were enrolled in non-credit adult and continuing education programs. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) has acknowledged that the overall purpose of the community college may have changed during the past 25 years, but one task has remained consistent throughout that period—the community college must offer or provide educational opportunities to a most heterogeneous population (AACJC, 1988a).

Since the 1983 publication of A Nation At Risk, the quality of education has been criticized. Elementary and secondary schools are the focus of the criticisms,
yet, little mention is made to higher education. However, the role and contribution of the community, technical, and junior colleges--the largest branch of American higher education--has been neglected (AACJC, 1988a).

As a new century approaches, a number of educational, social, and economic circumstances have made it necessary for community colleges to reach clear, and often new, understandings about their goals. In addition, continuing widespread financial and enrollment concerns make it imperative for community colleges to define and specify with greater clarity distinctive goals as they reassert their resolution to furnish service to their students, communities, state, and nation (AACJC, 1988a).

In 1986, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) specified that it was time for the current generation of community college leaders to evaluate the purpose of community colleges and seek recommendations to help community colleges move into the next century with wisdom and virility. Nineteen individuals were appointed to the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, and they were instructed to analyze issues and to make recommendations concerning issues that would

Virginia is entwined in a shifting environment. The nature of work and jobs have changed and are subject to the use of advanced technology. There is a link between education and the economy; Virginia's economy is dependent upon properly educated and skillfully trained employed citizens to sustain a healthy economy (Baliles, 1989; Dellinger, 1990). Because of these facts, former Virginia Governor Gerald Baliles (1989) stated that the need for community colleges in Virginia has never been more justified. Also, he charged Virginia community colleges to provide the tools and instruments to enable Virginia to adjust to its new environment, to manage change, and to prepare for tomorrow. Newly elected Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder's State Secretary of Economic Development, Lawrence Framme, has made similar claims (Dellinger, 1990).

Assessing goals developed from the Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century (AACJC, 1988a) report recommendations quantified the current status of these goals at Virginia community colleges. The assessment also established priorities of intent for the
Building Communities' (AACJC, 1988a) goals at Virginia community colleges.

Background

This study, grounded in goals analysis, focuses upon goal congruency and incongruency. Goal congruence is measured by the extent of agreement of existing goal status or preferred goal status in the colleges studied. Goal incongruence is gauged by the extent of disagreement of existing goal status or preferred goal status in the studied institutions.

Conceptual Framework for Goals Analysis

Universities were the pioneers in the use of surveys to identify institutional goals. Gross and Grambsch's (1968) ground-breaking efforts of empirically studying university goals are seen as the most significant contribution to goal analysis studies (Peterson, 1970). Gross and Grambsch's (1968) research revealed two major questions that higher education institutions should address: (a) What is the status of the institution's goals? and (b) What should be the status of the institution's goals? Gross and Grambsch (1968) devised an inventory of goal statements for universities. Individuals completing the inventory were asked to indicate (a) how important each goal statement
"is" at their institution and (b) how important each goal statement "should be" at their institution. The use of the "is" and "should be" goals reveals discrepancies between a college's current and future state. Gross and Grambsch (1968) believed that identifying discrepancies between what an institution is currently doing and what an institution should be doing may assist in planning the future direction of the college.

**Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI)**

The Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) developed by the Educational Testing Service in 1972 advanced and stimulated interest in research on college and university goals. The "is" and "should be" indicators were used in developing the IGI (Peterson & Uhl, 1977). The intent of the IGI is to provide institutions with an instrument for surveying the perceptions of college personnel and students regarding their attitudes as to what the goals of an institution should be. The IGI has also been used to ascertain the extent of agreement or disagreement on institutional goals and their priorities among students, staff, faculty, administrators, boards of trustees, and the citizenry.

The IGI design was adopted for use by community colleges and became the impetus for developing the
Community College Goals Inventory (CCGI). Goals on the CCGI relate to community college functions such as vocational preparation, developmental preparation, academic transfer, continuing education, and lifelong learning. The CCGI was devised in 1979 via the joint effort of the American Association of Junior Colleges and the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The "is" and "should be" format, popularized by Gross and Grambsch and the IGI, was incorporated in the CCGI. Arter (1981) stated that the stimulus for change on many community college campuses has resulted from examining goal congruency and goal incongruency data using the CCGI.

Community College Goal Implementation

Goals are an institution's aspirations, functions, and purposes as viewed by its internal constituents (Fenske, 1980). Internal constituents of an institution should be actively involved in establishing institutional goals. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1988b) believed that broad-based participation by internal constituents of a college is crucial in the processes of implementing college goals.

In Virginia community colleges, deans of instruction, deans of student services, provosts, directors of instruction and directors of student
services have the responsibility and authority to implement goals dealing with faculty, students, curriculum, and instruction (Virginia Community College System [VCCS], 1989). The chief instructional services position and the chief student services position have been combined at many Virginia community colleges. This organizational structure establishes overlapping responsibilities and authority among these positions. Division chairpersons at Virginia community colleges also have the responsibility and authority to implement goals related to students, faculty, instruction, and curriculum (VCCS, 1989). Hereafter, deans, provosts and directors will be referred to as deans only.

**Goal Congruency and Incongruency**

Goal congruence and incongruence at Virginia community colleges should be assessed to identify agreement and disagreement concerning the current status and the priorities of goals from the *Building Communities* (AACJC, 1988a) report. Goal achievement and organizational effectiveness may increase at Virginia community colleges if the congruence of goals among deans and division chairpersons is known.

Goal congruence indicates that groups are in agreement on institutional priorities necessary for an institution to be effective. Therefore, they are more
likely to work together to realize goals. A unified approach to achieving goals should make an institution more effective in its operations. It should be noted that three groups not included in this study, faculty, staff and students, also play roles in goal achievement and organizational effectiveness at Virginia community colleges.

Goal incongruence indicates that groups are in disagreement on institutional priorities. Knowledge of goal incongruency between deans and division chairpersons at Virginia community colleges may be used in problem-solving to improve goal achievement and institutional effectiveness. Analyzing goal incongruency may reveal areas of conflict among deans and division chairpersons and indicate issues for institutional change. Goal incongruency data should draw attention to differences between deans and division chairpersons and also present institutions options for decisions regarding institutional operations.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:

1. The process of implementing goals includes input from those directly charged with implementing goals.
2. Implementing goals that deal with faculty, students, curriculum, and instruction is the primary responsibility and authority of deans and division chairpersons at Virginia community colleges.

3. The chief instructional services position and the chief student services position have been combined; and they are considered a single unit for the purpose of analyzing data.

Problem Statement

The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, in its report Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century (AACJC, 1988a), made recommendations concerning issues impacting community colleges. Recommendations, aimed at the future, would assist in institutional planning. However, the Commission clearly recognized that community colleges must choose their own courses of action to implement the recommendations. The plan of action starts with clear, concise goals developed from the Commission’s recommendations (AACJC, 1988a). Former Governor Baliles evidently supports the Commission’s recommendations—he (1989) asked Virginia community colleges to assist the state in addressing and meeting the social, economical and educational changes and
challenges facing Virginia now and in the future—which require clear, concise goals.

How do the Building Communities' recommendations impact Virginia community colleges? Will recommendations assist Virginia community colleges in planning for their future? Which of the recommendations should Virginia community colleges implement? Will Virginia community colleges implement goals developed from Building Communities' recommendations to assist Virginia in addressing and meeting the social, economical and educational changes and challenges facing the state?

The problem for this study was to analyze the existing goal status and preferred goal status at Virginia community colleges as viewed by deans and division chairpersons.

Purpose Statements

The general purpose of this study was to assess the Building Communities' goals as these goals relate to Virginia community colleges. The results of this study may assist in planning an agenda for Virginia community colleges for their transition to the twenty-first century. Ancillary purposes of this study are:
1. To synthesize the extant literature to link the Virginia Community College System, the Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century report, goals, and goals analysis studies involving community college administrators.

2. To ascertain the differences, if any, between deans and division chairpersons regarding existing goal status.

3. To ascertain the differences, if any, between deans and division chairpersons regarding preferred goal status.

4. To ascertain the differences, if any, between existing goal status and preferred goal status among deans and division chairpersons.

Research Questions

The following research questions were answered in this study.

1. Chapter two consists of a literature review addressing several supporting questions: (a) what is the Virginia Community College System? (b) what is the American Association of Community and Junior College’s Futures Commission Report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century? (c) what are the definitions for goals? what is the importance and uses of goals in
higher education? What is the need for goal
determination and goal assessment in higher education?
and what is goal congruency and goal incongruency? And
(d) what goals analysis studies involve community
college administrators only?
2. Is there a difference between deans and division
chairpersons regarding reported existing goal status?
3. Is there a difference between deans and division
chairpersons regarding reported preferred goal status?
4. Is there a difference between reported existing goal
status and reported preferred goal status?

Delimitations

The following delimitations were made to narrow the
focus of this study.
1. Respondents were Virginia community college deans
and division chairpersons.
2. Goals were delimited to those recommendations
contained within the American Association of Community
and Junior College's Futures Commission report, Building
Communities: A Vision for a New Century, that deal with
students, faculty, instruction, and curriculum.
3. Goals were viewed in terms of existing and preferred
status. The study does not address any other way goals
may be viewed or any other aspect of goal status.
4. Goal congruency and incongruency were used to analyze the existing and preferred goal status as viewed by deans and by division chairpersons. Any other form of goal analysis was not considered.

Limitations

The following limitations were made to identify the shortcomings of this study.

1. The generalizability of results were limited to the deans and division chairpersons to community colleges in Virginia.

2. This study was limited to goals, related to students, faculty, instruction, and curriculum, from the American Association of Community and Junior College's Futures Commission report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. This study should not be construed as a comprehensive examination of all goals from the report or from other community college goal sources.

3. This study was not a comprehensive examination of goals. It addressed views on the existing and preferred status of goals.

4. The interpretation of results are restricted to goal congruency and goal incongruency analyses.
Definitions

The following terms were defined for this study.

**Curriculum:** The total set of experiences designed for students in community colleges meaning the whole body of courses offered and planned experiences for students outside the course framework (Cohen, 1969).

**Dean:** An individual employed by the VCCS as chief academic or student services personnel of a community college.

**Division chairperson:** An individual employed by the VCCS as an administrator that directs day-to-day division instructional programs.

**Existing goal status:** The purpose of an organization which individuals come to understand based on their experiences as members in the organizational environment. In this study, the respondent judged the goal statements in terms of whether or not the goal has been put into practice in the organization at the present time.

**Faculty:** Full-time and part-time professional teachers in community colleges.

**Goal:** The particularly unique patterns of specified ends, outputs, and priorities set for a college (Peterson, 1970).
Goal congruence: The extent of agreement between deans and division chairpersons on the existing or preferred status of goals as evidenced by similar responses.

Goal incongruence: The extent of disagreement between deans and division chairpersons on the existing or preferred status of goals as evidenced by different responses (Festinger, 1957; Hampton, Summer, & Webber, 1973).

Instruction: The action or practice of a faculty member in relation to the art of teaching.

Preferred goal status: The purpose of an organization which organizational members believe, based on their experiences and values, should be used by the organization. In this study, the respondent judged the goal statements in terms of whether or not the goal should be used by the organization.

Students: Persons who attend community colleges.

Views/viewed: An estimate of how an individual within a reference group sees the status of a goal that is measured by responses on an instrument.

Virginia Community College System (VCCS): Twenty-three community colleges in Virginia operating under the auspices of the Virginia State Board of Community
Colleges and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

Need for the Study

In 1986, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) specified that it was time for the current generation of community college leaders to evaluate the community college movement. Also, the community college leaders were to make recommendations to help community colleges make the transition to the next century with wisdom and virility (AACJC, 1988a).

Building Communities (AACJC 1988a) outlines procedures that community colleges should follow in preparing for the 21st century. The report addressed a real problem facing all community colleges—what should the agenda be for the future? Although some Buildings' recommendations may be currently underway at some community colleges, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges is deeply committed to implementing report recommendations. The Southern Growth Policies Board (1986) stated that community colleges should examine their goals to meet the challenges of the future.
Virginia's former governor Gerald Baliles (1989) saw Virginia's Community College System as an integral part of Virginia's attempt to provide academic and training opportunities for its citizens. In Baliles' view and in the view of current Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder's State Secretary for Economic Development, Lawrence Framme, the state's community colleges are a critical resource in the state's quest for social and economic development (Baliles, 1989; Dellinger, 1990). The former governor also stated that, with the challenges Virginia currently faces, "If we did not have community colleges . . ., we would be obliged to invent them, for never has the need for such institutions been more justified" (Baliles, 1989, p. 2).

This study may provide the Virginia Community College System with a consolidated source of information to base decisions concerning its students, faculty, instruction, and curriculum goals. An analysis of the views of deans and division chairpersons concerning existing and preferred goal status may indicate the extent to which these administrators agree and disagree upon selected goals. The results may assist Virginia community college administrators in preparing for the twenty-first century. Above all, this study may be the
first step in preparing an agenda for the 21st century for the Virginia Community College System.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters. The first chapter contains a proposal of the study. Chapter One consists of an introduction, background, assumptions, problem statement, purpose statements, research questions, limitations, delimitations, definitions, need for the study, and the organization of the study.

Chapter Two contains a review of the literature on the Virginia Community College System; the American Association of Community and Junior College's Futures Commission report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century; goals; and goals analysis studies involving community college administrators.

Chapter Three outlines the research methods used in this study. The research methodology and design, survey population, instrumentation and pilot study, data collection procedures, data analysis and recording, and methodological assumptions are discussed.

Chapter Four presents the analysis of the data and the results of the data analysis based upon the data obtained in the study.
Chapter Five presents an overview of the study, the findings of the study, conclusions drawn from the study, recommendations for future study and potential applications of the study, and a researcher's commentary.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

This research study concerned the perception of goals. Specifically, the views of Virginia community college deans and division chairpeople toward selected goals from AACJC’s futures report, Building Communities were compared. In addition to the researcher’s use of Newman Library at Virginia Tech, an ERIC search was performed to select pertinent literature to be reviewed.

Literature specific to this study was reviewed. It was concluded that a void existed in the area of community college goal research. The literature did not reveal a study that addressed current and preferred goal status views with respect to Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century report recommendations. Additionally, the literature review did not reveal evidence of community college goal research with respect to the degree of goal congruence or incongruence in the twenty-three institutions of the Virginia Community College System. The Virginia Community College System, the Building Communities report, the determination and assessment of goals, and goal congruence and incongruence were the focal points of the literature.

The literature review is presented in four major sections: (1) the Virginia Community College System,
(2) the American Association of Community and Junior College’s Futures Commission report, *Building Communities A Vision for a New Century*, (3) goals, and (4) goal analysis studies involving community college administrators.

The Virginia Community College System

In July, 1946, President Harry S. Truman appointed a Commission to examine the nation’s higher education system. The Commission was asked to give consideration in its deliberations to higher education’s objectives, methods, facilities, and the social role it should play (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). The Commission’s report was issued in six volumes beginning in 1947 and concluding in 1948. Abolishing barriers to educational opportunity was the Commission’s main proposal. The Commission stated every American should be empowered and inspired to pursue both formal and informal education as far as his/her abilities allow (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

The Establishment of Community Colleges

Specifically, the Commission proposed extending the American system of free public education upward two years beyond secondary school. The Commission recommended that community colleges be installed in every state as part of the public-school system. These colleges should be established to provide easily
accessible, tuition-free education through the sophomore year. Community colleges should stress terminal occupational programs and prepare students to pursue further higher education. The call for the "democratization" of higher education was sounded (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

Echoing the command of President Truman's Commission, Bogue (1950) characterized the fundamental role of community colleges as follows:

By examination of life situations, of identification of problems that need solution on national, state, and local levels, we arrive at conclusions regarding the basic functions of community colleges. They are guidance and counseling for all students and for the people of the community; general education for all students regardless of vocational objectives, technical, and other vocational training, and that on a continuing basis, for students who will not advance to upper-division collegiate studies; the further democratization of higher education by surmounting barriers of geography and family financial difficulties; the popularization of higher education by breaking down family traditions and creating greater personal interest and motivation; adult education and university-parallel studies for those who wish to continue formal education. (p.64)

Medsker (1960), Fields (1962), and others agreed with Bogue's characterization of the comprehensive community college. In addition to being comprehensive, community colleges should be democratic, community centered, and adaptable to local needs (Fields, 1962).
During the fifties and into the early sixties the concept of the comprehensive community college developed and matured. Throughout the country, community colleges were serving people with diverse backgrounds who aspired to attain this new form of higher education. In 1965, Congress finally replied to the Truman Commission's proposal for federal aid for higher education. The Higher Education Act of 1965 was the federal government's first bill to furnish a comprehensive permanent program of financial support to colleges and individual students. The Act's main thrust was on a synchronized program to aid undergraduate education and undergraduate students. The program provided financial resources to assist colleges in coping with rising enrollments of undergraduate students and problems of undergraduate colleges. In addition, the program provided assistance to colleges for dealing with rising aspirations of young people from every social class (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). This legislation assisted the community college movement--a movement characterized as possibly the most significant growth period in the democratizing of higher education in this country (Medsker & Tillery, 1971; Bushnell, 1973; Gleazer, 1973).
Creation of the Virginia Community College System

Virginia was not unlike other states in the process used to create its comprehensive community college system. Virginia explored several options for post-secondary education which led to programs offering less than a bachelor's degree. By the early 1960s, a number of two-year university branch campuses were in place throughout the Commonwealth. These institutions had no definitive scheme; however, an organizational structure for technical colleges was evolving, and adult education programs at area vocational schools were being established and expanded by public school systems (VCCS, 1988).

In 1964, the Virginia General Assembly created a Higher Education Study Commission. The Commission was charged to examine educational opportunities of less than four-year college or university duration. In 1966, the Commission recommended to the Virginia General Assembly that a statewide system of comprehensive community colleges be established. The existing university branches, the technical colleges, and the adult education programs of public area vocational schools should be incorporated into this new system (VCCS, 1988).
Legislation by the Virginia General Assembly

The Virginia General Assembly acted upon the Commission's recommendation in 1966. Legislation creating a state system of public community colleges was passed by Virginia's General Assembly in 1966. The law not only created the community college system, but it provided for the office of Director of Community Colleges. One of the Director's tasks was to work with a state board for community colleges in developing and executing procedures to implement policies and operational strategies for the system (Commonwealth of Virginia, 1966).

On September 28, 1966, the Virginia State Board for Community Colleges adopted policies and regulations for the system, and defined a community college as

... a comprehensive institution of higher education offering programs of instruction generally extending not more than two years beyond the high school level, which shall include, but not be limited to, courses in occupational and technical fields, the liberal arts and sciences, general education, continuing adult education, pre-college and pre-technical preparatory programs, special training programs to meet economic needs, and other services to meet the cultural needs of its service region (State Board for Community Colleges, 1966).

The community college system established by Virginia's General Assembly was largely state funded. It did not depend upon county, city, or town funding,
and it received wide-spread support by Virginians. All community colleges were to offer a comprehensive curriculum. To achieve this mission, the current educational efforts of university branch campuses, technical colleges, and area vocational schools would need to be combined (Vaughan, 1987).

Formation of Virginia Community Colleges

During the late 1960s through the 1970s, plans were formalized and fulfilled to establish a community college within 50 miles of every citizen in Virginia. Currently, the Virginia Community College System is a statewide organization consisting of 23 higher education institutions housed on 34 different campuses. The State Board for Community Colleges is the governing unit for the System. The Governor of Virginia, with approval by the General Assembly, appoints individuals to the State Board for Community Colleges. The chief executive officer of the System is the Chancellor. The community college presidents answer to the Chancellor, who reports to the State Board. Local governments appoint local Boards of Trustees for each college. The local Board is granted powers specified by the State Board and serves in an advisory capacity to the college president (VCCS, 1988).
Future of the Virginia Community College System

The Virginia Community College System (1988) recognizes community colleges in Virginia are changing. Their curriculum, their students, and their modes of operation are changing. These changes and social and economic issues necessitate the leadership of the Virginia Community College System contemplate ways in which Virginia’s community colleges can best execute their mission in the next decade. Because of these circumstances, the Virginia Community College System appointed The Committee on the Future of the Virginia Community College System. The Committee was to report about these issues and their impact on the future. The Committee issued its report, Toward the Year 2000: The Future of the Virginia Community College System, in 1988. The Committee raised a vital question in its report: "How is the mission of the Virginia Community College System to be interpreted and implemented between now and the year 2000" (VCCS, 1988)? By establishing The Committee on the Future of the Virginia Community College System and releasing the report focusing on the System’s future indicates the System is directing the attention of its community colleges towards their future.
Assessing goals may produce data which may provide colleges a guide for action in coming years. Assessing goals at Virginia community colleges may provide a guide for the colleges as they prepare their long-range plans. Assessing goals may also provide an agenda for the State Board for Community Colleges and other policymakers to follow as they consider the future of the Virginia Community College System. Finally, assessing the existing and preferred status of goals at Virginia community colleges may provide vital information as to how the mission of the Virginia Community College System is to be interpreted and implemented in the next decade.

Summary

The Truman Commission's report spurned the development and growth of the community college movement in this country. The legislation establishing Virginia's system of public community colleges responded to educational needs of Virginia. As a result more opportunities for post-high school education would exist for more Virginians. Consequently, Virginia's economy would grow and develop. The economy did grow and develop; but to continue this growth, the mission of the community college needs to be constantly reviewed (Vaughan, 1987; VCCS, 1988).
Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century

In 1986, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) stated it was time for current community college leaders to evaluate the effectiveness of existing community college programs. To assist in this endeavor, the AACJC appointed a group of 19 people—educators, business people, and politicians—to the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. The Commission was instructed to analyze and to recommend procedures for moving community colleges into the 21st century (AACJC, 1988a).

The report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century, was issued by the Commission on April 26, 1988 (AACJC, 1988a). The report steered away from a specific discussion of community college policies and practices. However, it made recommendations concerning several major aspects of institutional life—students, faculty, instruction, and curriculum. Each major aspect dealt with specific concerns. They are as follows: serving diverse students is the focus of student recommendations; faculty recommendations outline the faculty role in sustaining the intellectual and social environment of community colleges; strengthening teacher and student intellectual and social relationships are emphasized by instruction recommendations; and
curriculum recommendations coherently address changing needs of students and marketplace demands. A major recommendation within the report requested community colleges to use the recommendations as a resource for planning their future (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1988).

The recommendations presented in Building Communities (AACJC, 1988a) were not to predict the future. However, the recommendations were designed to bridge the gap from the present to the future. The Commission urges state community college systems and each community college to implement recommendations at state and local levels to fit their particular needs (AACJC, 1988a).

The Committee on the Future of the Virginia Community College System agreed Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century should be used as a major resource in planning the future of the Virginia community colleges. Specifically, the Committee asked: "How is the mission of the Virginia Community College System to be interpreted and implemented between now and the year 2000" (VCCS, 1988)? Although Building Communities (1988a) addressed the future of community colleges from a national perspective, the Committee on the Future of the Virginia Community College System felt
it was appropriate to interpret the report’s findings solely for Virginia community colleges. Therefore, the report could be used as a basis to examine the future of the Virginia Community College System.

Summary

The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges and the Committee on the Future of the Virginia Community College System agree the community college must change to meet needs of its clientele and service area. Both agree Building Communities (1988a) is an appropriate tool to use in planning for this change.

The Building Communities report recommendations can be used as a source of goals to be assessed. Using Building Communities’ future-oriented recommendations as goals may provide the Virginia Community College System with data and information to fulfill its mission and examine its current position and build its future.

Goals

Throughout the literature on organizations and higher education institutions, goals are a frequent discourse. Before the importance of goals, the determination and assessment of goals, and the congruency and incongruency of goals can be discussed; the term, goal, must be defined. Perrow (1970) stated that although the concept of a goal is difficult to
accurately and unambiguously define, a definition of goal is necessary to analyzing goals in organizations.

**Definition of Goal**

Mission, goals, and objectives are terms often used interchangeably in the literature. The relationship of mission, goals, and objectives is a hierarchy of decreasing levels of generality, beginning with mission and ending with objectives. Organizational theorists identify goals in the middle of this hierarchy between mission and objectives. The hierarchy moves from general to the specific—mission to objective. A mission statement is general in focus. Mission is often explained as an assertion of continuing purpose or desire. A mission statement possesses more agreement among its constituents. A mission statement often denotes an institutional intention for its constituencies. Goals are more specific than mission statements. Goals are stated in broad terms and often include reference to clientele served. Goals often refer to a process or outcome (Jedumas, et al., 1980). Goals depict conditions pursued in quest of a mission. Objectives are specific statements. Objectives refer to achievements necessary or that must be accomplished to satisfy a goal. Objectives are often stated so that they can be quantitatively measured (Lenning & Micek
1976). This literature review focuses on the intermediary level within this hierarchy—goals.

Goals are "a future state" which individuals or organizations attempt to cause or bring about. An organizational goal is the state of affairs that the organization is trying to realize—an image of a future state (Parsons, 1951). Etzioni (1964) asserted goals should be seen as desired states by all organizations. Goals should reveal preferred conditions that an organization should continually attempt to realize. Goals are a means of deciding upon activity involvement. Hughes (1965) stated goals should guide individual and organizational action. Hughes (1965) viewed goals as being predetermined with explicit end results or conditions to be achieved.

Goals need not describe the means that an institution should use to achieve its goals (Peterson & Uhl, 1977). Rather, goals should describe the intentions of what is to be achieved or include statements which specify desired conditions. Peterson and Uhl (1977) wrote institutional goals should state ideal conditions that an institution should strive to achieve. Goals are the specified, desired conditions of an institution as seen by the institution's internal
members and should be used in developing institutional policy (Fenske, 1980).

Goals may be oriented toward the future and toward completing an activity (Connor, 1980). Connor (1980) explained his definition as a future state that an organization is striving to achieve. The activity is the effort initiated by members of an organization to achieve the desired state. Pratt and Reichard (1983) concurred—a goal provides individuals and organizations with a sense of direction to attain a desired state.

A recurrent theme is present in the literature, goals are seen as desired states or intended outcomes that are achieved by the efforts of specified individuals. These efforts or guided activities are designed by individuals who determine institutional policy. Assessing goal status as viewed by Virginia community college deans and division chairpersons may provide institutions or the Virginia Community College System with input for deciding to engage in specific day-to-day activities as well as establishing individual institutional policy or policy for the Virginia Community College System.

The Importance of Goals in Higher Education

Goals are vital in studying and understanding all types of organizations. Goals distinguish organizations
from one another. Goals provide organizations with common elements to be effective—objectives. Thus, organizations cannot be effective unless their goals are developed (Gibb, 1954; Cyert & March, 1963; Drucker, 1969).

Organizational theorists agree goals are universally important to organizations (Fenske, 1980). "No aspect of an organization's strategy, or operation policies can be intelligently discussed or rationalized without a firm understanding of the unit's goals" (Hambrick, 1976, pp. 45-46).

Goals have many purposes in an organization. They may be used to measure organizational effectiveness (Peterson & Vale, 1973), to direct and control an organization (Conrad, 1974; Richards, 1978), and to provide a framework for decision-making (Peterson, 1970).

Effective organizations have clearly stated goals that serve as performance measures (Corson, 1975). Goals provide direction for an organization to work within to achieve its desired state (Conrad, 1974; Richards, 1978). Goals should be the main and sometimes the sole criteria used by institutions when making decisions (Connor, 1980). Goals should be a factor in making decisions that affect day-to-day operations
(Cyert & March, 1963; Peterson, 1970; Peterson & Uhl, 1977; Richards, 1978; Uhl, 1978; Connor, 1980). Not only are goals used for routine operations, they assist in determining needed resources (Cyert & March, 1963). If goals are not used in this fashion, they are useless (Cyert & March, 1963; Peterson, 1970; Peterson & Uhl, 1977; Richards, 1978; Uhl, 1978; Connor, 1980).

Goals may assist an institution in deciding on a specific course of action to attain a desired state. Another useful purpose for goals in higher education is to provide institutions with a basis for planning their futures (Peterson, 1970). Institutional planning should involve the presence of goals (Pratt & Reichard, 1983).

By examining goals, institutions are more likely to discover institutional problems and correct them through institutional policy (Richman & Farmer, 1974). A useful purpose for goals in higher education is to assist colleges in developing policies to govern the institutions (Peterson, 1970).

Goals have been assailed as vital assets of organizations, including higher education institutions. Goals help establish institutional identity and purpose. Understanding institutional goals provides institutions with information to allocate resources and to operate in a strategically effective manner. Goals are also major
contributors to institutional decision-making as well as institutional planning and policy development.

Goal Analysis--Determining and Assessing Higher Education Goals

Most organizational theorists agree organizations should determine and assess their goals through a process called goals analysis (Penske, 1980). The rationalization of goal analysis may involve (a) the explication of ideal states held to be desirable, (b) the clarification of present corresponding existential conditions, and (c) the identification of the gap between what is and what is desired (McIntosh & Housego, 1974). Goal analysis may also involve goal identification and goal prioritization. The results of goal analysis provides input to refine the reasons for an organization's existence (Peterson & Uhl, 1977).

The determination of goals and the assessment of their effectiveness assists in forming a philosophical base from which to operate (Gross & Grambsch, 1968; Peterson & Uhl (1977). They also create a firm base to use in decision-making (Uhl, 1978). Therefore, goal determination and assessment are essential exercises in institutional and system planning which advances the institution's being.
Parsons (1961) and Hambrick (1976) stated the strategy, structure, or operational policies of any organization cannot be contemplated without investigating the unit's goals. Uhl (1978) added goals are of little value to an institution unless they can be integrated into the institution's decision-making process. Integration will not happen unless formal steps are taken to determine and assess goals. Therefore, the determination and assessment of goals is a necessity (Fenske, 1980).

Peterson and Uhl (1977) emphasized the need for analyzing goals, particularly in higher education institutions. Goals of higher education institutions are devised in many ways. Higher education institutions have many goals developed for different functional areas within institutions. For example, community colleges typically are involved in five functions. They are: transfer education, occupational/technical education, continuing education, developmental education, and community services. Community colleges develop goals for each of these functional areas. Circumstances involving the possibility of multiple goals may make it difficult to determine and assess goals within an institution.
Goal analysis is an optimum way for an organization, educational or business, to learn about itself. Determining and assessing goals may not assure a successful education program, but it does establish a beginning point toward creating a satisfactory program (Medsker, 1960). An organization will not experience success unless it has a complete understanding of its goals (Perrow, 1970). Raia (1974) linked the good fortune of an organization to the results of the process of determining and assessing goals. When an organization takes the time to determine and assess goals, it has a focus that directs planning for the future (Latham & Locke, 1979).

Goals are central to the operation of an institution. Due to a continuous change in society, college administrators should constantly focus on determining and assessing higher education goals. Goals should deal effectively with the demands of everchanging societal pressures (Kerr, 1973). Bushnell (1973) stated the determination and assessment of an institution’s goals allows institutions to adopt new and different practices to meet societal demands. The results of goal assessment assists an institution in selecting goals to be accepted or deleted.
Goal determination and goal assessment are essential aspects of administering educational institutions (Romney, 1978). Goals assessment techniques can aid institutions in their institutional planning and accountability activities (Lenning, 1974). March (1982) concurred that it is of vital importance for higher education institutions to engage in a periodic process to identify and assess their goals. The results will assist in institutional planning and assessment (March, 1982).

Peterson (1970) identified three approaches to assist colleges in determining and assessing their goals. The first approach was to have goals established by a powerful body or individual such as a governing board or college president. The second approach identified goals through the use of a committee. The use of a committee, although regarded less authoritative than the use of a powerful body or individual, may or may not be representative of all individuals in the institution. The last approach used a survey to establish goals. The use of a survey was judged by Peterson (1970) as the most appealing approach to determine and assess goals because it allows for contributions by a large number of people, and it is an objective approach to gather information.
Educators became actively involved and interested in goal research in the late sixties. Until the 1960s, the dominant theme in the literature regarding goals was the views of college presidents; but these views were merely speculation with no research foundation (Peterson, 1970). Therefore, determining institutional goals was often done only by the president. Objective measures were not used to determine and assess institutional goals on many college campuses (Peterson & Uhl, 1977). Cosand (1979) indicated only subjective measures were being used for determining and assessing institutional goals. This practice was deemed inappropriate for providing accurate data for planning (Cosand, 1979).

Goal assessment research, in the last two decades, has been conducted using objective measures and involving many people. The research findings advocated using key members of the institution’s administrative team in establishing goals (Harrison, 1983). In the 1980s, the literature reported a change in presidential attitude—presidents now believed it was important to involve students, faculty, staff, and the citizenry in the goal setting process.

Institutions should use measures for objectively determining and assessing goals, and it should also
solicit input from a broader base of institutional personnel. Input from various institutional groups combined with objective measures for determining and assessing goals are the processes and foundation that should assist institutions in maintaining internal harmony. These processes assist in identifying institutional needs and planning for a successful future.

Information regarding the behavior, character, and uniqueness of an organization can best be ascertained through analysis of an organization’s goals (Gross, 1969; Perrow, 1970). The analysis of goals is the best and most meaningful way to understand colleges and universities (Richman & Farmer, 1974).

Goal Congruency and Incongruency

A method used in college goal analysis studies is to achieve congruency or incongruency of opinion about the status of goals (Fenske, 1980). For an organization to succeed, members within the organization should hold generally compatible or congruent views regarding goals of the organization. Congruent perceptions of goals by organizational personnel implies strength in the organization (D’Ambrosio, 1978). Organizations will become more productive and successful if individuals
within an organization share the same views on goals of that organization (Schuttenberg et al., 1979).

Goal congruency is defined as similar views among college administrators regarding the actual goal status or the preferred goal status (Moss & Michael, 1983). Goal incongruency indicates a differing opinion among college administrators concerning the actual status of a goal or the preferred status of a goal. Goal congruency might indicate contentment or satisfaction with one or more college goals; goal incongruency might indicate discontentment or dissatisfaction with one or more college goals (Harrison, 1983).

Congruency may be achieved when higher education administrators engage in joint efforts to determine and assess institutional goals. Therefore, the involvement of institutional administrators is essential to successful joint goal-setting (Lane, 1973; Odiorne, 1979; Baldridge, 1980). Joint-goal-setting activities result in institutional goal congruency (Moss & Michael, 1983).

Gross and Grambsch (1968, 1974) found a constant correlation between goal congruency and incongruency among college administrators. The lack of goal congruence among community college administrators may be a serious constraint in realizing college goals. While
goal congruency among college administrators fosters unity within an institution, the incongruency of goals among administrators may cause conflicts or problems for an institution. Gillo, Landerholm, and Goldsmith (1974) stated a lack of congruence is a sign of problems within an institution and may indicate a need for change. Also, it denotes the necessity for altering college operations to achieve the institution's goals (Knoell, 1980).

The effectiveness of an institution's administration depends on the congruency or incongruency of the administrators' views towards institutional goals (Coldarci & Getzels, 1955). Hersey and Blanchard (1977), Connor (1980), and Maxwell (1984) reported organizational effectiveness and goal achievement increase when goal congruency exists among institutional administrators. The institution has a much better chance of moving forward if congruency exists. However, the institution's advancement potential will be impeded if incongruency exists.

Agreement on goals will always be of vital importance in establishing satisfactory educational programs (Medsker, 1960). Goal congruency affects three encompassing issues in most community colleges: (a) allocation of resources, (b) internal harmony, and (c)
maintenance of public confidence (Laping, 1982). The greater the degree of congruency among community college administrators toward determining and assessing institutional goals, the likelihood of conflict is reduced in allocating resources and maintaining internal harmony and public confidence. Goal incongruency may create friction within and outside the institution, thereby generating barriers to preserving the institution. Barriers could result in discontented students, lowered faculty morale, and reduced community involvement (Baldridge, 1971; Lahti, 1973; Baldridge, 1980; Kahalas, 1980; November, 1982; Harrison, 1985).

Goal congruence is a fundamental concern in the complete scope of examining goals. The belief that goal congruency among administrators will greatly enhance the institution's likelihood of fulfilling its mission is the basis of this concern. The concern for goal congruence pertains to successful operations of the institution. If unity among administrators towards goals is achieved, the institution will be more successful (Creager, 1976). Agreement, which is a result of congruent goal views, may result in an increased institutional stature. However disagreement, which is a result of incongruent goal views, may lead to reduced institutional stature (Alfred & Weissman, 1987).
It is important for public higher education institutions to seek goal congruence among their administrators. Congruent views of institutional goals can foster unity and internal harmony within an institution; incongruent views may cause conflict and problems for an institution. Goal incongruency may result in institutional ineffectiveness, impediment, and lack of achievement. Institutions have a better chance of being effective, moving forward, and achieving their goals if goal congruency exists.

Goal Analysis Involving Community College Administrators

Goal congruence/incongruence studies proliferate in the literature. Regardless of the geographical location or the level of administrator surveyed, results were similar. Considerable congruency regarding the status of goals was evident.

Creager (1976) explored the extent to which goals recognized and developed by the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) Task Force on Management by Objectives adequately determined goal priority consonance at selected Virginia community colleges. Participants were administrators ranging from coordinators to presidents at the five multi-campus community colleges in Virginia. For analysis purposes, the administrators studied were grouped into two
categories: college-wide (central office) administrators and campus administrators.

Creager's (1976) research design is ex post facto/survey and uses the multivariate and univariate analysis of variance to provide statistical analyses. The Virginia Community College Systems Inventory was used to collect data. The Inventory is based upon the 1976 Virginia Community College System Task Force on Management by Objectives' goals.

Creager found a high degree of goal congruence between both administrative groups and among the five colleges. Therefore, a favorable managerial environment for the establishment of focused college objectives was provided. A high degree of congruence concerning goal priority existed among administrators. In addition, administrators agreed differences existed between the current importance and the preferred importance of goals. Creager (1976) further stated a high degree of goal congruence may provide a basis for developing cooperative goals for an institution.

Creager's (1976) recommendations included:
1. A future replication to determine if institutional practices reflect stated goals;
2. A future replication to reassess the degree of goal congruence among institutions;
3. A more detailed evaluation of goal priority perceptions between the Virginia Community College System management team and the twenty-three community college management teams;

4. Adapting the study for administration to faculty, administrators, classified personnel, students, local boards, and community representatives to evaluate goal congruence among and between groups per college and state-wide;

5. Conducting research to determine whether responses given resulted from passive acceptance of goals or whether commitment to the community college purposes among the multi-campus institutions exists.

Creager (1976) recommended further research to reassess goal congruence and detail goal priority perceptions at Virginia community colleges. Building Communities' recommendations, which are documented as pertinent to the success of community colleges, could be used to ascertain goal congruence/incongruence among deans and division chairpersons at Virginia community colleges.

Bers (1975) used the Institutional Goals Inventory to compare views of Oakton Community College administrators with administrators of six community colleges across the country. Bers found administrative
groups were in agreement concerning present and desirable goal perceptions. However, further data analysis revealed a high level of disagreement among Oakton Community College administrators in rank or order of both current and preferred goal perceptions.

Pilcher (1976) used the Institutional Goals Inventory to obtain the views of Waubonsee Community College administrators in Sugar Grove, Illinois. Administrators concurred that differences existed between the present and the preferred importance of goals.

The Institutional Goals Inventory was administered to Mississippi community/junior college administrators. Hampton (1979) identified significant differences between what "is" and what "should be" stressed in all goal areas.

The Community College Goal Inventory was used by Stetson (1980) to discover if a positive relationship between administrative goal agreement and systematic goal planning existed. From that Stetson found administrators at colleges where systematic planning occurred, less discrepancy was noted or perceived between the present and the preferred institutional goals than the administrators at colleges where systematic planning was not used.
Using the Community College Goals Inventory, Cross (1981) found large discrepancies between the "current" emphasis and the "should be" emphasis of goals. Participants were administrators from 18 geographically dispersed community colleges throughout the country. Cross and Fideler (1989) administered the Community College Goals Inventory to ten geographically dispersed community colleges. Comparing 1989 results to 1981 results, the gap between "is" and "should be" responses has closed for more goals then it has widened. Administrators appear to be satisfied with what is being accomplished in a number of goals; however, differences between "is" and "should be" still exist. 

Kerr (1981) administered the Institutional Goals Inventory to Hostos Community College administrators in Bronx, New York. Little difference was found between perceived mean goal scores and preferred mean goal scores. Therefore, college administrators were most satisfied with goal accomplishment. The current status of goals was very much near what administrators desired as the preferred status of goals.

Missouri community college presidents, department chairpersons, chief instructional, chief student personnel, and chief business administrators were administered the Community College Goals Inventory.
These administrators were asked if they valued or placed higher preference on goals relating to their employment role than goals that did not relate to their employment role. Robins (1981) reported that all goals were valued the same. Overall, no differences were significant.

Poling (1983) adapted a version of Gross and Grambsch’s Academic Administrators and University Goals Questionnaire to examine the opinions of academic administrators. No significant differences were found between academic administrative groups on any of the goal areas concerning how the goals were currently perceived. But, significant differences were found between groups concerning preferred opinions. Administrative groups tended to favor goals concerning their own areas.

A nationwide study was undertaken by The Center for the Study of Higher Education at Pennsylvania State University (Twombly, Moore, & Martorana, 1986). The study diagnosed internal and external issues perceived to be of importance by two-year college administrators. Among administrators, the highest congruence was reported for two goal areas (1) the need for state financial support and (2) the linkage with business and industry. Congruency was also found among administrators in many external issues. The strongest
differences among administrators concerning external issues related to the job role of the administrator. Also, the administrative job role accounted for the majority of differences among administrators concerning internal issues.

Pennsylvania community college administrators gave their views on the perceived importance and preferred importance of goals from the Community College Goals Inventory. Huskey (1987) found agreement among administrators on both perceived and preferred goal importance. However, Huskey identified significant differences between perceived goal importance and preferred importance of goals.

Because community colleges have a multi-function mission which includes transfer education, vocational education, developmental education, continuing education, and community service, there is continuous interest in analyzing and clarifying community college goals. Also, goal analysis and clarification in community colleges seem necessary because community colleges have the attention of or impact upon a diverse constituency which includes politicians, state officials, local officials, college administrators, faculty, staff, students, and the citizenry. Goal analysis and clarification is necessary to meet the
needs of these constituents. Colleges are void of any logical beginning point for engaging in activities to plan for their future if goals are not clear. Colleges should be clear about their goals in order to frame a logical point to begin planning their future (Freeman, 1977). The goal analysis process should include participation from various-level college administrators with the desired outcome being congruency (Richman & Farmer, 1974).

**Summary**

The Virginia Community College System acknowledges its concern for being able to fulfill its mission. Toward the Year 2000: The Future of the Virginia Community College System (VCCS, 1988) recommends using recommendations from the American Association of Community and Junior College’s Futures Commission Report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century (AACJC, 1988a) as a source of goals to chart its future direction.

Goals are characterized as desired states or intended outcomes. These outcomes are brought about by specified individuals and institutional activities. Also, goals assist institutions in understanding and distinguishing themselves, thereby providing institutions with an identity and a purpose.
Goals guide the allocation of resources, the making of decisions, the planning process, and the development of policy.

Bedeian (1984) stated that to understand an institution, one should understand an institution's goals. If an institution's goals are understood, then an institution's accomplishments can be easily determined. Also, goals provide legitimacy, define needs and priorities, and identify relationships between the institution and society.

Determining and assessing goals should be done in an objective manner, allowing for input from community college administrators. Objective input from administrators in determining and assessing goals should assist colleges in maintaining internal harmony, identifying institutional needs and planning for their future.

This study is based on the principle that college administrators' views of goals should mirror the evolution of the college and assist in planning the college's future. Demerouth, Perkins, and Wharton (1971) believed the identification of goal congruence and incongruence among administrators is a necessity for college effectiveness, cooperation, and planning.
Congruent views of institutional goals can foster unity and internal harmony within a college and incongruent views may cause conflict and problems. Therefore, it is important for colleges to assure goal congruence among their administrators. Colleges have a better chance of being effective, moving forward, and achieving their goals if goal congruency exists.

A number of empirical studies on goals analysis have been conducted. Most studies used the Institutional Goals Inventory developed by Gross and Grambsch (1968), and the Community College Goals Inventory devised by the Educational Testing Service, to analyze goals at community colleges affiliated with a state system. Most studies sought congruence or incongruence among and between the current and the preferred status of goals as viewed by administrative groups. A majority of the studies cited concluded that considerable congruency regarding the status of goals existed.
CHAPTER III

As indicated in Chapter I, the objective of this study was to ascertain the extent of agreement and disagreement between Virginia community college deans and division chairpersons toward goals presented in the report, *Building Communities*. This chapter's purpose is to describe the research methodology and design, population, instrumentation and pilot study, data collection procedures, data analysis and recording, methodological assumptions, and summary of study proceedings.

Research Methodology and Design

Survey research methodology was used. Dillman (1978) stated survey research methodology should be used when dealing with quantitative data, controlling costs of conducting research, and including a large portion of the population in the sample size. Therefore, survey research was appropriate as the research involved collecting and testing quantitative data from all deans and division chairpersons in Virginia's 23 community colleges.

The research design allowed two groups to be studied at one point in time to ascertain if differences exist between groups concerning the variables of this
study. Virginia community college deans and division chairpersons were selected because the VCCS (1989) stated that deans and division chairpersons have the responsibility and authority to implement goals dealing with students, faculty, instruction, and curriculum, the same goals included in this study. Percentages of responses and frequency of responses were analyzed.

Population

The total Virginia community college dean and division chairperson population was sampled for this study. A dean is an individual employed by the Virginia Community College System as a chief academic or student services officer of a community college. A division chairperson is an individual employed by the Virginia Community College System as an administrator of the day-to-day division instructional programs of a community college.

The population consisted of the 59 deans and 98 division chairpersons for the twenty-three state-supported community colleges. At least one dean and one division chairperson were sampled from each community college; however as many as 11 deans and 19 division chairpersons were sampled from some community colleges.
To be as accurate as possible in determining the population, its members were identified using college catalogs and confirmed through telephone calls to each of the community colleges. The author obtained the initial population list by examining the most recently published college catalog from each of the twenty-three institutions. Telephone calls were made to each college one month prior to the mailing of the questionnaire to confirm the population list.

Instrumentation and Pilot Study

The Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century report was used as the basis for the goal statements. Appendix A includes the goal statements in the questionnaire. The goal statements were developed from the report’s recommendations dealing with students, faculty, curriculum and instruction to represent four goal areas. The goal statements were randomly assigned to the questionnaire so as not to reveal continuity within the goal areas of students, faculty, instruction and curriculum.

Pilot study subjects were 10 Virginia Tech graduate students who hold or have held similar positions to those of the study’s population. Pilot-study subjects were administered an instrument and were asked to
critique it and a cover letter. Appendix B reveals the pilot instrument and cover letter. The questionnaire was administered in the pilot study for content and face validity. Pilot study subjects were asked to conclude whether or not the questionnaire goal statements comprise an adequate definition of what they claim to measure--content and face validity (Isaac & Michael, 1985). To avoid respondent bias, no comment was made by the researcher concerning the questionnaire's purpose until after the pilot-study subject had read the cover letter and completed the questionnaire. Then, the pilot-study subject was presented with an abstract which explained the study’s purpose and a list of questions about the instrument and cover letter. Appendix B contains the abstract and questions given to pilot-study participants. Lastly, pilot-study subject opinions and suggestions were solicited for improvements by the researcher.

The instrument and the cover letter were modified based upon feedback from pilot-study subjects. Minor editing--grammatical and wording--was made to the cover letter. Appendix C presents the edited cover letter. Revisions were also made to the survey instrument. First, example goal statements in the directions were changed to goal statements that were viewed by pilot-
study subjects as less controversial. Second, the directions for responses and response categories were revised from circling "yes," "no," or "don't know" for each response to checking a shaded box under "yes," "no," or "don't know" for each response. Third, the number of goal statements was reduced from 41 to 38. Three goal statements were viewed by the pilot group as being oriented towards continuing education or community services and were deemed inappropriate because continuing education administrators were not included in the population of this study. Finally, minor wording and grammatical changes were made to various goal statements. Appendix A presents the final version of the instrument.

Data Collection Procedures

The study was conducted in the late fall of 1989. An endorsement from the Virginia Community College System Office was sought because it is the System administrative unit of the State Board of Community Colleges. The endorsement was sought to add credibility to the study in hopes of increasing the response rate and to impress upon the 23 community colleges the importance the Virginia Community College System places on the Building Communities report. An endorsement from
Dr. Elmo Roesler, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research and Planning of the Virginia Community College System was requested and secured. Appendices D and E present the request for endorsement and Dr. Roesler’s endorsement.

The data collection procedures used for assembling and mailing questionnaires and appropriate follow-up mailings were modeled after the method advocated by Dillman (1978) with one modification: the first and only follow-up was in the form of a personalized letter rather than a postcard. The following specific procedures were used:

1. On December 4, 1989, the questionnaire (see Appendix A) was mailed to deans and division chairpersons of Virginia community colleges at their community colleges. Appendix F contains a cover letter which specified the purpose of the study and advised respondents that the questionnaires were coded to assist in follow-up mailings. Mention of the System’s endorsement was also included in the cover letter.

2. On December 11, 1989, a personalized letter specifying the purpose of the study and containing the endorsement from Dr. Roesler
was sent to all subjects. Appendix G contains the letter which served as a reminder for nonrespondents and a thank you for those who had.

Data Analysis and Recording

The deans and division chairpersons of Virginia community colleges were surveyed to assess their views on existing goal status and preferred goal status. The assessment was achieved by analyzing responses from the data collected on the instrument used in this study, to test the two null hypotheses identified below and research questions in Chapter 1.

Two hypotheses are tested in the study. To test the hypothesis, "there is no difference between deans and division chairpersons regarding existing goal status and preferred goal status," the Chi Square Test of Independence was applied to the data collected. The dependent variables are existing goal status and preferred goal status; the independent variable is job classification or role of the two sets of respondents. The Chi Square Test of Independence was used to ascertain the probability of observed differences between deans and division chairpersons regarding existing goal status or preferred goal status of each
goal. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979), the Chi Square statistic is frequently used to compare two or more groups on a nominal or categorical variable with two or more categories.

To test the hypothesis, "there is no difference between existing goal status and preferred goal status," the Dependent Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test was applied to the data collected. The dependent variable is goal status; while the independent variables are 2 points of goal status: existing and preferred. The Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test was used to compare proportions. Specifically, the proportion of "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status for each goal was compared to the proportion of goal area "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979), the most frequent use of the Chi Square distribution is in the analysis of nominal data. In these analyses, the observed frequencies of occurrence are compared to theoretical frequencies. The Goodness of Fit Test indicates whether or not the observed frequencies are a "good fit" to the expected frequencies.
Methodological Assumptions

The assumptions for using the Chi Square statistic must be met if resulting inferences are to be valid. Those assumptions, stated in Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh (1985), include:

1. Categories will be mutually exclusive; each response will appear in only one of the categories in a table.

2. The responses will be measured as frequencies.

3. The expected frequency in any cell will be at least 5 when the degrees of freedom equals one, and not less than 5 in 80 percent of the cells when the degrees of freedom are more than one.

4. The observed values with one degree of freedom will be corrected for continuity to use the table of critical values of Chi square.

5. The responses will be independent of one another.

It is assumed that sampling the population is a representative sample.

Summary

Deans and chairpersons from Virginia’s community colleges were surveyed to determine the existing and preferred status of goals from AACJC’s Building Communities (1988a). A preliminary version of a cover
letter and an instrument were pilot-tested. Virginia Tech graduate students who hold or have held similar positions as the population reviewed both the letter and instrument. After revising the instrument, the final version contained 38 goal statements. The revised cover letter and instrument were distributed using the mail survey method similar to that recommended by Dillman (1978). A follow-up personalized letter served as a reminder or a thank you to the participants. The data collected were analyzed using the Chi Square Test of Independence and the Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this study, as indicated in Chapter One, was to analyze the existing status and preferred status of goals from the American Association of Community and Junior College’s Building Communities’ report. To accomplish this objective, two groups of Virginia community college administrators who establish and manage goals were surveyed. Deans and division chairpersons were asked to indicate their perceptions of a goal’s existing status and preferred status. The data were collected via a mail questionnaire and tabulated using SAS Software System. The Chi Square Test of Independence was used to analyze the data for ascertaining differences between deans and division chairpersons regarding reported existing goal status and differences regarding reported preferred goal status. The Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test was used to analyze the data for ascertaining differences between reported existing goal status and reported preferred goal status.

This chapter presents the research findings in seven sections. Section 1, Questionnaire Responses, discusses the participants in the study. Section 2, Report and Analysis of Data, discusses how data was collected and analyzed. Sections 3-6, Student Goals,
Faculty Goals, Instruction Goals, and Curriculum Goals, discuss findings for existing goal status, preferred goal status, and differences between existing goal status and preferred goal status for each of the respective four goal areas. Section 7, Summary, summarizes findings of this study.

Questionnaire Responses

Participants in this study were limited to two groups of Virginia community college administrators—Deans and Division Chairpersons. Information presented in this section describes the number of participants.

The population for this analysis consisted of 157 Virginia community college administrators: 59 deans and 98 division chairpersons. Information presented in Table 1 outlines the response rates from both groups. Fifty-three out of 59 deans returned a completed questionnaire, for a usable response rate of 89.8%. Responses were received from 86 of the 98 division chairpersons, for a response rate of 87.8%. However, two questionnaires received from division chairpersons were not completed and were not used in the analysis of data. The usable response rate was adjusted to 85.7%.
## Table 1
Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Group</th>
<th>Surveys Sent</th>
<th>Total Returns</th>
<th>Usable Returns</th>
<th>Usable Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chairpersons</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses were received from at least one dean and one division chairperson from each college. Information in Table 2 presents paired responses from all institutions. A paired response is the least number of deans or division chairpersons that respond from the same institution. The total number of deans responding was 53. The total number of division chairpersons responding was 84. The total number of paired responses was 53.
Table 2
Number Responding From Each Group And Paired Responses From All Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chairpersons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution*</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chairpersons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired Responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DEANS RESPONDING = 53
TOTAL DIVISION CHAIRPERSONS RESPONDING = 84
TOTAL PAIRED RESPONSES = 53

* Names of Community Colleges
1 - J. Sargeant Reynolds
2 - Rappahannock
3 - Danville
4 - Mountain Empire
5 - Southwest Virginia
6 - Eastern Shore
7 - Central Virginia
8 - Virginia Western
9 - Virginia Highlands
10 - Germanna
11 - Southside Virginia
12 - Lord Fairfax
13 - John Tyler
14 - Wytheville
15 - Tidewater
16 - Northern Virginia
17 - New River
18 - Blue Ridge
19 - Paul D. Camp
20 - Dabney S. Lancaster
21 - Thomas Nelson
22 - Patrick Henry
23 - Piedmont Virginia
Report and Analysis of Data

Data were collected by using a survey questionnaire devised by the researcher. Appendix A contains the questionnaire. The questionnaire asked participants to indicate their view of the existing status and preferred status of goals from the American Association of Community and Junior College’s Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century report. The questionnaire consisted of 38 goals. The 38 goal statements were grouped into four goal areas: (a) student, (b) faculty, (c) instruction, and (d) curriculum. Goal areas correspond to the division of recommendations in the Building Communities report.

Serving a diversity of students is one of the biggest challenges community colleges face in the future (AACJC, 1988a). The student goals goal area offers goals community colleges should consider in meeting this challenge. There are 5 student goals including goals #5, #12, #14, #31, and #37. Appendix H contains a listing of student goals.

Community college faculty provide continuity for their institutions. Faculty cultivate the college’s environment and pass on institutional culture. Faculty goals address the faculty role in sustaining the intellectual and social environment of community
colleges (AACJC, 1988a). There are 7 faculty goals including goals #1, #3, #13, #22, #24, #25, and #38. Appendix H contains a listing of faculty goals.

Instruction goals refer to what takes place in the classroom. These goals address the strengthening of teacher and student intellectual and social relationships. In addition, instruction goals encourage teachers and students to become active partners in the learning process (AACJC, 1988a). There are 10 instruction goals including goals #2, #6, #9, #26, #27, #28, #32, #34, #35, and #36. Appendix H contains a listing of instruction goals.

Over the years, community college curricula have addressed the changing needs of students and marketplace demands. This responsiveness was not often guided by clear goals and has resulted in a fragmented curriculum and compartmentalized learning. Curriculum goals offer a coherent curriculum and set forth academic goals that the country's community colleges should actively prosecute (AACJC, 1988a). There are 16 curriculum goals including goals #4, #7, #8, #10, #11, #15, #16, #17, #18, #19, #20, #21, #23, #29, #30, and #33. Appendix H contains a listing of curriculum goals.

Participants were asked to respond to each goal in two different ways: Statement A dealt with the
participants' views of a goal's existing status; Statement B dealt with the participants' views of a goals' preferred status. Response choices were "Yes," "No," or "Don't Know."

Response choices were treated as nominal data. Goal statements were numbered randomly on the questionnaire. The "No" and "Don't Know" response categories were combined under one category, "No." Response categories were collapsed to better analyze the positive or "Yes" responses and negative or "No" and "Don't Know" responses. Percentage of "Yes" and "No" responses and number of "Yes" and "No" responses were computed. The percentage and number of "Yes" and "No" responses represented the amount of agreement or disagreement concerning the existing status or preferred status of each goal.

The Chi Square Test of Independence was used to analyze the data for ascertaining differences between deans and division chairpersons regarding the reported status of goals--existing and preferred. Frequencies were significantly different if the probability of obtaining the computed Chi Square by chance was less than 5%. The independent variable was job classification or role of the two groups: Virginia community college deans and Virginia community college
division chairpersons. The dependent variables were existing goal status and preferred goal status.

The Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test was used to analyze the data for ascertaining differences between the reported existing goal status and the reported preferred goal status. In determining the Chi Square value for each goal, observed frequencies of occurrence were compared to theoretical or expected frequencies. The "fit" was good when observed frequencies were within random fluctuation of expected frequencies (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1979). The Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test was used to compare proportions. Specifically, the proportion of "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status for each goal was compared to the proportion of goal area "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status. Chi Square values for each goal were determined and combined to produce a total Chi Square for a goal area. Proportions were significantly different if the probability of obtaining the total goal area Chi Square value by chance was less than 5%. For this analysis, the dependent variable was goal status; and the independent variables were (1) existing goal status and (2) preferred status of a goal.
Four sections are used to present research findings for each of the goal areas—student, faculty, instruction and curriculum—to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between deans and division chairpersons regarding reported existing goal status?

2. Is there a difference between deans and division chairpersons regarding reported preferred goal status?

3. Is there a difference between existing goal status and preferred goal status as reported by deans and as reported by division chairpersons?
Student Goals

Chi Square Test of Independence analysis was used to compare deans' and division chairpersons' views of the existing status and the preferred status of goals for the student goals goal area. Table 3 contains the derived Chi Square values for the goals in this goal area. A Chi Square (p<.05) value was calculated for each goal in the student goal area.

Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test analysis was used to compare proportions. Specifically, the proportion of "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status for each student goal was compared to the proportion of student goal area "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status. Table 4 contains a derived Chi Square value for the student goal area for both deans and division chairpersons. Chi Square (p<.05) values with 4 degrees of freedom were calculated for the student goal area.

The remainder of the student goals section discusses findings and describes participants' responses to student goals in relation to the three research questions identified earlier.
Table 3
Student Goals’
Existing Goal Status and Preferred Goal Status
Percentages for Deans and Division Chairpersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statement*</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th>Division Chairpersons</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5A</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>94.34</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5B</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12A</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12B</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>66.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14A</td>
<td>58.49</td>
<td>41.51</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14B</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>73.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31A</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>81.13</td>
<td>23.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31B</td>
<td>81.13</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>74.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37A</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>49.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37B</td>
<td>86.54</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>83.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 1 degree of freedom
Table 4
Deans' and Division Chairpersons'
Existing Goal Status to Preferred Goal Status
Proportions of "Yes" Responses and
Goodness of Fit Chi Square Values for Student Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statements*</th>
<th>Deans' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Deans' Chi Square</th>
<th>Division Chairs' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Division Chairs' Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#5A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.134</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12B</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.446</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31B</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals A</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>9.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.416**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 4 degrees of freedom
Existing Status of Student Goals

Information in Table 3 presents the Chi Square Test of Independence values calculated for the Student Goals goal area. Significant differences were identified between deans' and division chairpersons' views of the existing status for 2 of 5 goals. Significant differences were found between deans and division chairpersons regarding the existing status of goals #12A, outreaching to disadvantaged students, and #14A, outreaching to different adult populations.

A significant Chi Square value of .024 with a probability of significance at .05 was derived for goal #12A. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" was 32.08; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 15.66. Both groups agreed that outreach plans for disadvantaged students had not been implemented. Yet, deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate outreach plans had been implemented.

A significant Chi Square value of .002 with a probability of significance at .05 was derived for goal #14A. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" was 58.49; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 31.33. Deans indicated outreach plans for different adult populations had been
implemented, but division chairpersons indicated they had not been implemented.

Table 3 indicates no significant differences were identified for deans’ and division chairpersons’ views of the existing status of student goals #5A, #31A, and #37A. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #37A was 48.08%; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 49.40%. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #31A was 18.87; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 23.81. Lastly, the percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #5A was 5.66; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 13.10. Both groups agreed first-year retention programs (#37A), plans to reduce the number of students who do not complete programs (#31A), and plans to bring together heterogeneous student groups to enrich learning (#5A) have not been implemented.

Preferred Status of Student Goals

Information in Table 3 presents the Chi Square Test of Independence values calculated for the Student Goals goal area. No significant differences were identified between deans’ and division chairpersons’ views of the preferred status for any of the five student goals--#5B, #12B, #14B, #31B, and #37B.
The percentage of deans and division chairpersons who responded "yes" to goals #12B, #14B, #31B, and #37B ranged from 66.27 and 86.54. Both groups agreed outreaching to disadvantaged students (#12B), outreaching to different adult populations (#14B), reducing the number of students who fail to complete programs (#31B), and retaining first-year students (#37B) should be implemented.

The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #5B was 43.40; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 50.00. Division chairpersons did not indicate whether or not the bringing together heterogeneous student populations to enrich learning (#5B) should be implemented; however, deans felt it should not be implemented.

Differences Between Existing Status and Preferred Status of Student Goals

Information in Table 4 presents the Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test values calculated for the Student Goals goal area.

Deans. Significant differences were found between existing status and preferred status of student goals. The differences are attributed to deans' responses as reported in Table 4.
A significant Chi Square value of 12.416 with a level of significance at .05 and critical value of 9.488 was derived for student goals as viewed by deans. The largest contributors to the significant Chi Square value were goals #5 and #31. Deans' existing goal status observed frequencies of "yes" responses were much less than expected for both of these goals. And deans' preferred goal status observed frequencies of "yes" responses were much more than expected for both of these goals. Deans indicated bringing together heterogeneous student populations to enrich learning (#5) and reducing the number of students who fail to complete programs (#31) have not been implemented as much as they should.

Division chairpersons. No significant differences were identified between existing status and preferred status of student goals as reported in Table 4. Division chairpersons' responses did not reveal significant differences.

Summary of Student Goals' Findings

Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate outreach plans for disadvantaged students (#12A) and outreach plans for different adult populations (#14A) had been implemented. Deans indicated the bringing together of heterogeneous student populations to enrich learning (#5) and reducing the
number of students who do not complete programs (#31) had not been implemented as much as they should.
Faculty Goals

Chi Square Test of Independence analysis was used to compare deans' and division chairpersons' views of the existing status and the preferred status of goals for the faculty goals goal area. Table 5 contains the derived Chi Square values for the goals in this goal area. A Chi Square (p<.05) value was calculated for each goal in the faculty goal area.

Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test analysis was used to compare proportions. Specifically, the proportion of "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status for each faculty goal was compared to the proportion of faculty goal area "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status. Chi Square (p<.05) values with 6 degrees of freedom were calculated for the faculty goal area.

The remainder of the faculty goals section discusses findings and describes participants' responses to faculty goals in relation to the three research questions identified earlier.
Table 5
Faculty Goals’
Existing Goal Status and Preferred Goal Status
Percentages for Deans and Division Chairpersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statement*</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Division Chairpersons</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1A</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>51.19</td>
<td>48.81</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1B</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>94.05</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3A</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>81.13</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>77.38</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3B</td>
<td>71.15</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>89.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>.007**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13A</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>78.85</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>85.54</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13B</td>
<td>49.06</td>
<td>50.94</td>
<td>69.51</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>.017**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22A</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22B</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24A</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>62.26</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>84.34</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24B</td>
<td>96.23</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>86.59</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25A</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>95.18</td>
<td>.039**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25B</td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td>71.70</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>62.20</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38A</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>69.88</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38B</td>
<td>82.69</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 1 degree of freedom
Table 6
Deans' and Division Chairpersons' Existing Goal Status to Preferred Goal Status Proportions of "Yes" Responses and Goodness of Fit Chi Square Values for Faculty Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statements*</th>
<th>Deans' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Deans' Chi Square</th>
<th>Division Chairs' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Division Chairs' Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1B</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.497</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3B</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24B</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38B</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals A</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>4.588</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.414**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 6 degrees of freedom
Existing Status of Faculty Goals

Information in Table 5 presents the Chi Square Test of Independence values calculated for the Faculty Goals goal area. Significant differences were identified between deans' and division chairpersons' views of the existing status for 2 of 7 goals--#24A and #25A.

A significant Chi Square value of .003 with a probability of significance at .05 was derived for goal #24A. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" was 37.74; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 15.66. Both groups agreed plans for faculty renewal had not been implemented. Yet, deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate faculty renewal plans had been implemented.

A significant Chi Square value of .039 with a probability of significance at .05 was calculated for goal #25A. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" was 15.09; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 4.82. Both groups agreed insuring that the majority of classes are taught by full-time faculty had not been implemented. Yet, deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate insuring that full-time faculty teach the majority of classes had been implemented.
Table 5 indicates no significant differences were identified for deans' and division chairpersons' views of the existing status of faculty goals #1A, #3A, #13A, #22A, and #38A.

The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #1A was 56.60; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 51.19. Both groups agreed a policy affecting the selection, orientation, and renewal of part-time faculty (#1A) had been implemented.

Between 30.12% and 40.38% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #22A and #38A. Between 14.46% and 22.62% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #3A and #13A. Therefore, both groups agreed setting aside 2% of the instructional budget for professional development (#3A), limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty (#13A), establishing an Innovative Teachers' Fund (#22A), and recruiting and retaining top quality faculty (#38A) have not been implemented.

Preferred Status of Faculty Goals

Information in Table 5 presents the Chi Square Test of Independence values calculated for the Faculty Goals goal area. Significant differences were identified between deans' and division chairpersons' views of the preferred status for 2 of 7 goals--#3B and #13B.
A significant Chi Square value of .007 with a probability of significance at .05 was derived for goal #3B. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" was 71.15; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 89.29. Both groups agreed setting aside 2% of the instructional budget for professional development (#3B) should be implemented. Yet, division chairpersons were more likely than deans to indicate a 2% set aside should be implemented.

A significant Chi Square value of .017 with a probability of significance of .05 was derived for goal #13B. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" was 49.06; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 69.51. Division chairpersons indicated limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty (#13B) should be implemented, but deans indicated it should not be implemented.

Table 5 indicates no significant differences were identified for deans' and division chairpersons' views of the preferred status of faculty goals: #1B, #22B, #24B, #25B, and #38B.

Between 82.69% and 96.23% of both groups responded "yes" to goals #1B, #22B, #24B, and #38B. Deans and division chairpersons agreed selecting, orienting, and renewing part-time faculty (#1B), establishing an
Innovative Teachers’ Fund (#22B), developing a faculty renewal plan (#24B), and recruiting and retaining top quality faculty (#38B) should be implemented.

The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #25B was 28.30; the percentage of division chairpersons was 37.80. Deans and division chairpersons agreed insuring that the majority of credit-bearing classes are taught by full-time faculty (#25B) should not be implemented.

**Differences Between Existing Status and Preferred Status of Faculty Goals**

Information in Table 6 presents the Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test values calculated for the Faculty Goals goal area.

**Deans.** No significant differences were identified between existing status and preferred status of faculty goals as reported in Table 6. Therefore, deans’ responses did not reveal significant differences.

**Division chairpersons.** Significant differences were identified between existing status and preferred status of faculty goals. The differences are attributed to division chairpersons’ responses as reported in Table 6.

A significant Chi Square value of 18.414 with a level of significance at .05 and critical value of
12.592 was derived for faculty goals as viewed by division chairpersons. The largest contributor to the significant Chi Square value was goal #1. Division chairpersons' existing goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much more than expected for this goal. And division chairpersons' preferred goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much less than expected for this goal. Division chairpersons indicated selecting, orienting, and renewing part-time faculty (#1) had been implemented as much as it should.

Summary of Faculty Goals' Findings

Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate developing a faculty renewal plan (#24A) and insuring that the majority of the credit-bearing classes are taught by full-time faculty (#25A) had been implemented.

Division chairpersons were more likely than deans to indicate setting aside 2% of the instructional budget for professional development (#3B) should be implemented. Division chairpersons indicated limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty (#13B) should be implemented, but deans indicated it should not be implemented.
Division chairpersons indicated selecting, orienting, and renewing part-time faculty (#1) had been implemented as much as it should.
Instruction Goals

Chi Square Test of Independence analysis was used to compare deans' and division chairpersons' views of the existing status and the preferred status of goals for the instruction goals goal area. Table 7 contains the derived Chi Square values for the goals in this goal area. A Chi Square (p<.05) value was calculated for each goal in the instruction goal area.

Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test analysis was used to compare proportions. Specifically, the proportion of "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status for each instruction goal was compared to the proportion of instruction goal area "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status. Table 8 contains a derived Chi Square value for the instruction goal area for both deans and division chairpersons. Chi Square (p<.05) values with 9 degrees of freedom were calculated for the instruction goal area.

The remainder of the instruction goals section discusses findings and describes participants' responses to instruction goals in relation to the three research questions identified earlier.
Table 7
Instruction Goals' Existing Goal Status and Preferred Goal Status Percentages for Deans and Division Chairpersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statement*</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th>Division Chairpersons</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2A</td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>0.046**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2B</td>
<td>86.79</td>
<td>79.76</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6A</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6B</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>71.08</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9A</td>
<td>54.72</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9B</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26A</td>
<td>66.04</td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26B</td>
<td>83.02</td>
<td>84.52</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27A</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27B</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>59.52</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28A</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>72.29</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28B</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>97.59</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32A</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32B</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>72.62</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34A</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34B</td>
<td>39.22</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#35A</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#35B</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>67.07</td>
<td>0.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36A</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36B</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 1 degree of freedom
Table 8
Deans' and Division Chairpersons'
Existing Goal Status to Preferred Goal Status
Proportions of "Yes" Responses and
Goodness of Fit Chi Square Values for Instruction Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statements*</th>
<th>Deans' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Deans' Chi Square</th>
<th>Division Chairs' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Division Chairs' Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6B</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.043</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.230</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28A</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.763</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28B</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.631</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32B</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.763</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.948</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.
Table 8 Continued
Deans' and Division Chairpersons' Existing Goal Status to Preferred Goal Status Proportions of "Yes" Responses and Goodness of Fit Chi Square Values for Instruction Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statements*</th>
<th>Deans' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Deans' Chi Square</th>
<th>Division Chairs' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Division Chairs' Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#35A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#35B</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals A</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>32.956**</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.052**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 9 degrees of freedom
Existing Status of Instruction Goals

Information in Table 7 presents the Chi Square Test of Independence values calculated for the Instruction Goals goal area. Significant differences were identified between deans’ and division chairpersons’ views of the existing status of 1 of 10 goals—#2A.

A significant Chi Square value of .046 with a probability of significance at .05 was derived for goal #2A. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" was 45.28; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 28.57. Both groups agreed using computer technology to integrate educational and administrative applications (#2A) had not been implemented. Yet, deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate integrating applications via the computer had been implemented.

Table 7 indicates no significant differences were identified for deans’ and division chairpersons’ views of the existing status of instruction goals #6A, #9A, #26A, #27A, #28A, #32A, #34A, #35A, and #36A.

The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #28A was 84.62; the percentage of division chairpersons was 72.29. Deans and division chairpersons agreed that insuring the assessment of teaching (#28A) had been implemented.
The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #26A was 66.04; the percentage of division chairpersons was 55.95. Deans and division chairpersons agreed restricting class size in basic English courses (#26A) had been implemented.

The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #9A was 54.72; the percentage of division chairpersons was 49.40. Deans indicated restricting class size in developmental courses (#9A) had been implemented, but division chairpersons indicated it had not been implemented.

Between 7.14% and 25.00% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #6A, #27A, #32A, #34A, #35A, and #36A. The groups agreed recognizing faculty for excellent teaching (#6A), promoting the role of the faculty member as a classroom researcher (#27A), and rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs (#32A) had not been implemented. In addition, deans and division chairpersons agreed that requiring all discipline faculty to teach core curriculum classes in their discipline (#34A), using technology to provide instruction outside the institution (#35A), and restricting class size in core curriculum courses (#36A) had not been implemented.
Preferred Status of Instruction Goals

Information in Table 7 presents the Chi Square Test of Independence values calculated for the Instruction Goals goal area. No significant differences were identified for deans’ and division chairpersons’ views of the preferred status of instruction goals #2B, #6B, #9B, #26B, #27B, #28B, #32B, #34B, #35B, and #16B.

All deans and 97.59% of the division chairpersons responded "yes" to goal #28B. Both groups indicated insuring the assessment of teaching (#28B) should be implemented.

Between 79.76% and 87.80% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #2B, #9B, and #26B. Both groups indicated using computer technology to integrate educational and administrative applications (#2B), restricting class size in developmental courses (#9B), and restricting class size in basic English courses (#26B) should be implemented.

Between 71.08% and 75.47% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #6B and #32B. Both groups indicated recognizing faculty for excellent teaching (#6B) and rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs (#32B) should be implemented.
Between 56.60% and 67.07% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" goals #27B and #35B. Both groups indicated promoting the role of faculty member as a classroom researcher (#27B) and using technology to provide instruction outside the institution (#35B) should be implemented.

Between 32.93% and 39.22% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #34B and #36B. Both groups indicated requiring all discipline faculty to teach core curriculum classes in their discipline (#34B) and restricting class size in core curriculum courses (#36B) should not be implemented.

Differences Between Existing Status and Preferred Status of Instruction Goals

Information in Table 8 presents the Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test values calculated for the Instruction Goals goal area. Significant differences were found between existing status and preferred status of instruction goals. The differences are attributed to both deans' and division chairpersons' responses as reported in Table 8.

A significant Chi Square value of 32.956 with a level of significance at .05 and critical value of 16.919 was derived for instruction goals as viewed by
Large contributors to the deans' significant Chi Square value were goals #26, #28, and #32.

A significant Chi Square value of 48.052 with a level of significance at .05 and critical value of 16.919 was derived for instruction goals as viewed by division chairpersons. Large contributors to the division chairpersons' significant Chi Square value were goals #26, #27, #28, and #32.

Both groups' existing goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses were much more than expected for goals #28 and #26. And both groups' preferred goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses were much less than expected for both of these goals. Deans and division chairpersons agreed insuring the assessment of teaching (#28) and restricting class size in basic English courses (#26) have been implemented as much as they should.

Both groups' existing goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses were much less than expected for goal #32. And both groups' preferred goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses were much more than expected for goal #32. Deans and division chairpersons agreed rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs (#32) had not been implemented as much as it should.
Division chairpersons' existing goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much less than expected for goal #27. And division chairpersons' preferred goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much more than expected for goal #27. Division chairpersons indicated promoting the role of the faculty member as classroom researcher (#27) had not been implemented as much as it should.

**Summary of Instruction Goals' Findings**

Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate integrating administrative and educational applications via computer technology (#2A) had been implemented.

Deans and division chairpersons agreed insuring the assessment of teaching (#28) and restricting class size in basic English courses (#26) have been implemented as much as they should.

Deans and division chairpersons agreed rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs (#32) had not been implemented as much as it should.

Division chairpersons indicated promoting the faculty member as classroom researcher (#27) had not been implemented as much as it should.
Curriculum Goals

Chi Square Test of Independence analysis was used to compare deans' and division chairpersons' views of the existing status and the preferred status of goals for the curriculum goals goal area. Table 9 contains the derived Chi Square values for the goals in this goal area. A Chi Square (p<.05) value was calculated for each goal in the curriculum goal area.

Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test analysis was used to compare proportions. Specifically, the proportion of "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status for each curriculum goal was compared to the proportions of goal area "yes" responses for existing goal status to "yes" responses for preferred goal status. Table 10 contains a derived Chi Square value for the curriculum goal area for both deans and division chairpersons. Chi Square (p<.05) values with 15 degrees of freedom were calculated for the curriculum goal area.

The remainder of the curriculum goals section discusses findings and details participants' responses to curriculum goals in relation to the three research questions identified earlier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statement*</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Division Chairpersons</th>
<th></th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4A</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4B</td>
<td>94.34</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7A</td>
<td>94.34</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7B</td>
<td>94.34</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8A</td>
<td>66.04</td>
<td>33.96</td>
<td>60.71</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8B</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>97.62</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10A</td>
<td>58.49</td>
<td>41.51</td>
<td>63.86</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10B</td>
<td>86.79</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>81.93</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11A</td>
<td>58.49</td>
<td>41.51</td>
<td>60.24</td>
<td>39.76</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11B</td>
<td>86.79</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>75.90</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15A</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>98.11</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>92.68</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15B</td>
<td>49.06</td>
<td>50.94</td>
<td>58.54</td>
<td>41.46</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16A</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>98.11</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>96.34</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16B</td>
<td>39.62</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>41.98</td>
<td>58.02</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17A</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>94.34</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>85.54</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17B</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>52.83</td>
<td>54.22</td>
<td>45.78</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18A</td>
<td>71.70</td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td>67.47</td>
<td>32.53</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18B</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>80.72</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19A</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>51.81</td>
<td>48.19</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19B</td>
<td>83.02</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>92.77</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 1 degree of freedom
### Table 9 Continued

**Curriculum Goals'**

**Existing Goal Status and Preferred Goal Status Percentages for Deans and Division Chairpersons**

| Goal Statement* | Deans | | | | | | Division Chairpersons | | | |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                 | Yes   | No    | Yes   | No    | p value | |                          |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #20A            | 73.58 | 26.42 | 71.08 | 28.92 | .751    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #20B            | 92.45 | 7.55  | 85.54 | 14.46 | .223    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #21A            | 20.75 | 79.25 | 14.46 | 85.54 | .339    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #21B            | 66.04 | 33.96 | 67.47 | 32.53 | .863    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #23A            | 26.42 | 73.58 | 33.73 | 66.27 | .368    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #23B            | 56.60 | 43.40 | 68.67 | 31.33 | .153    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #29A            | 43.40 | 56.60 | 34.52 | 65.48 | .297    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #29B            | 75.00 | 25.00 | 64.29 | 35.71 | .192    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #30A            | 20.75 | 79.25 | 19.05 | 80.95 | .807    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #30B            | 58.49 | 41.51 | 70.24 | 29.76 | .158    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #33A            | 30.77 | 69.23 | 21.69 | 78.31 | .237    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| #33B            | 84.62 | 15.38 | 74.70 | 25.30 | .172    | |                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 1 degree of freedom
Table 10
Deans' and Division Chairpersons' Existing Goal Status to Preferred Goal Status Proportions of "Yes" Responses and Goodness of Fit Chi Square Values for Curriculum Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statements*</th>
<th>Deans' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Deans' Chi Square</th>
<th>Division Chairs' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Division Chairs' Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#4A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.245</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8B</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.199</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.900</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.352</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.796</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.330</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18B</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.
### Table 10 Continued

**Deans' and Division Chairpersons'**

*Existing Goal Status to Preferred Goal Status*

*Proportions of "Yes" Responses and Goodness of Fit Chi Square Values for Curriculum Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statements*</th>
<th>Deans' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Deans' Chi Square</th>
<th>Division Chairs' A to B* Proportions of &quot;Yes&quot; Responses</th>
<th>Division Chairs' Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#19A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20A</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20B</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29B</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30B</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>57.111**</td>
<td>79.844**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Appendix H for complete statements of goals. A refers to existing status and B to preferred status.

** Significant at .05 with 15 degrees of freedom
Existing Status of Curriculum Goals

Information in Table 9 presents the Chi Square Test of Independence values calculated for the Curriculum Goals goal area. Significant differences were identified between deans’ and division chairpersons’ views of the existing status for 1 of 16 goals—#7A.

A significant Chi Square value of .000 with a probability of significance at .05 was derived for goal #7A. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" was 94.34; the percentage of division chairpersons who responded "yes" was 69.05. Both groups agreed placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs (#7A) had been implemented. Yet, deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs had been implemented.

Table 9 indicates no significant differences were identified for deans’ and division chairpersons’ views of the existing status of curriculum goals #4A, #8A, #10A, #11A, #15A, #16A, #17A, #18A, #19A, #20A, #21A, #23A, #29A, #30A, and #33A.

Between 67.47% and 79.25% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #4A, #18A, and #20A. Deans and division chairpersons indicated insuring that the applied science degree give attention
to communication, computation, and problem-solving skills (#4A), assessing the basic skills of first-time students (#18A), and providing 2+2 and 2+1 programs in conjunction with secondary schools (#20A) had been implemented.

Between 51.81% and 66.04% of both groups responded "yes" to goals #8A, #10A, #11A, and #19A. Deans and division chairpersons agreed establishing writing labs (#8A), integrating the core curriculum into technical programs (#10A), requiring students to complete an English course emphasizing writing (#11A), and affirming that certificate and degree seeking students become proficient in writing and speaking English (#19A) had been implemented.

Between 21.69% and 43.40% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #23A, #29A, and #31A. Both groups indicated agreeing on core curriculum components in technical programs (#23A), requiring degree-seeking students to complete a core curriculum (#29A), and providing recurrent education for the workforce (#31A) had not been implemented.

Between 14.46% and 20.75% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #21A and #30A. Both groups indicated coordinating adult literacy programs with other public agencies (#21A) and selecting
technical education faculty and administrators capable of developing up-to-date programs and integrating the core and technical curriculums (#30A) had not been implemented.

Lastly, between 1.89% and 14.46% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #15A, #16A, and #17A. Both groups indicated requiring an international studies component in the core curriculum (#15A), requiring faculty to close the gap between the "liberal" and "useful" arts (#16A), and teaching oral and written communication in every class (#17A) had not been implemented.

Preferred Status of Curriculum Goals

Information in Table 9 presents the Chi Square Test of Independence values calculated for the Curriculum Goals goal area. No significant differences were identified for deans' and division chairpersons' views of the preferred status of curriculum goals #4B, #7B, #8B, #10B, #11B, #15B, #16B, #17B, #18B, #19B, #20B, #21B, #23B, #29B, #30B, and #33B. Deans and division chairpersons agreed that all but 3 goals, #15B, #16B, and #17B, in the goal area should be implemented.

Between 92.86% and 100.00% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #4B, #7B, and #8B. Both groups indicated insuring that the applied science
degree include communication, computation, and problem-solving competencies (#4B), placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs (#7B), and establishing writing labs (#8B) should be implemented.

Between 74.70% and 92.77% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #10B, #11B, #18B, #19B, #20B, and #33B. Both groups indicated integrating the core curriculum into technical education programs (#10B), requiring students to complete an English course emphasizing writing (#11B), assessing basic skills of first-time students (#18B), affirming that certificate and degree seeking students become proficient in the written and oral use of English (#19B), establishing 2+2 and 2+1 arrangements in conjunction with secondary schools (#20B), and providing recurrent education for the workforce (#33B) should be implemented.

Between 56.60% and 75.00% of deans and division chairpersons responded "yes" to goals #21B, #23B, #29B, and #30B. Both groups indicated coordinating adult literacy efforts with other agencies (#21B), agreeing on the core curriculum component in technical education programs (#23B), requiring associate degree students to complete a core curriculum (#29B), and selecting faculty and administrators who can develop up-to-date programs
and integrate the core and technical curriculums (#30B) should be implemented.

The groups did not agree on the preferred status of goals #15B and #17B. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #15B was 49.06; the percentage of division chairpersons was 58.54. The percentage of deans who responded "yes" to goal #17B was 47.17; the percentage of division chairpersons was 54.22. Division chairpersons indicated requiring an international studies component in the core curriculum (#15B) and teaching oral and written communication in every class (#17B) should be implemented. However, deans indicated these goals should not be implemented.

Finally, the percentage of deans who responded "yes to goal #16B was 39.62; the percentage of division chairpersons was 41.98. Both groups indicated requiring faculty to close the gap between the "liberal" and "useful" arts (#16B) should not be implemented.

**Differences Between Existing Status and Preferred Status of Curriculum Goals**

Information in Table 10 presents the Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test values calculated for the Curriculum Goals goal area. Significant differences were found between existing status and preferred status. The differences are attributed to both deans’ and
division chairpersons' responses as reported in Table 10.

A significant Chi Square value of 57.111 with a level of significance at .05 and critical value of 24.996 was derived for curriculum goals as viewed by deans. Large contributors to the deans' significant Chi Square value were goals #7, #15, #16, and #17.

A significant Chi Square value of 79.844 with a level of significance at .05 and critical value of 24.996 was derived for curriculum goals as viewed by division chairpersons. Large contributors to the division chairpersons' significant Chi Square value were goals #4, #15, #16, #17, #18, #20, #21, #30, and #33.

Both groups' existing goal status observed frequencies of "yes" responses were much less than expected for goals #15, #16, and #17. And both groups' preferred goal status observed frequencies of "yes" responses were much more than expected for goals #15, #16, and #17. Deans and division chairpersons agreed requiring an international studies component in the core curriculum (#15), requiring faculty to close the gap between the "liberal" and "useful" arts (#16) and teaching oral and written communication in every class (#17) had not been implemented as much as they should.
Deans' existing goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much more than expected for goal #7. And deans' preferred goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much less than expected for goal #7. Deans indicated placing ill-prepared students in developmental education courses (#7) had been implemented as much as it should.

Division chairpersons' existing goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much less than expected for goals #21, #30, and #33. And division chairpersons' preferred goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much more than expected for goals #21, #30 and #33. Division chairpersons indicated coordinating adult literacy efforts with other agencies (#21), selecting technical education faculty and administrators capable of developing up-to-date programs and integrating the core and technical curriculums (#30), and providing recurrent education for the workforce (#33) had not been implemented as much as they should.

Division chairpersons' existing goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much more than expected for goals #4, #18, and #20. And division chairpersons' preferred goal status observed frequency of "yes" responses was much less than expected for goals
Division chairpersons indicated insuring that the applied science degree give attention to communication, computation, and problem-solving competencies (#4), assessing basic skills of first-time students (#18), and arranging 2+2 and 2+1 programs with secondary schools (#20) had been implemented as much as they should. 

Summary of Curriculum Goals’ Findings

Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs (#7A) had been implemented.

Deans and division chairpersons agreed requiring an international studies component in the core curriculum (#15), requiring faculty to close the gap between the "liberal" and "useful" arts (#16), and teaching oral and written communication in every class (#17) have not been implemented as much as they should.

Deans indicated placing ill-prepared students in developmental education courses (#7) had been implemented as much as it should.

Division chairpersons indicated coordinating adult literacy efforts with other agencies (#21), selecting technical education faculty and administrators capable
of developing up-to-date programs and integrating the core and technical curriculums (#30), and providing recurrent education to the workforce (#33) have not been implemented as much as they should.

Division chairpersons also indicated insuring that the applied science degree give attention to communication, computation, and problem-solving competencies (#4), assessing basic skills of first-time students (#18), and arranging 2+2 and 2+1 programs with secondary schools (#20) have been implemented as much as they should.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the Building Communities' goals as these goals relate to Virginia community colleges. Research findings and data analysis from the 157 administrators surveyed were presented in this chapter. Administrators from two respondent groups included 59 deans and 98 division chairpersons. There were 53 usable responses from deans and 84 usable responses from division chairpersons.

Deans and division chairpersons agreed on the existing status of 32 of the 38 goals. Deans and division chairpersons agreed on the preferred status of 36 of the 38 goals. The remainder of the summary will
include reporting the statistically significant differences identified as they relate to the research questions of this study.

Statistically significant differences were identified between deans' and division chairpersons' views of existing goal status in 6 of the 38 goals. They were:

1. **Student Goals #12A and #14A.** Both groups agreed outreaching to disadvantaged students (#12A) had not been implemented. Deans reported outreaching to different adult populations (#14A) had been implemented; division chairpersons reported it had not been implemented. Significant differences indicated deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate outreach plans for disadvantaged students (#12A) and different adult populations (#14A) have been implemented.

2. **Faculty Goals #24A and #25A.** Both groups agreed these goals have not been implemented. Significant differences indicated deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate developing faculty renewal plans (#24) and insuring that full-time faculty teach the majority of credit-bearing classes (#25) have been implemented.
3. **Instruction Goal #2A.** Both groups agreed using computer technology to integrate educational and administrative applications (#2A) had not been implemented. Significant differences indicated deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate goal #2A had been implemented.

4. **Curriculum Goal #7A.** Both groups agreed placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs (#7A) had been implemented. Significant differences indicated deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate goal #7A had been implemented.

Statistically significant differences were identified between deans’ and division chairpersons’ views of preferred goal status in 2 of the 38 goals. They were:

1. **Faculty Goals #3B and #13B.** Both groups agreed setting aside 2% of the instructional budget for professional development (#3B) should be implemented. Division chairpersons indicated limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty (#13B) should be implemented. However, deans indicated it should not be implemented. Significant differences
indicated division chairpersons were more likely than deans to support the implementation of these two goals.

Statistically significant differences were identified between existing goal status and preferred goal status. They were:

1. **Student Goals, as reported by deans.** Large contributors to these differences were goals #5 and #31. Deans indicated that the bringing together heterogeneous student populations to enrich learning (#5) and reducing the number of students who fail to complete programs (#31) have not been implemented as much as they should.

2. **Faculty Goals, as reported by division chairpersons.** The large contributor to these differences was goal #1. Division chairpersons indicated selecting, orienting, and renewing part-time faculty (#1) has been implemented as much as it should.

3. **Instruction Goals, as reported by deans and by division chairpersons.** Large contributors to these differences were goals #26, #28 and #32 and indicated by both groups. Deans and division chairpersons agreed restricting class size in basic English courses (#26) and insuring the assessment of teaching (#28) have been implemented as much as they should. Deans and division chairpersons agreed rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs (#32) had not
been implemented as much as it should. Division chairpersons also indicated goal #27 was a major contributor to the differences. Promoting the faculty member as classroom researcher (#27) had not been implemented as much as it should.

4. Curriculum Goals, as reported by deans and by division chairpersons. Deans indicated that large contributors to the differences were goals #7, #15, #16, and #17. Division chairpersons indicated large contributors to the differences were goals #4, #15, #16, #17, #18, #20, #21, #30, and #33. Deans and division chairpersons agreed requiring an international studies component in the core curriculum (#15), requiring faculty to close the gap between the "liberal" and "useful" arts (#16), and teaching oral and written communication in every class (#17) have not been implemented as much as they should. Deans reported placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs (#7) had been implemented as much as it should. Division chairpersons indicated coordinating adult literacy programs with other public agencies (#21), selecting technical education faculty and administrators capable of developing up-to-date programs that integrate the core and technical curriculums (#30), and providing recurrent education for the workforce (#33) have not
been implemented as much as they should. Division chairpersons also indicated insuring the applied science degree give attention to communication, computation, and problem-solving skills (#4), assessing basic skills of first-time students (#18), and arranging 2+2 and 2+1 programs with secondary schools (#20) have been implemented as much as they should.

Overall, significant differences were identified in the existing goal status of 6 goals, preferred goal status of 2 goals, and between existing goal status and preferred goal status in 3 of the 4 goal areas as viewed by deans and by division chairpersons.
CHAPTER V

Chapter five includes an overview of the study. The overview states the purpose of the study, describes procedures used in gathering the data, and outlines the statistical design employed to analyze the data. The conclusions address the research questions based upon the data analyses findings. Recommendations are proffered based on both the conclusions and areas for possible further research. This chapter is presented in five sections: study overview, summary of findings, conclusions, recommendations, and researcher’s commentary.

Study Overview

The general purpose of this study was to assess the Building Communities’ goals as these goals relate to Virginia community colleges. Specifically, the purpose of this study was three-fold: (a) to ascertain differences, if any, between deans and division chairpersons regarding existing goal status; (b) to ascertain differences, if any, between deans and division chairpersons regarding preferred goal status; and (c) to ascertain differences, if any, between existing goal status and preferred goal status as reported by deans and by division chairpersons.
To accomplish the objectives of this study, the following research questions were asked.

1. Is there a difference between deans and division chairpersons regarding reported existing goal status?

2. Is there a difference between deans and division chairpersons regarding reported preferred goal status?

3. Is there a difference between existing goal status and preferred goal status as reported by deans and as reported by division chairpersons?

Based on the research questions, two null hypotheses were formulated. They were:

1. There will be no difference between deans and division chairpersons regarding existing goal status or preferred goal status.

2. There will be no difference between existing goal status and preferred goal status.

Survey methodology was used to collect data to test the null hypotheses. Deans and division chairpersons from Virginia community colleges were chosen to be the participants for this study. A questionnaire based on recommendations from Building Communities was mailed to 59 deans and 98 chairpeople in December 1989. Fifty-
three deans and 84 chairpeople returned a usable questionnaire.

The questionnaire, developed by the researcher, was based on recommendations stated in Building Communities. The recommendations were rewritten as goal statements. Participants were asked to indicate whether a goal had been implemented and whether a goal should be implemented.

A Chi Square Test of Independence (p<.05) was used to compare deans' and division chairpersons' responses on existing goal status and on preferred goal status. A Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test (p<.05) was used to examine the relationship of existing goal status to preferred goal status.

Summary of Findings

Deans and division chairpersons agreed on the existing status of 32 of the 38 goals. Significant differences were identified between deans and division chairpersons regarding the existing status of (a) outreaching to disadvantaged students (#12A), (b) outreaching to different adult populations (#14A), (c) renewing faculty (#24A), (d) insuring that full-time faculty teach the majority of credit-bearing courses (#25A), (e) using computer technology to integrate
- educational and administrative applications (#2A), and (f) placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs (#7A). Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to respond that these goals had been implemented.

Deans and division chairpersons agreed on the preferred status of 36 of the 38 goals. Significant differences were identified between deans and division chairpersons regarding (a) setting aside two percent of the instructional budget for professional development (#3B) and (b) limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty (#13B). Division chairpersons were more likely than deans to respond that these goals should be implemented.

Deans and division chairpersons indicated (a) insuring the assessment of teaching (#28) and (b) restricting class size in basic English courses (#26) have been implemented as much as they should. Deans and division chairpersons also indicated (a) rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs (#32), (b) requiring an international studies component in the core curriculum (#15), (c) requiring the faculty to close the gap between the "liberal" and "useful" arts (#16), and (d) teaching oral and written
communication in every class (#17) have not been implemented as much as they should.

Deans indicated (a) placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs had been implemented as much as it should (#7). Deans also indicated (a) bringing together students from different backgrounds to enrich learning (#5) and (b) reducing the number of students who fail to complete programs (#31) have not been implemented as much as they should.

Division chairpersons indicated (a) selecting, orienting, and renewing part-time faculty (#1), (b) arranging 2+2 and 2+1 programs with secondary schools (#20), (c) assessing basic skills of first-time students (#18), and (d) insuring that the applied science degree give attention to communication, computation, and problem-solving skills (#4) have been implemented as much as they should. Division chairpersons also indicated (a) promoting the faculty member as classroom researcher (#27), (b) coordinating adult literacy programs with other public agencies (#21), (c) selecting technical education faculty and administrators capable of developing up-to-date programs that integrate the core and technical curriculums (#30), and (d) providing recurrent education for the workforce (#33) have not been implemented as much as they should.
Conclusions

The following conclusions based on the findings were drawn. Conclusions include a discussion of the implications of the study. Conclusions are linked to the literature. See Table 11 for a reader's map to identify conclusions in relationship to findings. All conclusions are in bold type in the narrative.
Table 11
Reader’s Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Page Number Supporting Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Considerable consistency exists between deans and division chairpersons regarding existing goal status.</td>
<td>116, 124-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A high degree of consistency exists between deans and division chairpersons regarding preferred goal status.</td>
<td>116, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deans and division chairpersons believe differences exist between existing goal status and preferred goal status.</td>
<td>119, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Deans believe more so than do division chairpersons that outreaching to disadvantaged students (#12A), outreaching to different adult populations (#14A), developing a faculty renewal plan (#24A), insuring that full-time faculty teach the majority of credit-bearing classes (#25A), using computer technology to integrate educational and administrative applications (#2A), and placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs (#7A) have been implemented.</td>
<td>79, 124-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Division chairpersons believe more so than do deans that setting aside two percent of the instructional budget for professional development (#3B) and limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty (#13B) should be implemented.</td>
<td>89, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deans believe more should be done to bring together students from different backgrounds to enrich learning (#5) and reduce the number of students who fail to complete programs (#31).</td>
<td>82, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Division chairpersons believe selecting, orienting, and renewing part-time faculty (#1) should not be pursued anymore than it has been.</td>
<td>91, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Deans and division chairpersons believe more should be done to reward faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs (#32).</td>
<td>101, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Deans and division chairpersons do not see a need to further emphasize insuring the assessment of teaching (#28) and restricting class size in basic English courses (#26).</td>
<td>101, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Division chairpersons advocate the need to do more to promote faculty members as classroom researchers (#27).</td>
<td>102, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Deans and division chairpersons believe more emphasis needs to be placed on requiring an international studies component in the core curriculum (#15), requiring faculty to close the gap between the &quot;liberal&quot; and &quot;useful&quot; arts (#16), and teaching oral and written communication in every class (#17).</td>
<td>113, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Deans view existing efforts to place ill-prepared students in developmental educational programs (#7) as sufficient.</td>
<td>114, 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> Division chairpersons believe college's have neglected implementing coordinating adult literacy programs with other public agencies (#21), selecting technical education faculty and administrators capable of developing up-to-date programs that integrate the core and technical curriculums (#30) and providing recurrent education for the workforce (#33).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114, 126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 14. Division chairpersons believe current efforts to arrange 2+2 and 2+1 programs with secondary schools (#20), assess basic skills of first-time students, (#18) and insure that the applied science degree give attention to communication, computation, and problem-solving skills (#4) have been adequate. |
| 115, 126 |
Existing Goal Status

Deans and division chairpersons agreed on the existing status of 32 of the 38 goals. Therefore, it is concluded that considerable consistency exists between deans and division chairpersons regarding the existing goal status of a vast majority of goal statements. Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to view each of the six goals that lacked congruence as having been implemented.

One cannot justify that deans and division chairpersons do not share the same beliefs on the current status of goals at Virginia community college colleges. The Virginia Community College System should feel proud and secure that such internal harmony exists among deans and division chairpersons at the state’s twenty-three community colleges.

Student Goal Area

Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate . . . outreaching to disadvantaged students and . . . outreaching to different adult populations have been implemented. Therefore, it is concluded that deans believe more so than do division chairpersons that outreaching to disadvantaged students and different adult populations have been implemented.
Deans are responsible for outreach efforts for the entire institution. Deans may believe that the institutions' efforts to outreach to disadvantaged students and adult populations are successful. Division chairpersons are responsible for outreach efforts for their division. Some division chairpersons may see their division lacking in these efforts.

Faculty Goal Area

Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate . . . developing a faculty renewal plan and . . . insuring that full-time faculty teach the majority of credit-bearing classes have been implemented. Therefore, it is concluded that deans believe more so than do division chairpersons that developing a faculty renewal plan and insuring that full-time faculty teach the majority of credit-bearing classes have been implemented.

Overall, it appears that institutions are doing enough to insure the renewal of faculty. However, divisions representing the health science fields and vocational trades may feel a need for more renewal. These divisions tend to employ faculty who teach in specialized and technical areas and who have not earned graduate degrees or have not received pedagogy training. Division chairpersons, more so than deans, view their
roles as advocates for faculty-related needs. Hence, division chairpersons will often contend enough is not being done to insure faculty renewal.

Deans and division chairpersons differ in their beliefs of whether full-time faculty or part-time faculty teach the majority of credit-bearing courses. Data to address this disagreement need to be collected and presented.

**Instruction Goal Area**

Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate . . . using computer technology to integrate educational and administrative applications as having been implemented. **Therefore, it is concluded that deans believe more so than do division chairpersons that using computer technology to integrate educational and administrative applications has been implemented.**

Deans are more involved in administrative applications than are division chairpersons. At many institutions, computer technology will be integrated into administrative applications prior to educational applications. Immediate benefit is gained by computer automating an administrative application such as the registration process. Benefit does not occur as soon as desired when the instruction process is transformed to using a computer. In addition, the pace of integrating
computer technology into educational applications has been slow.

**Curriculum Goal Area**

Deans were more likely than division chairpersons to indicate . . . placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs had been implemented. Therefore, it is concluded that deans believe more so than do division chairpersons that placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs has been implemented.

Deans may gauge access to developmental education programs as indications of goal accomplishment. They may also view existing programs as meeting student needs, division chairpersons do not. Division chairpersons recognize that too many students spend multiple semesters in developmental education classes and never matriculate into a curriculum program.

**Preferred Goal Status**

Deans and division chairpersons agreed on the preferred status of 36 of the 38 goals. Therefore, it is concluded that a relatively high degree of consistency exists between deans and division chairpersons regarding preferred goal status in a majority of the goal statements. Division chairpersons
were more likely than deans to support the use of both of the two goals that lacked congruence.

To claim that deans and division chairpersons do not share the same vision as to the preferred status of goals at Virginia community colleges would be inaccurate. The strong agreement on the preferred status of goals by administrator groups implies a stable foundation and future for Virginia community colleges.

Faculty Goal Area

Division chairpersons were more likely than deans to support . . . setting aside two percent of the instructional budget for professional development and . . . limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty. Therefore, it is concluded that division chairpersons believe more so than do deans that setting aside two percent of the instructional budget for professional development and limiting the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty should be implemented.

Overall, it appears institutions are doing enough to provide professional development. However, divisions representing the health science fields and vocational trades may feel a need for more professional development. These divisions tend to employ faculty who teach in specialized and technical areas and who have not earned graduate degrees or have not received
pedagogy training. Division chairpersons, more so than deans, view their roles as advocates for professional development needs. Hence, division chairpersons will often contend enough is not being done to provide professional development.

Division chairpersons, who have direct responsibility for part-time faculty, may believe the unrestrained use of part-time faculty deters from "normal" division or college operations. With few exceptions, part-time faculty responsibilities only include teaching. They do not hold regular office hours for student conference; they do not academically advise students; they do not serve on college committees; they do not attend department, division, or college meetings; and they are not involved in department, division, or college activities. Thus, students may not receive the attention they need with a part-time instructor.

Related Literature on Existing Goal Status and Preferred Goal Status

Many goal studies that examined existing goal status and preferred goal status were reported in the literature. With few exceptions, findings of these studies revealed agreement among community college administrators regarding existing goal status and
preferred goal status; these findings are similar to those of this study.

Creager (1976) used the Virginia Community College System Goals Inventory to examine goal priority among college administrators, ranging from coordinators to presidents, of multi-campus Virginia community colleges involving 18 campuses. Creager found a high degree of congruence. Therefore, this study supports Creager's findings.

Robins' (1981) findings are harmonious to the findings of this study. Using the Community College Goals Inventory, Robins found no differences existed among Missouri community college presidents, department chairpersons, chief instructional, chief student personnel, and chief business administrators regarding their views of the status of institutional goals.

Huskey (1987) reported few differences in the responses of Pennsylvania community college administrators with respect to the perceived importance or preferred importance of goals. Huskey's (1987) findings are uniform with those of this study.

Bers (1975) used the Institutional Goals Inventory to compare views of Oakton Community College administrators with administrators of six community colleges across the country. Both groups of
administrators were in agreement regarding perceptions of present and desirable goals. Findings of this study were consistent with Bers. However, further analysis of Bers' data revealed a high level of disagreement within the group of Oakton Community College administrators in rank or order of both perceived and preferred goal areas.

Differences Between Existing and Preferred Goal Status

Both deans and division chairpersons identified differences between existing goal status and preferred goal status in 3 of the 4 goal areas. Therefore, according to deans and division chairpersons, it is concluded that differences exist between existing goal status and preferred goal status of the Building Communities' goals at Virginia community colleges.

Conclusions follow which relate to the individual goals of each significant goal area.

Student Goal Area

Bringing together students from different backgrounds to enrich learning and . . . reducing the number of students who fail to complete programs were viewed by deans as not being implemented as much as they should. Therefore, it is concluded that deans believe more should be done to meet these goals.
Deans are continually concerned with discovering new methods to improve the learning environment for students. They are also preoccupied with maintaining or increasing college enrollment. Hence, deans feel more should be done to use students from different backgrounds to enrich learning and to retain more students so that they may complete their programs.

**Faculty Goal Area**

Division chairpersons indicated enough has been done to select, orient, and renew part-time faculty. *Therefore, it is concluded that division chairpersons believe . . . selecting, orienting, and renewing part-time faculty should not be pursued any more than it has been.*

Community college use of part-time faculty has skyrocketed in the last decade. Many colleges have established an adequate and a competent part-time faculty pool from which to draw. Thus, division chairpersons, who are responsible for selecting, orienting, and renewing part-time faculty, believe their efforts have been successful.

**Instruction Goal Area**

Deans and division chairpersons agreed that . . . rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs had not been implemented as much as
it should. Therefore, it is concluded that deans and division chairpersons believe Virginia community colleges need to do more than they have in ... rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs.

Community colleges pride themselves for being known as "teaching institutions." Virginia community college administrators acknowledge that rewarding faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs will enhance faculty teaching. Hence, community colleges should do more to reward faculty who adapt educational technology to classroom needs.

Deans and division chairpersons agreed that ... insuring the assessment of teaching and ... restricting class size in basic English courses have been implemented as much as they should. Therefore, it is concluded that both administrative groups do not see a need to further emphasize these goals.

Virginia community colleges no longer emphasize assessing teaching because their faculties are senior with many years of teaching experience. Restricting class size in basic English courses is normally practiced by Virginia community colleges. Thus, assessing teaching and restricting class size in basic
English courses have been adequately addressed by Virginia community colleges.

Division chairpersons indicated . . . promoting faculty members as classroom researchers had not been implemented as much as it should. Therefore, it is concluded that division chairpersons advocate the need for community colleges to do more to . . . promote faculty members as classroom researchers.

Division chairpersons evaluate faculty performance. Division chairpersons believe that faculty involvement in classroom research will enhance faculty performance. Hence, Virginia community college faculty members may enhance their performance by engaging in classroom research.

Curriculum Goal Area

Deans and division chairpersons agreed that . . . requiring an international studies component in the core curriculum, . . . requiring faculty to close the gap between the "liberal" and "useful" arts, and . . . teaching oral and written communication in every class have not been implemented as much as they should. Therefore, it is concluded that deans and division chairpersons believe Virginia community colleges need to place more emphasis on these goals.
Virginia community colleges are not meeting student needs in various curriculum areas. Efforts to incorporate international education into the curriculum, merge the "liberal" and "useful" arts, and emphasize communication skills have not been adequate.

Deans indicated . . . placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs had been implemented as much as it should. Therefore, it is concluded that deans view existing efforts to . . . place ill-prepared students in developmental education programs as sufficient.

Providing developmental education is a community college function. Deans contend that, by placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs, the state's community colleges are adequately fulfilling their developmental education function. Developmental education program offerings are meeting student needs. Thus, emphasis on placing ill-prepared students in developmental education programs is not needed.

Division chairpersons indicated that goals to . . . coordinate adult literacy programs with other public agencies, . . . select technical education faculty and administrators capable of developing up-to-date programs that integrate the core and technical curriculums, and . . . provide recurrent education for
the workforce have not been implemented as much as they should. Therefore, it is concluded that division chairpersons believe the state's community colleges have neglected implementing these goals.

Division chairpersons are more critical than deans of some curriculum issues. Virginia community colleges' effort to coordinate adult literacy programs with other public agencies and provide recurrent education for the workforce are not adequate. Community college technical education faculty and administrators have not successfully developed up-to-date programs that integrate the core and technical curriculums.

Division chairpersons indicated . . . arranging 2+2 and 2+1 programs with secondary schools, . . . assessing basic skills of first-time students, and . . . insuring that the applied science degree give attention to communication, computation and problem-solving skills have been implemented as much as they should. Therefore, it is concluded that division chairpersons believe current efforts to implement these goals are adequate.

Division chairpersons have more praise than deans for some curriculum issues. Virginia community colleges have successfully established 2+2 and 2+1 programs with secondary schools, assessed student basic skills, and
incorporated communication, computation, and problem-solving skills in applied science degree programs.

**Related Literature on Differences Between Existing Goal Status and Preferred Goal Status**

Many goal studies that examined differences between existing goal status and preferred goal status were reported in the literature. With few exceptions, findings of these studies revealed differences between existing goal status and preferred goal status; these findings are similar to those of this study.

Creager’s (1976) findings concur with those of this study. Creager found significant differences between current importance and preferred importance of goals from the Virginia Community College System Goals Inventory as viewed by administrators. Administrators participating in Creager’s study ranged from coordinators to presidents.

Pilcher’s (1976) findings are congruous with the findings of this study. Using the Institutional Goals Inventory, Pilcher found significant differences between present and preferred importance of goals as viewed by administrators at Waubonsee Community College in Sugar Grove, Illinois.

A study of Mississippi community/junior college administrators resulted in findings consistent with
those of this study (Hampton, 1979). Using the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI), significant differences were identified between what "is" and what "should be" stressed in all IGI goal areas.

Cross's (1981) findings are uniform with those of this study. Using the Community College Goals Inventory, the discrepancy between the "current" emphasis and "should be" emphasis of goals was high for community college administrators in 18 geographically dispersed community colleges throughout the country. These findings agree with Cross and Fideler (1989). In a replication of Cross' 1981 study, they found discrepancies between the "current" emphasis and "should be" emphasis of goals at 10 geographically dispersed community colleges.

Findings from this study are in accordance with the findings of Huskey (1987). Significant differences between perceived importance and preferred importance of goals, from the Community College Goals Inventory, as viewed by five groups of chief administrators of Pennsylvania community colleges were identified.

However, Kerr’s (1981) findings are inconsistent with those of this study. Using the Institutional Goals Inventory at Hostos Community College in Bronx, New York, Kerr found college administrators were most
satisfied. The current status of goals was very near what administrators desired as the preferred status of goals. Therefore, administrators at Hostos Community College were satisfied with the status of goals at their institution.

Recommendations

This section offers recommendations based on findings and conclusions of this study. It also offers recommendations for further research.

1. This study should be used as an information source from which decisions relative to students, faculty, instruction and curriculum can be made by the Virginia Community College System. Goals which had the highest percentage of deans and division chairpersons preferring implementation were viewed most worthy of attaining. Therefore, more financial and human resources should be directed toward these goals. Goals which had not been implemented as much as they should were viewed as being neglected. Therefore, more financial and human resources should also be directed toward these goals.

2. This study should be considered as a future agenda for dealing with student, faculty, instruction and curriculum goals for Virginia community colleges.
Deans and division chairpersons agreed that some goals should be implemented; those goals should be pursued. Deans and division chairpersons agreed that some goals should not be implemented; those goals should not be pursued or should be explored further as to why administrators felt they should not be implemented.

3. This study should provide the Virginia Community College System with a basis for further investigation and to improve goal attainment at the state’s community colleges.

4. Research on community colleges with similar characteristics should be undertaken to determine if there is a relationship between goal perception and college characteristics.

5. College personnel who did not participate in this study should be involved in further research to determine their goal perceptions.

6. Similar or extended research should examine the eight goals where disagreement occurred between deans and division chairpersons. The eight goals should be explored to determine why these differences exist, what do these differences mean, and what should be done to eradicate these differences.

7. Similar or extended research should examine goals which had the lowest percentage of deans and
division chairpersons preferring their implementation. These goals should be explored to determine why they are viewed as undesirable.

Researcher's Commentary

Researcher observations beyond the findings of this study conclude Chapter five.

Administrator level or function was a contributor to the differences between deans and division chairpersons on the six goals that lacked congruence regarding existing goal status and on the two goals that lacked congruence regarding preferred goal status. Both administrative groups portrayed goals for which they had closer interaction and more day-to-day responsibility in a more favorable light. Administrator responses also revealed a "terриториal" attitude: both groups were concerned for and cautious of goals that most affected their administrative roles.

Skepticism regarding responses to both goal status questions may be warranted. It may be likely that participant responses were not their own views. Perhaps community college presidents impacted upon administrator responses. Dean and division chairperson responses may have been influenced by the beliefs of institutional presidents. In essence, responses given
may reflect community college presidents' agendas and not the true views of deans and division chairpersons.


State Board for Community Colleges. (1966). *Policies, procedures, and regulations governing the establishment and operation of the program of comprehensive community colleges in the Commonwealth of Virginia as authorized by the 1966 general assembly.* Richmond: Author.


APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTIONS

The questionnaire consists of statements of possible institutional goals. Using the answer key shown below, you are asked to respond to each statement in two different ways:

A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal ____________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal ____________________________?

Answer Key:

YES NO DON'T KNOW

Examples:

1. to develop a written policy to limit the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty.

   A. ✓   ✓   ✓
   B. ✓   ✓   ✓

In this example, the respondent believes that "a written policy to limit the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty" is currently being put into practice at his/her community college, but believes it should not be used by his/her community college.

2. to develop a written plan to reduce the number of students who fail to complete the program in which they are enrolled.

   A. ✓   ✓   ✓
   B. ✓   ✓   ✓

In this example, the respondent believes that "a written plan to reduce the number of students who fail to complete the program in which they are enrolled" is currently not being put into practice at his/her community college, and does not know if it should be used by his/her community college.

Consider your institution as a whole in making your judgments.

In responding to question "B.," do not be restrained by your beliefs about whether the goal, realistically, can ever be attained or used by your community college.

Please respond to every goal statement on the questionnaire by checking one box after "A." and one box after "B."
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal __________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal __________________________?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To develop written policies for the selection, orientation, and renewal of part-time faculty.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To develop a written plan for the campus-wide use of computer technology in which educational and administrative applications are integrated.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To set aside at least two percent of the instructional budget for professional development.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To develop a written plan to insure that the Associate of Applied Science Degree give attention to communication, computation, and problem-solving competencies in addition to technical skills.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To develop a written plan for older and younger students and those from different ethnic backgrounds to come together to enrich learning.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To establish Distinguished Teaching Chairs or other appropriate recognitions for faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To develop written policies that require placement of students who are not well prepared in an intensive developmental education program.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To establish writing labs so students may receive individual tutoring.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal _____________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal _____________________________?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. To restrict class size in developmental courses to a student to faculty ratio of no more than 20 to 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To require an integration of the core curriculum into technical and career programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To develop a written policy for all students to complete a collegiate English course with an emphasis on writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To develop a written outreach plan for disadvantaged students, specifically including an Early Identification Program with surrounding schools, focusing first on junior high school students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To develop a written policy to limit the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To develop a written outreach program for adults, reaching such groups as displaced workers, single parents, and adults returning after military service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To require an international studies component in the core curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To develop a written plan to require faculty to close the gap between the so-called &quot;liberal&quot; and &quot;useful&quot; arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. To develop a written policy to teach oral and written communication in every class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal ____________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal ____________________________?

10. To assess the reading, writing, and computational abilities of all first-time students when they enroll in a course.

   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

19. To develop a written policy that affirms that all certificate and degree seeking students become proficient in the written and oral use of English.

   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

20. To join with secondary schools in 2+2 and 2+1 arrangements in which technical programs begun in high school are completed at the community college.

   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

21. To develop a written plan to coordinate adult literacy programs with other public service agencies.

   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

22. To develop a written program to provide small grants to faculty members to improve teaching through an Innovative Teachers' Fund.

   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

23. To develop a written agreement among students, faculty, and administrators on what portions of the core curriculum are to be included in technical education programs.

   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

24. To develop a written faculty renewal plan, in consultation with the faculty, that includes campus workshops, faculty-led seminars, retreats, short-term leaves, and sabbaticals.

   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

25. To develop a written policy to insure that the majority of credits awarded are earned in classes taught by full-time faculty.

   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal __________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal __________________________?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. To restrict class size in basic English courses to a student to faculty ratio of no more than 25 to 1.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. To develop a written plan to promote the role of the faculty member as classroom researcher--focusing evaluation on instruction and making a clear connection between what the teacher teaches and how students learn.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. To develop written guidelines that insure assessment of teaching of both full-time and part-time faculty.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. To require all associate degree students to complete a core curriculum that provides an historical perspective and understanding of our social institutions, knowledge of science and technology, and an appreciation of the visual and performing arts.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. To develop a written procedure for selecting technical education faculty and administrators to assure that they can develop up-to-date programs that integrate the core curriculum and technical curriculum.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. To develop a written plan to reduce the number of students who fail to complete the program in which they are enrolled.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. To develop written incentive plans for faculty who wish to adapt educational technology to classroom needs.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal ____________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal ____________________________?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. To develop a written program with employers, for recurrent education to keep the workforce up to date and well educated.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. To develop a written policy that requires all discipline faculty to teach core curriculum classes in their discipline.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. To develop a written plan to use technology to provide instruction to the workplace, to schools, and to other community organizations.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. To restrict class size in core curriculum courses to a student to faculty ratio of no more than 25 to 1.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. To develop a written first-year retention program with orientation for all full-time, part-time, and evening students. Such a program would include an &quot;early warning&quot; system, career counseling, and mentoring arrangements.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. To develop a written plan to recruit and retain top quality faculty.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Eugene Giovannini  
UCOB 236  
Virginia Tech  
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0302  
(701) 231-9629

Daniel E. Vogler  
UCOB 203  
Virginia Tech  
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0302  
(703) 231-9702
APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY INSTRUMENT, LETTER, ABSTRACT AND QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTIONS

The questionnaire consists of 41 statements of possible institutional goals. Using the answer key shown below, you are asked to respond to each statement in two different ways:

A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal ____________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal ____________________________?

Answer Key:

YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

Examples:

1. to develop a written policy to limit the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty.  A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

In this example, the respondent believes the goal "to develop a written policy to limit the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty" is currently being put into practice at his/her community college, but believes it should not be used by his/her community college.

2. to set aside at least two percent of the instructional budget for professional development.  A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

In this example, the respondent sees the goal "to set aside at least two percent of the instructional budget for professional development" as currently not being put into practice at his/her community college, and does not know if the goal should be used by his/her community college.

Consider your institution as a whole in making your judgments.

In responding to the second question, do not be restrained by your beliefs about whether the goal, realistically, can ever be attained or used by your community college.

Please respond to every goal statement on the questionnaire by circling one response after "A." and one response after "B."
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal __________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal __________________________?

1. To develop written policies and programs for the selection, orientation, and renewal of part-time faculty.  
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

2. To develop a written campus-wide plan for the use of computer technology in which educational and administrative applications are integrated.  
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

3. To set aside at least two percent of the instructional budget for professional development.  
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

4. To develop a written plan to insure that the Associate of Applied Science Degree give attention to communication, computation, and problem-solving competencies in addition to technical skills.  
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

5. To develop a written plan for older and younger students and those from different ethnic backgrounds to come together to enrich learning.  
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

6. To establish Distinguished Teaching Chairs or other appropriate recognitions for faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching.  
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

7. To develop written policies that requires placement of students who are not well prepared in an intensive developmental education program.  
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW  
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal __________________________________________________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal __________________________________________________________________?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To develop a written outreach program for adults, reaching such groups as displaced workers, single parents, and adults returning after military service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To develop a written outreach plan for disadvantaged students, specifically including an Early Identification Program with surrounding schools, focusing first on junior high school students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To require an integration of the core curriculum into technical and career programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To develop a written policy for all students to complete a collegiate writing course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To develop a written policy to limit the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To develop a written plan to provide adult and continuing education programs that reflect both community college needs and the education traditions of the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To restrict class size in developmental courses to no more than 20 students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To require an international perspective (component) in the core curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To develop a plan to require faculty to close the gap between the so-called &quot;liberal&quot; and &quot;useful&quot; arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal ________________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal ________________________________?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. To restrict student enrollment in basic English courses to no more than 25 students.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To assess the reading, writing, and computational abilities of all first-time students when they enroll.</td>
<td>A. YES</td>
<td>B. YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To develop a written plan to provide adult and continuing education programs that are coordinated with schools, churches, and other groups to avoid duplication.</td>
<td>A. YES</td>
<td>B. YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To develop a written policy that affirms that students become proficient in the written and oral use of English.</td>
<td>A. YES</td>
<td>B. YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. To join with secondary schools in 2+2 and 2+1 arrangements in which technical programs begun in high school are completed at the community college.</td>
<td>A. YES</td>
<td>B. YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To develop written incentive programs for faculty who wish to adapt educational technology to classroom needs.</td>
<td>A. YES</td>
<td>B. YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. To develop a written program to provide small grants to faculty members to improve teaching through an Innovative Teachers' Fund.</td>
<td>A. YES</td>
<td>B. YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. To develop a written agreement among students, faculty, and administrators on what portions of the core curriculum are to be included in technical education programs.</td>
<td>A. YES</td>
<td>B. YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal ____________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal ____________________________?

25. To develop a written plan to promote the role of the faculty member as classroom researcher--focusing evaluation on instruction and making a clear connection between what the teacher teaches and how students learn.  

26. To develop written guidelines that insure assessment of teaching.  

27. To develop a written policy to teach oral and written communication in every class.  

28. To require all associate degree students to complete a core curriculum that provides a historical perspective and understanding of our social institutions, knowledge of science and technology, and an appreciation of the visual and performing arts.  

29. To develop a written procedure for selecting technical education faculty and administrators to assure that they can develop up-to-date programs that integrate the core curriculum and technical curriculum.  

30. To develop a written plan to reduce the number of students who fail to complete the program in which they are enrolled.  

31. To develop a written program to coordinate adult literacy programs with other public service agencies.
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal ____________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal ____________________________?

32. To develop a written policy to establish that the majority of credits awarded are earned in classes taught by full-time faculty.
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

33. To develop a written policy that requires all faculty to teach core curriculum classes.
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

34. To develop a written plan to recruit and retain top quality faculty.
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

35. To develop a written plan to use technology to provide instruction to the workplace, to schools, and to other community organizations.
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

36. To restrict class size in core curriculum courses to 25 students.
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

37. To establish writing labs so students may receive individual tutoring.
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

38. To develop a written first-year retention program with orientation for all full-time, part-time, and evening students. Such a program would include an "early warning" system, career counseling, and mentoring arrangements.
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW

39. To develop a written program with employers, for recurrent education to keep the workforce up-to-date and well-educated.
   A. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
   B. YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
A. To date, has your community college put into practice the goal ____________________________?

B. In your judgment, should your community college use the goal ____________________________?

40. To develop a written plan to provide adult and continuing education programs that emphasize civic literacy by focusing on government, public policy, and contemporary issues. A. YES NO DON'T KNOW

B. YES NO DON'T KNOW

41. To develop a written faculty renewal plan, in consultation with the faculty, that includes campus workshops, faculty-led seminars, retreats, short-term leaves, and sabbaticals. A. YES NO DON'T KNOW

B. YES NO DON'T KNOW
November 7, 1969

Dear:

We and the Virginia Community College System would like to assess how you view goals from the American Association of Community and Junior College's Futures Commission report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. Your views will help provide the Virginia Community College System with a consolidated information source from which decisions may be made.

You are one of a small number of individuals employed by the Virginia Community College System being asked to provide help. In order that the results will truly serve our and the Virginia Community college system's needs, it is important that you participate. Thus, we would like for the enclosed questionnaire to be completed by you.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name or your institution's name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this research will be made available to Virginia community colleges and Virginia Community College System decision-makers. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

We would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call collect. The telephone number is (703) 331-9029.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Eugene Giovannini  
Research Associate

Daniel E. Vogler  
Research Director

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
ABSTRACT

I intend to mail survey all deans and division chairpersons of Virginia community colleges for their views on goals dealing with faculty, students, curriculum, and instruction from the Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century report. The general purpose of this study is to assess how deans and division chairpersons of Virginia community colleges view goals from the Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century report in terms of existing goal status and preferred goal status, and to determine the extent of agreement by deans and division chairpersons.

This study will provide the Virginia Community College system with a consolidated information source from which decisions relative to faculty, students, curriculum, and instruction goals can be made. An analysis of the congruency and discrepancy between deans and division chairpersons concerning existing goal status and preferred goal status may indicate what these administrators agree and disagree upon as goals that are to move Virginia community colleges into the twenty-first century.
1. Is the study measuring what it is intended to measure?

2. Is each of the two questions measuring what it is intended to measure?

3. Are all the words understood?

4. Does the cover letter and questionnaire create a positive impression, one that motivates people to answer it?

5. Does any aspect of the cover letter or questionnaire suggest bias on the part of the researcher?

6. Are the directions clear?

7. Does the format of the questionnaire make it easy to answer?
APPENDIX C

EDITED COVER LETTER FROM PILOT STUDY
December 4, 1989

Dear 

The Virginia Community College System would like to assess how you view goals from the American Association of Community and Junior College's Futures Commission report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. Your views will help provide the Virginia Community College System with a consolidated information source from which decisions may be made.

You are one of a small number of individuals employed by the Virginia Community College System being asked to provide help. In order that the results will truly serve your institution and the Virginia Community College System's needs, it is important that you participate. Thus, we would like the enclosed questionnaire to be completed by you, personally.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off of the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name and your institution's name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this research will be made available to Virginia community colleges and Virginia Community College System decision-makers. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

We would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call collect. The telephone number is (703) 231-6136 or 231-9629.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Eugene Giovannini
Research Associate

Daniel E. Vogler
Research Director
APPENDIX D

REQUEST OF VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

FOR ENDORSEMENT
November 7, 1989

Dr. Elmo Roesler
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Research and Planning
Virginia Community College System
James Monroe Building
101 North 14th Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Dr. Roesler:

Please find attached copies of chapters one and three of Gene Giovannini’s dissertation proposal. We realize that they amount to more than the ten pages you requested, and we apologize. However, we wanted you to have a thorough documentation of the proposed study. We request your reaction to and endorsement of the proposed study.

We intend to mail survey all deans and division chairpersons of Virginia community colleges for their views on goals dealing with faculty, students, curriculum, and instruction from the Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century report. This study is designed to assess how deans and division chairpersons view these goals in terms of existing goal status and preferred goal status, and to determine the extent of agreement by deans and division chairpersons.

The proposed study will be approved by Gene’s doctoral committee upon your endorsement. We would be happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. The telephone number is (703) 231-9429.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Eugene Giovannini  Daniel E. Vogler
Researcher    Research Director

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
November 29, 1989

Dr. Elmo D. Roesler
Assistant Vice Chancellor
for Research and Planning
Virginia Community College System
James Monroe Building
101 North 14th Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Dr. Roesler:

Thank you for your prompt reply to and approval of Gene's research dissertation proposal.

Per your request, enclosed please find Appendix A, the 38 items which will appear in the instrument. You can be assured that we will do our very best to see to it that the survey instrument requires only a brief amount of time for a response; that is a concern we share with you.

Once again, thank you for your support and cooperation. We will keep you informed of our progress.

Sincerely,

Eugene Giovannini
Researcher

Daniel E. Vogler
Research Advisor

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
APPENDIX E

ENDORSEMENT FROM THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
November 13, 1989

Dr. Daniel E. Vogler
Mr. Eugene Giovannini
Virginia Tech
Division of Administrative and Educational Services
University City Office Building
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0302

Dear Sirs:

I approve of the dissertation proposal concerning a study "...to assess the Building Communities' goals as they relate to Virginia Community Colleges (page 8)." It is understood that the study is intended to assess (1) how deans and division chairpersons view the goals for faculty, students, curriculum and instruction as found in Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century report (AACJC, 1988); and (2) how deans and division chairpersons view the goals in terms of existing goal status and preferred goal status.

I have two requests. First, I would like to receive a copy of Appendix A, the 41 items which will appear in the instrument. Secondly, I ask that the survey instrument require only a brief amount of time for a response, since the study will engage the total population of VCCS deans and division chairpersons.

I wish you both every success in this study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Elmo D. Roesler

EDR/h

cc: Dr. Marshall W. Smith, Vice Chancellor
    Academic and Student Affairs
    Dr. B. Carlyle Ramsey, Assistant Vice Chancellor
    for Instructional Programs
APPENDIX F

COVER LETTER SENT WITH QUESTIONNAIRE
December 4, 1989

Dear :

The Virginia Community College System would like to assess how you view goals from the American Association of Community and Junior College's Futures Commission report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. Your views will help provide the Virginia Community College System with a consolidated information source from which decisions may be made.

You are one of a small number of individuals employed by the Virginia Community College System being asked to provide help. In order that the results will truly serve your institution and the Virginia Community College System's needs, it is important that you participate. Thus, we would like the enclosed questionnaire to be completed by you, personally.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off of the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name and your institution's name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this research will be made available to Virginia community colleges and Virginia Community College System decision-makers. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

We would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call collect. The telephone number is (703) 231-6136 or 231-9629.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Eugene Giovannini
Research Associate

Daniel E. Vogler
Research Director
APPENDIX G

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS
December 11, 1989

Dr. Ruth A. Douglas  
Division Chairperson of Nat. Sci. and Eng. Tech.  
Piedmont Virginia Community College  
Route 6, Box 1-A  
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Dear Dr. Douglas:

Last week a questionnaire seeking your views about goals from the American Association of Community and Junior College's Futures Commission report, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century, was sent to you. Dr. Elmo Roesler, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research and Planning, of the Virginia Community College System has endorsed conducting this research.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of Virginia Community College System employees, it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the views of Virginia Community College System employees.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call us right now, collect (703-231-6136 or 231-9629) and we will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Eugene Giovannini  
Research Associate  

Daniel E. Vogler  
Research Director
APPENDIX H

LIST OF GOALS BY GOAL AREA
Goals By Goal Area

Student Goals

5. To develop a written plan for older and younger students and those from different ethnic backgrounds to come together to enrich learning.

12. To develop a written outreach plan for disadvantaged students, specifically including an Early Identification program with surrounding schools, focusing first on junior high school students.

14. To develop a written outreach program for adults, reaching such groups as displaced workers, single parents, and adults returning after military service.

31. To develop a written plan to reduce the number of students who fail to complete the program in which they are enrolled.

37. To develop a written first-year retention program with orientation for all full-time, part-time, and evening students. Such a program would include an "early warning" system, career counseling, and mentoring arrangements.

Faculty Goals

1. To develop written policies for the selection, orientation, and renewal of part-time faculty.

3. To set aside at least two percent of the instructional budget for professional development.

13. To develop a written policy to limit the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty.

22. To develop a written program to provide small grants to faculty members to improve teaching through an Innovative Teachers' Fund.
Faculty Goals Continued

24. To develop a written faculty renewal plan, in consultation with the faculty, that includes campus workshops, faculty-led seminars, retreats, short-term leaves, and sabbaticals.

25. To develop a written policy to insure that the majority of credits awarded are earned in classes taught by full-time faculty.

38. To develop a written plan to recruit and retain top quality faculty.

Instruction Goals

2. To develop a written plan for the campus-wide use of computer technology in which educational and administrative applications are integrated.

6. To establish Distinguished Teaching Chairs or other appropriate recognitions for faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching.

9. To restrict class size in developmental courses to a student to faculty ratio of no more than 20 to 1.

26. To restrict class size in basic English courses to a student to faculty ratio of no more than 25 to 1.

27. To develop a written plan to promote the role of the faculty member as classroom researcher--focusing evaluation on instruction and making a clear connection between what the teacher teaches and how students learn.

28. To develop written guidelines that insure assessment of teaching of both full-time and part-time faculty.

32. To develop written incentive plans for faculty who wish to adapt educational technology to classroom needs.
**Instruction Goals Continued**

34. To develop a written policy that requires all discipline faculty to teach core curriculum classes in their discipline.

35. To develop a written plan to use technology to provide instruction to the workplace, to schools, and to other community organizations.

36. To restrict class size in core curriculum courses to a student to faculty ratio of no more than 25 to 1.

**Curriculum Goals**

4. To develop a written plan to insure that the Associate of Applied Science Degree give attention to communication, computation, and problem-solving competencies in addition to technical skills.

7. To develop written policies that require placement of students who are not well prepared in an intensive developmental education program.

8. To establish writing labs so students may receive individual tutoring.

10. To require an integration of the core curriculum into technical and career programs.

11. To develop a written policy for all students to complete a collegiate English course with an emphasis on writing.

15. To require an international studies component in the core curriculum.

16. To develop a written plan to require faculty to close the gap between so-called "liberal" and "useful" arts.

17. To develop a written policy to teach oral and written communication in every class.
Curriculum Goals Continued

18. To assess the reading, writing, and computational abilities of all first-time students when they enroll in a course.

19. To develop a written policy that affirms that all certificate and degree seeking students become proficient in the written and oral use of English.

20. To join with secondary schools in 2+2 and 2+1 arrangements in which technical programs begun in high school are completed at the community college.

21. To develop a written plan to coordinate adult literacy programs with other public service agencies.

23. To develop a written agreement among students, faculty, and administration on what portions of the core curriculum are to be included in technical education programs.

29. To require all associate degree students to complete a core curriculum that provides an historical perspective and understanding of our social institutions, knowledge of science and technology, and an appreciation of the visual and performing arts.

30. To develop a written procedure for selecting technical education faculty and administrators to assure that they can develop up-to-date programs that integrate the core curriculum and technical curriculum.

33. To develop a written program with employers, for recurrent education to keep the workforce up to date and well educated.
VITA
EUGENE VINCENT GIOVANNINI

EDUCATION

1990 Doctor of Education (Community College Education), Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA

1981 Master of Education (Business Education), Bloomsburg University, Bloomsburg, PA

1979 Bachelor of Science (Business Education), Bloomsburg University, Bloomsburg, PA

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1987-1990 Graduate Assistant, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA

1985-1987 Department Chairperson and Assistant Professor, Broome Community College, Binghamton, NY

1983-1985 Instructor, Eastern Shore Community College, Melfa, VA

1982-1983 Teacher, Mynderse Academy, Seneca Falls, NY

1981-1982 Teacher, Waterloo Senior High School, Waterloo, NY

1980-1981 Graduate Assistant, Bloomsburg University, Bloomsburg, PA

PERSONAL DATA

Married, one child
Birthdate: January 22, 1957

Eugene Vincent Giovannini