THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

ISSUES IN THE DESIGN OF A PROGRAM OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS IN MANITOBA

by

ROBERT JOHN INNES

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND FOUNDATIONS

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

JUNE, 1980

ISSUES IN THE DESIGN OF A PROGRAM OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS IN MANITOBA

BY

ROBERT JOHN INNES

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife, Glenys, and my children, Miranda, David, and Christopher, whose patience, understanding, and continued support and assistance made the whole enterprise possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank first my advisor, Dr. J.C. Long, for his continued support and assistance throughout the period of the doctoral program.

Thanks are also due to the other members of my committee -- Dr. P.J. Husby, Dr. A.M. McPherson, and Dr. L.C. Jansson -- who helped in a variety of ways, and to Dr. A.G. Konrad for his advice as external examiner.

Thanks also to Dr. J.A. Riffel for his support and encouragement, which commenced before I started the doctoral program and continued throughout.

Special thanks are due to Mr. L. Judt, Chairman of the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College, without whose assistance the study could not have been conducted. Similarly, I express my gratitude to all of those personnel within the community college system in Manitoba who assisted in the study.

I wish also to thank my wife Glenys for typing and proof-reading the manuscript, and for assisting in countless other ways.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare the resolution of selected issues of program design in the development of the Certificate in Adult Education program for community college instructors in Manitoba with the program design preferences of community college staff in that province. The issues included such questions as whether the program should emphasize pedagogy or subject matter expertise, and what credential, if any, should be associated with the program.

Data for the study were obtained from documentary sources and from a questionnaire sent to all community college staff in Manitoba. Since it was thought that the program design preferences of the respondents might be influenced by certain respondent attributes such as Age, Sex, and Instructional Area, chi-square tests of independence were used to examine the degree of independence between those attributes and the program design preferences of the college staff.

In general, the program design preferences of the respondents tended to match the design choices exhibited by the C.A.E. However, there were some important differences. Respondents generally did not favour the singular pedagogical emphasis of the C.A.E., and many of them thought that the universities should be involved in the program. Also, it was found that each respondent attribute was statistically related ($p < 0.05$) to one or more of the program design issues. The attribute most potentially useful for program design was Position in the College,

since administrators and instructors differed with respect to their preferences on several of the issues.

Implications and recommendations for program design were suggested. For example, the differences between administrators and instructors suggest that there should be both instructors and administrators on any policy-making and advisory structures which are established. Also, the professional preparation program should be on-going, i.e., continuous professional development. The formal teacher education program should be viewed as one part of this professional development, not as a separate entity, complete in itself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure page

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Manitoba's community college system is, in many respects, unique in Canada. One of the areas in which this uniqueness arises is that of the certification of college instructors. Manitoba has traditionally required its community college instructors to possess some kind of certificate or credential as a requirement for college-level teaching, whereas some other college systems in North America which had similar requirements have, over the years, tended to drop them. In part, this requirement in Manitoba is explained by the origin of the community colleges in that province.

The three community colleges now operating in Manitoba were not created as new institutions, but developed or evolved from two other types of institutions. The two rural community colleges (Assiniboine and Keewatin) were formerly Vocational Centres, while the larger metropolitan college (Red River) was formed by combining the Manitoba Institute of Technology and the Manitoba Institute of Applied Arts. The teaching staff in these precursor institutions had been required to have teaching certificates. Because of the nature of their work and their occupational background, many of these instructors did not possess the teaching credential normally possessed by elementary and secondary school teachers in the province. They were required to obtain a "Special Certificate in

Vocational Industrial, Technology, Applied Arts, Related Subjects valid in provincially operated schools."[1] This requirement of special certification for college teaching was carried through to the "new" colleges, and, two years later, in 1971, a new "Certificate in Adult Education", and a program of preparation leading to that certificate, were developed.

The development of this relatively unique certification requirement involved certain choices of program or curriculum design, which, according to David Pratt, may be defined as a "process of devising, planning, and selecting the elements, techniques, and procedures that constitute . . . an organized set of formal educational and/or training intentions."[2] In concrete terms, the "Certificate in Adult Education" reveals the resolution of issues or the choice of alternatives available for specific "elements", "techniques", or "procedures" in a program of "training intentions." For example, these design choices involved the resolution of such issues as whether the emphasis in the certification program should be upon the upgrading of competence in the subject area specialty or upon pedagogical skill, and what credential, if any, should be associated with a program of instructional preparation for the community college setting. It seemed important, therefore, to examine this unique certification requirement from the point of view of the resolution of such issues of program design at the time that the program was originally established and to determine how such program design choices are regarded today by the instructors and administrators in Manitoba's

---

[1] These "Special Certificates" are described more fully in Chapter 4.

[2] David Pratt, Curriculum: Design and Development, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1980), pp. 5-6.

community colleges.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study, then, was to compare the program design choices which are exhibited by the development of the Certificate in Adult Education with the program design preferences expressed by the present-day staff in Manitoba's community colleges.

To assist in the realization of this purpose, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. When the Certificate in Adult Education was originally established, how were the key issues of program design resolved, and what changes, if any, have these resolutions undergone since?

2. With respect to these same key issues, what are the program design preferences of present-day instructors and administrators in Manitoba's community colleges?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study could serve as the basis for an evaluation of the C.A.E. program.[3] This program has been in existence now for eight years and, in that time, only one comprehensive examination of the program has been made when, in 1976, the Planning and Evaluation section of the

[3] This study is not concerned primarily with this evaluative aspect, although it could be argued that the instructors and administrators are being asked, in some sense, to evaluate certain parts of the program.

Community Colleges Division of the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower undertook to evaluate the program. Despite some methodological limitations, many of the recommendations from that Review were subsequently implemented.[4] This present study could, in some respects, be regarded as a replication, with improvements and extensions, of the 1976 Review. It could, as did that Review, lead to modification of the C.A.E. program, so that the needs of Manitoba's community college instructors and students are better met. It should provide guidance and assistance in the design of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors, which could take into account, for each issue, the actual range and strength of program design choices on the part of instructional and administrative staff in the colleges. Further, within the limits of its generalizability, the study could be of value to those who wish to develop or modify a program of professional preparation for their instructional staff in any post-secondary educational institution.

ISSUES OF PROGRAM DESIGN

This study focussed on certain key issues in the design of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors. Several such issues arise in the literature related to the initial preparation and continuing professional development of community college staff. The following ten were considered most significant for examination in this study. A detailed discussion of each issue -- its nature and the findings related to it as reported in the literature -- is

---

[4] The 1976 Review is discussed more fully in Chapter 4.

provided in Chapter 3.

Issue 1. Should community college instructors be required to participate in a program of professional preparation?

Given that the community college is a "teaching" institution it would seem reasonable to expect an affirmative answer to this question. This question is not concerned with the type of program, but simply whether there should be a program of some sort in which instructors are obliged to participate, with the avowed purpose of making them better teachers of community college students.

Strictly speaking, the remaining issues cease to exist if this first question receives a negative answer. However, because the scope of a "program of professional preparation" is so broad and could, therefore, include a number of activities which might be called "professional development", i.e. on-going professional preparation, and not just initial "teacher education", the remaining issues are very likely still germane.

Issue 2. Should the program of professional preparation be pre-service or in-service?

This issue really concerns the fundamental nature of the program, and its resolution depends on one's concept of professional preparation -- is it something which can be packaged and dispensed either before the instructor is employed or during the early stages of his employment, or is it rather something which must be continuous throughout the instructor's teaching career, or, is it perhaps both of these?

Issue 3. Should the emphasis in the program be on the upgrading of competence in the subject area specialty, (either academic subject matter knowledge or technical-vocational skill and knowledge) or should it be on the development of pedagogical skills? What should be the balance between these?

Clearly the main purpose of the program of professional preparation is to produce effective teachers of community college students. What is not so clear, though, is the best way to achieve this. It is perhaps interesting to note that many programs of preparation for instructors in the university transfer programs seem to emphasize academic upgrading, with less time devoted to pedagogy, while programs for instructors of the technical-vocational subjects in the college appear to devote more time to teaching skills.

Issue 4. What should comprise the main content of the program?

This issue deals very specifically with some of the fine details of the program. What should be included, and why? How will this content contribute to the overall effectiveness of the program? Clearly the answer to this issue question is dependent upon the answers given for Issue 3, which concerns the fundamental direction of the program. Whether the emphasis in the program is on academic upgrading or pedagogical skill will influence the type of content which is included in the program.

Issue 5. Should community college instructors in different instructional areas have the same type of professional preparation program?

As was implied earlier, it seems likely that community college instructors require a different preparation program from people who are training to be elementary or secondary school teachers, at least partly because of the differences in the students and the subject matter being taught. Does it follow, then, that community college instructors from different instructional areas also need different forms of preparation, given that their students and their subject matter differ? If different programs are required, are the differences merely differences in the content of some subjects, or are the differences much more fundamental? Is it possible, for example, that instructors in Business Administration, Nursing, Automotive and Adult Basic Education might need completely different types of programs?

Issue 6. How should the program be organized with respect to the delivery of instruction?

What sorts of instructional procedures should be used? Is a lecture-seminar format more appropriate than some form of individualized instruction? What other instructional modes might be utilized? Would, for example, an "apprenticeship" system in which the novice instructor learns on-the-job by working with an experienced instructor, be appropriate for some content and for some instructional areas? What role does the instructor's classroom teaching play in the overall program (in the case of an in-service program), or how can some form of practice teaching be incorporated into the program (in the case of a pre-service program)?

Issue 7. What type of credential, if any, should be associated with the program?

The statement of the issue in this form does not pre-suppose any specific form of the program. If the program is one of initial preparation which consists of a finite set of components (not necessarily the same for all instructors either in terms of content or even of number), successful completion of these components could lead to the award of some type of credential. However, if the program is a continuous, in-service program of on-going professional development, then the award of a credential becomes more difficult, although a non-permanent certificate could be issued on completion of some portion of the program, to be renewed periodically as other conditions are satisfied. Or, no certificate may be issued -- continuing professional development may be simply a condition of continued employment.

This issue of the credential is not just the trivial one of what the credential should be called -- a Certificate or a Diploma, for example. However, the name of the credential is important because of the role that the name plays in the acceptability, credibility and transferability of that credential. This is of special significance to the instructor who may want to transfer to another educational authority and therefore wants that authority to recognize and accept the credential as part of his qualifications. It may be very important to the instructor who wants to pursue further studies outside the college and who wants to know what studies would be equivalent to the achievement of the credential. It is also important to the instructor who simply wishes to teach, but who expects adequate recognition of the effort expended to

attain his present position. Thus, this issue is more significant than it might perhaps appear at first glance.

Issue 8. Who should be responsible for the organization and administration of the program?

Several questions arise here. Should the program be conducted by an outside agency such as a university, or by the college or college system? Is it possible to have a joint responsibility with input from several partners, in such a way that no one party dominates the others? What problems and opportunities do arrangements of joint organization create?

Issue 9. What mechanism should exist to monitor, evaluate, and modify the program?

This issue is interwoven with several of the others, as for example, the nature of the program and the responsibility for the organization and administration of the program. It is important, however, that some mechanism be established so that the program can continue to serve the purposes for which it was originally intended and accommodate changes which may be necessary over time. The form of the overseeing structure is also important. As will be seen later, the initial resolution of this issue in Manitoba proved to be inappropriate, and changes had to be made.

Issue 10. Who should pay for the program?

To what extent should the individual instructor contribute financially toward the cost of the program? To what extent should the instructor be given release from his teaching duties to participate in the program, if the program is not of the pre-service type? These are some of the main questions which arise concerning this issue.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

Chapter 1 has presented the background, purpose, and significance of the study. The ten "key issues" of program design upon which the study focussed are identified and clarified.

Chapter 2 describes the methodology employed in the study. The sources and collection of the data are discussed, as is the method of analysis of the research data. The chapter concludes with a statement of the delimitations and the limitations of the study.

Chapter 3 presents a review of relevant literature, concerning the key issues of program design, with the discussion focussing on each issue in turn. The emphasis in this chapter is on how various writers approach the resolution of these key issues -- what choices do they favour and why? Some examples of actual programs are mentioned in order to illustrate how some of the issues have been resolved.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the first part of the study, that is, the history of the development of the Certificate in Adult Education. In particular, it describes how the key issues were resolved when the C.A.E. program was originally established. It also describes significant changes to the C.A.E. since its inception.

Chapter 5 presents the results of the questionnaire survey and answers the second question. It identifies what resolutions the instructors and administrators of Manitoba's community colleges prefer today, along with any other issues they think are significant. Statistically significant relationships between the program design preferences and ten respondent attributes are highlighted.

Chapter 6 compares the program design preferences of college instructors and administrators with the actual resolution of program design issues exhibited in the Certificate in Adult Education. Implications which can be drawn from the findings on the major research questions are presented. These implications take the form of suggestions for the modification of the C.A.E. in particular, and for the design of programs of professional preparation for community college instructors in general. Suggestions for further research are also included.

Chapter II

METHODOLOGY

THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As stated in Chapter 1, this study sought answers to two specific questions. These were:

1. When the Certificate in Adult Education was originally established, how were the key issues of program design resolved, and what changes, if any, have these resolutions undergone since?

2. With respect to these same key issues, what are the program design preferences of present-day instructors and administrators in Manitoba's community colleges?

THE DATA: SOURCES AND COLLECTION

For the first question, the essential data were historical information. This information was obtained by an examination of documentary materials and by interviews with some of the personnel involved in the establishment of the C.A.E. The documentary sources included minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee and the C.A.E. Advisory Committee, as well as records and reports of the Teacher Education section of Red River Community College and the Department of Education.

Interviews were conducted with personnel who were involved in the original development of the Certificate in Adult Education program, or who were, or are currently, involved in its evaluation and modification. These personnel included the Chairman of the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College, the Assistant Deputy Minister (Community Colleges), and consultants in the Planning and Evaluation section of the Community Colleges Division of the Manitoba Department of Education. Documents constituted the major source of data for answering this first research question. Interviews were conducted to provide clarification or further explanation of the documents and to identify other documentary sources.

Data for the second question were obtained by means of a questionnaire[1] sent to all instructors and academic administrators in the three community colleges in Manitoba. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Section 1 was designed to identify the attributes of the respondents which constituted the independent variables in the study. Section 2 sought the views of current college staff regarding several issues integral to the design of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors. Section 3 solicited comment about each respondent's particular program of instructional preparation.

The questionnaire was sent to all full-time instructors and academic administrators in the three community colleges in Manitoba. 615 questionnaires were distributed, and initially 289 (47.0 percent) were returned. Subsequent telephone calls and a second mail-out increased the total return to 377 (61.3 percent). Ten of the returned questionnaires

---

[1] A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix A.

were unusable. Thus the results in this report are based on 367 usable returns, representing a return rate of 59.7 percent. Two factors are presented as possible causes for the return rate being lower than was expected. First, the questionnaire asked respondents to identify themselves, and, although this information was required only in order to permit follow-up procedures to be instituted, this was controversial with some of the recipients of the questionnaire. During the follow-up telephone calls, many instructors seemed to be willing to complete the questionnaire provided that it could be done anonymously, and they were invited to do so. (In fact, a total of 85 (23.2 percent) of the returned questionnaires were returned anonymously). A second possible cause is that staff at the community colleges, particularly at Red River, had recently been involved in a number of other questionnaire surveys, unrelated to the present study. Thus, another questionnaire (this one) seemed to be just another burden.[2]

ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

In essence, respondents were asked to state their preferences on each of the key issues of program design. These program design preferences were examined in relation to selected attributes of the respondents. These attributes -- the independent variables of this part of the study -- were of interest because it was thought that they might help to identify the bases for important differences in perceptions and preferences as regards preparation for college teaching. Such differ-

---

[2] One instructor, when asked on the telephone about the questionnaire, replied, "Which one is yours? I have four on my desk at the moment!"

ences might reasonably have some specific implications for the design of such programs. Thus, the important question to be answered was this: On which of the respondent attributes, if any, were there significant differences regarding the program design preferences of respondents?

Attributes of the Respondents

These attributes are outlined below, together with the relationships anticipated between them and the program design preferences of the respondents.

1. Age. It was thought that there might be differences between the responses of younger and older staff members with respect to many of the issues. For example, it could be anticipated that older staff members would tend to be more conservative in their approach to teaching, based upon years of successful experience, while younger staff members, without that experience, might be stronger advocates of innovative teaching procedures which are largely untried. It could also be expected that these groups might differ with respect to specific content in the preparation program, and with respect to the methods used to ensure that new instructors acquire that content.

2. Sex. Initially, it was not anticipated that major sex differences would emerge in the responses to the issue questions. If differences did occur it was thought that these would more likely be due to occupational differences, e.g., instructors in Nursing programs at Red River Community College may give responses which differ markedly from those given by instructors in the Industrial Electrical Department, but

these differences in response would probably be due to the nature of the tasks involved rather than the fact that one of these sections is staffed almost entirely by women while the other has a completely male staff.

3. Amount of community college experience. As instructors gain more experience their perceptions of the values of the various components of their overall professional preparation program may alter. Some part of the preparation which was initially thought to be of limited value may later acquire more value, as the instructor becomes more aware of its contribution to his teaching tasks.

4. Previous teaching experience. Teaching experience in other than a community college environment might be perceived to be of more value to the community college instructor than all or part of a college-based professional preparation program. If so, this perception could have implications for the design of such a program.

5. Instructional area. As was mentioned previously there are some substantial differences in the nature of the teaching which occurs in the different instructional areas, these differences being due at least partly to characteristics of students in particular programs and partly to different material being taught. It was suspected, then that personnel from different instructional areas might have different views on professional preparation.

6. Teacher certification. Does the instructor have a teaching certificate and, if so, how was it obtained? Some community college instructors have teaching certificates other than the C.A.E. The majority of these other certificates have been awarded on completion of a

program of training designed for the preparation of elementary or secondary school teachers, not for the preparation of teachers of adults. The value of these certificates (as perceived by their holders) for teachers of adults could have implications for the design of a program such as the C.A.E.

7. Qualifications. The specific qualifications of the instructors and administrators might have some bearing on their perception of the value of various components of a professional preparation program, or indeed, upon the need for a program at all.

8. Position in the college. It was anticipated that instructors and administrators would differ on some of the issues while agreeing on others. These differences, however, were expected to be differences of degree, not fundamental disagreements. Further, some administrators carry a substantial teaching load and could, therefore, experience some ambivalence in their approach to the resolution of some of the issues of program design.

9. Size of college. The two rural community colleges in Manitoba are small and the city college is large. Does this size difference lead to any differences regarding the resolution of any of the issues? It could be, for example, that the larger college can offer a greater variety of courses in the preparation program, thus providing greater flexibility, and increased opportunity to satisfy the particular needs of individual instructors. It could also be the case that the larger college could more easily accommodate a "release-from-duties" type of in-service program, since it has available more staff to share the teaching load of the released teacher. This variable may be confounded

by the fact that it is a rural-urban variable as well. For example, instructional staff at the two rural colleges may have preparation needs different from their city counterparts. However, it would not be possible to determine the cause of any differences which emerged with respect to this variable.

10. Job satisfaction. This attribute was included because it was considered to be of some importance to the interpretation of some responses. For example, if an instructor commented unfavourably about some aspects of the teacher education program, and also indicated some degree of dissatisfaction with his job, then it may be that the dissatisfaction with his job affects his perception of the professional preparation program.[3] Clearly it will be impossible to determine whether that actually is the case, but the researcher, if aware of some indication of job dissatisfaction, can look at the other responses with caution.

Data Analysis: The Tests

Two different tests were used in the analysis of the questionnaire data. First, a chi-square test was used to determine whether there was any relationship between the respondent's answers to most of the issue questions, and the ten independent variables. Second, a one-way analysis of variance was used to examine differences between subgroups of the respondent population with respect to those questions in which respondents were asked to state their opinion regarding the importance

---

[3] It may also be the reverse, i.e., the professional preparation program may be contributing to his job dissatisfaction!

of a topic or an instructional procedure in a program of professional preparation. Details of these tests are contained in Appendix B.

In this report, only relationships which proved to be statistically significant at the 0.05 level are presented. However, in order that the reader may apply a stricter significance level if he so desires, probability levels are reported for each case.

DELIMITATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Delimitations

This study is delimited to the time period from 1969 to the present. The community colleges came into being in 1969 and the C.A.E. was established some two years later. Prior to 1969 the institutions existed, and although they were not called community colleges they were in many respects similar to the present colleges. Also, prior to that date there was a training program for instructors in those institutions, a program which was replaced by the C.A.E. program. The decision to delimit the study to the specific period was due to the availability of data and the relevance of the current program to the present day community college system.

The study is further delimited to an examination of preparation programs for community college instructors. The C.A.E. program is taken by others as well, including prison officers in Federal Penitentiaries in Manitoba, and nursing educators in some schools of nursing in the province. These people, however, were not included in this study, because they are not instructors in Manitoba's community colleges.

Limitations

In the consultation of documentary sources, one of the main problems is obtaining access to all relevant material. In the present study, interviews were used to help identify and locate additional sources of material. Also, since all minutes of the meetings of both the C.A.E. Advisory Committee and the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee were accessible, it is considered likely that no significant documentary sources were overlooked.

The accuracy of the data obtained from these sources is another possible limitation of this study. However, in most cases information could be checked against other documents, or by consultation with individuals who were involved in the original process. Inaccuracies in the documentary sources were not considered to be a major limitation of this study.

A major problem in the use of a questionnaire as a source of data is obtaining a sufficiently high rate of return. In the present study respondents were asked to place their names on the questionnaire forms, in order to permit follow-up procedures, by telephone, by mail, or in person, to be instituted. It was thought that the lack of anonymity would not constitute a significant problem in this study, since the confidentiality of the responses was assured. However, this was not the case. As indicated earlier, the response rate (59.7 percent) was somewhat lower than expected and, in retrospect, it appears that the lack of anonymity was at least partly responsible. Regardless of the reason, the low return rate constitutes a limitation of this study, because the program design preferences of forty percent of the college staff are not

known. Thus we cannot say with certainty that the respondent group is representative, in all respects, of the total college staff.

This study concentrated on the community college system in Manitoba, and since no comparisons with other systems or institutions were carried out, this clearly limits the generalizability of the findings. Two institutional characteristics of Manitoba's community colleges -- the lack of university transfer programs, and a staff comprised of civil servants -- set them apart from most community colleges in North America. This fact further limits the extent to which the findings of this study can be generalized.

Also, no multiple comparison tests were conducted on the data for Issues 4 and 6. Thus, although mean differences between respondent groups on the perceived importance of program topics and instructional procedures have been identified, it is not possible to determine exactly where these differences are located. Though the data did not seem to warrant such sophisticated statistical treatment, this nevertheless constitutes a limitation in the analysis of the data and thereby qualifies, to some extent, the conclusions reached regarding these issues.

In addition, the approach to the study, based on a systematic examination of program design through selected issues rather than following a comprehensive theoretical framework further limits the generalizability of the findings.

Chapter III

ISSUES OF PROGRAM DESIGN: A LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, it is to show that the development of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors necessarily involves the resolution of a number of key issues. That these issues are significant is indicated by their frequent mention by several writers in the literature related to the initial preparation and professional development of community college instructors. A second purpose is to present, for each issue, some of the main alternative resolutions advocated or taken, together with the major reasons supporting these alternative choices.

Throughout this discussion the definition of "a program of professional preparation" remains somewhat problematical. This is because preparation for community college teaching is a multi-faceted endeavour which may, in fact, continue well into the teaching career of the instructor. Thus, a definition must be sufficiently broad as to permit the inclusion of such activities as obtaining a degree in an appropriate teaching subject or working in a trade or profession, as well as participation in formal teacher education programs. Accordingly, in this study, a program of professional preparation for community college teaching is defined as a set of activities which provides the knowledge and skills necessary for effective community college teaching. Implicit

in this definition is the notion that the program is in some way formal, i.e., the instructor is not left entirely on his own to "do his own thing". Instead, the activities in which he participates are planned with the specific intent of assisting the individual to be a better instructor. The definition then is broad, it suggests some element of formality, but it is not one which gives rise to a unique interpretation. The definition does not specify just what particular activities should be involved. Indeed, the number and nature of the many facets of preparation are different for different writers and authorities concerned with such programs. It is to a discussion of some of these different interpretations that this chapter now turns.

ISSUE 1: COMPULSORY PARTICIPATION?

Should community college instructors be required to participate in a program of professional preparation?

Since preparation for community college teaching necessarily involves the acquisition of the appropriate content of the subject matter which the instructor will be teaching, there is a sense in which all instructors do participate in a program of professional preparation. But is content preparation sufficient, though? Frequently the content aspect of preparation is not necessarily undertaken with teaching in mind, i.e., while the future instructor is actually acquiring the knowledge (by university studies or by work experience, or both) he may not be contemplating the utilization of that knowledge as a teacher, but rather planning to use it in another occupation. Thus, while content knowledge is clearly an essential part of his preparation, the means by

which the instructor obtains that knowledge is frequently not intended to prepare him specifically for teaching.

This first issue becomes more significant and arouses more controversy if the "for teaching" aspect is emphasized. How then should the issue be resolved if the program of professional preparation is to be a program of preparation for teaching in a community college?

According to Cohen, the answer to this first issue question is a definite "yes - the instructors should participate in such a program." He says:

> We can assume that the junior college instructor of academic subjects, who holds the master's or higher degree, is expert in a subject matter field and that the instructor in the occupational curriculum comes to his position with the backing of the industrial community. Both possess expertise gained through years of experience in a portion of the academic or business world.
>
> These conditions, however, guarantee only a portion of that which is needed by the instructor who by virtue of the mission of his institution, must be a specialist in learning. Knowledge of the subject field is essential but is not enough in itself. The junior college instructor needs, in addition to that capacity, certain attitudes and skills not necessarily assured by his academic study or previous experience. His set of particular competencies must run far beyond those commonly gained in degree programs or in occupational backgrounds.[1]

Agreement is not universal, though. Gleazer reports that in California, in 1966, the necessity for a junior college teacher to obtain a teaching credential was eliminated by the state board of education, since a master's degree was regarded as "sufficient evidence of professional preparation." Furthermore, says Gleazer, this decision is not restricted to California but illustrates the trend nationally.[2]

---

[1] Arthur M. Cohen, "Developing Specialists in Learning," in William K. Ogilvie and Max R. Raines, eds, Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971), pp. 331-332.

Some other writers still disagree. Stoops says that "obviously the community college teacher would be better for having some training in the didactical problems which will confront him,"[3] and Cohen and Brawer argue that the profession of college teaching is not likely to be enhanced "by the abandonment of all training requirements."[4]

It could perhaps be argued that the Californian decision represents not disagreement with the need for professional preparation, but rather disagreement over what constitutes adequate professional preparation. However, the Californian decision seems to be saying that no specific preparation for teaching is required.

Monroe, referring to the tendency of some states to drop certification requirements for community college instructors, says that:

> College faculty, as a rule, have welcomed this release from state certification requirements for education courses. But second thoughts are now being given to the wisdom of freeing community college teachers from courses in the field of professional education and psychology. Teaching may be more of an art than a science, but, even granting this dubious premise, even artists profit from disciplined instruction.[5]

Commenting on the trend away from requiring community college instructors to possess teaching certificates Cohen suggests that this move may be beneficial, in that it helps to break the ties between the

---

[2] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., This is the Community College, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 115.

[3] John A. Stoops, ed., The Community College in Higher Education, (Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Lehigh University, 1966), p. 54.

[4] Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer, Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 156.

[5] Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College: A Handbook, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), p. 277.

community college and the secondary school, and rightly places the community college in the post-secondary education arena. He cautions, however, against some possible "undesirable side-effects" of the community college instructor's "self-identification with the university professor." In outlining the important differences between teaching in a community college and teaching in a university, Cohen says that the community college teacher is "committed to a broad field of teaching, and also to a specialization in instructional processes," and has, as his main purpose, "to teach." "The junior college is, first and last, a teaching institution,"[6] contends Cohen.

Others too have emphasized that a community college is a teaching college. One writer, for example, suggests that in a community college "a higher value is placed on quality instruction than on scholarship or research."[7] Others say that community colleges have, as their "central purpose" the provision of "optimum instructional services to students."[8] Stoops says that the community college was created as an institution which "needed to be primarily a teaching institution."[9] Arguing that the success or failure of the community college rests on the quality of the teaching staff, O'Banion says:

---

[6] Cohen, p. 331.

[7] Bruce B. Suttle, "Quality Instruction at Community College: Fact or Fable?" Community College Frontiers, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Winter, 1978), p. 46.

[8] S.V. Martorana, H.J. Purcell, and M.J. Reynolds, "Toward Improving the Learning Process," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 1 (August-September, 1973), p. 56.

[9] Stoops, p. 51.

> This emphasis upon quality teaching has echoed so loudly in the community-junior college rhetoric that this institution has become known as the "teaching college."[10]

It would seem then that despite some differences there is largely agreement that community college instructors do need some form of preparation specifically for teaching, since the community college, perhaps more than other post-secondary educational institutions, is a "teaching" college and there probably does exist a body of knowledge, attitudes and skills which, if acquired, will assist the community college instructor in the performance of his prime function -- teaching.[11] Furthermore, this agreement seems to have been gaining ground in recent years. Lindquist says:

> Significant survival for many colleges and universities comes down to effective teaching. . . . Until recently, however, teaching effectiveness was left to chance in most institutions. Now, faculty development projects and teaching improvement centers are sprouting like spring grass, and teaching is being emphasized in faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure.[12]

What then are some of the characteristics of the program of professional preparation in which instructors should participate? These characteristics are examined in the discussion of the remaining issues.

---

[10] Terry O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior College. (Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1972), p. 52

[11] This is not to suggest that there is agreement on the specifics of this body of knowledge, attitudes, and skills, but rather that such a body does exist. Part of this study will show what one group of educators thinks should comprise that body of knowledge, attitudes, and skills.

[12] Jack Lindquist, "Institutional Services for Teaching Improvement," New Directions for Higher Education: Strategies for Significant Survival. Vol. 3, No. 4 (Winter, 1975), p. 33.

ISSUE 2: PRE-SERVICE OR IN-SERVICE?

The second issue concerns the timing of the program of professional preparation -- should it be pre-service or in-service and, if in-service, should it concentrate on special preparation at the beginning of teaching, or should it be on-going, i.e., a program of continuing professional development?

As was indicated earlier, the portion of the preparation of the community college instructor which involves the acquisition of the appropriate subject content knowledge is almost always pre-service, i.e., acquired before the individual is employed as an instructor, while the portion of the program of preparation which emphasizes the transmission of that content to the learner may be pre-service or in-service. While there are arguments for and against both of these approaches, there seems to be a tendency now to advocate some form of integration of these two phases of preparation, with some form of "initial preparation" either pre-service or early in-service, followed by a more extensive, on-going program of professional development throughout all of, or at least a substantial part of, the instructor's teaching career.

Because of rapid expansion in the community college movement in the late 'sixties many college staff are, in O'Banion's view, inadequately prepared for their teaching duties. Arguing from this purely practical view-point, O'Banion says that in-service programs must necessarily take priority over pre-service training because "the latter will not graduate enough staff to meet the needs of community-junior college employment,"[13] and that, with some exceptions, "pre-service programs for

---

[13] Terry O'Banion, "Staff Development: Priorities for the Seventies,"

the preparation of community-junior college staff are grossly inadequate."[14] Although critical of pre-service programs, O'Banion is not advocating that they should be abandoned. Indeed, he suggests that

> it is extremely important that these programs be adequately supported to insure that the new, ever-increasing numbers of community-junior college staff will not have to encounter the time-consuming, and expensive limitations of re-education programs.[15]

Another writer has expressed dissatisfaction at what goes on in pre-service programs of preparation.

> Among the top leaders in the two-year colleges, there exists widespread, growing uneasiness and dissatisfaction over the insufficient, inappropriate kinds of orientation, subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills which are being transmitted at many colleges and universities where students are now preparing to become teachers in our two-year colleges.[16]

Kastner also emphasizes the need for community college instructors to receive in-service training, but not because those who are responsible for pre-service programs are failing in their responsibilities. He thinks that a pre-service program, no matter how good, just cannot provide complete preparation for the instructors. He says:

> Not only are [pre-service] programs unable to accommodate the diversity of the comprehensiveness of the community college movement, but the nature of the services provided is too dynamic for those who have graduated from such programs to maintain relevancy without additional training.[17]

Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), p. 10

[14] O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow, p. 84.

[15] O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow, p. 85.

[16] Derek S. Singer, "Do We Need a Community College Institute?" Junior College Journal, Vol. 39, No. 2 (October, 1968), p. 36.

[17] Harold H. Kastner, Jr., "A System-Wide Approach," Community and Jun-

Kastner is suggesting, then, that there is a need for both pre-service and in-service training. This suggestion is repeated by Meade,[18] Blake,[19] and by others. For example:

> Despite the myriad problems surrounding the still burgeoning community college movement, none apppears more critical than the continuing professional development of community college faculty. If community colleges are, as they claim, to be institutions which stress effective teaching and maximum learning, good teachers are a necessity. The pre-service and continuing development of these teachers must, therefore, become a point of central concern for community college decision-makers.[20]

Those who favour the establishment of in-service programs suggest that they are necessary given the diversity of staff backgrounds. For example:

> A typical community college instructor may come from a university staff, public secondary school, industry, or a university graduate school. With such varied backgrounds, the community college must provide in-service educational experiences for professional development resulting in a teaching-learning process which does, in fact, exemplify the mission and commitment of the community college.[21]

---

ior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3 (November, 1973), p. 14.

[18] Edward J. Meade, Jr., "No Health in Us," in Louis J. Rubin, ed., Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and procedures for change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), pp. 211-224.

[19] Larry J. Blake, "A Catalyst for Staff Development," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), pp. 12-13.

[20] Charles A. Atwell and Robert W. Sullins, "Cooperative Faculty Development," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3 (November, 1973), p. 32.

[21] David M. Sims and Glen I. Bounds, "Some Perspectives on Staff Development: E.P.D.A. at a Community College," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), p. 14.

Although he is writing more specifically about the in-service education of elementary and secondary school teachers, Rubin makes some points which can be readily applied to community college instructors. He says:

> There is a pervasive belief that professional growth is something to be "done and gotten over with". Precisely the opposite attitude should prevail; teachers should aspire toward sustained improvement, and policy makers should (i) make possible and (ii) expect that the extension of competence be endless. There is an unfortunate tendency to assume that the possession of a license or credential and teaching ability are synonymous. What is worse, there is an even greater tendency to assume that teachers, once trained, can automatically adjust to whatever new teaching programs are invented. At a time when . . . new approaches to learning are being installed at an unprecedented pace, these assumptions constitute a great handicap.[22]

Other contributors to Rubin's volume agree on the importance of in-service education. Bush, for example, suggests that in-service education is essential because "we need to realize that changes in professional behavior will take place slowly over a long period of time."[23] Thus all the attitudes, skills, and competencies which the teacher will require cannot be acquired in a comparatively short pre-service, or early in-service, program. Fantini, calling for more coordination between pre-service preparation and in-service education, suggests that real professional growth does not occur until the teacher actually starts to teach. According to Fantini, the pre-service training program

---

[22] Louis J. Rubin, ed., Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and procedures for change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 272.

[23] Robert N. Bush, "Curriculum-Proof Teachers: Who does what to whom?" in Louis J. Rubin, ed., Improving In-service Education: Proposals and procedures for change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 68.

> may provide a preface to the real world of the classroom, but it does not produce an able practitioner. . . . If the school is the real laboratory of the teacher, it follows that we must revise the relationship between pre-service and in-service training.[24]

Rubin concurs, saying:

> I contend that much of the finesse teachers need can be acquired only after they enter professional service . . . time is an indispensable element in the development of craftmanship. The practitioner must engage in repeated practice, evaluate his progress in some systematic way, and cumulatively increase his adeptness.[25]

The preceding discussion would seem to suggest that pre-service professional preparation cannot be complete, i.e., at the end of such a program, we do not have a competent teacher. Instead, we have a beginning teacher, who is just about to learn how to teach and, if this learning is to be effective and efficient, he needs help and guidance, i.e., in-service professional preparation or development. It should be noted, too, that for many community college instructors, pre-service teacher preparation is impractical, or even impossible. This is especially true of instructors who have been recruited from business or industry, rather than of those, usually teachers of academic subjects, who are typically recruited from a university. Furthermore, for these instructors recruited from business and industry, a "regular" pre-service program may not be appropriate, even if it were possible. What they will need, according to Garrison, "are refresher and background courses germane to their specialities; and some real help, preferably not from

---

[24] Mario Fantini, "Teacher Training and Educational Reform," in Louis J. Rubin, ed., Improving In-service Education: Proposals and procedures for change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), pp. 191-192.

[25] Rubin p. 259.

formal courses in pedagogy, in how to teach."[26] Garrison goes on to suggest that an increasingly popular method of providing this preparation is by means of "thoroughly planned in-service experiences on their own campuses."[27]

Further, this in-service component of preparation for community college teaching should not just be an initial preparation program, but should be on-going, to accommodate the slow professional growth of the instructor, and also to accommodate the rapidly changing teaching material and environment. As O'Banion says:

> All staff members . . . need continuing opportunities to keep up with new developments in education. . . . With increasing new developments in curriculum, instructional technology, organizational patterns, facilities and equipment, and teaching- learning styles, . . . it is imperative that staff have opportunities to learn about and to adapt these innovations to their situation.[28]

Thus, just as pre-service preparation programs are seen as inadequate, providing an incomplete form of preparation, early in-service programs of initial preparation are viewed in the same manner. This is not to say that pre-service and early in-service programs should be abandoned. Quite the contrary -- they should be used wherever possible! The cautionary note being sounded here is against the exclusive use of pre-service and early in-service programs which reflect the attitude that teacher training can indeed "be done and gotten over with" and suggests

---

[26] Roger H. Garrison, "The Junior College Teacher - A New Breed?" in William K. Ogilvie and Max R. Raines, eds, Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971), p. 444.

[27] Garrison, p. 444.

[28] O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow, p. 101.

instead that preparation be on-going and perhaps continuous. It would seem, therefore, that the answer to our second issue question is that the program should be both pre-service and in-service where possible. And, concerning the in-service component, it should be of an on-going continuing professional development nature, rather than a comparatively short initial preparation.

ISSUE 3: SUBJECT MATTER OR TEACHING TECHNIQUE?

The third issue attempts to determine the overall nature of the preparation program: Should the emphasis be on subject matter preparation or on teaching skills?

It was indicated earlier that the overall preparation for teaching at a community college involves both of these components and that usually the "content" aspect is handled in a pre-service program, either of academic studies or of work experience, which is often undertaken not as part of a formal program of preparation for teaching, but for some other purpose. What then should be the emphasis in a program of professional preparation -- is there a place for subject matter preparation or should the program concentrate exclusively on teaching techniques? Could it be argued that subject matter preparation is adequate preparation for teaching?

Wallace Cohen, in making some suggestions for improving the pre-service preparation of community college instructors, clearly sees the need for a strong "teaching" component in such preparation. He says:

> To be a successful instructor in a community college, a person obviously must have strong preparation in his subject field. But he also needs an equally strong understanding of the way stu-

> dents learn, the environment in which this learning is to occur, and the most efficient processes for transmitting learning. These three factors should form the basis for any pre-service program of community college staff development.[29]

Stratton agrees, saying "We are a profession of teachers, but there has been resistance to open recognition of the fact that professional skill in teaching involves more than mastery of a subject field."[30]

Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer take a largely opposite stand. They advocate a preparation program, following upon a master's degree in a subject usually taught in a community college, which consists of one core course and a one-year internship. The core course tends to emphasize course construction and evaluation. In fact, "the students' major project in the course is to construct outlines for the courses they plan to teach" in the community college during their internship.[31] Cohen and Brawer point out that "no 'methods' are taught in the . . . program because no-one knows which teaching techniques would be best for the trainees,"[32] and because they "believe that these [teaching] skills can be learned in a short period of on-the-job practice."[33] Thus Cohen and Brawer regard adequate preparation as consisting of thorough subject matter preparation and a single course devoted to teaching, before commencing teaching, followed by a period of learning on-the-job. For Cohen and Brawer then, the emphasis is very much on subject matter

---

[29] Wallace Cohen, "Knowing the Student and the College," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), p. 17.

[30] Alan G. Stratton, "Needed: The Doctor of Arts in College Teaching," Junior College Journal, Vol. 39, No. 8 (May, 1969), p. 20.

[31] Cohen and Brawer, p. 164.

[32] Cohen and Brawer, p. 168.

[33] Cohen and Brawer, p. 158.

preparation, in a pre-service program.

Roger Garrison feels that subject matter should be emphasized in a junior college teacher preparation program, although he suggests that supervised teaching, and a professional seminar which continues throughout the fifteen-to-twenty-four month pre-service program, should also be included.[34]

An example of a program for the preparation of technical education instructors at community colleges is provided by the University of Akron, in Ohio. This program has two purposes:

> It is a formal offering of instruction for the preparation of instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and it is a graduate degree program to upgrade current instructors.[35]

The undergraduate program is heavily content-based with only about fifteen percent devoted to specific teaching preparation, while the graduate program has the reverse emphasis. Persons employed as community college instructors would be more likely to take the graduate program than the undergraduate program, since they would already possess the content knowledge which forms the bulk of the undergraduate program, while the undergraduate program is more likely to be selected by those who hope to become college instructors. Thus it would seem that the undergraduate program could be regarded as a pre-service program, while the graduate program is an in-service program.[36]

---

[34] Garrison, pp.444-446.

[35] Robert E. Andreyka, "Akron University's Many Roads to Technical Teacher Preparation," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, Vol. 60, No. 9 (December, 1971), p. 78.

[36] Clearly there will be many exceptions to this broad classification.

Another program for technical instructors, the Occupational Instructor Project at Southern Illinois University, leads to a master's degree, and follows upon a bachelor's degree in either an academic subject such as English or mathematics, or in an occupational field. The program itself, designed as a pre-service program, has about 15 percent of the courses in the community college and technical college fields, about 60 percent in the student's subject area, and about 25 percent in a one-semester teaching internship in a community college.[37]

As far as the third issue is concerned -- should the program emphasize subject matter or teaching techniques? -- there seems to be no single, clear cut answer which will satisfy everybody. There does, however, appear to be a trend which joins this issue closely to the previous one - i.e., the emphasis in the program, either on pedagogy or subject matter, would seem to be linked to the question of whether the program should be pre-service or in-service. In particular it would seem that, if the program of professional preparation is completely pre-service, it frequently will consist mainly of subject matter preparation with comparatively minor, if any, attention being paid to the development of teaching skills. However, if the program is an in-service one, the emphasis is reversed, with subject matter preparation or upgrading receiving relatively little attention, since, if the individual is employed as a community college instructor he presumably already has an adequate understanding of the appropriate content of the subject or subjects which he is, or will be, teaching.

---

[37] Gleazer, p. 119.

ISSUE 4: MAIN CONTENT?

What should comprise the main content of a program of professional preparation? Clearly the answer to this question is dependent upon the answers given to the previous questions, particularly the issue of the main emphasis in the program -- is it to be subject matter or pedagogy?

To examine this question, it is convenient to rephrase the statement of this issue somewhat. Given that a thorough subject matter knowledge is assumed (obtained through either academic studies or work experience, or both), and that the main concern of this study is the preparation for teaching, the question could be stated as: What should comprise the main content of that part of the program which is not subject matter preparation, either academic or technical-vocational?

Cohen and Brawer have very clear ideas on this question. In the preparation program which they advocate,[38] there is only one course which is not subject matter oriented. This course deals with the functions, facilities, students, and curriculum of the junior college, and then devotes a major portion of its time to topics related to course development.[39] As was indicated earlier, the main outcome of this course is a set of outlines for the courses the interns will be teaching during their internship.[40]

---

[38] This program was mentioned briefly in the discussion of Issue 3.

[39] These topics are: Goals and Objectives -- Criteria and Classification; Tests and Assessments; Instructional Media and Design; Building the Course; and Assessment of Curriculum and Instruction.

[40] Cohen and Brawer, pp. 158-166,223-227.

A somewhat different set of program requirements is proposed by Virginia Keehan, who feels that the areas needing particular attention are:

> (a) understanding the role and mission of the community college; (b) the importance of and the necessity for career programs of all kinds; (c) developing teaching techniques and methods appropriate to the needs of its heterogeneous clientele; (d) preparing specialists in student development who are equipped to work with adults and all minority groups in a variety of situations, including career development, orientation and community leadership.[41]

Still another emphasis is advocated by Gleazer. Reporting on a United States study into how community college teachers feel about their preparation, Gleazer says:

> In place of separate course offerings in educational philosophy, educational psychology, and methods of teaching, teachers generally recommended what could be considered a continuing professional seminar, involving all graduate students, from whatever discipline, who were seeking this "enriched master's degree" for prospective teachers. The seminar would [cover such topics as] the history of education, the nature of the learning process, the psychology (and problems) of students, the nature of teaching, and the like.[42]

Gleazer goes on to suggest, though, that for instructors in the "occupational programs, different patterns of experience may be needed." He describes a program which provides, for those instructors, "an opportunity to gain, before employment, an understanding of the philosophy, objectives, and organization of the community college and the post-secondary technical institute."[43]

---

[41] Virginia R. Keehan, "Orienting Staff to College Goals," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2 (October,1972), p. 16.

[42] Gleazer, p. 118. See also Garrison, pp. 443-445.

[43] Gleazer, p. 119.

Another survey of community college staff indicated the following areas of need as regards preparation for teaching: "(1) self-instructional techniques, (2) evaluation procedures for self-paced instruction, (3) writing and classifying behavioural objectives, and (4) multimedia materials and methods."[44] Still another survey of community and junior college presidents in the north east of the United States identified the following areas of need in staff development:

1. The community colleges' role in remedial and developmental programs; and

2. Non-traditional instructional procedures, e.g., individualized instruction, and group discussions.[45]

The foregoing discussion has focussed on what various writers advocate should be the content of programs of preparation for community college instruction. Let us now look at what content is contained in some actual programs.

In a report of a study which surveyed 87 institutions in 34 states to determine the current status and anticipated growth of professional education courses and programs "specific to the topic of the two-year college," O'Banion has described some existing and planned programs of preparation for community college instructors. In general, this survey revealed that an overview course, courses in curriculum, methods

---

[44] Roger Yarrington, "Facing the Critical Issues," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3 (November, 1973), p. 9.

[45] James O. Hammons and Sharon Jaggard, "An Assessment of Staff Development Needs," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 47, No. 3 (November, 1976), p. 20.

and procedures of instruction, and a teaching internship, provided "the core for current preparation programs for two-year college instructors."[46]

O'Banion also describes two specific programs of preparation for college instructors -- one at the University of Hawaii and the other at Texas Tech University. The program at the University of Hawaii has three phases:

1. Academic preparation, including a small proportion of professional education courses;

2. Community college foundation courses such as the history and philosophy of junior colleges, organization and administration, evaluation, curriculum, audio-visual media, community college teaching, vocational education, and learning theory; and

3. An internship.[47]

The program at Texas Tech University requires the participant to have a master's degree in a teaching field. The program itself has two major parts:

1. A six-week institute, involving courses in curriculum and instruction in the junior college, and a seminar in higher education, as well as workshops during which teaching materials are developed and junior colleges are visited; and

---

[46] O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow, pp. 133-134.

[47] O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow, p. 138.

2. An internship, during which the intern is observed and helped by university professors.[48]

Another program, at the Western Michigan University, involves subject matter preparation of an inter-disciplinary nature, a supervised teaching internship, and "courses on the nature of the community college and characteristics of college-age students, as well as a seminar in teaching."[49]

Brown describes a baccalaureate program for prospective community college instructors who are currently employed in industry. The program is conducted by a university in conjunction with a large industrial organization, and classes are frequently held at the industrial plant after working hours. About one-third of the program is devoted to general studies, mathematics, and laboratory sciences, and another one-third to courses in the particular technology specialization of the prospective instructor. The remaining one-third is taken up by an occupational internship, and courses in professional technical education (one of which is a teaching internship).

From the preceding, certain common elements in the desired patterns of preparation for community college teaching can be discerned. First, there is concern for competence in the subject matter to be taught. This may form part of the formal program of preparation for college teaching but, in many cases, it is considered to be a pre-requisite to such a program. Second, there is a group of courses which deals

---

[48] O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow, pp. 138-139.

[49] Louis J. Venuto, "New Promise for Teacher Preparation," Junior College Journal, Vol. 42, No. 5 (February, 1972), p. 24.

with the nature and role of the community college, and the needs and characteristics of its students. Third, but not as common as the previous two, is a group of courses dealing with instructional techniques. Where these are given, they tend to emphasize non-traditional procedures and the use of instructional technology. Fourth, and very common in pre-service programs, is an internship. This varies in length from teaching one or two courses for a semester, to a full teaching load for a year, but is considered an essential element in almost all programs of preparation. A period of probationary employment often serves, in an in-service program, many of the purposes served by the internship in the pre-service program.

ISSUE 5: A COMMON PROGRAM FOR ALL INSTRUCTORS?

Should community college instructors in different instructional areas have the same professional preparation program?

There seems to be a commonly-held belief that teaching in an elementary school, a secondary school, a community college, and a university are, despite some similarities, quite different tasks in many ways and, therefore, require different forms of preparation. Is it not possible also that teaching in one section of a community college, e.g., management, is different from teaching in another section, e.g., motor mechanics, and that these differences also justify different preparation programs for instructors?

In discussing several issues concerning the recruitment and training of community college staff, Stoops finds it convenient to consider separately three groups of instructors: the "college parallel" or

"university transfer" group, the "collegiate technical" group, and the "occupational and recreational" group. For each of these groups, Stoops suggests preparation programs which are different with respect to content, credentials, and organization and administration.[50]

In a panel discussion following the presentation in which Stoops made the preceding comments, another speaker, Dr. Louis Bender, made a statement which could be interpreted as contrary to Stoop's position on this issue:

> The community college president and his staff must consistently strive to eliminate the artificial dichotomy that exists between those aspects of curricula that are generally referred to as the academic program and the vocational technical program. The community college will be seriously handicapped in its mission as action agent if it proves to be incapable of minimizing status differentiation between the various components of its instructional program.[51]

It would seem to be difficult, then, to offer the three separate and distinct training programs suggested by Stoops, and not strengthen still further the "artificial dichotomy."

For instructors in the "college parallel" or "university transfer" programs, Stoops suggests that they should have "academic qualifications equal to their colleagues in four-year institutions and didactical skills which, if anything, exceed those of the four-year college teacher."[52] However, for teachers in the collegiate technical program, says Stoops, the first priority "must be for the content of each speciality, its curricular organization, and the effective modes and

---

[50] Stoops, pp. 56-58.

[51] Bender was, at the time, Director of the Bureau of Community Colleges in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. See Stoops, p. 60.

[52] Stoops, p. 56.

methods of its exposition."[53] The diversified nature of the occupational and recreational programs makes it difficult to specify criteria for a training program. In fact, Stoops does not! He suggests that the college itself may provide some training (with caution, due to the dangers of "inbreeding"), or the teacher may study part-time at a college or university.

Gleazer also identifies three broad types of preparation programs for community college instructors.

> Those teachers responsible for the academic courses leading to university transfer will be required to have subject matter competence similar to that needed by teachers of lower division courses in the university . . . instructors in the remedial programs require university preparation which will equip them to deal with these kinds of problems . . . [and, in the] occupational fields . . . there is no adequate substitute for actual job experience.[54]

Gleazer concedes that the question of preparation of instructors in the occupational programs is troublesome, "because very little headway has been made in determining the best ways to qualify faculty" for these programs.

Wolf also advocates a different form of preparation for instructors in different instructional areas. For "those working in the practical or occupational aspects of the community college program," he suggests that experience can be substituted for degrees.[55] He does not, however, indicate just how "experience" and "degrees" can be equated as, for example, in salary schedules. Reese also addresses this question,

---

[53] Stoops, p. 57.

[54] Gleazer, p. 117.

[55] See Stoops, p. 61.

but does not provide a practical answer. He admits to problems in the occupational area especially concerning the interpretation of "the equivalent of a master's degree."[56]

Gillie also sees important differences between the preparation of academic subject teachers at community colleges, and the preparation of occupational instructors. For the former he advocates the development of a new graduate program which, being exclusively for potential community college instructors, could concentrate on the "community college philosophy" as well as proficiency in a subject area. For occupational instructors, who, he says tend to more readily identify with the "equalitarian philosophy" of the community college, the training program does not need to emphasize the philosophical problem. He suggests that for occupational instructors,

> the most promising approach seems to be the combination of academic preparation, internships, and selected work environments, practice teaching, and a selection of professional education courses.[57]

In summary, on this fifth issue there would seem to be a large measure of agreement -- instructors in different instructional areas probably do need different programs of preparation. These differences are not just differences of degree, in that some courses in a program of preparation are different for different instructors, but may also be differences of type, with occupational or technical instructors requiring a vastly different form of preparation from instructors in academic

---

[56] See Stoops, p. 64.

[57] Angelo C. Gillie, Sr., Principles of Post-Secondary Vocational Education, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973), p. 187.

areas.

ISSUE 6: INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES?

How should the program of professional preparation be organized with respect to the delivery of instruction?

Again, it may be desirable to rephrase this question. Given that there is a body of knowledge and a collection of competencies which, if acquired and developed, will increase the quality and efficiency of the instructor's teaching, the question becomes: What is the best way to ensure that an instructor does acquire that body of knowledge, and learns and develops those competencies?

In general, this is a difficult issue to discuss, particularly in isolation from the others. How material should be taught (or perhaps, how it should be learned), will depend upon the particular material, upon the particular learner, and upon a host of other considerations. The most that can be accomplished in a literature review of this issue, is an attempt to identify some of the most important of these considerations and the way in which they operate in specific circumstances.

A study by Croy asked college instructors and administrators their views on a number of aspects of in-service education. He found that the majority (about two-thirds) were opposed to "relying on their own reading to learn about the philosophy and goals of the community college" but they could not agree on just how they should acquire that knowledge. As for learning about instructional skills, teachers' meetings were favoured as the learning vehicle, with a stated preference for

learning through packaged media e.g., television and tapes. Teachers' meetings were also favoured for learning about subject matter, again through pre-packaged media, and for learning about human relations, but teachers' meetings were not a preferred way to learn about community college students. In fact, about 60 percent were opposed to any formal in-service program in this area, preferring instead apprenticeships or internships.[58]

When planning their instructional stategies, Cohen suggests that the people who are responsible for the program should consider the following:

1. Require that prospective instructors build actual junior college courses complete with measurable objectives, test items, and media specified.

2. Have trainees try out selected course units (including pre- and post- assessment) on junior college students in small group instructional sessions so that they may judge their own actual effect.

3. Place trainees as teaching interns with pay for classes taught in junior colleges. Have them report back to the university regularly bringing evidence of learning achieved by their students.

4. Abandon the archaic practice of having prospective teachers serve as apprentices to subject area master teachers; its roots are in the 'Watch-me-and-do-it-the-way-I-do' school. Rather select and develop certain junior college instructors as 'clinical professors of education' who will work closely with trainees at their colleges.[59]

---

[58] John E. Croy, "How do you feel about in-service programs?" Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3 (November, 1973), pp. 28-29.

[59] Cohen, "Developing Specialists in Learning," pp. 334-335.

Cohen's first three points reflect the need, expressed by many, for a "practical" approach in the preparation of community college instructors. His fourth point, though seems to be more personal and, frankly, somewhat more controversial since there would seem to be no reason why the "apprentice" and the "clinical professor" approaches could not both be used.

Thus, with respect to the delivery of instruction, it would seem that there are two guiding principles which emerge in the literature:

1. The approach used should be as practical as possible, so that students (i.e., the new or future instructors) can see immediately the use and applications of what they are learning.

2. An internship, or some form of supervised or assisted teaching, should be employed so that the student instructors can try out what they have been taught, perhaps discarding some ideas and techniques, and modifying others, until they can develop "their own teaching style."

ISSUE 7: WHAT CREDENTIAL?

What type of credential should be associated with a program of professional preparation for community college instructors?

This issue has generated a great deal of discussion, but with apparently no substantial agreement as to its resolution. Stoops says:

> The community college is primarily a teaching and not a research institution. Doctorate degrees need not be the paradigm of scho-

> larly achievement for the community college teacher. He will be a teacher. Good master degree programs will generally suffice for his subject matter preparation.[60]

Stoops goes on to suggest that teachers in the college parallel program at the community college probably need a master's degree in a teaching field, as well as "didactics, seminars on the nature of higher education, and internships."[61] For teachers in the collegiate technical programs, "the question of a degree program is premature and not presently relevant,"[62] while teachers in the occupational and recreational programs are necessarily a very diverse group. Of this group, Stoops has observed:

> Some will have Ph.D.'s, some will be lawyers, physicians, and engineers. Some may have no degree but will hold undisputed authority in their speciality. The characteristics of this group will differ from college to college and from year to year".[63]

Further, says Stoops, these people "may not have academic degrees and should not be pressured into getting them".[64]

A study by Kovach tried to ascertain which degrees senior administrators in community colleges felt that an instructor should possess. The "desired minimum educational training" for liberal arts teachers was a master's degree, while for applied arts teachers it was a bachelor's degree. The "most desirable degree" for both groups was a master's degree in a subject field plus advanced work in education. An interest-

---

[60] Stoops, p. 55.

[61] Stoops, pp. 56-57.

[62] Stoops, p. 57.

[63] Stoops, p. 58.

[64] Stoops, p. 53.

ing finding of this study was that "the doctorate, as a degree for faculty members, is not needed or wanted in the community college."[65] Kovach's study reinforces a statement by Gleazer, who reports that:

> From all the evidence we can gather, junior college teachers are definitely not satisfied with the nature , scope, and orientation of their graduate work. Indeed, they report that departmental narrowness and the typical academic focus on pre-Ph.D. course work are, at best, irrelevant to their needs, and at worst, even detrimental.[66]

In a comment which elaborates on Gleazer's remarks, Garrison explains why the traditional route of graduate study is "unnecessary or irrelevant" for the bulk of junior college teachers:

> In the comprehensive public junior colleges . . . nearly 70 percent of the instruction is in non-traditional areas: in vocational, preprofessional, technical, public service, and other immediately job-related areas. Further, since about two-thirds of all junior college students do not continue their education, but move to employment, the traditional scholarship-oriented teaching, even of liberal arts and so-called general education subjects, is only partially appropriate to that proportionately small group which intends to transfer to four year colleges and universities.
>
> For example, most vocational instructors will have backgrounds of extensive work experience and on-the-job training. They will have little use for a "regular" academic postbaccalaureate M.A. or Ph.D. program.[67]

Gillie attempts to explain this aversion to and scepticism of traditional academic preparation for college teachers. He argues that the two main attributes sought in new community college teaching staff

---

[65] Robert V. Kovach, "Which Degrees for Faculty?" Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3 (November, 1973), p. 31.

[66] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Preparation of Junior College Teachers," in William K. Ogilvie and Max R. Raines, eds, Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971), p. 461.

[67] Garrison, pp. 443-444.

-- subject matter expertise in some discipline, and an educational philosophy suited to community colleges -- are frequently contradictory, mainly due to the fact that the former attribute is typically developed in a university graduate school program, and that the way in which the new community college instructor teaches is strongly influenced by the way in which he himself was taught. He says:

> This very fundamental contradiction between the manner in which community college teachers are trained and the approaches they are expected to take when they teach can result in serious role-conflict problems among the faculty and administrators.[68]

Further, a study by Gillie, Leslie, and Bloom, in which teaching staff at several community colleges were questioned on a number of issues, uncovered a distinctly "anti-Ph.D." sentiment. Teachers without a doctoral degree were found to have a more positive attitude toward the occupational preparation and community service aspects of community college activities, and community college staff in general were opposed to publication and research activities being used as primary criteria for promotion.[69] This "anti-Ph.D." sentiment received some official sanction when in 1967 the United States congress passed an Education Professions Development Act, (E.P.D.A.) part of which provided fellowships for the preparation of community college instructors, but restricted such preparation to less than the Ph.D. or equivalent level.[70]

---

[68] Gillie, p. 174.

[69] Gillie, pp. 177-178.

[70] Venuto, p. 22.

In an attempt to provide graduate training which satisfied the E.P.D.A. requirements, several new degree programs for community college instructors have been created. These include:

1. the Diplomate in Collegiate Teaching (D.C.T.), introduced by the University of Miami, with the cooperation of Miami-Dade Junior College;[71]

2. the Doctor of Arts in College Teaching, proposed by the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges;[72]

3. the Educational Specialist degree (Ed.S.), as, for example, the specialist degree in college teaching offered by the University of Iowa;[73] and

4. the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree, a "teaching" degree which attempts to avoid the research orientation of the Ph.D.

Cohen and Brawer suggest, however, that "these patterns seem to offer little that would change the present situation"[74] since altering the degree titles or the course sequences is of minimal value if the

---

[71] S.L. Besnivick and T.W. Fryer, Jr., "Miami Begins the Diplomate in Collegiate Teaching," Junior College Journal, Vol. 39, No. 5 (February, 1969), p. 48.

[72] Stratton, p. 19.

[73] Duane D. Anderson, "E.P.D.A. at the University of Iowa," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), p. 19.

[74] Cohen and Brawer, Confronting Identity, p. 156.

basic premises of program design remain unchanged. Proponents of the new "patterns," though, would argue that the basic premises have not remained unchanged, and that such new patterns replace a research oriented program with a field-based, practical program.

Still, the credentials question remains unresolved. New programs, some leading to a Ph.D., others leading to other degrees, are continually being developed. However, this controversy has revolved mainly around only a portion of the community college staff -- those who are involved in the academic or liberal studies programs. As indicated earlier in this section, Garrison argues that a large proportion of the college staff will have little use for academic graduate degree programs, this being particularly so in colleges which have a large technical-vocational- occupational component.[75]

What trends can be singled out from the preceding illustrations? It would seem that for teachers in academic programs, graduate preparation at either the master's or doctoral level is desirable, but at the doctoral level there is still a controversy over the title of the degree, largely centering around whether a Ph.D. can be a "teaching" degree. For teachers in the occupational programs, graduate preparation is seen as "nice-if-one-can-get-it" but employers do not usually insist upon it, relevant work experience being considered much more important.

This question of the credential associated with the preparation program is compounded still further by its relationship to others of the key issues. For example, if the program is sponsored by the community college itself (Issue 8) then the award of a degree credential --

---

[75] As, for example, Manitoba's three community colleges which have no university parallel programs.

Bachelor, Master's, or Doctorate -- becomes very difficult, if not impossible, since in most cases the community college is not a degree-granting institution. This is especially so in Canada's community colleges. Alternatively, if the program is an in-service program of on-going professional development (Issue 2), it may be that no credential can be associated with the program since the program itself is never "completed."

ISSUE 8: RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PROGRAM?

Who should be responsible for the organization and administration of the program?

Universities have traditionally held the responsibility for the preparation of community college instructors. The instructor in the academic area obtained his master's degree at a university, and the instructor in the occupational programs usually went to a university for the teacher education courses which he was required to take. However, "criticism of university-based preparation programs has been widespread."[76] For example, Stratton says that, on occasion, the university professor teaching the course on "The Junior College," and the text book which he is using, both reflect "little familiarity with the reality of this new and complex institution";[77] Cohen and Brawer talk about junior college leaders who "sometimes claim that university-directed programs stress matters irrelevant to the practices of junior college instruction

---

[76] Arthur M. Cohen, The Two-Year College Instructor Today, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977), p. 70.

[77] Stratton, p. 20.

and to the uniqueness of junior college students";[78] and, claiming that many college leaders are dissatisfied with university-based preparation, Singer has advocated the establishment of a community college institute which "would be planned, directed, staffed, and administered by the junior college movement -- not just for it."[79]

Some writers, though, are quite happy with the universities playing a dominant role. Reese, for example, says that the teacher education programs for community college instructors "should be the function of colleges and universities that have graduate level work"[80] although the colleges could run their own in-service programs. However, such in-service programs conducted by the community college itself have tended to be more of a continuing, professional development nature than initial preparation and, as such, have tended sometimes to be considered of minor importance. As one writer has observed in the recent context of budget restraint, "in-service training has maintained a consistently low status, with little financial backing."[81]

However the most common pattern for the organization and administration of programs of professional preparation for community college instructors now seems to be some sort of cooperative effort in which the community college itself is one of the partners. These cooperative efforts range from arrangements in which the university has the primary role, with the college acting in an advisory capacity, to arrangements

---

[78] Cohen and Brawer, Confronting Identity, p. 152.

[79] Singer, p. 36.

[80] See Stoops, p. 64.

[81] O'Banion, "Staff Development: Priorities for the Seventies," p. 11.

in which neither party is dominant. In one study which attempted to produce a set of guidelines for developing teacher education progams for community college instructors, a group of "national and state experts" agreed that:

> Cooperative arrangements between community colleges and universities should be developed in order to maximize the effectiveness of: content and professional preparation; internships and field experiences; planning, development, and review of programs; use of physical and personnel resources between institutions, and; overall coordination and communication of the teacher education program.[82]

A joint pre-service training program for community college instructors is described by Atwell and Sullins. This program is run by the university's college of education, but with input from the community college sector by means of an advisory committee. Further, some of the university staff were recruited from community colleges, and community college staff serve on the advisory committees of doctoral candidates working in the field of community college education.[83]

Wallace describes another cooperative program which "links the university and the community college in joint sponsorship of a training program." The cooperation extends to internships in the community colleges, with community college and university staff jointly framing program objectives and conducting seminar programs.[84]

---

[82] Daniel B. Dunham, "Guidelines for Developing a Community College Teacher Education Program in Oregon," Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 31 (1971), p. 4595-A.

[83] Atwell and Sullins, pp. 32-33.

[84] Dale C. Wallace, "A Functioning Program for the Preparation of Community-College Biology Teachers," The American Biology Teacher, Vol. 36, No. 2 (February, 1974), p. 99.

The Diplomate in Collegiate Teaching of the University of Miami is another example of a joint effort between a university and neighbouring community colleges. Some courses are jointly taught by faculty from the university and the colleges, working as a team. Interns are supervised by a university faculty member and work under the guidance of a directing teacher from the colleges. The planning committee for the whole venture comprised members from both sectors. The junior colleges have established several types of leave programs so that their staff can participate in the program, and the university's residency requirements are such that many participants are able to teach in nearby colleges while participating in the program.[85]

Brown describes a program which is an example of a different sort of cooperative arrangement, for preparing community college instructors. Here the partners are a university and a major industrial organization. Much of the program is conducted at the organization's plant, and its employees form a large part of the student population in this program.[86]

This issue, too, is closely linked with some of the others. For example, if the preparation program is pre-service (Issue 2) it is much more likely to be conducted by a university than by a community college. Also, if the program _is_ run by the community college itself, it will very likely emphasize pedagogy over subject matter content (Issue 3) since, in this case, the students in the program will be already

---

[85] Besnivick and Fryer, pp. 48,50,52,54,56.

[86] Donald V. Brown, "A Teaching Partnership for Technical Staff," _Community and Junior College Journal_, Vol. 44, No. 3 (November, 1973), pp. 35-36.

employed as community college instructors, and will, consequently, have a thorough content background.

In summary, then, it would seem that because of criticism of university-based programs of preparation for college teaching, and also because of criticism of programs run by the colleges themselves, there is now a trend toward a joint responsibility pattern, with significant contributions from at least the college and university sectors, and, frequently, from other sectors as well.

ISSUE 9: EVALUATION?

What mechanism should exist to monitor, evaluate, and modify the program?

If a formal program of preparation for teaching is established, then some mechanism needs to be established to monitor, evaluate, and modify it so that the program remains relevant despite changes in the environment in which it exists. What form should this mechanism take? Frequently, this is not considered to be an issue, because universities, for example, usually have reasonably standardized procedures for the monitoring of courses and programs for which they are responsible, and the community college teacher preparation program would come under these standardized procedures. Usually, then, the agency which assumes or accepts the responsibility for the organization and administration of a program also accepts the responsibility for monitoring the program, evaluating it, and modifying it where necessary. As a result,little has been written about the specific ways in which this function can be carried out, and a review of the literature related to preparation for

teaching in a community college offers little assistance in this matter. Because of the cooperation which has been suggested in the discussion of other issues in this chapter, however, it would seem reasonable that the program be monitored and evaluated in a cooperative way. Perhaps if one agency, e.g., the university, has primary responsiblity for the program, it might be useful to have personnel from the community college play a dominant role in any evaluation since they are not actually responsible for the program but they can certainly comment meaningfully on its effect. In general, the concern that Dunham identifies would seem central to any monitoring mechanism:

> Programs for the . . . preparation of community college teachers should be designed with built-in flexibility in order to retain sensitivity to the changing and special needs of the community college.[87]

ISSUE 10: PAYMENT FOR THE PROGRAM?

Who should pay for the program?

The emphasis in this issue is on the contribution of the teacher himself to the cost of the program. Persons preparing to teach in an elementary or a secondary school make substantial contributions toward the cost of such preparation. While clearly not paying the complete cost of the program, since the preparing institutions -- universities, teachers' colleges, etc., -- are heavily subsidized by government funding, the student does contribute by paying for tuition, books, laboratory

---

87 Dunham, p. 4595-A. Dunham was referring specifically to pre-service programs, but his suggestion would seem to apply to any preparation program.

fees, and so on. He also contributes his time, usually devoting three or four years to full-time study in preparing to become a teacher. Why then should not the potential community college instructor make a similar contribution?

The answer is that he probably already has! The academic instructor has probably used his own time and money to obtain the degree which attests to his content knowledge. Similarly, the technical instructor, in obtaining his content preparation, incurred substantial expenses. For example, in the cooperative pre-service program described by Brown,

> costs for the industrial plant or other mini-campus sponsor would include space, equipment, and utilities for the necessary laboratories and classrooms, [but the] cost of the instruction, and equipment maintenance . . . were provided solely from student fees.[88]

But this deals with the "content" side of the preparation, not the "teaching" side. Who should pay for that, especially bearing in mind that in many cases the instructor is already employed by the community college while he is doing that part of his preparation?

O'Banion recommends that state governments should directly contribute to staff development activities. He cites the example of Florida, where an amount equivalent to three percent of the total amount for salaries in the community college system is provided for community college program and staff development. Although he is talking about in-service professional development rather than initial preparation, his point is clear -- the financial burden on the instructor should be substantially reduced.[89] O'Banion's views on this point are supported by

---

[88] Brown, p. 36.

Bender, who suggests that state funds be made available to carry out programs of pre-service and in-service staff development.[90]

The colleges themselves could perhaps contribute more of the cost of in-service professional preparation or development. For example, Blake points out that "business organizations which have the . . . need to stay constantly abreast of current and future trends invest a certain percentage of their profits in research and development". He goes on to suggest that

> similarly, community-junior colleges must invest a certain portion of their income in their R and D, staff development, so that they might continue to meet the current and the undefined future responsibilities placed upon them.[91]

Another way in which colleges could assist financing these programs is, rather than pay the actual costs involved, reward the program participants when the program is completed. This point of view is expressed by Anderson who says:

> Programs specifically designed to prepare community college instructors will be successful only if those responsible for the development of the two-year institution believe they are necessary and are willing to reward the graduates,[92]

and by Bender, who suggests that

> when the community colleges do not provide a climate for their instructional staff to learn, to grow, and to develop through provision for continuous contact with the academic and technical community and do not maintain salary schedules that will permit

---

89 O'Banion, "Staff Development: Priorities for the Seventies," p. 11.

90 See Yarrington, p. 9.

91 Blake, p. 13.

92 Anderson, p. 19.

and encourage instructional staff to do these kinds of things, these institutions will begin to fail.[93]

An example of how the financial burden on the instructor can be reduced by the college is furnished by the Miami-Dade College, which provides several types of professional leave programs. These include:

1. Short-term study leaves, usually of six weeks duration during the spring and summer, with full pay.

2. Sabbatical leaves, during which the instructor who is engaged in full-time study receives 75 percent of his contract salary.

3. Special study leaves, with conditions similar to the sabbatical leaves, but which may be awarded after only three years of service (and which require a commitment to return to the college for at least one year after the completion of the leave). These special leaves may also be taken on a part-time basis.[94]

One of the major objectives of these programs is

> to provide incentives for faculty members to pursue programs of advanced study and professional development . . . . A heavy investment of college funds has been made in these programs. The college feels, however, that its greatest resource is the human resource of its faculty and staff, and investments in people show promise of yielding greatest returns through better educational service to students.[95]

---

[93] See Stoops, p. 61.

[94] Besnivick and Fryer, pp. 54,56.

[95] Besnivick and Fryer, p. 56.

Clearly though, the extent of the financial contribution of the college is limited, especially in times of economic restraint. For example, Hoem says that

> few educators deny the importance of human resource development to overall educational quality. Yet, the possibility of dwindling support for professional development is one of the many financial dilemmas currently being faced by two-year colleges because of inflation.[96]

Konrad, reporting on a survey of community colleges in Western Canada, found that financial matters were a significant problem in professional development programs. He says:

> Who pays for specific programs is a major concern to colleges. How can cost-benefits be determined for such a variety of approaches to staff development? Should faculty development policy become a part of the contractual agreement? Perhaps faculty would be willing [to pay] for a larger portion of direct costs if appropriate incentives were developed. For example, institutions might provide for released time or a reduced load to encourage greater participation in programs.[97]

Konrad also found that colleges tended to provide more support to programs which emphasized the improvement of teaching and learning, than programs whose primary purpose was to keep the instructor abreast of development in his field.[98]

One way in which the cost to the individual instructor can be reduced is to conduct the program at the community college (even if it is the responsibility of a university and is being taken for university

---

[96] Eric Hoem, "The Professional Development Program You Can Afford," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 45, No. 8 (May, 1975), p. 32.

[97] Abram G. Konrad, "Staff Development in Western Canadian Colleges," STOA, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1973), p. 50.

[98] Konrad, p. 51.

credit). In one survey of community college instructors, over half indicated a preference for an on-campus program, while, if that could not be arranged, three-quarters said that they would "commute to an off-campus site within reasonable driving distance."[99] Other studies, however, have shown opposing preferences. For example, a survey of administrators and teachers in community colleges showed that

> all groups favored an off-site campus . . . The preferred locations and occasions for in-service programs are given in order: (1) special staff retreats, (2) summer institutes, and (3) periodical seminars during the school year.[100]

Thus while on-campus sites may reduce costs for the participants, there may be some instructors who would prefer to forfeit this cost saving in order to participate in an off-campus program. Indeed it could perhaps be argued that the value of an off-campus program lies mainly in the program content, but also partly in the actual experiences of another educational environment.

Another way in which the financial burden on the instructor can be reduced, particularly in a pre-service program, is by means of a paid internship. Simmons, for example, suggests that community college internships should be financed, either by a foundation or by the institution itself, covering "salary, transportation, and incidental costs . . . After all, the benefits accruing to the institution should not be minimized."[101]

---

[99] Hammons and Jaggard, p. 20.

[100] Croy, p. 29.

[101] Howard L. Simmons, "Priorities for Training Minority Staff," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), p. 16.

What trends, or commonly selected alternatives, can be discerned on this issue? It would seem that this issue is closely linked to the pre-service/in-service issue, in that for that portion of his program which is undertaken prior to employment as a community college instructor the individual usually has to meet all the "normal" student expenses -- tuition, laboratory fees, books, etc., -- but he is also able to compete for scholarships and other forms of financial assistance. If the pre-service program involves an internship, there seems to be wide, although not universal, agreement that the intern should be paid during that period. There is not agreement, however, on how much the intern should be paid -- full salary, as though the intern were a first-year teacher, an appropriate fraction of such full salary dependent upon the proportion of a normal full teaching load his duties involve, or some other amount, determined in accordance with other formulae. Nor is there agreement on who should pay the intern -- the university in whose program the intern is registered, the host community college, or some other authority.

If the program is in-service in nature, the question of who pays is less clear. Should the college pay, since it is the college which will benefit? Is the college under an even stronger obligation to pay if the individual is required, as a condition of continued employment, to participate in the program? This question is compounded still further by the emphasis in the program. If the program emphasizes teaching skills, college authorities seem to be more likely to pay all or most of the costs than if the program involves upgrading in the instructor's area of specialization.

Associated with this question of cost to the individual instructor is the related question of how much of his own time he should be required to devote to the program. Again it can be argued that, if the employing college requires participation in a preparation program then it (the employing college) should make sufficient time available for such participation by releasing the instructor from some or all of his teaching and allied duties for the duration of the program. Counter to this is the argument that since the instructor himself will reap some benefit from the program, he should be prepared to devote some of his own time to the program. Also, preparation for teaching at the elementary or secondary level is usually undertaken in the individual's own time -- why should preparation for community college teaching be different?

THE ISSUES AND THEIR RESOLUTION: A SUMMARY

There seems to be no consensus in the literature concerning the question of compulsory participation in a program of preparation for teachers in a community college. Opponents of such participation argue that mastery of the appropriate subject matter is sufficient preparation, and that teaching skills can be quickly acquired on-the-job. Advocates of participation in a program which prepares the instructor for teaching agree that subject mastery is necessary, but they do not see it as sufficient preparation for teaching. The emphasis on the community college as a <u>teaching</u> college helps to give support to this latter point of view, which seems to be increasing in popularity over recent years.

The issue of whether the program of professional preparation should be pre-service or in-service depends largely upon the instructional area involved. If the instructor is to teach technical subjects, he is usually recruited from industry or business after a number of years of occupational experience. In this case the provision of pre-service preparation for teaching becomes difficult or impractical -- economic considerations virtually dictate an in-service form of preparation. Instructors in academic areas, however, can frequently participate in a pre-service program, similar to potential teachers in elementary or secondary schools. Pre-service preparation programs, however, and even early in-service programs of an "initial preparation" type, are frequently claimed to be inadequate. The rapidly changing technology and the "slow professional growth" of instructors suggests the importance of on-going preparation in the form of continuing professional development.

The emhasis in the program -- "content or methods?" -- seems to be closely linked to the previous issue. Pre-service programs tend to emphasize mastery of the subjects to be taught in the community college, while in-service programs tend to place a major emphasis on teaching, presumably because subject mastery is assumed, since the instructors are already employed in the community college.

There seems to be reasonable agreement with the proposition that instructors in different instructional areas need different preparation programs, not just in terms of content but also in terms of the learning methods employed. Broadly, it is suggested that instructors of "technical" subjects need a different form of preparation from instructors of "academic" subjects -- unfortunately there is no agreement on what this different form should be.

Because of differences of opinion regarding the other issues, it is inappropriate to expect agreement as to the main content of the program (or programs)! However, frequently suggested topics include:

1. The nature and role of the community college, and the characteristics of its students, and

2. Instructional techniques, particularly innovations in teaching.

Where this content is taught in a formal course structure it is suggested that the instructional techniques used be as pragmatic as possible. The new instructors will be teaching students who will need to see the "practical use" of what they are being taught, and perhaps the instructors themselves should be taught the same way. An internship or some other form of supervised teaching is frequently seen as a valuable way in which the new instructor can, with guidance, develop his own preferred teaching style.

The question of what credential should be associated with the program is a complex one. It is linked to the issue concerning content, and also to the question of who should be responsible for the program. There seems to be little agreement on what the credential should be. In the academic areas, a bachelor's degree is usually seen as a minimum qualification, with a master's degree preferred. For technical instructors, work experience is of paramount importance, and the problem of equating work experience and academic qualifications (e.g., for salary purposes, and for further study) is not easily solved. On the question of credentials, one frequently expressed view is that the Ph.D. is not a

desirable qualification for community college instructors, because the preparation leading to it is not compatible with the community college philosophy.

The traditional role of the university as the agency responsible for preparation of teachers is being eroded in the case of community college instructors. Opponents of university-based training for community college instructors frequently claim that the university is not sufficiently familiar with the community college to permit it to adequately prepare instructors for that institution, while programs run by the colleges themselves have been criticized because of the dangers of "inbreeding." There seems to be a move now toward cooperative organization and administration of the programs, usually between the colleges and the universities. The relative influence of each party varies considerably between different cooperative plans.

The question of how the program should be monitored and evaluated frequently is not seen as an issue, since the agency which has the responsibility for the organization and administration of the program usually has its own procedure for performing that function with all of the programs for which it is responsible, including the community college instructor preparation program.

The extent to which the individual instructor contributes financially toward the program seems to depend largely on whether the program is pre-service, in which case the instructor usually meets all normal student expenses such as tuition, laboratory fees, and books, or in-service, in which case the instructor's contribution tends to be minimal.

From the above it is clear that there is not agreement on all of the identified issues. Indeed, if there were, they would cease to be issues! In the next chapter the ways in which these issues were resolved when the Certificate in Adult Education program in Manitoba was being developed are outlined, and in the following chapter, the way in which Manitoba's community college instructors and administrators think that these issues should be resolved today is presented.

Chapter IV

THE CERTIFICATE IN ADULT EDUCATION: PROGRAM DESIGN CHOICES

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the development of the Certificate in Adult Education, and to show how the ten key issues which are the focus of this study have been resolved by the C.A.E. as it emerged in the Manitoba community college system.

Publicly supported post-secondary vocational education in Manitoba commenced in 1948, when the province's first permanent post-public-school vocational institution -- the Manitoba Technical Institute (M.T.I.) was established in premises at 1181 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg. "All vocational training for out-of-school youth and adults now became centred in this location."[1] Vocational training in rural areas first became available in 1961 when the Brandon Vocational Training Centre was opened, and was expanded in 1966 with the opening of the Northern Manitoba Vocational Centre at The Pas. Also in 1966 the Brandon facility moved into new buildings and was renamed the Manitoba Vocational Centre. In the fall of 1963, the Manitoba Technical Institute moved into new buildings at the site of what is now the Red River Community College, and was renamed the Manitoba Institute of Technology (M.I.T.). It then offered two-year post-secondary technology courses, as well as trades

---

[1] A History of Community Colleges in Manitoba, (Winnipeg: Department of Colleges and Universities Affairs, Community Colleges Division, [n.d.]), p. 2.

training. In 1968 a new section, the Applied Arts Division, was added, and the new complex was renamed the Manitoba Institute of Technology/Manitoba Institute of Applied Arts (M.I.T./M.I.A.A.). On December 15, 1969, the Winnipeg institution and two rural vocational centres were designated community colleges. The Manitoba Vocational Centre at Brandon became the Assiniboine Community College, the Northern Manitoba Vocational Centre became the Keewatin Community College, and the M.I.T./M.I.A.A. in Winnipeg became the Red River Community College.

ORIGIN OF THE CERTIFICATE IN ADULT EDUCATION

Prior to December 15, 1969, instructors in these institutions who did not already possess a teaching certificate were required to obtain a "Special Certificate in Vocational Industrial, Technology, Applied Arts, Related Subjects, valid in provincially operated schools."[2] The requirements for these certificates were:

1. An appropriate degree or other satisfactory training and experience at the post high school level.

2. Three years of practical experience in the appropriate field.

3. Four summer sessions, or the equivalent, of approved teacher training.

---

[2] Henceforth, for convenience, these will be referred to simply as Special Certificates.

4. Two years of teaching experience.

5. The recommendation of a senior administrator in the Provincial School concerned that the certificate be granted.[3]

An Interim Special Certificate was available on completion of the first two of these requirements, and two of the four summer sessions of teacher training. The Permanent Certificate was awarded on completion of the remaining requirements. This certification requirement was continued for some time after December 15, 1969, so that instructors in the new community colleges were also required to obtain a Special Certificate unless they already possessed an acceptable equivalent.

The Teacher Education section of M.I.T./M.I.A.A. was responsible for the administration of the program of instruction leading to the award of these Special Certificates, although the provincial Board of Teacher Education and Certification was the certifying authority. Classes were conducted in Winnipeg during the summer, and the "four summer sessions" requirement was satisified by completing eight forty-hour courses. These summer courses were taught by visiting lecturers, frequently from other provinces or from the United States, who were recruited by, but not from, the Teacher Education Section.[4]

On January 16, 1970, a meeting was held to discuss a proposal to modify the summer school requirements for college instructors seeking a Special Certificate. The meeting was held at Red River Community College, and in attendance were representatives from the University of

---

[3] Manitoba Regulation No. 55/67 dated May 19, 1967, Sections 16 and 17.

[4] Instructors' contracts prevented them from being employed as summer school instructors, unless special Government approval was obtained.

Manitoba, the Department of Youth and Education, the Manitoba Teachers' Society, and the college itself. The meeting agreed that a change from forty-hour to sixty-hour courses was desirable. It also agreed to submit to the provincial Board of Teacher Education and Certification the following proposal:

> That the section of the regulations which deals with the number of courses to be completed by instructors [in] provincially-operated schools be amended to require four approved courses of sixty hours duration or a total of 240 hours for interim certification and a further two courses of sixty hours each or a total of 360 hours for permanent certification.[5]

The reasons for these suggested changes seem to have been to provide the opportunity to treat the courses in greater depth, and to satisfy "the requirement of a 'teaching certificate' for admission to a Bachelor of Paedagogy or Bachelor of Education program" at the University of Manitoba.[6]

The Board of Teacher Education and Certification agreed to recommend to the Minister of Youth and Education that these suggested changes be accepted.[7] Replying on behalf of the Minister, the Deputy Minister of Youth and Education wrote:

> The Minister has asked whether we need to insist on the requirement of the equivalent of a whole year of study for certification. As a matter of fact, he wonders why we need to require certification at all for our instructors at the colleges.[8]

---

[5] Minutes of Meeting re Summer Courses for Vocational Teachers, January 16, 1970.

[6] Minutes of meeting re Summer Courses for Vocational Teachers, January 16, 1970.

[7] Minutes of Board of Teacher Education and Certification Meeting, January 30, 1970.

[8] Memorandum from Dr. W.C. Lorimer, Deputy Minister, Youth and Educa-

Thus, recommended changes to the requirements for the Special Certificates were not made.

In September, 1970, the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College prepared a statement intended to assist in giving "better and more consistent guidance to community college instructors in selecting courses for certification."[9] Part of the intent of this statement was to

> avoid the problem of people "reaching back" into transcripts of previous training for credit and of asking to have participation in various business or industry-sponsored training sessions evaluated for credit.[10]

The statement was based on a six-course program, and suggested that "all teachers should have at least one course in each of Psychology of Learning, Educational Testing and Evaluation, Curriculum or Course Construction, and the Methods area."[11] The remaining two courses could be "other professional courses (e.g., Introduction to Guidance, Audio-Visual Aids, . . . etc.,)" or "non-professional" courses which would "add to the competence of the teacher in his subject matter or trades area."[12]

---

tion, to Mr. R.W. Lightly, Assistant Deputy Minister, Youth and Education, February 27, 1970.

[9] Memorandum from P.F. Penner, Supervisor, Teacher Education Division and Learning Resources Centre, to Mr. J.E. McCannel, Director General, Community Colleges, September 30, 1970. This statement was the forerunner of a formal proposal for a new teaching certificate for college instructors.

[10] Memorandum from P.F. Penner, Supervisor, Teacher Education Division and Learning Resources Centre, to Mr. H.P. Moffat, Director of Teacher Certification, September 29, 1970.

[11] "Proposed Conditions Governing Selection of Courses in Certification Programs of Community College Instructors," Red River Community College, September, 1970, p. 1.

[12] "Proposed Conditions," p. 2.

The Director of Teacher Certification wrote that he felt that the proposals contained in the statement were "quite reasonable."[13] This statement then became the basis of a formal proposal for a new certificate -- the Certificate in Adult Education.

In May, 1971, a Staff Meeting of the Community Colleges Division considered:

> A proposal for the issuance of a Certificate in Adult Education to Community College Instructors and others who have completed a specific phase of their in-service training, namely pedagogical training.[14]

The key points in this proposal were:

1. "That the Red River Community College issue Certificates in Adult Education." Previously all teaching certificates in the province were issued by the Teacher Certification Branch of the Department of Education.

2. "That the pre-requisites to enrol for this certificate be limited to the single criterion that the enrollees are engaged in, or will be engaged in, instructing in the adult education field." It was this question of pre-requisites which seems to have been one of the major influences in the initiation of the new certificate. The Special Certificates valid in provincially operated schools (i.e., community colleges) were also intended to serve as Interim Certificates valid in the public school system for teachers of Industrial Arts, Vocational Industrial and Business Education courses. However, to be eligible for

---

[13] Memorandum from Mr. H.P. Moffat, Director of Teacher Certification, to Mr. P. Penner, Supervisor, Teacher Education Division and Learning Resources Centre, October 8, 1970.

[14] "Staff Development Programmme for Community College Instructors and Others," Red River Community College, March 12, 1971. p. 1.

public school certification an instructor required "training in specialized areas, work experience, and [an appropriate] academic level." As a result, community college instructors who

> have their training in academic areas, those who are qualified in an occupational area but do not have the academic pre-requisites, and those who do not have the required verified work experience cannot be granted a certificate valid in the Public Schools. This has caused delays in granting interim certification, which in turn has resulted in delays in reclassification of college staff . . . which in turn has caused dissatisfaction of those staff so affected.[15]

The proposed new certificate, being specifically for those engaged in the teaching of adults, would sever this dependence upon public school certification.

3. "That ALL INSTRUCTORS in the Community Colleges who complete six (6) sixty-hour approved teacher education courses, four of which being from the core areas, be granted this Certificate in Adult Education." The core areas, and the courses available in each were:

Understanding People

Psychology of Learning
Introduction to Guidance
Psychology of Adult Learning
Cross Cultural Education

Methodology

Methods and Aids in Industrial Education
Scientific Bases for Teaching Business Subjects
Shop and Laboratory Organization and Management
Programmmed Instruction
Methods of Teaching Business Subjects
Audio-Visual Aids in Teaching
Teaching English as a Second Language

Course Planning

---

[15]"Staff Development Programme for Community College Instructors and Others," p. 1.

Curriculum and Instruction in Business Education
Course Construction and Analysis in Industrial Education

Evaluation

Testing and Evaluation[16]

4. "That a maximum time be set for all staff to acquire standing in the six courses necessary for the certificate." It was suggested that this period should be not more than six opportunities[17] after the hiring date, and that failure to meet this condition should result in withholding of salary increments.

This proposal does not include the "non-professional" electives which were suggested in its forerunner.[18] It does suggest, however, that the six-course program, with four courses selected from the core areas, permits other courses to be "offered as the need arises to meet the special requirements of certain of our instructional staff, e.g., Cross-cultural education; teaching language skills to adults, etc."[19] Clearly,

---

16 "Staff Development Programme for Community College Instructors and Others," Appendix II.

17 Not all courses were offered in each Summer School session, nor was it possible for every instructor to be released each summer from instructional duties in order to attend these courses. An "opportunity" therefore was defined as the simultaneous release of an instructor to take training and the concurrent offering of a course which would be acceptable for credit toward the C.A.E. (From the Revised version of "Staff Development Programme for Community College Instructors and Others," July 13, 1971, p. 3.)

18 The reason for the deletion of the "non-professional" or technical upgrading options is not clear. It has been suggested, however, that since college instructors are hired on the basis of their technical competence, there should be no technical upgrading in a teacher training program which takes place early in the instructors' teaching careers. It will be seen later that a number of college staff feel that there is a need for such upgrading in the initial training program.

19 "Staff Development Programme for Community College Instructors and Others," p. 2.

it was the intention that the program leading to the Certificate in Adult Education be wholly pedagogical in nature, with no specific allowance for upgrading in the subject matter or technical competence of the teaching speciality. This intended pedagogical emphasis was detailed in the proposal, which listed "seven major requirements of staff who are to function effectively as instructors." These requirements were:

1. The ability to effectively communicate orally and in writing with those that are to be taught.

2. Adequate mastery of the subject field in which they are to instruct.

3. A knowledge of the social, cultural and psychological traits and characteristics of the students and a sensitivity to the personal, emotional, physical and social needs in order to develop rapport with the students as individuals and as a group.

4. A knowledge of, and the ability to apply, learning theory so as to most effectively enable the students to meet the objectives of the learning situation. This implies a knowledge of instructional methods most applicable to the particular learning objectives whether it is in the classroom, shops, or laboratory; encompassing techniques of dealing with large classes or individual instruction, as well as, the ability to maximize the effectiveness of the use of educational technology in the form of ETV, A-V, P/I, CAI, etc.

5. A knowledge of, and a skill in curriculum development, lesson planning, scheduling, etc.

6. An ability to evaluate the performance of others in meeting the training objectives, and to diagnose students' learning problems and innovate remedial teaching techniques for the removal of such blocks to effective learning.

7. An understanding of and an appreciation for the objectives of the college system together with an ability to follow the practices and apply the principles involved with the organization and administration of the college system.[20]

---

[20] "Staff Development Programme for Community College Instructors and Others," p. 2.

The statement went on to suggest that the first two of these requirements "are insisted upon before an individual is hired to instruct", and that the last is "acquired by formal and informal orientation." Further, "the core of any teacher education programme encompasses the development of skills in the areas 3 to 6 inclusive."[21] The new certificate was to emphasize those aspects of preparation which specifically concern teaching, as opposed to subject matter or "content" preparation.

The proposed new certificate seems to have been greeted with indifference by college staff. Asked to ascertain staff reaction to the proposal, one principal wrote:

> I would conclude that not too many people seem concerned about the Certificate itself or what is required to get it. If it is necessary to have it as a means to more pay in the case of non-degree instructors, so you get it, regardless of the number of courses or hours or subject material . . . No doubt these courses do provide other than monetary benefits but few staff seem to be interested to any great degree in the mechanics of the Certificate.[22]

Some minor changes were made to the proposal before it was submitted to the Community Colleges Division for approval. These changes were the inclusion of three more courses to the core areas -- Individual Instruction and Continuous Progress Methods, and Micro-teaching, were added to the Methodology area, and Educational Statistics was added to the Evaluation area -- and the additional recommendation:

---

[21] "Staff Development Programme for Community College Instructors and Others," p. 2.

[22] Memorandum from S.P. Didcote, Principal, Industrial and Technology Division, Red River Community College, to Mr. A.R. Low, Director, Support Services, Instruction and Facilities, September 14, 1971.

That all Community College instructors who do not provide evidence of equivalent training be required to enrol for this Certificate. (Credits for previous training can be granted up to a maximum of three courses.)[23]

The proposal was "officially approved for implementation at the meeting of the Deputy Minister's senior staff on Tuesday, September 14th, 1971,"[24] and, on November 23, 1971, Management Committee of Cabinet formally approved amendments to Instructor Vocational Class Specifications which established the equivalence of the Certificate in Adult Education and the Special Certificate in Vocational Industrial, Technology, Applied Arts, Related Subjects, valid in provincially operated schools.[25] Thus, in November, 1971, the Certificate in Adult Education was established as an equivalent alternative to the Special Certificate. (In September, 1972, the Regulation defining the Special Certificate was repealed.)[26] Although the requirements for both certificates were basically the same, there were some differences. The important ones were these:

1. The pre-requisites for entry to the C.A.E. program were less restrictive than those for the Special Certificate program.

---

[23] "Staff Development Porgramme for Community College Instructors and Others," (Revised), July 13, 1971, p. 3.

[24] Memorandum from J.E. McCannel, Director General, Community Colleges, to Miss Shirley Bradshaw, Director, Personnel Administration, Management Committee of Cabinet, November 2, 1971.

[25] Memorandum from Miss Shirley Bradshaw, Director of Personnel Administration, Management Committee of Cabinet, to B.S. Bateman, Deputy Minister of Colleges and Universities Affairs, December 10, 1971.

[26] Sections 16 and 17 of Manitoba Regulation No. 55/67 dated May 19, 1967 were repealed by Manitoba Regulation No. 159/72 dated September, 20, 1972.

2. The number of courses was reduced, but the courses were of longer duration -- eight forty-hour courses for the Special Certificate replaced by six sixty-hour courses for the C.A.E.

3. There was no interim Certificate in Adult Education.

4. The period of satisfactory teaching was reduced from two years to one year.

The Teacher Education section at Red River Community College retained the responsibility for the organization and administration of the C.A.E. program. Normally, C.A.E. classes were held during the summer sessions, (and a few in the evening during winter sessions), at Red River Community College in Winnipeg. A limited number of classes have also been held at the two rural colleges, commencing in the summer of 1973 at Keewatin Community College and in 1974 at Assiniboine Community College.[27] Prior to these dates instructors from these colleges were required to travel to Winnipeg for their C.A.E. studies.

The C.A.E. ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In 1972 the Principal of the Applied Arts Division of Red River Community College[28] established a "C.A.E. Advisory Committee" to "deal

---

[27] "Review of the Certificate in Adult Education Program," Report prepared by the Planning and Evaluation Directorate, Community Colleges Division, Department of Continuing Education and Manpower, November, 1976. p. 21.

[28] Teacher Education is a section of the Applied Arts Division at R.R.C.C.

with all matters which had direct relevance to the Certificate in Adult Education."[29] This Committee included representatives from the three community colleges, the Faculties of Education at Brandon University and the University of Manitoba, and the Faculty Association, as well as the Director of the Instructional Planning and Evaluation Section of the Department of Colleges and Universities Affairs, and the Director of Teacher Certification and Records of the Department of Education. There seemed to be some confusion among the members concerning the role of the committee. The minutes of the first meeting record that

> there was some questioning as to powers and legal status of the Committee. Should not the Committee be set up and members appointed by the Minister? Should not the powers of the Committee be clearly outlined?[30]

The minutes of this first meeting also indicate that the character of the C.A.E. as it was established was the focus of some debate. During the discussion, the following points were made:[31]

1. "All instructors at Community Colleges need teacher training even though such training is not required for university professors." This view clearly supported the compulsory aspect of the C.A.E., but did not give any reason for its claim.

---

[29] Minutes of the C.A.E. Advisory Committee Meeting, January 15, 1973.

[30] Minutes of the C.A.E. Advisory Committee Meeting, January 15, 1973.

[31] These points were raised during the discussion, but no formal motions were made with respect to any of them. Consequently it can not be concluded that these points reflect the views of the whole Committee, or even of a majority of its members. See Minutes of the C.A.E. Advisory Committee Meeting, January 15, 1973.

2. "Teacher training should be a pre-employment qualification." No details as to how this desirable objective could be achieved were provided and, given the nature of the recruiting procedures for college staff, it seems unlikely that it could be easily achieved.

3. "Upgrading of technical efficiency must not be downgraded because of teacher training requirements," and "provision should be made for upgrading in areas of expertise." This view was contradictory to the philosophy of the C.A.E. as it was established.[32]

4. "If a person has a background of studies which in part overlaps the teacher education program, he should be required to meet the six-course requirement in other areas." This appeared to express the view that it was the number of courses which was important, not the collective body of knowledge and skills possessed by the new instructor. The official statement that "not more than three courses from other institutions may be transferred in" supported this view.[33]

---

[32] But not to that of the proposal from which the formal C.A.E. proposal was developed. See "Proposed Conditions," pp. 2, 3.

[33] "Notice to Community College Instructional Staff: Certificates in Adult Education," from J.E. McCannel, Director General, Community Colleges, December, 1971.

The C.A.E. Advisory Committee was shortlived, however, meeting on only three occasions.[34] Further, its impact on the C.A.E. seems to have been minimal, its major achievement being the recommendation to change from four core areas to three. The revised core areas, and the courses in each area, were:

Understanding People

Psychology of Learning
Introduction to Classroom Guidance
Psychology of Adult Learning
Cross Cultural Education
Sociology of Adult Education
Communication Skills
Confluent Education
Classroom Counselling Techniques in Adult Basic Education

Methodology

Methods in Industrial Education
Scientific Bases for Teaching Business Subjects
Shop and Laboratory Organization and Management
Programmed Instruction
Methods of Teaching Business Subjects
Teaching English as a Second Language
Audio-Visual Aids in Teaching
Multi-Media Approach to Business Education
Individualizing Instruction for Continuous Progress
A Systematic Approach to Better Instruction
Micro-teaching
Orientation to Teaching of Reading to Adults (BTSD)
Principles of Vocational Education
Introduction to Methods in Research
Industrial Safety
Teaching Strategies in Adult Basic Education

Course Planning and Evaluation

Curriculum and Instruction in Business Education
Course Construction (May be oriented to Industrial Education, Business Education, or Health Sciences)
Curriculum Development in Adult Upgrading
Preparing Instructional Packages
Educational Testing and Evaluation
Educational Statistics[35]

---

[34] January 15, May 30, and October 15, 1973.

This revision appears to have provided increased flexibility for the instructor in the selection of courses for his program, both in the elective area and in the core areas. However, soon after this change was implemented, the core areas were replaced by core courses, and the flexibility was reduced.

The Advisory Committee met for the last time on October 15, 1973. Despite one call for its re-establishment,[36] the Committee has been essentially non-existent for the last six years.

THE 1976 REVIEW AND THE C.A.E. TRI-COLLEGE COMMITTEE

Evaluation of the C.A.E.

In 1976 the Planning and Evaluation Directorate of the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower conducted a review of the Certificate in Adult Education program. The reasons for the review were these:

1. Both structural and curriculum changes came into effect in 1971. No review has been done of the program in the interim to determine the scope and impact of the above changes.

2. The compulsory nature of the program: all permanent instructors not holding equivalent certificates are required to obtain this certificate as a condition of employment.

---

[35] "Certificate in Adult Education Advisory Committee Proposal," May 30, 1973, pp. 2-3.

[36] The 1976 Review of the C.A.E. recommended that "the Advisory Committee should be reinstated [and] should meet on a regular basis." (1976 Review, p. 58.) However, the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee which was subsequently established "agreed to defer the implementation of [that] recommendation." (Minutes ot the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, January 19 and 20, 1977.) Details of the 1976 Review and the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee are contained in the next section of this chapter.

3. Previous evaluations of specific program areas in the colleges have raised specific questions with regards to the C.A.E. program.

4. Desire on the part of the College Heads that a review be done for their information.[37]

The Review involved interviews with Teacher Education staff and other college supervisory staff, as well as instructors teaching the C.A.E. courses. Instructor-students[38] in the C.A.E. classes completed questionnaires, and documentary materials such as Teacher Education records were examined. It should be noted that this 1976 Review, although comprehensive in nature, had one major methodological limitation. One of the main sources of information about several aspects of the program was the group of instructor-students enrolled in C.A.E. classes during the 1976 summer session. By using only one year a non-representative group was selected (thirty percent of the instructor-students were from Health Sciences, although Health Sciences staff comprised only 9 percent of the total colleges' population.)[39] Also, by using students in the C.A.E. program, those instructors who had graduated from the program were not given the opportunity to contribute (unless they happened to be among the supervisory staff consulted). As a result of this selection a potentially valuable source of information was overlooked. Despite this limitation the 1976 Review reached several conclusions which, while they may not have represented the views of the entire college staff, certainly were representative of the views of a significant portion of it.

---

[37] 1976 Review, p. 1.

[38] The term instructor-student is used to denote the new instructor who is at the same time a student in a C.A.E. class.

[39] 1976 Review, pp. 6, 11.

The 1976 Review identified several problems in the C.A.E. and made recommendations intended to alleviate these problems. One such problem concerned the determination of teacher certification that would be acceptable as equivalent to the Certificate in Adult Education. An associated problem was deciding, for those instructors who possessed some (but not equivalent) teacher training, the number of courses required to satisfy the C.A.E. requirements. The C.A.E. proposal stated "that all community college instructors who do not provide evidence of equivalent training be required to enrol for this certificate."[40] The Certificate in Adult Education became a contractual requirement for college instructors in 1974. The Education Component Sub-Agreement of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association states, in part, that "each Community College instructor shall be required to attain the Certificate in Adult Education or an equivalent qualification acceptable to the employing authority."[41] However, "equivalent qualification acceptable to the employing authority" is interpreted differently in different sections of the colleges. For example, instructors in the Teacher Education Section at Red River Community College are not required to obtain a C.A.E. if they already possess a Professional Certificate, while similarly qualified instructors in other parts of the college may be required to take at least two C.A.E. courses.[42]

---

[40] "Staff Development Programme for Community College Instructors and Others." (Revised), July 13, 1971. p. 3.

[41] "Master Agreement between Her Majesty in the Right of the Province of Manitoba and the Manitoba Government Employees' Association respecting Employees of the Civil Service and Education Component Sub-Agreement," Winnipeg, July 25, 1979, p. 75.

[42] Take, for example, the case of an instructor who was to teach mathematics to technology students. Despite his Professional Certificate

This lack of specific written guidelines to indicate just what was required of each college instructor was noted in the 1976 Review:

> There is no list of certification considered to be equivalent to the C.A.E. available to program participants;[43]

And:

> The criteria for exemption from taking the C.A.E. program, that is, what is considered to be equivalent, are not clearly laid out. Therefore, inconsistencies in decision making have occurred and the potential still exists for them to occur.[44]

And further:

> There is no formalized written procedure or guidelines for the assessment of documents presented to the Teacher Education Section for transfer credit.[45]

In an attempt to remedy this problem, the Review recommended that a C.A.E. Tri-College Committee be established, and that its responsibilities include:

> Preparing a list of all certificates which are acceptable as equivalents to the C.A.E. to be made available to all persons involved in the program; [and]

---

and several years of high school teaching experience, he would probably be required to take at least two C.A.E. courses. The rationale offered for this requirement is that the instructor's previous experience involved teaching children, whereas in the community college he would be teaching adults. Consequently, at least one of the required courses would deal with teaching/learning in an adult context. Though the same argument would seem to apply to instructors in the Teacher Education Section, such instructors have not been required to obtain the C.A.E. The reason for the apparently anomalous blanket exemption for instructors in the Teacher Education section is not clear.

[43] 1976 Review, p. 53.

[44] 1976 Review, p. 54.

[45] 1976 Review, p. 54.

> Reviewing the whole area of transfer credits and preparing detailed guidelines for use by an Appeal Board being instituted to ensure equal treatment of applicants for credit transfer.[46]

Establishment and Role of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee

In November, 1976, this Tri-College Committee was established, and has met regularly since.[47] With respect to the first of the two specific recommendations of the 1976 Review, the Tri-College Committee recommended that no certificates be accepted as equivalent to the C.A.E.[48] With respect to the second recommendation of the 1976 Review, the Tri-College Committee decided that credits[49] should be given for other certificates and degrees. For example, an instructor with a Bachelor of Education degree and a Professional Certificate "usually"[50] would be given three advance or transfer credits toward the C.A.E. Credits given other instructors, who also held a teaching certificate, ranged from one (for holders of a First Class Teaching Certificate), to four (for holders of Vocational Industrial or Business Teacher Education Cer-

---

[46] 1976 Review, p. 57.

[47] The C.A.E. Tri-College Committee membership comprises one representative from each college, and a consultant from the Planning and Evaluation Section who acts as chairman of the Committee. The chairman of the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College is a non-voting member. With the exception of the consultant from Planning and Evaluation, the membership of the Committee has remained unchanged since 1976.

[48] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, December 10, 1976.

[49] A credit, in this context, means an exemption from one of the six C.A.E. courses.

[50] The word "usually" was specifically stated in the list of credits drawn up by the committee.

tificates).[51] This list of "usual" credits was used by the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College in the initial determination of exemptions or advanced credit, and by the Tri-College Committee itself when it functioned as an Appeal Board.

The Tri-College Committee has been instrumental in alleviating, to some extent, the problems of certificate equivalence and transfer credits. However, in 1980, it would seem that some of the earlier difficulties remain. There are still no teaching certificates or degrees which are accepted as completely equivalent to the C.A.E. -- "instructors will usually be required to take a minimum of two C.A.E. courses regardless of what their academic backgrounds are."[52] There are still no "detailed guidelines" to assist in determining transfer credits -- "all assessments are done on an individual basis."[53] And, there is still different treatment of instructors in different parts of the colleges.[54]

The concept of "core areas" in the Certificate program was another problem indicated by the 1976 Review. They noted that:

1. There are three core areas outlined in the Bulletin:[55] Understanding People, Methodology, and Course Planning and Evaluation.

---

[51] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, December 10, 1976.

[52] C.A.E. Tri-College Committee, Certificate in Adult Education Handbook, Winnipeg, 1980, p. 7, emphasis added.

[53] 1980 C.A.E. Handbook, p. 7.

[54] As, for example, the blanket exemption of Teacher Education staff from the C.A.E. requirement.

[55] "Certificate in Adult Education Information Bulletin," (Revised) August, 1975.

2. The choice of which course to take from each of the core areas is determined more by what is offered than by an individual's need.

3. Because only a few courses have been offered frequently, a "core" has emerged. That core is: Course Construction, Educational Testing and Evaluation, Psychology of Learning, and Audio-Visual Aids.

4. Supervisors and summer school instructors in general support the concept of core courses.[56]

The Tri-College Committee "agreed that there should be core courses.[57] (instead of courses from core areas) and, from 1977, new instructors were required to take Introduction to Instruction, General Instructional Methods, and Subject Development and Evaluation, as well as three electives from a list of "Other Subjects."

The course Introduction to Instruction represented a departure from C.A.E. tradition, since it is a completely individualized course. Instructors who were employed by the colleges just before the start of the school year, or during the school year, had no opportunity to attend formal C.A.E. classes before they started teaching. (Some instructors taught for as much as a year without any teacher training at all.) In an attempt to ensure that all instructors had access to some teacher training early in their teaching careers, one of the core courses -- Introduction to Instruction -- was produced in an individualized form, and made available to all new instructors immediately upon employment by the college, with the recommendation that it be completed within one month. Essentially a "survival kit" for new instructors, this course is

---

[56] 1976 Review, p. 51.

[57] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, November 23, 1976.

> an introduction to basic instructional methods and college procedures . . . Topics to be covered will include writing objectives, lesson planning, lesson presentation, evaluation techniques, and orientation to the college.[58]

Introduction to Instruction is the only C.A.E. course which is available in an individualized form.

However, in April, 1978, the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee examined a proposal to offer an individualized approach to the second core course, General Instructional Methods. This proposal, from Assiniboine Community College, was presented

> in view of the economic and population demands of the rural colleges. It was pointed out that a small group/individualized format would permit the rural colleges to offer all of the Core Subjects on-site. The numbers problem is particularly acute at A.C.C. where instructors are at different points in their progress toward the C.A.E. with the result that after this summer there will not be a sufficient number of students to warrant offering a summer course in Brandon.[59]

The major concern of the Committee was that under this proposal instructors would lose classroom interaction, although it was pointed out that "peer and group critique is part of the proposed model."[60] The proposal was approved, and the small group format was utilized for one session.

In general, however, the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee seems to be reluctant to offer individualized forms of the C.A.E. subjects, this reluctance apparently stemming from the importance it places on interaction between instructor-students which occurs in a group learning situation.

---

[58] 1980 C.A.E. Handbook, p. 16.

[59] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, April 12, 1978.

[60] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, April 12, 1978.

Another problem identified by the 1976 Review had to do with course content. The Review noted that:

> There is no mechanism to ensure that course content and objectives are the same from one year to the next for a course with the same title.[61]
>
> In many cases, courses with different titles have at least partially similar content.[62]
>
> There is considerable criticism of some courses by instructor-students on the basis that the content is not directly applicable/relevant to the classroom.[63]

The Review recommended that the Tri-College Committee should review course content "to ensure continuity and standardization and to prevent overlap," and that it should develop "course descriptions for all courses offered."[64] These course descriptions have been developed, and summer school instructors are expected to adhere to these descriptions when teaching the courses. The question of relevance to the classroom remains a problem, though, in a program in which instructors from a wide variety of instructional areas are required to take the same course. It would seem to be difficult for the instructor to teach the C.A.E. courses in such a way that the diversity of backgrounds, needs, and interests could be accommodated.[65]

---

[61] 1976 Review, p. 52.

[62] 1976 Review, p. 52.

[63] 1976 Review, p. 52.

[64] 1976 Review, p. 57.

[65] In the questionnaire portion of this present study a number of instructors expressed dissatisfaction with the practice of having instructors from widely-differing areas in the same classes. Suggestions for solving the problem were not so forthcoming!

Staffing the summer school C.A.E. classes also remains a problem. The 1976 Review noted that:

> Given that instructors for summer school can only be offered a short-term contract, recruitment of staff causes problems. [Further], participation of summer school instructors on a continuing basis cannot be assured.[66]

The Review also noted that there was criticism of an apparent tendency to appoint instructors from the United States who lacked familiarity with the Manitoba Community College environment. It recommended that "a more active recruitment program for C.A.E. staff [be] set up with particular emphasis on trying to attract Canadians to the program," and that "potential instructors from within the college with the necessary expertise be identified for the teaching of C.A.E. courses."[67] It would seem that community college staff, because of their particular familiarity with the college environment, would be eminently suitable as C.A.E. instructors. However, the reason such staff are employed infrequently in this capacity is that the contract under which community college instructors are employed prohibits them from further contracting to teach summer school unless special Government approval is obtained. Obtaining that approval can be an arduous and time-consuming task and, as a result, it is sought only when it is considered absolutely necessary to do so.[68]

---

[66] 1976 Review, p. 53.

[67] 1976 Review, p. 59.

[68] As, for example, when a particular course must be offered and there is no suitable intructor available from outside the college system.

The relationship between the C.A.E. program and on-going professional development also was seen as a problem by the 1976 Review. It recommended that "program goals and philosophy should be revised and re-articulated to set the certification process within a total professional development scheme for instructional staff."[69] This recommendation appears to have been based on the observation that "a large percentage of C.A.E. holders do not continue to take courses on a regular basis."[70] This observation should not seem too surprising, considering some of the other conclusions of the Review:

> There is considerable criticism of some courses by instructor-students on the basis that the content is not directly applicable/relevant to the classroom;
>
> A recurring attitude was that the C.A.E. was not held in high regard;
>
> A fair amount of resentment was evident due to having to take a course in the summer; and
>
> There is a lack of an extrinsic reward system for professional development.[71]

In order to achieve this "re-articulation" the 1976 Review recommended that:

> College Heads should establish policy whereby instructors MUST take a course or participate in an activity decided to be equivalent at least every three years following certification. The taking of such courses would be necessary in order to keep the certificate valid and would provide for continuous pedagogical updating. This policy to be referred to Management Committee for inclusion in the 1977-78 Educational component contract negotiations.[72]

---

[69] 1976 Review, p. 59.

[70] 1976 Review, p. 55.

[71] 1976 Review, pp. 52, 53, 56.

This policy was included in the 1977-78 contract negotiations, and was rejected by the Manitoba Government Employees' Association. It was also included in each of the next two years, and was rejected each time. It would appear that, in the near future, compulsory "continuous pedagogical updating" is not likely to be achieved.

The C.A.E. Tri-College Committee adopted the policy of compulsory updating every three years,[73] and, recognizing the need for technical upgrading, suggested that the "every three years activity . . . may in some instances be a technically related one."[74] However, the Committee seems to hold the view that the C.A.E. and professional development are separate concepts. In one meeting the following view was expressed:

> I believe there is a distinct difference between the C.A.E. and the role of Professional Development. The C.A.E. primarily fulfills [these goals]: to prepare people for teaching and to update instructors in more innovative teaching practices. Professional Development relates to the updating of instructors in their area of specialty as it relates to technical skills (content) and instructional strategies. C.A.E. subjects can provide the updating in instructional strategies but on the other hand cannot provide for the updating in technical skills and content.[75]

The Committee seems to have been persuaded! It recognized "the need for a college mechanism that appropriately responds to the identified professional needs of college staff," and it agreed to encourage Principals and Chairpersons

---

[72] 1976 Review, p. 59.

[73] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, April 28, 1977.

[74] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, May 19, 1977.

[75] "C.A.E. and Professional Development," an "idea sheet" prepared by the Chairman of the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College, and discussed at the meeting of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee on May 23, 1978.

> to submit course initiation forms that reflect the instructional needs of their staff. In addition, the Committee will attempt to refer requests that are not within the parameters of the C.A.E. to the appropriate body for action.[76]

Thus the Committee retained the separation between the certification program and professional development.

The 1976 Review observed some resentment on the part of instructors "due to having to take a course in the summer."[77] 1976 was the first year in which college instructors had eight weeks vacation. However, for those instructors without a Certificate in Adult Education, part of that vacation had to be devoted to C.A.E. studies. (Prior to 1976, college instructors had just over four weeks annual vacation, and were released from duty time to attend C.A.E. classes in the early part of the summer.) Although the Review did not make any recommendations regarding this problem, the Tri-College Committee did make some attempt to alleviate it. The individualization of the introductory course meant that instructors could complete one of the six courses at their convenience, and not have to sacrifice a summer session for it. Further, in 1977, the Tri-College Committee recommended that, in order that the second core course, General Instructional Methods, could be taken by new instructors during their first year, there should be "a reduction of one hour in the teaching load of all new instructors."[78] This recommendation was not generally accepted. One college director wrote:

---

[76] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, May 23, 1978.

[77] 1976 Review, p. 53.

[78] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, May 19, 1977.

> Although I feel it would be most beneficial to provide a reduced instructional load for instructors in their first year of employment, it must be recognized that this will not always be possible.[79]

The Committee then agreed "that it was impractical at this time to offer General [Instructional] Methods to new instructors during the regular workday."[80] However, while the college director was probably concerned about replacing staff who would be taking time out of their instructional duties to attend C.A.E. classes, the Committee's reasons were different. The Committee said: "One problem is hiring a person to conduct these classes; another is the expense of moving this person from college to college so that the [course] is available to all."[81] It would seem that the problems identified by the Committee could have been overcome by employing a suitably-qualified person at each of the colleges to conduct these C.A.E. classes.[82] The other problem, that of finding replacement staff so as to permit the provision of a reduced instructional load is probably difficult, especially in the smaller colleges. It should not, however, be too difficult in the larger metropolitan college, particularly in those departments which have a larger pool of experienced staff on which to call. It would seem that, if it is considered sufficiently important that new instructors receive the teacher training very early in their teaching careers, then some arrangement

---

79 Memorandum from L.M. Britton, Director, Keewatin Community College to Ardith Pelton, Consultant, Instructional Planning and Evaluation, July, 1977.

80 Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, October 6, 1977.

81 Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, October 6, 1977.

82 Members of the full-time college staff could be employed on a part-time or overload basis if the contract restrictions could be eased.

could be made to achieve this. Unfortunately, the teacher training is not universally accepted throughout the colleges as being sufficiently important to justify such an arrangement. For example, one college chairman expressed the view that "a new instructor has enough to do planning his classes and may not be able to handle the [introductory course] right away".[83] This view seems to overlook the fundamental purpose of the introductory course, which is "to provide new instructors with skills which will allow them to function in a community college."[84] To the present time, then, little has changed with respect to the issue of when the instructor should do his C.A.E. studies -- since 1976 he has been required to devote his own time to the teacher training program.

The C.A.E. Program Today

Further changes to the overall C.A.E. program have resulted from the 1976 Review and the subsequent work of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee. The most significant of these is the delineation and specification of areas of responsibility for parts of the program. The C.A.E. Handbook now specifies clearly the roles of the supervisors (department heads or chairpersons) of the instructor-students, the chairperson of the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College, the

---

[83] Memorandum from D.S. Williamson, Chairman, Applied Arts Section, Red River Community College, to A. Pelton, Consultant, Instructional Planning and Evaluation, May 10, 1977. It should be noted that the view quoted here was not expressed by Mr. Williamson, but by another chairman in a different part of the college. Mr. Williamson, as the R.R.C.C. representative on the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee, was simply formally conveying to the Committee, through its chairperson, a view that had been expressed to him. It would be reasonable to assume that Mr. Williamson's views on the importance of the introductory course are quite different.

[84] 1980 C.A.E. Handbook, p. 16.

Teacher Education representative at the two rural colleges, and the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee.[85]

There has been another change in the Certificate in Adult Education, a change not directly attributable to the 1976 Review. When the C.A.E. was initiated, instructors were required to take one course from each of four core areas, and two additional courses. In the Methodology area, nine separate courses were listed, including Methods and Aids in Industrial Education, Scientific Bases for Teaching Business Subjects, Methods of Teaching Business Subjects, and Teaching English as a Second Language.[86] Clearly the intention was to try to permit the new instructor to select a Methodology course related to his area of specialization. However, although these courses were "available" or "recognized" they were not all offered at every session and the range of courses actually offered has diminished considerably. Instructors now must take Introduction to Instruction, General Instructional Methods, and Subject Development and Evaluation, and three elective courses usually selected from the following list:

Psychology of Learning
Counselling Skills for Adult Educators
Psychology of Adult Learning
Interpersonal Communications for Instructors
Organizing and Managing Industrial Education Facilities
Audio Visual Aids in Teaching
Individualizing Instruction for Continuous Progress
Foundations of Vocational Education
Occupational Health and Safety
Preparing Instructional Packages
Advanced Methods of Instruction.[87]

---

[85] 1980 C.A.E. Handbook, pp. 29-35.

[86] "Staff Development Program," (Revised), Appendix II.

[87] 1980 C.A.E. Handbook, p. 9.

It will be noticed that the above list contains no Methodology courses specific to particular areas of the college (e.g., Methods of Teaching Business Subjects). Thus it would appear that the C.A.E. program is now structured in such a way that it is difficult for an instructor to design a program which emphasizes his specific needs in his specific teaching area.[88]

In summary, it would appear that the C.A.E. program has moved toward a "one-program-for-all" pattern, by offering a core of "general" teacher education courses within which there is flexibility only to the extent of modifying assignments and exercises to suit the intructor-students' particular teaching areas. The reluctance to offer specialized methods courses was noted in 1979 when the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee was considering a proposal to initiate a new subject "Science Teaching in the Community Colleges." Suggesting that "the proposed subject might, more appropriately, be offered as part of an in-service program," the Committee pointed out that it has, "in the past, been reticent to offer methods subjects specific to a particular subject area."[89] Thus, when first established the C.A.E. provided the opportunity for an instructor to select courses within the Methodology area which suited his teaching specialization. That opportunity no longer exists.

---

[88] An intructor can elect, with prior approval, to substitute courses taken at other institutions for some of his non-core courses. In that way he could, for example, take a methods course relating to his specific teaching area at one of the universities, if such courses were available. Unfortunately, the universities' offerings of methods courses related to the teaching specialities in the community colleges are very limited. Thus, the point remains: the C.A.E. program now does not offer special methods courses to suit the different instructional areas in the colleges.

[89] Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, January 23, 1979.

THE C.A.E. AND THE RESOLUTION OF PROGRAM DESIGN ISSUES

This study focussed on ten key issues in the design of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors. The development and evolution of the C.A.E. in Manitoba clearly reveals that these issues were involved, some more prominently than others. As the conclusion of this chapter, the following question is now answered: How were these issues of program design resolved with respect to the Certificate in Adult Education in Manitoba's community college system?

Issue 1. Should community college instructors be required to participate in a program of professional preparation?

Instructors in the institutions which were to become community colleges were required to possess, or obtain, a teaching certificate. This requirement was continued when these institutions became community colleges. However, the introduction of the Certificate in Adult Education has been accompanied by a stricter interpretation of this requirement. Whereas previously instructors were required to participate in a program of professional preparation, now they are required to participate in a particular program, namely the C.A.E. program. The question of complete or partial exemption from the program remains somewhat troublesome, though, and inconsistencies still are evident.

Issue 2. Should the program of professional preparation be pre-service or in-service and, if in-service, should it concentrate on special preparation at the commencement of teaching, or should it be on-going, i.e., continuing professional development?

The C.A.E. program was developed as an in-service program of initial preparation for teaching. Since the majority of staff are recruited from business or industry, a pre-service program is impractical. Further, even though college administrators and the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee are in favour of some form of on-going pedagogical training or renewal, moves to achieve this as a contractual requirement have failed. A further barrier to the integration of the certification program into a scheme of overall professional development is the refusal by the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee to permit any academic or technical upgrading as components of a program of professional preparation and development.

Issue 3. Should the emphasis in the program be on subject-matter preparation or on pedagogy?

Initially it was proposed that up-grading or subject matter courses could be included in a limited way (one or two of a total of six courses). This, however, was not included in the C.A.E. program when it was formally established, and now the C.A.E. program has no provision for such courses.

Issue 4. What should comprise the main content of the program?

The content of the program has changed. It reflects a shift in emphasis from specialized methodology courses to general instructional methods, and a narrowed range of course offerings in both "core" and "elective" areas. Because of the large number of courses available when the C.A.E. was established, and the lack of control over what was actu-

ally taught from one year to the next, it is difficult to discuss the content of "the program" at that time. Now, with half of the program prescribed, the content is more easily discerned. Briefly, the content of the present core includes the following areas of emphasis:

Psychology of adult learning

Behavioural objectives

Unit and lesson planning

Basic instructional methods

Evaluation techniques

Issue 5. Should community college instructors in different instructional areas have the same professional preparation program?

Although the basic format is the same for all instructors (i.e., six courses) there was, initially, provision for instructors to select special methods courses which were related to their teaching area. This is no longer the case -- the C.A.E. has moved toward a "one-program-for-all" type of program, a move which is seen by some college staff as undesirable, as will be seen in Chapter 4.

Issue 6. How should the program be organized with respect to the delivery of instruction?

Instruction is carried out in a traditional large group format in most of the C.A.E. courses. The major exception is the introductory course which is, of necessity, individualized. There is a general reluctance, on the part of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee, to offer individualized forms of other courses.

Issue 7. What type of credential should be associated with the program?

When the C.A.E. was introduced, it was as a replacement for another certificate. However, no systematic consideration seems to have been given at that time to the type of credential which would be the most appropriate accompaniment of the program. Instead, the name was changed so as to better reflect the apparently new emphasis, i.e., that of adult education.

Issue 8. Who should be responsible for the organization and administration of the program?

The teacher education program for instructors in the colleges was the responsibility of the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College before the C.A.E. was introduced. This continued with the new certificate.

Issue 9. What mechanism should exist to monitor, evaluate, and modify the program?

For one year an Advisory Committee performed this role. When that committee lapsed, the task was assumed by the Chairman of the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College and his Principal. Following the 1976 Review of the C.A.E. program by the Planning and Evaluation section of the Community Colleges Division, a C.A.E. Tri-College Committee was established, and has taken responsibility for this role since then. In terms of changes to the program, the Tri-College Committee clearly has been more effective than the Advisory Committee

was. However, the Tri-College Committee cannot easily facilitate input from external agencies, a feature which was available with the Advisory Committee. It would seem that the concept of one representative from each college has left the large college, Red River, in a position where it is under-represented.

Issue 10. Who should pay for the program?

College instructors make no financial contribution to the C.A.E. program, since tuition fees are waived and books are supplied free of charge. However, they do contribute their time, since the program is available only in the evenings, or during the summer sessions.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has traced the development of the Certificate in Adult Education from its inception in 1971. It concluded with a statement, in summary form, of how the ten issues of program design were resolved. The next chapter presents the views of current college staff about how these issues should be resolved.

Chapter V

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STAFF: PROGRAM DESIGN PREFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the results of the questionnaire survey of community college staff in Manitoba are presented. From the information provided by respondents to the questions in Section 1 of the questionnaire, a profile of respondents was constructed. This profile is presented in Table 1.

The preamble in Section 2 of the questionnaire stated:

> In the development of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors, several issues must be resolved. Some of these issues are presented in this section of the questionnaire. For each question, please give the answer which you feel would be best for the community college system in Manitoba today.

Respondents were, therefore, not being asked to react to a particular program, but to answer the questions as though they were designing a program. Thus, the answers to these questions do not necessarily reflect comment on the Certificate in Adult Education program, although the perceptions of the C.A.E. clearly will be one factor influencing the program design choices.

Section 3 of the questionnaire sought specific comments about each respondent's particular instructional preparation program. Of special interest was the Certificate in Adult Education program, and a section of this chapter summarizes the respondents' perceptions of that program.

TABLE 1

Profile of Respondents

Attributes and Sub-groups	Number	Percentage
Age.		
20-29	34	9.3
30-39	135	36.8
40-49	106	28.9
50-59	66	18.0
Over 59	22	6.0
Not stated	4	1.1
Sex.		
Female	105	28.6
Male	259	70.6
Not stated	3	0.8
Amount of Community College Experience.		
Less than one year	29	7.9
1-4 years	58	15.8
5-9 years	110	30.0
10-14 years	134	36.5
15 years or more	31	8.4
Not stated	5	1.4
Previous Teaching Experience.		
Yes	216	58.9
No	136	37.1
On-the-job teaching	13	3.5
Not stated	2	0.5
Instructional area.		
Adult Basic Education	53	14.4
Applied Arts and Business	108	29.4
Industrial and Technology	120	32.7
Health Sciences	49	13.4
Not Stated or Not Applicable	37	10.1
Teacher Certification.		
No Certificate	62	16.9
C.A.E. only	138	37.6
C.A.E. plus another certificate	47	12.8

Special Certificate only	26	7.1
Special Certificate plus another	12	3.3
Professional Certificate only	58	15.8
Vocational Certificate, or other	24	6.5

Qualifications.

A. Job Related Credentials

Journeyman	42	11.4
Other job-related (e.g., R.N.)	68	18.5
Bachelor's degree	180	49.0
Master's/Doctoral degree	31	8.4
Not stated	46	12.5

B. Qualifications in Education.

Diploma	3	0.8
Bachelor's degree	53	14.4
Master's degree	17	4.6
Doctoral degree	2	0.5
Not stated, or none	292	79.6

Position in the College.

Administrator	29	7.9
Instructor	336	91.6
Not stated	2	0.5

College.

Assiniboine Community College	72	19.6
Keewatin Community College	48	13.1
Red River Community College	246	67.0
Not stated	1	0.3

Job Satisfaction.

A. Preference for Teaching in Other Institution.

Yes	57	15.5
No	293	79.8
Not stated	17	4.6

B. Preference for Non-Teaching Job.

Yes	60	16.3
No	278	75.7
Not stated	29	7.9

PROGRAM DESIGN PREFERENCES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STAFF

This section reports, for each issue in turn, the distribution of responses given to the relevant questionnaire items, and any significant differences among respondents with respect to program design preferences.

Issue 1: Compulsory Participation?

Should all community college instructors be required to participate in a program of professional preparation?

Question 18 on the questionnaire asked that question and, if No, who should be exempted? The results were as follows:

Yes	262 (71.4)
No	102 (27.8)
Not stated	3 (0.8)
	367

The results for the second part of the question, concerning who should be exempted, were:

All instructors	5
Instructors with a specified minimum period of previous formal teaching experience	41
Instructors with a specified minimum period of successful experience in their trade or profession	26
Instructors with a teaching certificate	54

Note: These numbers do not total 102 because several respondents checked more than one category.

Clearly the majority of respondents thought that instructors should participate in some form of professional preparation program. This becomes even more evident when it is noted that only five respondents advocated a blanket exemption for all instructors.

Several of the respondent attributes were statistically related to this issue question. These were Age, Qualifications (Job-related credentials), Position in the College, and Job Satisfaction (Preference for teaching in another institution), as shown in Table 2. Older college personnel were more likely to favour compulsory participation in a program than were younger staff members. Administrators were strongly in favour of participation in professional preparation programs, while Instructors, although favouring such participation, were not as strong in this preference. Respondents who indicated that they were satisfied with their present teaching positions generally favoured compulsory participation, while those who would prefer to be teaching elsewhere were evenly divided concerning this first issue question. Finally, holders of a degree were less strongly in favour of compulsory participation than were those respondents without a degree. It should be noted that for all four of the attributes on which significant differences occurred, the differences were of magnitude, not direction. Thus, when the total group of respondents was partitioned into appropriate subgroups for each attribute, the majority in each subgroup favoured compulsory participation. The nearest to an exception was the Master's/Doctoral degree sub-group for the variable Qualifications -- 46.7 percent of this subgroup said No.

TABLE 2

Compulsory Participation in a Professional Preparation Program

Attributes and Sub-Groups	Compulsory Participation:Yes	Compulsory Participation:No	Total
Age (p=0.0305)			
20-29	23 (67.6)	11 (32.4)	34
30-39	90 (67.2)	44 (32.8)	134
40-49	77 (73.3)	28 (26.7)	105
50-59	48 (73.8)	17 (26.2)	65
59+	22 (100.0)	-	22
Position in College (p=0.0158)			
Administrator	27 (93.1)	2 (6.9)	29
Instructor	234 (70.3)	99 (29.7)	333
Job Satisfaction (p=0.0040)			
Satisfied	219 (75.3)	72 (24.7)	291
Dissatisfied	31 (55.4)	25 (44.6)	56
Job Related Credential (p=0.0093)			
Not stated	35 (81.4)	8 (18.6)	43
Journeyman	33 (78.6)	9 (21.4)	42
Other job-related	55 (82.1)	12 (17.9)	67
Bachelor's degree	120 (67.0)	59 (33.0)	179
Master's/Doctoral degree	16 (53.3)	14 (46.7)	30

Issue 2: Pre-Service or In-Service?

Should the program of professional preparation be pre-service or in-service?

Question 19 on the questionnaire asked, "When should the program of professional preparation take place?" The results for this question were as follows:

Entirely before employment as a community college instructor	14 (4.2)
After being employed as a community college instructor, but before doing teaching	21 (6.3)
Both before and during employment as a community college instructor	298 (89.5)
	333

The only attribute which proved to be related to this question was the respondent's Previous Teaching Experience. Respondents with no previous teaching experience were not in favour of a completely pre-service program. However, they did express, more than the other groups, a favourable disposition toward a post-employment but pre-service program, as can be seen from Table 3.

TABLE 3

Pre-Service or In-Service Program

Attribute and Sub-Groups	Pre-Service	In-Service before teaching	Before and during employment	Total
Previous Teaching Exp. (p=0.0423)				
Previous teaching	9 (4.5)	8 (4.0)	181 (91.4)	198
No teaching	3 (2.5)	12 (9.9)	106 (87.6)	121
On-the-job teaching	2 (16.7)	1 (8.3)	9 (75.0)	12

Another question on the questionnaire concerned this second issue. Question 20 asked:

If any part of the program is to be in-service in nature, i.e., undertaken while the individual is employed as a community college instructor, how should it be scheduled to fit in with teaching duties?

The results were as follows:

Concurrent with teaching duties, e.g., participation in a day or evening program of professional preparation during the regular teaching sessions.	128 (36.3)
In between teaching terms or semesters, e.g., participation in a program of professional preparation during the summer session.	130 (36.8)
Some combination of the above	70 (19.8)
Other	25 (7.1)
	353

Given that the 1976 Review discerned some "resentment" to taking C.A.E. courses at "Summer School" it is perhaps somewhat surprising that such a large proportion (almost 37 percent) of the respondents favoured holding classes for the professional preparation program during the summer.

Responses to this question were related to the attribute Sex, as shown in Table 4. Females favoured scheduling the program concurrently with teaching duties, while Males preferred the program to be conducted between teaching sessions.

TABLE 4

Timing of the In-Service Component of the Program

Attribute and Sub-Groups	Concurrent with teaching	Between teaching sessions	Combination	Other	Total
Sex (p=0.0266)					
Female	42 (40.8)	26 (25.2)	25 (24.3)	10 (9.7)	103
Male	85 (34.4)	103 (41.7)	45 (18.2)	14 (5.7)	247

In summary then it would seem that college staff appeared to favour a preparation program having both pre-service and in-service components. A completely pre-service preparation program was not considered feasible, probably due to the fact that a majority of college staff are recruited from business or industry (not from school and university as is the case with most public school teachers). A small number (6.3 percent) of respondents saw merit in the alternative which would permit an instructor to be hired, and then receive his professional preparation before doing any teaching. Thus it would seem that the preferred pattern is probably pre-service content preparation followed by in-service pedagogical training, with at least some of the pedagogical training taking place before any teaching is commenced. Further, a substantial portion (36.3 percent) preferred that the in-service component be conducted concurrently with teaching duties.

Issue 3: Subject Matter or Teaching Technique?

Should the emphasis in the program be on the up-grading of competence in the subject area specialty or should it be on the development of pedagogical skills?

Question 23 asked what percentage of the total time in the preparation program should be devoted to each of the following major emphases -- Subject matter expertise or technical upgrading; Teaching techniques and skills; Other. The average results were:

Subject matter	40 percent
Teaching techniques and skills	56 percent
Other	4 percent

Only one attribute was related to this question of program emphasis -- Position in the College. Administrators thought that Subject Matter should occupy 26 percent of the program, while Instructors thought that it should occupy 41 percent. This difference was statistically significant at the 0.05 level ($p=0.0012$). However, for Teaching Techniques and Skills, the difference (Administrators 63 percent, Instructors 55 percent) was not significant ($p=0.0884$). In general it would seem that Administrators favoured a greater emphasis on teaching techniques and skills, with much less emphasis on subject matter preparation, while Instructors' preferences were in the same direction, but not as extreme.

Issue 4: Main Content?

What should comprise the main content of the program?

Question 27 asked the respondents to indicate on a four point scale from "1. Very Important: Must be Included" to "4. Undesirable: Should be Excluded", the importance of each of twenty-six topics for a program of professional preparation for community college instructors. These topics are listed below in descending order of perceived importance. The rank order was determined by the mean of the assigned values for each topic.

Evaluation of Student Performance
Test Construction
Course Planning
Motivation of Students
Communication Skills
Curriculum Development
Audio-Visual Materials
Adult Psychology
Innovative Teaching Techniques
Classroom Management
Methods of Reporting Student Performance
Learning Theory
Individualization of Instruction
Counselling Techniques
Characteristics of Community College Students
Remedial Education
Psychology
Goals of the Community College
Role of the Community College in Post-Secondary Education
Philosophy of the Community College
General Mathematics
General Science
Laws Relating to Community Colleges
Computer Applications
History of the Community College
Financial Aspects of Community Colleges

The last five items in this list were rated, on the average, on the "unimportant" side of the scale -- all of the rest were rated on the "important" side, although General Mathematics was only marginally so.

There were differences of opinion among respondents regarding the perceived importance of most of these topics. The only exception was Financial Aspects of Community Colleges -- the general lack of favour for this topic was not modified by any of the variables.

In the remainder of this section, statistically significant relationships between the perceived importance of each topic and the independent variables are presented in tabular form. The tables indicate the means of the perceived importance values assigned to the topics by the respondents in each subgroup of that attribute. In all of these tables, a low numerical value denotes a high importance rating.

From Table 5 it can be seen that for almost all of the topics for which there was a significant sex difference, Females placed more importance on the topic than did Males. The two exceptions were General Mathematics and General Science.

From Table 6 it is readily apparent that respondents with previous teaching experience rated all of these topics (except one) as more important in a program than did their colleagues without any teaching experience, or those with on-the-job experience only. The exception was Course Planning.

TABLE 5

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by Sex

Topic	Female	Male	prob.
Test Construction	1.19	1.36	0.0092
Course Planning	1.23	1.37	0.0365
Motivation of Students	1.23	1.40	0.0162
Communication Skills	1.21	1.44	0.0016
Curriculum Development	1.31	1.52	0.0062
Adult Psychology	1.43	1.69	0.0013
Innovative Teaching Techniques	1.28	1.78	0.0000
Classroom Management	1.50	1.73	0.0060
Methods of Reporting Student Performance	1.52	1.81	0.0008
Learning Theory	1.60	1.85	0.0053
Individualization of Instruction	1.51	1.98	0.0000
Counselling Techniques	1.62	2.05	0.0000
Characteristics of Community College Students	1.75	2.12	0.0001
Remedial Education	1.79	2.20	0.0001
Psychology	1.85	2.18	0.0010
Goals of the Community College	2.08	2.31	0.0217
Philosophy of the Community College	2.11	2.44	0.0009
General Mathematics	2.68	2.35	0.0027
General Science	2.72	2.41	0.0047
Computer Applications	2.47	2.69	0.0223

TABLE 6

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by Teaching Experience

Topic	Formal Teaching	No Teaching	On-the-job Teaching	prob.
Course Planning	1.33	1.29	1.75	0.0285
Adult Psychology	1.46	1.83	1.83	0.0000
Innovative Teaching Techniques	1.53	1.78	2.00	0.0037
Learning Theory	1.68	1.88	2.17	0.0114
Individualization of Instruction	1.77	1.91	2.42	0.0083
Counselling Techniques	1.84	2.06	2.08	0.0382
Characteristics of C.C. Students	1.91	2.10	2.67	0.0020
Remedial Education	2.00	2.19	2.55	0.0293
Psychology	2.00	2.20	2.50	0.0285
Goals of the C.C.	2.15	2.36	2.58	0.0288
Role of the C.C. in Post-Sec. Education	2.23	2.45	2.75	0.0152
Philosophy of the Community College	2.23	2.53	2.42	0.0064
Computer Applications	2.54	2.70	3.18	0.0140
History of the C.C.	2.82	2.91	3.42	0.0264

Table 7 presents the mean importance values for each of the thirteen topics on which significant differences were observed with respect to Job Related Credentials. While no overall pattern is apparent, there does seem to be a set of differences, based on the nature of the qualifications, for several topics. Respondents whose qualifications were "academic," e.g., university degrees, tended to place less importance on topics which could be considered to be directly involved with day-to-day classroom operations than did their colleagues whose qualifications were more specifically job-oriented. These topics included Test Construction, Course Planning, Reporting Student Performance, and General Mathematics and Science. There was also a group of topics in which the opposite trend was evident. This group included Adult Psychology, Characteristics of Community College Students, and Philosophy of the Community College, topics which were somewhat more remote from the immediate classroom situation.

While there were several topics which were influenced by Instructional Area, there seems to be no pattern emerging from Table 8. It can be observed, however, that most of these topics received their lowest importance value (the highest numbers in the table) from staff in the Industrial and Technology area.

The topic Adult Psychology was given more importance by those with higher qualifications in education, but this trend was reversed for the topics Remedial Education and Goals of the Community College, as can be seen in Table 9.

TABLE 7

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by Job Related Credentials

Topic	Not stated	J'man	Job related	Bach. Degree	Mast./ Ph.D.	prob.
Eval. of Student Performance	1.24	1.28	1.34	1.25	1.70	0.0052
Test Construction	1.29	1.18	1.24	1.33	1.65	0.0069
Course Planning	1.24	1.24	1.28	1.32	1.74	0.0022
Adult Psychology	1.49	1.90	1.70	1.53	1.67	0.0150
Innovative Teach. Techniques	1.51	2.03	1.58	1.56	1.85	0.0030
Reporting Student Performance	1.69	1.63	1.64	1.72	2.19	0.0144
Individualization of Instruction	1.64	2.10	1.78	1.81	2.15	0.0147
Counselling Techniques	1.60	2.05	1.96	1.91	2.30	0.0097
Characteristics of C.C. Students	2.10	2.22	2.09	1.87	2.19	0.0458
Philosophy of the Community College	2.33	2.68	2.27	2.26	2.59	0.0318
General Math.	2.14	2.05	2.51	2.53	2.93	0.0004
General Science	2.29	2.28	2.55	2.53	2.92	0.0344
Computer Applications	2.56	2.98	2.70	2.52	2.67	0.0227

TABLE 8

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by Instructional Area

Topic	A.B.E.	A.A.&B.	I.&T.	H.S.	prob.
Adult Psychology	1.42	1.63	1.84	1.40	0.0001
Characteristics of C.C. Students	1.94	1.95	2.17	1.72	0.0162
Counselling Techniques	1.45	2.05	2.18	1.53	0.0000
General Mathematics	2.04	2.65	2.21	2.81	0.0000
General Science	2.02	2.82	2.26	2.74	0.0000
Individualization of Instruction	1.53	1.88	2.09	1.55	0.0000
Innovative Teaching Techniques	1.37	1.60	1.88	1.40	0.0000
Methods of Reporting Student Performance	1.70	1.83	1.78	1.33	0.0005
Philosophy of the Community College	2.11	2.41	2.57	1.96	0.0001
Psychology	1.87	2.13	2.25	1.71	0.0005
Remedial Education	1.60	2.15	2.24	2.04	0.0002

In this table the following abbreviations are used:

A.B.E.	Adult Basic Education
A.A.&B.	Applied Arts and Business
I.&T.	Industrial and Technology
H.S.	Health Sciences

These same abbreviations are used in all tables in which the attribute Instructional Area is displayed.

TABLE 9

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by Qualifications in Education

Topic	None	Dip.Ed.	B.Ed.	M.Ed.	Ph.D.	prob.
Adult Psychology	1.67	1.00	1.46	1.24	1.00	0.0084
Remedial Education	2.14	1.33	1.80	1.93	3.50	0.0074
Goals of the Comm. College	2.31	1.33	2.08	1.94	2.00	0.0449

Note: In Table 9, and in all other Tables in which the attribute Qualifications in Education is displayed:

B.Ed. includes Bachelor of Teaching and Bachelor of Paedagogy as well as Bachelor of Education;

M.Ed. includes Master of Arts in Teaching as well as Master of Education; and

Ph.D. includes Doctor of Education as well as Doctor of Philosophy.

Table 10 shows that three topics were considered more important by respondents from Assiniboine College than from either of the other two colleges.

In both cases where Job Satisfaction had an influence on the perceived importance of topics, college staff who indicated satisfaction with their present positions placed more importance on the topic than did their dissatisfied colleagues. This is shown in Table 11.

TABLE 10

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by College

Topic	A.C.C.	K.C.C.	R.R.C.C.	prob.
Individualization of Instruction	1.65	1.71	1.93	0.0113
Goals of the Community College	2.04	2.46	2.26	0.0270
History of the Community College	2.69	3.04	2.90	0.0346

TABLE 11

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by Job Satisfaction

Topic	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	prob.
Course Planning	1.29	1.51	0.0110
Counselling Techniques	1.88	2.15	0.0212

Administrators saw more importance in Audio-Visual Materials than did Instructors, while the pattern was reversed for General Mathematics, as can be seen in Table 12.

Although the relationship is not linear, Table 13 appears to indicate a trend whereby younger instructors placed more importance in the topic "Innovative Teaching Techniques" than did their older colleagues. Table 14 shows a similar trend -- respondents with increasing amounts of community college experience placed less importance on "Innovative Teaching Techniques."

TABLE 12

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by Position

Topic	Administrator	Instructor	prob.
Audio-Visual Materials	1.21	1.50	0.0206
General Mathematics	2.79	2.42	0.0457

TABLE 13

Mean Importance Value of Topic, by Age

Topic	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	Over 50	prob.
Innovative Teaching Techniques	1.44	1.64	1.60	1.63	2.10	0.0338

TABLE 14

Mean Importance Value of Topic, by Amount of College Experience

Topic	<1 yr	1-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15 yrs or more	prob.
Innovative teaching techniques	1.55	1.41	1.63	1.66	2.14	0.0010

The variable Teacher Certification was related to the perceived importance of two topics, General Mathematics and General Science. As can be seen from Table 15, respondents whose only teaching certificate was the Certificate in Adult Education considered both of these topics less important than did holders of other certificates.

TABLE 15

Mean Importance Values of Topics, by Teacher Certification

Certificate	General Math.	General Science
No Certificate	2.49	2.51
Special + Other, No C.A.E.	2.42	2.42
Professional, No C.A.E., No Special	2.58	2.57
Vocational or Other, No C.A.E., No Special	2.37	2.53
C.A.E. + some other	2.02	2.07
Special only	2.16	2.43
C.A.E. only	2.59	2.64
prob.	0.0116	0.0340

In summary then, it would appear that Sex, Previous Teaching Experience, Qualifications, and Instructional Area, are the attributes which should be especially considered when determining program content, because it was on these attributes, more than upon any others, where significant differences occurred.

Respondents were also asked to list any other topics which they felt should be included in a program of professional preparation for community college instructors. The responses are summarized below, with the frequency of occurrence of each topic stated.

Technical/subject-matter upgrading 13

Personal growth and development	8
Affective training	2
Humanistic learning theory	1
Human relations training	1
Student-instructor interrelations	1
Public relations	1
Professionalism	7
Politics of the community college system	4
Labour relations	4
Administration and use of college facilities	1
Instructional techniques	5
Methods courses in specific areas of instruction	2
Native studies	4
Cross-cultural studies	1
Catering for special needs students	3
Assessing student needs and skills	1
Educational administration	1
Educational statistics	1
Educational theory and practice	1
Sociology	1
Sociology of educational change	1
Shop and laboratory organization	1
Industrial safety	1
Evaluation of college subjects	1
Public speaking	1
Library skills	1
Typing	1
First aid	1
The community college and the community	2
Group processes	2
The changing world of work	1

From this list it can be seen that, in the view of some of the respondents, academic or technical subject matter courses should be included in the preparation program.

Issue 5: A Common Program for All Instructors?

Should community college instructors in different instructional areas have the same type of professional preparation program?

Question 21 asked that question, and the respondents were almost evenly divided: 174 (48.7 percent) answered Yes and 183 (51.3 percent) answered No. However, the results were related to two attributes -- College, and Job Satisfaction (Preference for teaching in another institution). As can be seen from Table 16, respondents at Assiniboine Community College were in favour of instructors in different areas having the same type of program, while those at Red River Community College thought that instructors in different areas needed different programs. Respondents from Keewatin Community College were evenly divided on this question. Also, those who were dissatisfied with their present teaching positions were strongly in favour of different programs, while those who were satisfied were evenly divided on this issue.

TABLE 16

Common Program for All Instructors?

Attributes and Sub-Groups	Same	Different	Total
College (p=0.0297)			
Assiniboine Community College	44 (62.0)	27 (38.0)	71
Keewatin Community College	24 (52.2)	22 (47.8)	46
Red River Community College	106 (44.4)	133 (55.6)	239
Job satisfaction (p=0.0172)			
Satisfied	149 (52.1)	137 (47.9)	286
Dissatisfied	18 (33.3)	36 (66.7)	54

Issue 6: Instructional Procedures?

How should the program be organized with respect to the delivery of instruction?

Question 25 provided a list of instructional procedures, and asked respondents to indicate the importance of each of these in a program of preparation for teaching in a community college. A four point scale was used, ranging from "1. Very important: Must be included" to "4. Undesirable: Should be excluded." These procedures are listed below in descending order of perceived importance.

Lectures and seminars
Independent study
Individualized instruction using standardized materials
Micro-teaching
Visits to other community colleges
Supervised classroom teaching
Observation of other community college instructors in their classrooms

Perceptions of the importance of these procedures were influenced by several of the respondent attributes. Table 17 shows an identical pattern for Independent Study and Micro-teaching. Both of these procedures were considered most important by Health Sciences respondents and least important by those from Industrial and Technology. Industrial and Technology respondents also placed least importance on Individualized Instruction, whereas Observation of Other Instructors was rated most important by those from Adult Basic Education and least important by Health Sciences personnel.

TABLE 17

Mean Importance Values of Procedures, by Instructional Area

Procedure	A.B.E.	A.A.&B.	I.&T.	H.S.	prob.
Independent Study	1.65	1.81	1.88	1.37	0.0011
Individualized Instruction	1.55	1.98	2.06	1.59	0.0000
Micro-teaching	1.88	2.11	2.31	1.69	0.0003
Observation of Other Instructors	1.85	2.12	2.26	2.37	0.0282

While Table 18 reveals no clear relationship between Teacher Certification and the four instructional procedures on which significant differences were observed, it can be noted that respondents whose only teaching certificate was the C.A.E. gave three of the four procedures lower ratings than holders of any other certificate. These three procedures were Micro-teaching, Supervised Classroom Teaching, and Observation of Other College Instructors.

Table 19 shows that Females regarded three instructional procedures with more importance than their Male colleagues. These three were Independent Study, Individualized Instruction, and Micro-teaching.

TABLE 18

Mean Importance Values of Procedures, by Teacher Certification

Certificate	Indep. Study	Micro-teach.	Sup. Teach.	Observ-ation
No Certificate	1.63	1.93	2.21	2.15
Special + Other, No C.A.E.	1.67	1.82	1.73	1.50
Professional, No C.A.E. No Special	1.98	1.70	1.93	2.02
Vocational or Other, No C.A.E., No Special	1.89	2.06	1.83	1.80
C.A.E. + Some Other	1.48	2.07	2.24	1.98
Special only	1.92	2.05	1.92	2.19
C.A.E. only	1.75	2.22	2.33	2.42
prob.	0.0300	0.0259	0.0427	0.0015

TABLE 19

Mean Importance Values of Procedures, by Sex

Procedure	Female	Male	prob.
Independent Study	1.51	1.85	0.0002
Individualized Instruction	1.64	1.99	0.0001
Micro-teaching	1.76	2.15	0.0003

Administrators placed more importance on Micro-teaching and Supervised Teaching, and less on Independent Study, than did Instructors. (See Table 20.)

TABLE 20

Mean Importance Values of Procedures, by Position in College

Procedure	Administrator	Instructor	prob.
Independent Study	2.03	1.72	0.0413
Micro-teaching	1.70	2.06	0.0432
Supervised Teaching	1.43	2.21	0.0000

From Table 21 it can be seen that respondents from Red River Community College placed more importance on Lectures and Seminars, and less on Observation of Other Instructors, than did those from either of the two rural colleges.

TABLE 21

Mean Importance Values of Procedures, by College

Procedure	A.C.C.	K.C.C.	R.R.C.C.	prob.
Lectures and Seminars	1.80	1.75	1.57	0.0180
Observation of Other Instructors	1.96	1.98	2.28	0.0149

Table 22 reveals no clear relationship between Age and the perceived importance of two procedures: Micro-teaching, and Lectures and Seminars. Micro-teaching appears to have been considered less important by older staff members, although the 40-49 years group upsets even that pattern. In general Lectures and Seminars were considered more important by older staff members, but again there was an age group (50-59) which did not conform with that trend.

TABLE 22

Mean Importance Values of Procedures, by Age

Procedure	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	over 59	prob.
Lectures and Seminars	1.88	1.62	1.54	1.80	1.41	0.0160
Micro-teaching	1.73	1.93	2.22	2.09	2.07	0.0491

Qualifications in Education were related to the perceived importance of two procedures, Micro-teaching and Supervised Classroom Teaching, as shown in Table 23. Generally it seems that persons with higher education qualifications placed more importance on both of these topics than did those with lower education qualifications. This generalization would appear to be somewhat weakened by the Dip.Ed. group in the case of Micro-teaching, and by both the Dip.Ed. and Ph.D. groups in the case of Supervised Classroom Teaching. However, the number of respondents in these groups was so small -- two in each -- that the mean values in these categories should be regarded with caution.

TABLE 23

Mean Importance Values of Procedures, by Education Qualifications

Procedure	None	Dip.Ed.	B.Ed.	M.Ed.	Ph.D.	prob.
Micro-teaching	2.12	1.50	1.74	1.50	1.00	0.0014
Supervised Teaching	2.25	1.67	1.90	1.50	2.00	0.0081

Table 24 shows that respondents with previous formal teaching experience placed more importance on Micro-teaching than did those with no previous teaching experience, or on-the-job experience only.

TABLE 24

Mean Importance Value of Procedure, by Teaching Experience

Procedure	Previous teaching	No teaching	On-the-job teaching	prob.
Micro-teaching	1.89	2.22	2.64	0.0003

Job-related Credentials also were related to the perceived value of Micro-teaching as an instructional procedure. The results are sum-

marized in Table 25. In general it seems that those whose qualifications were somewhat academic in nature placed more importance on this procedure than did those whose qualifications were more job-related.

TABLE 25

Mean Importance Value of Micro-Teaching, by Job Credentials

Qualification	Mean Value
Not Stated	1.92
Journeyman	2.35
Other job-related	2.24
Bachelor's degree	1.92
Master's/Doctoral degree	1.83
prob.	0.0122

Questionnaire respondents were given the opportunity to suggest additional intructional procedures that did not appear on the list of seven. Question 26 asked: Are there any other instructional procedures which you feel should be used? The results were as follows:

Yes	88 (24.0)
No	221 (60.2)
No answer	58 (15.8)
	367

Two of those who answered Yes did not specify what these additional procedures should be. The most frequently specified other procedure was some form of practical teaching in the form of a student teaching practicum, working with one or more teachers as a team, or working with a master teacher. Of the 86 respondents who suggested an additional procedure, 23 (26.7 percent) thought that some form of practical teaching should be incorporated into the program. Periodic return to industry, either for first-hand job experience, or to teach in an industrial setting, was suggested by 13 respondents (15.1 percent), while seven (8.1 percent) favoured visits to, or other contacts with, business or industry. Eight respondents (9.3 percent) suggested conferences, seminars, informal discussions, and workshops, and seven (8.1 percent) favoured small group discussions as a formal instructional procedure. Other procedures suggested (and the number of respondents who suggested each) were:

Use of audio-visual aids (films, T.V., etc.,)	6
Conducting the instruction in an industrial/ laboratory setting	5
Tutorial with appropriate resource person	3
Student evaluation of instructors	3
Specific on-the-job assistance, e.g., with preparation of lesson plans, teaching aids, etc.	3
Sensitivity awareness and assertiveness training	3
Auditing a course before teaching it	2
Guest lecturers	1
Correspondence programs	1

In summary, it would appear that four of the seven listed procedures -- Lectures and Seminars, Independent Study, Individualized Instruction, and Micro-teaching were considered, by respondents as a whole, to be quite important in a preparation program. There were several differences with respect to the respondent attributes, but the most important of these would appear to be the following:

1. Administrators perceived Supervised Teaching and Micro-teaching as much more important than did Instructors, and saw less value in Independent Study.

2. Respondents who had some formal qualifications in education perceived both Micro-teaching and Supervised Teaching as more important than did their colleagues without such qualifications.

3. Staff with previous teaching experience placed more value in Micro-teaching than did those without such experience.

Issue 7: What Credential?

What type of credential, if any, should be associated with the program?

Two questions on the questionnaire concerned this issue. Question 31 asked, "At the completion of the program, what type of credential should be awarded, and why?" Question 32 asked, "Should this credential, if any, be permanent, or should it be of an interim or temporary nature, with periodic renewal of it depending on participation

in further professional development activities?" The results were as follows:

No Credential	17 (4.6)
Certificate	171 (46.6)
B.A. or B.Sc.	5 (1.4)
Diploma	46 (12.5)
B.Ed.	53 (14.4)
M.Ed.	11 (3.0)
No answer, no opinion, or "other"	64 (17.4)
	367

Of those who gave an answer (343), 252 gave no reason for their choice of credential. Reasons which <u>were</u> provided for each credential choice were as follows:

No credential:
"There should not be a program." (2)
"Education should be ongoing." (1)

Certificate:
"The program is too short/the material is too basic for a degree." (19)
"Recognition of work done." (18)
"Training is very specific." (5)
"Transferability." (1)

B.A. or B.Sc.:
"Motivation for the instructor." (1)

Diploma:
"Recognition of work done." (3)
"Too short/too basic for a degree." (2)
"Transferability." (2)

B.Ed.:
"Transferability." (9)
"Recognition of work done." (4)
"It is professional/graduate level work." (4)
"Training is very specific." (2)
"Motivation." (1)

M.Ed.:
"Professional/graduate level work." (3)
"Recognition of work done." (1)

The majority of respondents (232 or 65.2 percent) thought that the credential should be permanent, while 124 (34.8 percent) stated that it should be renewable.

Several of the respondent attributes were statistically related to the questions of the nature and permanency of the credential to be associated with a program of professional preparation. From Table 26 it can be seen that respondents from all instructional areas preferred a certificate, but this preference was much stronger for respondents from Adult Basic Education and Industrial and Technology. All except Industrial and Technology respondents listed a Bachelor of Education degree as a strong second preference. Further, with respect to the job satisfaction attribute, both groups of respondents preferred a certificate as the appropriate credential, although the preference of the Satisfied group was much stronger than that of the Dissatisfied group. Also, a portion of the Dissatisfied group thought that a Bachelor of Education degree would be an appropriate credential.

The statistical relationships between respondent attributes and the permanency of the credential are shown in Table 27. Male respondents were stronger in their preference for a permanent credential than were female respondents. Also, personnel from the Industrial and Technology area expressed a very strong preference for a permanent credential. The relationship between Qualifications in Education and the per-

TABLE 26

Choice of Credential

Attributes and Sub-groups	None	Cert.	Dip.	B.Ed.	M.Ed.	Total
Instructional Area (p=0.0412)						
Adult Basic Education	1 (2.5)	25 (62.5)	2 (5.0)	8 (20.0)	4 (10.0)	40
Applied Arts & Business	7 (8.0)	40 (45.5)	13 (14.8)	22 (25.0)	6 (6.8)	88
Industrial and Technology	7 (6.6)	68 (64.2)	17 (16.0)	13 (12.3)	1 (0.9)	106
Health Sciences	1 (2.9)	19 (55.9)	6 (17.6)	8 (23.5)	-	34
Job Satisfaction (p=0.0414)						
Satisfied	11 (4.6)	147 (61.3)	37 (15.4)	36 (15.0)	9 (3.8)	240
Dissatisfied	4 (8.9)	18 (40.0)	7 (15.6)	14 (31.1)	2 (4.4)	45

manency of the credential is not immediately apparent. However, if the Dip.Ed. and Ph.D. groups are omitted (because of the small number of respondents in each of these groups), it would appear that as the level of the education qualification possessed by the respondents increases, the preference for a permanent credential decreases. Finally, Administrators favoured a renewable credential while instructors favoured a permanent one.

In summary, then, the views of the respondents concerning the credential questions would seem to be that a certificate is the appropriate credential, and it should be permanent, not renewable.

TABLE 27

Permanency of Credential

Attributes and Sub-Groups	Permanent		Renewable		Total
Sex (p=0.0323)					
Female	58	(56.3)	45	(43.7)	103
Male	173	(68.9)	78	(31.1)	251
Instructional Area (p=0.0019)					
Adult Basic Education	31	(58.5)	22	(41.5)	53
Applied Arts and Business	69	(67.6)	33	(32.4)	102
Industrial and Technology	93	(79.5)	24	(20.5)	117
Health Sciences	25	(52.1)	23	(47.9)	48
Qualifications in Education (p=0.0009)					
None or Not Stated	194	(69.8)	84	(30.2)	278
Dip. Ed.	-		3	(100.0)	3
B. Ed.	29	(54.7)	24	(45.3)	53
M. Ed.	6	(35.3)	11	(64.7)	17
Ph. D.	2	(100.0)	-		2
Position in College (p=0.0000)					
Administrator	7	(24.1)	22	(75.9)	29
Instructor	224	(68.7)	102	(31.3)	326

Issue 8: Responsibility for the Program?

Who should be responsible for the organization and administration of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors?

This was Question 34 on the questionnaire, and the respondents indicated a marked preference for a university-community college partnership, as can be seen from the results below:

A university Faculty of Education	11 (3.4)
The provincial Department of Education	37 (11.4)

One of the community colleges	5 (1.5)
Each community college, separately	25 (7.7)
The three community colleges, together	93 (28.6)
A joint university-community college effort	154 (47.4)
	325

Both male and female respondents preferred a university-community college partnership, but the female preference was stronger, as can be seen in Table 28. Similarly, Females were less opposed to a university Faculty of Education than were Males. However, there was a marked difference between instructors and administrators with respect to this question of responsibility for the program, with instructors preferring a university-community college partnership, while administrators preferred a combined community college organization.

Issue 9: Evaluation?

What mechanism should exist to monitor, evaluate, and modify the program?

Question 35 asked, "Who should monitor and evaluate the professional preparation program," and "How often should it be evaluated?"

TABLE 28

Responsibility for the Program

Attributes and Sub-Groups	Fac. of Ed.	Dept. of Ed.	One Coll.	Each Coll.	Three Colls.	Univ./ Coll.	Total
Sex (p=0.0108)							
Female	7 (7.4)	5 (5.3)	-	5 (5.3)	25 (26.6)	52 (55.3)	94
Male	4 (1.8)	30 (13.2)	5 (2.2)	20 (8.8)	67 (29.4)	102 (44.7)	228
Position in College (p=0.0088)							
Administrator	-	1 (3.7)	1 (3.7)	1 (3.7)	16 (59.3)	8 (29.6)	27
Instructor	11 (3.7)	34 (11.5)	4 (1.4)	24 (8.1)	77 (26.0)	146 (49.3)	296

The majority of the respondents preferred to leave this role in the hands of "those who are responsible for the organization and administration of the program," as can be seen from the results below:

Those who are responsible for the organization and administration of the program.	160 (44.4)
Impartial external consultants	68 (18.9)
The Planning and Evaluation section of the Community Colleges Division	54 (15.0)
The Teacher Education Section at Red River Community College	23 (6.4)
Others, or combinations of the above	55 (15.3)
	360

Evaluation of the program should take place "about every 3 to 5 years" according to 215 (60.1 percent) of the respondents to this question -- 80 (22.3 percent) answered "every year," while 63 (17.6) percent) answered "only when required." The majority of respondents clearly preferred a periodic evaluation of the program.

The attributes Position in the College, College, and Job Satisfaction were related to this issue. As can be seen from Table 29, Administrators and Instructors differed considerably on the degree of their preference for "Planning and Evaluation" and also on "Those responsible for the program." While respondents from all colleges generally favoured "those responsible for the program," Keewatin's preference was not as strong as that of the other two colleges. Keewatin respondents also expressed much more favour with "Planning and Evaluation" than did those from the other two colleges. Also, while both the Satisfied and Dissatisfied groups preferred to leave this function in the hands of those who were responsible for the program, a large portion (31 percent) of the Dissatisfied group favoured the use of impartial, external consultants.

TABLE 29

Evaluation of the Program

Attributes and Subgroups	Those responsible for program	Impartial, external consult.	Plan.& Eval. section	Teacher Ed. R.R.C.C.	Others/ Comb.	Tot.
Position in College (p=0.0353)						
Administrator	7	4	9	3	6	29
	(24.1)	(13.8)	(31.0)	(10.3)	(20.7)	
Instructor	152	64	44	20	49	329
	(46.2)	(19.5)	(13.4)	(6.1)	(14.9)	
College (p=0.0031)						
Assiniboine C.C.	33	14	12	2	11	72
	(45.8)	(19.4)	(16.7)	(2.8)	(15.3)	
Keewatin C.C.	16	9	16	-	6	47
	(34.0)	(19.1)	(34.0)		(12.8)	
Red River C.C.	111	45	25	21	38	240
	(46.2)	(18.8)	(10.4)	(8.8)	(15.8)	
Job Satisfaction (p=0.0486)						
Satisfied	130	48	47	20	43	288
	(45.1)	(16.7)	(16.3)	(6.9)	(14.9)	
Dissatisfied	24	17	3	2	9	55
	(43.6)	(30.9)	(5.5)	(3.6)	(16.4)	

Issue 10: Payment for the Program?

Who should pay for the program?

Question 36 on the questionnaire asked, "How much of the cost of the program should be borne by the individual instructor?" The results were as follows:

The instructor should not have any financial expense	190 (52.3)
The instructor should make some financial contribution	114 (31.4)
The instructor should pay all normal expenses of the program e.g., tuition, books, laboratory fees, etc.	59 (16.3)
	363

Several of the respondent attributes were related to the question of the financial contribution by the instructor. These are shown in Table 30. Twice as many Males as Females preferred that the instructor should have no financial expense in the program, whereas a majority of Females thought that some contribution from the instructor would be reasonable. Respondents from Industrial and Technology expressed a strong preference for a program which would be free to the instructor. Applied Arts and Business personnel expressed the same preference, but not as strongly, while respondents from Adult Basic Education were approximately evenly divided between "None" and "Some" with respect to the instructor's financial contribution. Health Sciences respondents, however, thought that instructors <u>should</u> make some financial contribution. Holders of a Professional Certificate were less likely to favour "no expense to the instructor" than were holders of other teaching certificates (or no certificate at all).

TABLE 30

Instructor's Expenses

Attributes and Sub-Groups	No expense	Some payment	Normal expenses	Total
Sex (p=0.0000)				
Female	31 (30.1)	45 (43.7)	27 (26.2)	103
Male	156 (60.7)	69 (26.8)	32 (12.5)	257
Instructional Area (p=0.0029)				
Adult Basic Education	23 (44.2)	21 (40.4)	8 (15.4)	52
Applied Arts and Business	57 (53.8)	30 (28.3)	19 (17.9)	106
Industrial and Technology	79 (66.4)	25 (21.0)	15 (12.6)	119
Health Sciences	16 (32.7)	23 (46.9)	10 (20.4)	49
Teacher Certification (p=0.0424)				
No Certificate	33 (53.2)	17 (27.4)	12 (19.4)	62
Special & other, No C.A.E.	5 (41.7)	4 (33.3)	3 (25.0)	12
Professional,No C.A.E. or Special	20 (35.1)	19 (33.3)	18 (31.6)	57
Other, No C.A.E. or Special	11 (61.1)	3 (16.7)	4 (22.2)	18
C.A.E. & Other	26 (55.3)	15 (31.9)	6 (12.8)	47
Special Only	14 (53.8)	9 (34.6)	3 (11.5)	26
C.A.E. Only	78 (56.9)	47 (34.3)	12 (8.8)	137
Job Related Credentials (p=0.0149)				
Not stated	23 (56.1)	12 (29.3)	6 (14.6)	41
Journeyman's Certificate	26 (63.4)	11 (26.8)	4 (9.8)	41
Other job-related	36 (52.9)	26 (38.2)	6 (8.8)	68
Bachelor's degree	81 (45.0)	59 (32.8)	40 (22.2)	180
Master's/Doctoral degree	23 (76.7)	5 (16.7)	2 (6.7)	30
Qualifications in Education (p=0.0003)				
None	162 (56.8)	83 (29.1)	40 (14.0)	285
Dip. Ed.	1 (33.3)	-	2 (66.7)	3
B. Ed.	21 (39.6)	20 (37.7)	12 (22.6)	53
M. Ed.	4 (23.5)	10 (58.8)	3 (17.6)	17
Ph. D.	-	-	2 (100.0)	2
College (p=0.0266)				
Assiniboine C.C.	28 (39.4)	24 (33.8)	19 (26.8)	71
Keewatin C.C.	25 (52.1)	13 (27.1)	10 (20.8)	48
Red River C.C.	136 (56.0)	77 (31.7)	30 (12.3)	243

As well as the financial cost to the instructor, the time which he must devote to the program is also an important consideration. Question 37 asked, "How much of his/her own time should the instructor be required to devote to the program of professional preparation?" The results were as follows:

The instructors should get some release from teaching duties but should also use some of his/her own time for the program	220 (61.1)
The instructor should do the entire program in his/her own time	81 (22.5)
The instructor should be released from sufficient of his/her teaching duties so that the entire program can be completed in the employer's time	59 (16.4)
	360

Two of the respondent attributes were related to this question -- Sex and Instructional Area. These relationships are displayed in Table 31. Both male and female respondents expressed a preference for some release from teaching. Females, however, were generally not in favour of doing the program entirely in the employer's time, whereas 20 percent of the male respondents favoured this alternative. Respondents from Health Sciences and Adult Basic Education expressed very strong preferences for some release, whereas those from the other two areas were less emphatic about that preference.

In summary then, with respect to the questions of cost and time, these observations can be made. The respondents were approximately evenly divided on the question of whether the instructor should have any

TABLE 31

Release-Time Arrangements

Attributes and Sub-Groups	Some release	Instructor's time	Employer's time	Total
Sex (p=0.0005)				
Female	77 (75.5)	19 (18.6)	6 (5.9)	102
Male	141 (55.3)	62 (24.3)	52 (20.4)	255
Instructional Area (p=0.0061)				
Adult Basic Education	39 (73.6)	6 (11.3)	8 (15.1)	53
Applied Arts and Business	56 (53.3)	30 (28.6)	19 (18.1)	105
Industrial and Technology	66 (55.9)	26 (22.0)	26 (22.0)	118
Health Sciences	39 (81.2)	6 (12.5)	3 (6.2)	48

financial expenditure for the program. Most respondents thought that instructors should receive some release so that teacher education studies could be partly completed in the employer's time. Also, several of the respondent attributes were related to these questions of the instructor's financial and time commitments -- these were College, Sex, Instructional Area, Teacher Certification, and Job Related Credentials.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RESPONDENT ATTRIBUTES

In Chapter 2 it was suggested that the ten selected attributes of the respondents might affect their program design preferences. Indeed, as has been shown in this chapter, each of these attributes proved to be statistically related in some way to one or more of those program design preferences. It would seem appropriate, then, to look at these relationships with a view to determining, if possible, what impor-

tance should be given each attribute when considering matters of program design.

As can be seen from Figure 1, it would seem that the answers given by respondents to questions of program design were independent of Age and Amount of Community College Experience. The latter is surprising in terms of the relationships anticipated originally. Previous Teaching Experience, Teacher Certification, and Qualifications were important attributes in the content and procedures issues, but not of much interest in the other issues. The attributes Sex, Instructional Area, and College, were related to several issues. However, in the case of Sex and College, this information may not be especially useful since, for example, it is not clear whether differences attributed to Sex were true sex differences, or perhaps differences due to instructional area. Similarly, differences presently identified with College might be due to the size of the college, or its rural-urban geographical location,or any of a number of other factors. The attribute Job Satisfaction is another which was related to several issues, but again this information may not be particularly useful, since determining which instructors were satisfied could be difficult. The most significant and potentially useful attribute would appear to be Position in the College. The extent of the Administrator-Instructor differences which were observed have important implications, both for the C.A.E. program in particular and program design generally. These implications are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Attributes of the Respondents	Issues												
	1	2A	2B	3	4	5	6	7A	7B	8	9	10A	10B
Age	+				1		2						
Sex			+		20		3		+	+		+	+
Amount of C.C. experience					1								
Previous Teaching Experience		+			14		1						
Instructional Area					11		4	+	+			+	+
Teacher Certification					2		4					+	
Qualifications A. Job-related Credentials	+				13		1					+	
B. Qualifications in Education					3		2		+			+	
Position in College	+			+	2		3		+	+	+		
College					3	+	2				+	+	
Job Satisfaction A. Prefer to teach in other inst.	+				2	+		+			+		
B. Prefer a non-teaching job													

Notes: 1. + denotes a statistically significant relationship between the respondent attribute and the program design preference for the issue.
2. For Issue 4 the numbers indicate the number of topics (from the list of 26) on which statistically significant differences occurred.
3. For Issue 6 the numbers indicate the number of instructional procedures (from the list of 7) on which statistically significant differences occurred.
4. The Issue numbers are explained on the next page.

Figure 1: The Issues and the Respondent Attributes

The Issues. (Refer to Figure 1)

1. Compulsory participation in a program of professional preparation?

2A. A pre-service or an in-service program?

2B. Timing of the in-service component?

3. Program emphasis -- subject matter or teaching technique?

4. Content of the program?

5. A common program for all instructors?

6. Instructional procedures?

7A. Nature of the credential, if any?

7B. Permanency of the credential?

8. Responsibility for the program?

9. Monitoring the program?

10A. Instructor's financial contribution?

10B. Release from teaching duties for the program?

OTHER ISSUES

In addition, Questionnaire respondents were given the opportunity to identify other issues "which need to be resolved" (Question 38) and also to "make any general observations or suggestions about preparation for community college teaching" (Question 44). Most of the responses did not constitute identification of new issues, but instead were elaborations of, or comments on, answers to previous issue questions. There were, however, three groups of responses which, while not completely separate from the ten key issues, seemed to be worthy of sepa-

rate consideration. These had to do with transferability (both of component parts of the program and the credential associated with it), standards, and the relationship between a certification program and professional development. These three additional issues were expressed more as "Certificate in Adult Education issues" rather than general issues of program design. They do, however, have implications for the latter.

Transferability

Questionnaire respondents identified two aspects of this transferability issue: transfer of credits in the program between different institutions, and recognition of the credential in other jurisdictions. Concern was expressed that "the C.A.E. doesn't get much credit from the university." However, of more concern was the transfer of credits to the C.A.E. Respondents made comments like: "Total credit should be given for C.A.E. if someone already has a B.Ed. or M.Ed.;" and "A teacher having a certificate from another agency should be exempt." These comments clearly are in contradiction to C.A.E. policy which recognizes no certificate as equivalent to the C.A.E., and which permits no more than three credits to be transferred in to the C.A.E. from another institution. Respondents also expressed concern that "past experience" was not taken into consideration when C.A.E. exemptions were being arranged. "Credit equivalencies would have to be set up for past experience and individual qualifications", "Issue credit for experiential learning and enable [instructors] to take courses more meaningful to them" and "Give credit for past experience" were some of the comments. The second concern

expressed was with respect to the recognition of the credential by other employing authorities, particularly the public school system in Manitoba and post-secondary institutions in other provinces. Respondents thought that the credential "should permit the instructor to teach in high school" and that there should be "portability of certification between regional vocational high schools and community colleges." They also thought that "the Certificate should have national recognition" and that it should be "recognized by all Canadian universities and community colleges." The greatest barrier to an easy solution of the "within Manitoba" part of this problem would seem to be the difficulty of equating work experience and academic credits in a regular certification program. It is difficult to agree that the "across Canada" problem is really a problem since Manitoba is the only province in which a teaching certificate is a requirement for teaching in a community college.

Standards

Several college staff expressed the view that the C.A.E. is held in low regard and "not taken seriously by instructors" due to low standards of work required of the instructor-students. One respondent wrote:

> There seems to be an attitude on the part of those administering the courses that no-one can fail. Class members who ignore instructions, contribute very little, and even refuse to do assignments, will be given a "C" in a course.

Several others expressed similar views. It would seem that instructors want the program to be one which is worthwhile and one way to achieve this, according to several respondents, is to "set higher standards, and enforce them."

Professional Development

The most common comment by respondents reflected the lack of opportunity or incentive for post-certification professional development of both a subject matter and pedagogical nature. Several respondents suggested that there was a need for a sabbatical leave policy whereby an instructor could return to industry for a period of about six months every six or seven years. It was also suggested that leave for further studies (at the university, for example) should be provided, and that instructors should be encouraged to take additional teacher education courses, either at the colleges or the universities, after they have completed the C.A.E. As indicated in Chapter 4, the college authorities have, for the last few years, attempted to introduce a policy whereby instructors would be required to take additional courses (either pedagogical or subject matter oriented) every three years. These attempts have so far been unsuccessful. The question of post-certification professional development represents another area of major disagreement between instructors and administrators -- instructors would like some incentive, in the form of paid leave or salary benfits, for further professional development, while administrators want to make professional development compulsory, with no financial or other rewards, and probably done in the instructor's own time.

While these comments identify areas of concern for program design in general, they clearly derive from experience with, or knowledge of, the Certificate in Adult Education program. More specific comments about that program are contained in the next section.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE C.A.E. PROGRAM

In Section 3 of the questionnaire, the following questions were asked:

> Question 41. Which subjects and/or activities in your program [of preparation for teaching] do you regard as being the most valuable to you as a community college instructor?
>
> Question 42. What changes would you like to see made in your program as preparation for community college teaching, and why?
>
> Question 43. Please rank the following in order of the value of their contribution to your preparation for teaching in a community college.
>
> Previous teaching experience
> Previous occupational experience other than teaching
> Formal program of preparation for teaching
> On-the-job community college teaching

Although these questions solicited comment about the particular program in which each instructor had participated, not just the Certificate in Adult Education program, it is the C.A.E. which is of particular interest in this study. Thus, the following discussion is based upon an analysis of the responses for those respondents who identified themselves (through Question 13) as holders of a C.A.E. only. These comments then quite specifically reflect perceptions of the Certificate in Adult Education program.

The "most valuable" courses were those dealing with Testing and Evaluation, Course Construction, Audio-Visual Aids, and Psychology of Learning (including Psychology of Adult Learning). The popularity of these courses could be related to the frequency with which these courses have been conducted.[1] However, it is not certain whether the courses are

---

[1] The 1976 Review (p. 24) made a similar observation.

offered frequently because a large number of instructors want to take them, or whether a large number of people take them because they are offered frequently. This is not to question the perceptions of the value of these courses, but rather to suggest that perhaps the lower popularity of some other subjects may be due to their not having been offered frequently, rather than due to any inherent lack of value. In terms of an overall count of responses, however, the four courses listed are regarded by many instructors as very valuable components of their preparation for teaching.

Suggested changes to the Certificate in Adult Education program included the following:

1. Design the courses to meet the needs of individual instructors, taking into account their background and, particularly, the area in which they will be teaching. General, "all-encompassing" courses were seen as less valuable than more specific courses.

2. Pay more attention to the selection of staff for the C.A.E. classes. Perhaps highly qualified and experienced instructors from within the colleges could be employed to teach C.A.E. courses. Particularly it was suggested that "we don't want Americans who are here mainly for the fishing and golf."

3. Make provision within the program for technical content courses, and permit frequent contacts with business or industry in order that the instructor may be kept up-to-date in his field.

4. Increase the standards of the work associated with the program. The emphasis should be on the "production of quality, not quantity."

When asked to rank their teacher education program (in this case, the C.A.E.), previous teaching experience, previous occupational experience other than teaching, and on-the-job community college teaching, in order of the value of their contribution to preparation for teaching in a community college, the C.A.E. was rated quite low: nine respondents rated it as most valuable of the four components, thirty rated it second, thirty rated it third, and twenty six rated it fourth. These results, however, are somewhat more alarming when it is noted that 31 of the 50 who rated the C.A.E. third had not had any previous teaching experience. Thus, for these respondents, the C.A.E. was rated third out of three, i.e., a total of 57 of the 115 respondents rated the C.A.E. lower than the other components of their preparation for teaching. (Another eleven C.A.E. holders did not rank their teacher education program at all, even though they ranked the other components!) It would seem then that many instructors regard the C.A.E. as contributing less to their preparation for teaching than their previous occupational experience and what they learn while teaching.

PROGRAM DESIGN PREFERENCES: A SUMMARY

The questionnaire data provided the answer to the second research question: How would the key issues of program design be resolved today by college instructors and administrators in Manitoba? In this section that question is answered for each of the issues in turn.

Issue 1. Should community college instructors be required to participate in a program of professional preparation?

The majority of respondents thought that instructors should participate in a program of professional preparation. Further, respondents who were satisfied in their present position, administrators, older respondents and respondents without a degree were stronger in their preference for compulsory participation.

Issue 2. Should the program of professional preparation be pre-service or in-service?

Most respondents thought that a preparation program should take place both before and during employment as a community college instructor. However, some respondents with no previous teaching experience favoured a program which would be conducted after the instructor had been employed by the community college but before he commenced teaching.

Approximately two-fifths of the respondents thought that the in-service portion of the program should be conducted concurrently with teaching duties, and an equal-sized group thought that it should be conducted between teaching terms or semesters. Also, female respondents

preferred the concurrent pattern, while male respondents thought that the program should be conducted between teaching sessions.

Issue 3. Should the emphasis in the program be on the upgrading of competence in the teaching specialty (either academic subject matter knowledge or technical-vocational skill and knowledge), or should it be on the development of pedagogical skills? What should be the balance between these?

According to respondents a preparation program should be approximately sixty percent pedagogical and forty percent subject matter preparation. However, administrators placed more emphasis on pedagogy and less on subject matter preparation than did instructors.

Issue 4. What should comprise the main content of the program?

Respondents appeared to place more importance in topics related to day-to-day classroom practice, and less in topics more removed from the immediate classroom situation. However, respondents with "academic" qualifications tended to view the day-to-day classroom topics with less importance than did their colleagues whose qualifications were more specifically job-related.

Issue 5. Should community college instructors in different instructional areas have the same type of professional preparation program?

Half of the respondents thought that all instructors should have the same type of program, while the other half thought that instructors

from different areas needed different programs. Respondents who were dissatisfied with their present positions favoured different programs, while those who were satisfied were evenly divided on this issue. Respondents from Assiniboine favoured the same type of program, respondents from Red River favoured different programs and respondents from Keewatin were evenly divided on the question.

Issue 6. How should the program be organized with respect to the delivery of instruction?

Respondents placed more importance on Lectures and Seminars, Independent Study, Individualized Instruction, and Micro-teaching, and less on Supervised Teaching, Observation of Other Instructors in their Classrooms, and Visits to Other Community Colleges. Several respondents suggested the inclusion of practical teaching, and periodic return to business or industry.

Administrators placed more importance on Supervised Teaching, and Micro-teaching, and less on Independent Study than did instructors. Respondents with Qualifications in Education saw more value in Supervised Teaching and Micro-teaching than did respondents without such qualifications. Respondents with previous teaching placed more value in Micro-teaching than did those without such experience.

Issue 7. What type of credential, if any, should be associated with the program?

About half of the respondents thought that a certificate was the appropriate credential, and almost two-thirds thought that it should be

permanent, not renewable. However, administrators favoured a renewable credential, while instructors favoured a permanent one. Female respondents and respondents with higher education qualifications tended to be less strongly in favour of a permanent credential than did male respondents and respondents whose education qualifications were lower.

Issue 8. Who should be responsible for the organization and administration of the program?

Almost half of the respondents thought that a program of professional preparation should be a joint university-college responsibility, while one-quarter favoured a tri-college organization, without university involvement. Female respondents were stronger in their preference for a joint university-college structure than were male respondents. Administrators preferred a tri-college structure, while instructors preferred the joint university-college pattern.

Issue 9. What mechanism should exist to monitor, evaluate, and modify the program?

The majority of respondents thought that those who were responsible for the program should also monitor and evaluate it. However, respondents from Keewatin Community College, more than either of the other two colleges, thought that the Planning and Evaluation section of the Community Colleges Division should have some responsibility for this function. Administrators also preferred Planning and Evaluation.

Issue 10. Who should pay for the program?

Just over half of the respondents thought that instructors should have no financial expense, and about three-fifths thought that instructors should receive some release from teaching duties, so that part of the program could be completed in the employer's time. Several of the respondent attributes were related to these questions of financial and time commitments. In particular, male respondents preferred that the instructor have no financial expense, while female respondents thought that instructors should make some financial contribution. Both male and female respondents favoured some release from teaching, but one-fifth of the male respondents thought that the program should be done entirely in the employer's time.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented the questionnaire findings, and thus reveals the program design preferences of present-day community college staff in Manitoba. In the next chapter these preferences are compared with the actual resolutions of the key issues in the development of the Certificate in Adult Education program.

Chapter VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to compare the program design choices which are exhibited by the development of the Certificate in Adult Education with the program design preferences expressed by the present-day staff in Manitoba's community colleges, and to determine the important implications of the similarities and differences for program design. Thus, this chapter compares the findings which were presented in the two previous chapters. Similarities and differences between the actual issue resolutions in the C.A.E. program and the program design preferences of college staff are discussed, and the implications of these similarities and differences are presented. The chapter concludes with a statement of suggestions for further research.

CONCLUSIONS

Issue 1. Should community college instructors be required to participate in a program of professional preparation?

The Certificate in Adult Education is a compulsory program. All college instructors (except those who possess equivalent qualifications) are required, as a condition of employment, to obtain a C.A.E. The views of current college staff seem to support this requirement, since the majority of questionnaire respondents expressed the view that all col-

lege staff should be required to participate in a program of preparation for teaching. College staff did not so readily agree, however, on the details of the particular program in which they should participate!

Within this issue, however, the questions of exemptions and equivalence of certification remain troublesome. The policy of "no equivalent certificates" and the inconsistency of treatment of applications for transfer of credits have contributed to some resentment of the C.A.E. on the part of some college instructors. It would seem that this is an area where the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee should concentrate its attention.

Issue 2. Should the program of professional preparation be pre-service or in-service?

Preparation for teaching in a community college in Manitoba has two phases. The first phase is subject-matter preparation in the teaching specialty, and is usually completed before employment as a community college instructor. The second phase, the pedagogical preparation, is almost always in-service (except for those instructors who enter the colleges from the public school system). Thus, preparation for teaching in a community college in Manitoba is both pre-service and in-service, and the questionnaire responses reflected general agreement with this practice. Some college staff thought that instructors should receive the pedagogical preparation after being employed as instructors but before doing any teaching, and a number of respondents commented that a failing of the C.A.E. program was that in many instances instructors had to teach before they had undergone any teacher training. Thus, it would

seem that the preferred pattern is probably pre-service content preparation followed by in-service pedagogical training, with at least some of the pedagogical training taking place before any teaching is commenced. This last aspect, i.e., some pedagogical training before commencing teaching duties, is generally not being realized now in Manitoba. However, the individualization of the introductory C.A.E. course has alleviated, to some extent at least, this problem of instructors starting to teach without having any teacher training. Agreement with current practice does not extend, however, to the related sub-issue about the scheduling of the in-service component of the program, with a significant portion favouring a preparation program which is concurrent with their teaching duties, instead of the summer session format which is the predominant pattern in Manitoba's C.A.E. program. Conducting C.A.E. classes during the summer may be administratively convenient, but it is not without disadvantages. First there is the obvious inconvenience and annoyance to the instructor-students who must devote part of their summer vacation to the C.A.E. program. But second, and more important, is that the instructor-student receives his teacher education at a time when he is unable to try out what he has learned with his own classes. It might be preferable to try to arrange a new instructor's C.A.E. classes parallel with his normal teaching duties.

Issue 3. Should the emphasis in the program be on the upgrading of competence in the subject area specialty (either academic subject matter knowledge or technical-vocational skill and knowledge) or should it be on the development of pedagogical skills? What should be the balance between these?

The formal program of preparation for teaching in community colleges in Manitoba is one hundred percent pedagogical -- there is no provision whatsoever for content preparation of either an initial preparation or upgrading (renewal) nature.

The questionnaire respondents would appear to be not wholly in favour of that extreme emphasis on only one aspect of preparation. It could be argued that the wording of Question 23, referring as it did to "the total time in the preparation program," could be interpreted to include the content preparation, which is usually pre-service and over which college authorities have little control, as well as the more formal, usually in-service, pedagogical preparation. As a consequence the respondents might have included this content preparation in their answers, thus giving less than total emphasis to pedagogy in the total preparation program, even though they might feel that the formal program itself should concentrate exclusively on pedagogy. However, a frequent comment about the C.A.E. was that it could be improved by including technical upgrading options in the program. Community college instructors, when employed, usually have a background of successful experience in their trade or profession. Frequently that experience tends to be somewhat specialized, but in the colleges they are expected to teach widely in their field. The technical courses which many respondents thought should be part of the preparation program could help these new instructors to refresh their knowledge of those areas of their trade or profession in which they did not have recent experience. Further, some instructors can take up to six years to complete the C.A.E. program, and, in that time, many technical fields (e.g., electronics) can undergo

substantial changes. For these instructors, particularly, technical courses of an upgrading or refresher nature could be valuable, if taken toward the end of that period, in helping the instructor to keep up-to-date in his field. Thus, the answers to Question 23, taken in conjunction with comments from respondents, would seem to suggest that a formal program of preparation for college teaching should not emphasize pedagogy to the extent that renewal is excluded completely, even though sound content preparation is assumed before the commencement of the formal program.

This, then, is an issue on which the program design preferences of the respondents are not congruent with the resolution of the issue for the C.A.E. program. Further, it is an issue on which the views of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee are clear and, apparently, quite firm. As a result the differences would seem to be not easily resolved.

Issue 4. What should comprise the main content of the program?

How do the opinions of the college staff compare with the C.A.E. program, with respect to program content topics? Most of the topics to which the respondents assigned high importance values are included in the C.A.E. program, although some of these are treated only briefly in the core courses and, in considerably more detail in the elective courses. Examples of such topics include: Audio-Visual Materials, Adult Psychology, and Communication Skills. Two topics -- Individualization of Instruction and Counselling Techniques -- are not in the C.A.E. core courses, but there is an elective course for each of these topics. The topic Characteristics of Community College Students is not in any of the

C.A.E. courses although there would, presumably, be some similarity between that topic and "characteristics of adult learners" which is a part of one of the C.A.E. core courses. The nine topics which received the lowest importance ratings are not included in the C.A.E. program. Thus, in terms of these twenty-six topics, there generally is agreement between the views of the respondents and current C.A.E. practice. There is some disagreement, however, over the question of whether academic or technical upgrading courses should be part of the program. While some staff expressed the view that such renewal courses should be part of the C.A.E., they are not, and, given that the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee is opposed to the inclusion of either academic or technical upgrading as an aspect of the C.A.E. program, the present situation is likely to remain.

Issue 5. Should community college instructors in different instructional areas have the same type of professional preparation program?

In Chapter 4 it was shown that the C.A.E. program has moved toward a "one-program-for-all" structure, with little provision for accommodating the different requirements of instructors from different instructional areas. Only about half of the questionnaire respondents indicated support for that position, and a frequent comment on the questionnaire expressed dissatisfaction with the current practice of putting together instructors from a variety of areas for the C.A.E. classes.[1]

---

[1] Twenty-two instructors specifically commented that the program should accommodate each instructor's individual needs and teaching area, and that the C.A.E. program does not presently do this.

It would seem that this issue is one on which the present college staff are not totally in agreement with current practice. Further, it would seem that, given the diversity of college instructors with respect to such factors as background, qualifications and interests, it would be difficult to accommodate this diversity in a single class. Yet the C.A.E. attempts to do this! While this practice has undoubtedly developed because of important economic considerations it would seem to have serious educational disadvantages.

Issue 6. How should the program be organized with respect to the delivery of instruction?

Three of the seven instructional procedures listed on the questionnaire are not utilized in the C.A.E. program. These three are: Independent study, Visits to other community colleges, and Observation of other community college instructors in their classrooms. Independent study was rated second in terms of the perceived importance of these procedures and thus represents an area where the C.A.E. does not match the views of the respondents. The omission of the other two procedures from the C.A.E. would not seem to be a cause for concern to the college staff, since these procedures were rated fifth and seventh in the overall order of importance. There is agreement, however, regarding another three topics. These are: Lectures and seminars, rated first by the college staff and used extensively in the C.A.E. program; Individualized instruction using standardized materials, rated third, and used (somewhat reluctantly)[2] in the first of the three core courses; and

[2] As indicated in Chapter 4, the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee is not in favour of individualized instruction. The introductory course was indi-

Micro-teaching, rated fourth , is also part of the C.A.E. core. The remaining instructional procedure, Supervised classroom teaching, was rated sixth by respondents, and is marginally a part of the C.A.E. One of the requirements for the C.A.E. is a period (ten months) of satisfactory teaching. Thus a new instructor's teaching must be evaluated, but this evaluation is done by personnel (typically the instructor's department head) who have no other contact with the C.A.E. program. Their role is, consequently, more evaluative than supervisory although it would be reasonable to expect that the new instructor would receive some guidance and assistance as a result of these evaluations. The amount and nature of this guidance and assistance, though, is dependent solely upon the particular department head involved. There seems to be no procedure whereby the efforts of the Teacher Education section, the C.A.E. instructors, and the supervising department heads are coordinated with a view to assisting the new instructor to relate the "theoretical" aspects of his training to the "practical" aspects of his teaching. As previously noted, despite the low rating of Supervised Classroom Teaching as an instructional procedure, a number of staff suggested that some form of practical teaching should be incorporated into a professional preparation program.

With respect to the other additional suggestions by questionnaire respondents, most of these are not presently part of the C.A.E. This situation would seem likely to prevail, at least into the near future, since the suggested procedures tend to be concerned with technical upgrading or renewal, are somewhat short-term and informal in

---

vidualized by necessity rather than by choice.

nature, or lack peer interaction, and the present C.A.E. Tri-College Committee seems to regard each of these characteristics with disfavour. Thus, with respect to instructional procedures, there would appear to be areas of both substantial agreement and substantial disagreement between current C.A.E. practice and the practices which college staff prefer.

Issue 7. What type of credential, if any, should be associated with the program?

The C.A.E. is a permanent credential, i.e., once the requirements have been satisfied, the certificate can be awarded, and the instructor is under no obligation to do any further study in order to keep the certificate current.[3] While the majority of respondents (65.2 percent) thought that the credential should be permanent, more than three-quarters of the administrators did not agree. As previously indicated, the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee favours some form of additional study every three years in order to keep the C.A.E. current, and college management agrees. Attempts to obtain instructor agreement have, so far, been unsuccessful and there would seem to be little likelihood of this changing soon. The question of permanency of the credential is another on which there is a sharp Administrator-Instructor difference.

---

[3] Like all teaching certificates in the province, the C.A.E. is issued by the Minister of Education and could be revoked by him at any time. However, also like other provincial teaching certificates, (with the exception of some Interim certificates) it is not a renewable certificate. Within the colleges, though, many instructors are required to take additional courses, as a result of their annual evaluations. This, however, is a contractual agreement, and is not related to the C.A.E.

Although instructors in the colleges do not want a renewable credential associated with the preparation program, they did express concern over the lack of professional development opportunities. It would seem that both Instructors and Administrators favour some form of continuing professional development, but they disagree over how to achieve this -- Instructors want incentives to encourage professional development, while Administrators want to enforce it.

Issue 8. Who should be responsible for the organization and administration of the program?

This is another issue on which the preferences of the respondents, and current practice, are somewhat divergent. While the C.A.E. program is a program of the three colleges together,[4] a large proportion of the respondents (47.4 percent) favoured a joint university-community college effort. The main reason offered for this choice was that both groups, the universities and the colleges, have expertise to contribute, expertise considered important to the program. At the moment, however, the university component of that expertise is not being utilized. The failure to re-establish the C.A.E. Advisory Committee has effectively ended any opportunity for university input to the program.[5]

---

[4] It is not universally perceived that way. Several college staff, particularly from the two rural colleges, perceived the C.A.E. program as the responsibility of one section of one college -- the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College.

[5] As, indeed, it has ended that opportunity for input from any external source.

This, too, is another issue on which Instructors and Administrators disagree, with almost sixty percent of the Administrators, but only one-quarter of the Instructors, favouring the present system.

Issue 9. What mechanism should exist to monitor, evaluate, and modify the program?

The C.A.E. program currently is monitored at three levels. First, the Chairman of the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College receives informal feedback from instructor-students and their supervisors. Second, upon conclusion of each C.A.E. course the instructor-students are required to complete a course evaluation questionnaire, the results of which are conveyed, through the Chairman of Teacher Education, to the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee. Third, the Planning and Evaluation section of the Community Colleges Division has, since 1976, conducted an annual evaluation of parts of the program, specifically those courses offered at the summer school.[6] These evaluations incorporate the instructor-students' questionnaires referred to above, and data obtained from C.A.E. course instructors, either by questionnaire or interview or both. It would seem, then, that college personnel are generally in favour of current C.A.E. practice in that the monitoring/evaluation function is largely performed by those who are responsible for the organization and administration of the program -- the

[6] These evaluations are not as comprehensive as the 1976 Review. They could perhaps be more accurately described as course evaluations rather than program evaluations. Further, the evaluations by Planning and Evaluation are not as "impartial and external" as they might perhaps be thought to be, since the report of each such evaluation goes to the C.A.E. Tri-College so that its "revisions" can be incorporated into the final draft of the report. (Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meeting, October 5, 1978.)

Teacher Education section at Red River Community College and the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee.

Issue 10. Who should pay for the progam?

At present the C.A.E. program requires no financial contribution from the instructor. Tuition fees are waived, books are supplied free of charge and, if it is necessary to travel to another college to take a C.A.E. course, a travelling allowance and a daily subsistence allowance are paid to the instructor. However, the instructor must complete the program in his own time, either by attending evening classes, or, more commonly, by taking classes during the summer vacation. It is interesting to note that almost half of the respondents (47.7 percent) thought that instructors should make some financial contribution to the program, thus expressing a view which contradicts current C.A.E. practice. The preferences of respondents with respect to the question of release from duties to attend C.A.E. classes were also in contradiction to C.A.E. practice, with only one-fifth of the respondents favouring the present system whereby the instructor completes the program in his own time. It would seem that many respondents would prefer to pay for the program but have some release from teaching to attend C.A.E. classes. Further, this conclusion is supported by some of the findings related to Issue 2, when it was noted that about two-fifths of the respondents favoured a program which was held concurrently with their teaching duties. Such an arrangement could permit a closer relationship between the C.A.E. classes and the actual classroom practice of the instructor-student.

IMPLICATIONS

The findings and conclusions of this study have important implications for the modification of the Certificate in Adult Education in particular, and for the design of programs of professional preparation in general. These implications, presented here in the form of suggestions, are therefore, of two broad types. Some of these suggestions focus on the C.A.E. specifically, and propose modifications to it which can be supported by the results of this study. Other suggestions are intended, within the limits of their generalizability, to be applicable beyond the specific arena of the Manitoba community college system. These latter suggestions identify potential problem areas in program design generally and indicate alternative ways of avoiding or overcoming them. Following the style adopted throughout this report, these implications are presented here for each issue in turn.

Issue 1. Should community college instructors be required to participate in a program of professional preparation?

1. Since the majority of questionnaire respondents thought that community college instructors should participate in such a program, there would seem to be no reason the Certificate in Adult Education should not continue to be a requirement for all instructors who do not possess an equivalent certificate.

2. However, the questions of equivalent certification and transfer of credits remain somewhat troublesome. In order to avoid the problem of duplication caused by requiring an instructor who already possesses a teaching certificate from some other educational system to

take further teacher education courses, it would seem preferable to interpret the "equivalent certificate" part of the conditions of employment rather more widely, but realistically. That is, permit other appropriate certificates or degrees to be regarded as equivalent to the Certificate in Adult Education, and thus satisfy the certification requirement, while at the same time recognizing that the community college environment in Manitoba is different from that of colleges elsewhere, and also different from that of other educational systems within Manitoba. The new instructor could then be required to engage in appropriate activities, probably unique to him, intended to orient him more closely to the new environment in which he is to teach. These additional activities, which may involve taking formal courses, or attending orientation seminars, or holding discussions with a department head, for example, would be designed to remove deficiencies in each instructor's preparation for teaching in a college. They would probably, however, tend to concentrate more on such areas as the philosophy and role of the community colleges in Manitoba, and the characteristics of community college students, rather than upon pedagogical skills, since these should have been acquired in the original certification program.

3. The implication for program design in general then would seem to be that it is not unreasonable to require instructors to participate at some time, in a program of preparation for teaching in a community college. However, the instructor's previous experience and training should be taken into account when determining the requirements which he must satisfy in the program.

Issue 2. Should the program of professional preparation be pre-service or in-service?

1. For Manitoba's community college instructors the typical preparation pattern involves pre-service subject matter preparation and in-service pedagogical preparation. Again, the majority of respondents preferred that pattern, and there would seem to be no reason it should not continue.

2. Two-fifths of the respondents thought that C.A.E. classes should be held during the regular college teaching sessions, instead of during the summer. If more C.A.E. classes were scheduled as evening classes during the regular teaching sessions, three benefits would accrue. First, the instructors could elect to attend at a time which was convenient to them. Second, those instructors who chose the "non-summer" route would be in a position to immediately apply their newly-acquired knowledge and skills. Third, this would more easily permit the employment of regular full-time college staff (e.g., instructors from the Teacher Education section) as C.A.E. instructors. The summer sessions should not be abandoned, though, because to do so would remove an element of flexibility from the program (and would be in opposition to the preferences of another two-fifths of the respondents).

3. Because of the requirement that community college instructors have a background of work experience[7] it would seem likely that the practice of recruiting such instructors directly from business or industry (rather than from universities or colleges of education) will

[7] This requirement may not be essential for instructors in the academic or liberal studies sectors of some community colleges. However, in colleges which are largely vocationally oriented (as, for example, the colleges in Manitoba) it is extremely important.

continue. Thus the preparation of such instructors will continue to be both pre-service and in-service. It would seem to be desirable that the in-service component of preparation (which will probably be largely pedagogical in emphasis) should be related as closely as possible to the instructor's actual teaching. One way to achieve this would be to offer teacher education classes concurrently with the instructor's regular teaching duties.

Issue 3. Should the emphasis in the program be on the upgrading of competence in the teaching specialty, or upon the development of pedagogical skills?

1. The questionnaire respondents were not in total agreement with the current emphasis in the C.A.E. program. The total concentration on pedagogy was seen by some respondents as a failing of the program. It would seem that the inclusion of subject matter courses could permit the instructor to refresh and renew his knowledge of his teaching specialty, and to keep informed of current developments in his field. These non-pedagogical courses could be offered, as C.A.E. elective courses, by departments other than the Teacher Education section.

2. In the design of a program of preparation for college teaching, a balance must be achieved between subject matter and pedagogy. This balance probably can not be determined in advance, but must take into consideration the peculiar needs of each instructor.

Issue 4. What should comprise the main content of the program?

1. Most of the respondents who commented specifically upon the C.A.E. expressed general satisfaction with the courses which were in that program, particularly the core courses. It would seem, therefore, that if the present C.A.E. structure is to be retained, there would be no reason to substantially change the content of the core courses overall.

2. There is, however, the problem of duplication within the core courses, apparently caused by the attempt to provide a broad overview of many areas in the introductory course, followed by a deeper treatment of some of these areas in the other courses. While this was not seen by the respondents as a major cause for concern, it suggests the possibility of reducing the number of core courses from three to two.[8] As well as reducing the duplication, such a move could permit the inclusion of another elective course which might involve academic or technical upgrading.

3. This issue is clearly one which cannot be resolved in isolation. The content of the program will depend upon the extent to which the program emphasizes pedagogy. Also, it will depend upon the opinions of the program designer regarding just what constitutes the body of knowledge and skills which should be possessed by all college instructors. Since the determination, with any exactness, of the constituent parts of that body of knowledge and skills would be extremely difficult,[9] it would seem essential that program designers should consider

---

[8] Since the Tri-College Committee is not opposed to the principle of courses which carry only half the normal credit, perhaps a reduction of the core from three credits to two-and-a-half credits might be a suitable alternative.

[9] See "Suggestions for Further Research" later in this chapter.

their opinions against a background of awareness of the opinions or preferences of the instructors for whom the program is designed.

Issue 5. Should community college instructors in different instructional areas have the same type of professional preparation program?

1. The C.A.E. program has moved toward a "one-program-for-all" structure, and, while half of the respondents expressed a preference which agreed with current C.A.E. practices, the other half expressed the opposite view. Perhaps some of the concerns of this latter group could be dispelled by offering methodology courses specific to the various instructional areas. (This would not be a new idea in Manitoba. As mentioned in Chapter 4, such courses as Methods of Teaching Business Subjects were available when the C.A.E. program was established.)

2. The diversity among community college students, the types of programs they take, and the background and experience of their instructors, suggests the possibility of diversity in the nature of the programs of instructional preparation for these instructors. It might be desirable, for some instructors, to abandon the concept of courses in such a program, and attempt a different form of preparation. For example, in some cases an "apprenticeship" model, in which a new instructor learns on-the-job by working beside a master teacher, might be appropriate.

Issue 6. How should the program be organized with respect to the delivery of instruction?

1. The questionnaire respondents expressed substantial agreement with the instructional procedures currently employed in the C.A.E. program. There would, therefore, seem little reason to depart in any major way from the use of lectures, seminars and individualized instruction.

2. Offering individualized or small group versions of methodology courses might be one way of overcoming the problem of diversity within C.A.E. classes.

3. Respondents expressed a strong preference for independent study as an instructional procedure. It would seem that some of the C.A.E. requirements could be satisfied by independent study, especially in the elective area, and particularly if, as suggested earlier, subject matter courses were accepted as C.A.E. electives.

4. This too is an issue which cannot be resolved in isolation, as the instructional procedures to be employed will depend, for example, upon the content of the program, and upon the type of program. The instructional procedures employed should be appropriate to the type of program and the content of that program. They should also, as far as possible, accommodate the differing learning styles of the instructors. They will also, of course, be influenced by financial and other resource limitations. Thus there is no way to determine, in advance, what procedures should be used, except to suggest that dependence upon one procedure with the exclusion of all others is probably unwise.

Issue 7. What type of credential, if any, should be associated with the program?

1. The majority of respondents who expressed a particular preference on this issue thought that a certificate was the appropriate credential for a program of preparation for teaching in a community college. Thus there would seem to be little reason for the college authorities to offer a different credential.

2. The administrators' desire to have a renewable credential suggested the need for continuing professional development. While the instructors expressed the same need, they did not want that development tied to a renewable certificate. It would seem that the role of the C.A.E. in relation to continuing professional development should be clearly articulated.

3. Respondents expressed a desire for a credential which would be transferable to other jurisdictions and accepted by other educational institutions. University involvement in the preparation program might help to achieve both of these.

4. It would seem that associating a credential with a program conveys the impression of completion. Thus, upon obtaining a certificate the instructor's preparation for teaching is complete. It has been shown, however, in the review of the literature, and in the report of current practice and preferences in Manitoba, that college personnel generally feel the need for continuing professional development throughout the instructor's teaching career. Thus, the question of a credential should receive careful consideration. It may be preferable if there were to be no credential since, in this way, the on-going nature of professional development could be emphasized.

Issue 8. Who should be responsible for the organization and administration of the program?

1. Since only one-quarter of the respondents favoured the present tri-college responsibility, while almost half expressed a preference for joint university-community college responsibility, it would seem desirable to seek ways in which the universities could become involved in the program. Such university involvement could make available a wider range of expertise, and might help to overcome some of the problems associated with the acceptability and transferability of the credential associated with the program.

2. It has been shown that there are several areas in which the preferences of college administrators differ from those of instructors. Also, C.A.E. policy decisions are made by administrators, with very little input from the instructors for whom the program is intended. The inclusion of instructors on the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee might help to overcome some of these instructor-administrator differences.

3. The role of the Teacher Education section in the C.A.E. program is somewhat controversial. The C.A.E. is a tri-college program, but its operations are centered at the Teacher Education section at Red River Community College. This has led to feelings of resentment by some staff from the other two colleges, where the program is often seen as a Red River program. However, given that the Teacher Education section has little instructional input to the program, there would seem little reason for the responsibility for the administration of the program to continue to be centered in one college. There would seem to be no reason that this administrative function could not be located with, for

example, the Planning and Evaluation section of the Community Colleges Division, if only to underscore the point that the C.A.E. is a tri-college program.

An alternative, however, would be for the Teacher Education section to take a more active role in the program, by employing staff from that section as instructors for the C.A.E. courses, and as supervisors of new instructors. Since staff from that section have particular expertise in the development of pedagogical skills, and since they are familiar with the Manitoba community college system, there would seem to be no reason that they should not be employed as instructors of those C.A.E. courses which are pedagogically oriented. (If subject matter courses are incorporated into the C.A.E. as electives, these could be taught by persons from other sections of the colleges, not by Teacher Education personnel.) Teacher Education staff could also assist in the supervision of new instructors, by observing such instructors in their own classrooms. In this way the instructor's classroom teaching would become, in effect, a supervised teaching practicum and, in this way, the "theory" and the "practice" of teacher education could be more closely linked.

Issue 9. What mechanism should exist to monitor, evaluate, and modify the program?

1. In general it would seem that present C.A.E. practice, in which the C.A.E. program is monitored and evaluated by those who are responsible for the program, is viewed favourably by questionnaire respondents, and should, therefore, be continued.

2. However, the lack of an advisory committee prevents input to the program from external agencies, and there exists the potential for the program to achieve an insular nature. While this is partly counteracted by employing personnel from outside the Manitoba community college system as instructors for the C.A.E. courses, a more positive move would be the re-establishment of a C.A.E. Advisory Committee which could view the C.A.E. with more detachment than can the present Tri-College Committee. Because such an advisory committee would be necessarily somewhat remote from the program it should not be a policy-making group. The policy-making function should remain the responsibility of the Tri-College Committee (or a wider universitiy-college committee if that suggestion is implemented).

3. In any program of professional preparation it would seem that there should be some form of external monitoring mechanism in order to avoid the dangers of inbreeding which could arise without such a mechanism. This could, for example, take the form of periodic evaluations conducted by the funding agency (typically a state or provincial government). Or, it could involve the formation of a Review Committee or an Advisory Committee. Perhaps some combination of these would be desirable.

Issue 10. Who should pay for the program?

1. Although almost half of the respondents thought that the instructor should be required to make some financial contribution to the program, since it is to his advantage as well as to the advantage of the college and the students, the remainder (slightly more that half) fav-

oured the present system whereby the instructor has no financial expense. There would seem to be no reason, therefore, to change the present system.

2. If, however, the preparation program for college teaching changes substantially (as, for example, if there should be more university involvement and, perhaps, the award of a degree at the end of the program) so that the personal benefit to the instructor increases in relation to the professional benefit, the question of the instructor's financial contribution might have to be reconsidered.

3. Almost eighty percent of the respondents thought that instructors should receive some release from teaching duties in order to complete at least part of the program. Perhaps the college authorities could institute a reduced teaching load for instructors who were working toward a C.A.E. A reduction of six hours per week for two years would permit the entire program to be completed in that time. Or, a reduction of four hours per week for two years, and the requirement of attendance at C.A.E. classes in the intervening summer, could also lead to the completion of the program in two years. While such a release scheme would increase the overall cost of the program to the employing authority, it could also produce several benefits, including:

1. A reduction in the time required for certification. Thus a new instructor would become a trained instructor sooner and this, presumably, would be of benefit to his students;

2. The opportunity, as discussed earlier, to immediately relate the teacher education to the classroom; and

3. The opportunity to offer the introductory C.A.E. course as a classroom course rather than as an individualized one and, in this way, to introduce to that course the peer interaction which is considered, by the Tri-College Committee,[10] to be of some importance.

4. In general there would seem to be no reason for community college instructors to receive a completely free teacher education, since those who prepare for teaching in elementary and secondary schools contribute toward the cost of that preparation. On the other hand, college instructors usually do have some financial expenses in the pre-service component of their preparation, so it would seem reasonable to reduce or even eliminate their personal costs in the in-service component. Since the pedagogical preparation is intended to benefit the client group of the community colleges (i.e., the students) then perhaps the colleges should meet the costs of that preparation. In the same way the time for the program should be regarded as a cost, and the question to be answered is: How much of that cost is borne by the instructors, and how much by the employing authorities? It would seem that, with respect to both time and money costs, principles of fairness should prevail, with contributions from both parties.

---

[10] And by this researcher!

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The studies suggested below, if carried out, could add considerably to knowledge about the design of programs of professional preparation for college instructors. It is recognized, however, that most of them would be quite difficult to conduct, largely due to the lack of specificity and clarity of the variables to be measured and the consequent lack of instruments which could validly and reliably measure those variables. Given that difficulty, though, they are still important studies. Indeed it would seem that until answers can be provided to the questions raised in the first two of these studies, the practice of basing a program on the "body of knowledge and skills" premise cannot be easily justified.

1. How justifiable is Manitoba's requirement that community college instructors have a teaching certificate? It would be interesting to determine if possession of a teaching certificate, and, in particular, possession of a Certificate in Adult Education, had any influence on teaching performance. Provided that "teaching performance" could be defined, and measured in a valid and reliable way, such a study could concentrate solely on Manitoba's colleges and compare the teaching performances of those instructors with a C.A.E., those with other teaching certificates, and those with no teaching certificate, or it could compare the teaching performance of some of Manitoba's instructors with that of instructors from other provinces where there are no certification requirements.

2. Perhaps of more immediate use would be an attempt to determine, very specifically, what constitutes "the requisite andragogical

knowledge and skills required to teach within an adult context,"[11] and the simultaneous construction of an instrument which measures the extent to which an individual possesses these.

3. A related study would be a replication of this present study in a province in which community college instructors are not required to possess teaching certificates. It is conceivable that, without a background of compulsory certification and a certification program upon which to reflect, such instructors might give quite different answers to the issue questions. If differences did occur, and if reasons for these differences could be determined, such a study could have implications both for Manitoba and other provinces.

4. In the present study approximately fifteen percent of respondents indicated some measure of dissatisfaction with their present position. Comments on the questionnaire suggested that some of this dissatisfaction was due to factors unrelated to the C.A.E., but some did relate to the lack of provision for professional development. A study which attempted to identify the extent, and the causes, of this dissatisfaction would be valuable, and, to the extent that the dissatisfaction was caused by the C.A.E. program, such a study would have implications for that program.

5. In the present C.A.E. program no attempt is made to separate the instructor-students into groups which are relatively homogeneous (e.g., with respect to the teaching specialty of these instructor-students). What educational disadvantages are created by this practice, both to the instructor-students themselves in the first instance, and to

---

[11] 1980 C.A.E. Handbook, p. 1.

their students subsequently? How serious are these disadvantages, and are they serious enough to justify the increase in expenditure which would be required to overcome them? A study which found answers to these questions would have implications both within Manitoba and in other college systems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

Anderson, Duane D. "E.P.D.A. at the University of Iowa." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, October, 1972, p. 19.

Andreyka, Robert E. "Akron University's Many Roads to Technical Teacher Preparation." Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, Vol. 60, No. 9, December, 1971, pp. 78-80.

Atwell, Charles A. and Robert W. Sullins. "Cooperative Faculty Development." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3, November, 1973, pp. 32-33.

Besnivick, S.L. and T.W. Fryer, Jr. "Miami Begins the Diplomate in Collegiate Teaching." Junior College Journal Vol. 39, No. 5, February, 1969, pp. 48,50,52,54,56.

Blake, Larry J. "A Catalyst for Staff Development." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, October, 1972, pp. 12-13.

Brown, Donald V. "A Teaching Partnership for Technical Staff." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3, November, 1973, pp. 35-36.

Bush, Robert N. "Curriculum-Proof Teachers: Who does what to whom?" in Rubin, Louis J. (ed.) Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971, pp. 37-68.

Cashin, H. John. "Some Attitudes Toward Instructor Preparation." Junior College Journal, Vol. 39, No. 6, March, 1969, pp. 31-34.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Developing Specialists in Learning," in Ogilvie, William K. and Max R. Raines, (eds.) Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971, pp. 330-335.

Cohen, Arthur M. The Two-Year College Instructor Today. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Cohen, Wallace. "Knowing the Student and the College." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, October, 1972, pp. 17-18.

Croy, John E. "How do you feel about inservice programs?" Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 3, November, 1973, pp. 28-29.

Dunham, Daniel Bentley. "Guidelines for Developing a Community College Teacher Education Program in Oregon." Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 31, 1971, p. 4595-A.

Fantini, Mario. "Teacher Training and Educational Reform," in Rubin, Louis J. (ed.) Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971, pp. 189-204.

Garrison, Roger H. "The Junior College Teacher - A New Breed?" in Ogilvie, William K. and Max R. Raines (eds.) Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971, pp. 438-446.

Gillie, Angelo C. Sr. Principles of Post-Secondary Vocational Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973.

Gleazer, Edmund J. Jnr. This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. "Preparation of Junior College Teachers," in Ogilvie, William K. and Max R. Raines (eds.) Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1971, pp.459-465.

Hammons, James O. and Sharon Jaggard. "An Assessment of Staff Development Needs." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 47, No. 3, November, 1976, pp. 20-21.

Hoem, Eric. "The Professional Development Program You Can Afford." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 45, No. 8, May, 1975, pp. 32-34.

Kastner, Harold H. Jr. "A System-Wide Approach." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol, 44, No. 3, November, 1973, pp. 14-15.

Keehan, Virginia R. "Orienting Staff to College Goals." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, October, 1972, p. 16.

Konrad, Abram G. "Staff Development in Western Canadian Colleges." STOA Vol. 3, No. 1, 1973, pp. 47-52.

Konrad, A.G., Long, J.C., and Small, J.M. "Professional Development Needs of Administrators in Higher Education." The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1976, pp. 1-17.

Kovach, Robert V. "Which Degrees for Faculty?" Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3, November, 1973, pp. 30-31.

Lindquist, Jack. "Institutional Services for Teaching Improvement." New Directions for Higher Education: Strategies for Significant Survival. Vol. 3, No. 4, Winter, 1975, pp. 33-48.

Martorana, S.V., H. Joan Purcell, and Michael J. Reynolds. "Toward Improving the Learning Process." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 1, August-September, 1973, pp. 56-57.

Meade, Edward J. Jnr. "No Health in Us," in Rubin, Louis J. (ed.) Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971, pp. 211-224.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College: A Handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

O'Banion, Terry. "Staff Development: Priorities for the Seventies." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, October, 1972, pp. 10-11.

O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior College. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

O'Banion, Terry. "Teachers for Tomorrow: One Year Later." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3, November, 1973, pp. 10-11.

Ogilvie, William K. and Max R. Raines (eds.) Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Pratt, David. Curriculum: Design and Development. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1980.

Reese, Jack E. "Structuring the Teaching Internship." Junior College Journal, Vol. 42, No. 8, May, 1972, pp. 27-31.

Rubin, Louis J. (ed.) Improving In-service Education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Scigliano, John A. and Eugene E. DuBois. "Staff Development: NOVA Style." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 47, No. 2, October, 1976, pp. 38-39,41.

Simmons, Howard L. "Priorities for Training Minority Staff." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, October, 1972, pp. 15-16.

Sims, David M. and Glen I. Bounds. "Some Perspectives on Staff Development: E.P.D.A. at a Community College." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, October, 1972, pp. 14-15.

Singer, Derek S. "Do We Need a Community College Institute?" Junior College Journal Vol. 39. No. 2, October, 1968, pp. 36,38,40.

Stoops, John A. (ed.) The Community College in Higher Education. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Lehigh University, 1966.

Stratton, Alan G. "Needed: The Doctor of Arts in College Teaching." Junior College Journal Vol. 39, No. 8, May, 1969, pp. 19-23.

Suttle, Bruce B. "Quality Instruction at Community College: Fact or Fable?" Community College Frontiers, Vol. 6, No. 2, Winter, 1978, pp. 46-49.

Venuto, Louis J. "New Promise for Teacher Preparation." Junior College Journal Vol. 42, No. 5, February, 1972, pp. 22-24.

Wallace, Dale C. "A Functioning Program for the Preparation of Community-College Biology Teachers." The American Biology Teacher, Vol. 36, No. 2, February, 1974, pp. 99-101.

Wilson, Richard E. "Staff Development: An Urgent Priority." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 9, June/July, 1973, pp. 69-69.

Yarrington, Roger. "Facing the Critical Issues." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 3, November, 1973, pp. 8-9.

MEMORANDA

Memorandum from Dr. W.C. Lorimer, Deputy Minister, Youth and Education, to Mr. R.W. Lightly, Assistant Deputy Minister, Youth and Education, February 27, 1970.

Memorandum from P.F. Penner, Supervisor, Teacher Education Division and Learning Resources Centre, to Mr. H.P. Moffat, Director of Teacher Certification, September 29,1970.

Memorandum from P.F. Penner, Supervisor, Teacher Education Division and Learning Resources Centre, to Mr. J.E. McCannel, Director General, Community Colleges, September 30, 1970.

Memorandum from Mr. H.P. Moffat, Director of Teacher Certification, to Mr. P. Penner, Supervisor, Teacher Education Division and Learning Resources Centre, October 8, 1970.

Memorandum from S.P. Didcote, Principal, Industrial and Technology Division, Red River Community College, to Mr. A.R. Low, Director, Support Services, Instruction and Facilities, September 14, 1971.

Memorandum from J.E. McCannel, Director General, Community Colleges, to Miss Shirley Bradshaw, Director, Personnel Administration, Management Committee of Cabinet, November 2, 1971.

Memorandum from Miss Shirley Bradshaw, Director of Personnel Administration, Management Committee of Cabinet, to B.S. Bateman, Deputy Minister of Colleges and Universities Affairs, December 10, 1971.

Memorandum from L.M. Britton, Director, Keewatin Community College, to Ardith Pelton, Consultant, Instructional Planning and Evaluation, July, 1977.

MINUTES OF MEETINGS

Minutes of Meeting re Summer Courses for Vocational Teachers, held at Red River Community College, January 16, 1970.

Minutes of Board of Teacher Education and Certification Meeting, January 30, 1970.

Minutes of the C.A.E. Advisory Committee Meetings, January 15, May 30, and October 15,1973.

Minutes of the C.A.E. Tri-College Committee Meetings, November 23 and December 10, 1976; January 19,20, April 26, May 19, and October 6, 1977; April 12 and May 23, 1978; and January 23, 1979.

MISCELLANEOUS SOURCES

"Certificate in Adult Education Advisory Committee Proposal," May 30, 1973.

"Certificate in Adult Education Information Bulletin," Red River Community College, Revised August, 1975.

"A History of Community Colleges in Manitoba." Winnipeg: Department of Colleges and Universities Affairs, Community Colleges Division, [n.d.].

Manitoba Regulations No. 55/67 dated May 19, 1967, Sections 16,17.

"Notice to Community College Staff: Certificates in Adult Education," from J.E. McCannel, Director General, Community Colleges, December, 1971.

"Proposed Conditions Governing Selection of Courses in Certification Programs of Community College Instructors," Red River Community College, September, 1972.

"Review of the Certificate in Adult Education Program." Report prepared by the Planning and Evaluation Directorate, Community Colleges Division, Department of Continuing Education and Manpower, November, 1976.

"Staff Development Program for Community College Instructors and Others," Red River Community College, March 12, 1971; revised July 13, 1971.

Appendix A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND FOUNDATIONS

A SURVEY OF PREPARATION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHING

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____
Surname or family name Given names

For the following questions please check (✓) the appropriate category.

1. At which college are you currently employed?
   1....Assiniboine Community College.
   2....Keewatin Community College.
   3....Red River Community College.

2. What is your sex?
   1....Female.
   2....Male.

3. What is your age?
   1....20-29.
   2....30-39.
   3....40-49.
   4....50-59.
   5....Over 59.

Section 1.

This section seeks information about your qualifications and experience.

For Questions 4,5 and 6, please write your answer in the space provided.

4. What is your present position in the college and how long have you held it? Please be specific, e.g. Instructor, Nursing Education, 5 years.

   _____

5. How many hours each week do you teach (if any)? _____

6. What subjects, if any, do you teach?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

7. Please list your qualifications (Diplomas, Certificates, Degrees, etc.) other than teaching certificates, including the major area of specialization and where the qualification was obtained.

Qualification	Specialization	Awarding Agency	Country or Province

For the following questions please check (✓) the appropriate alternative. In some cases you may have to check more than one. For some questions you are asked for an additional comment. Please be brief but as specific as you can.

8. How long have you been a full-time staff member at one of Manitoba's community colleges? (In this question, and in questions 9 and 10, include time spent at the institutions from which the community colleges developed, if applicable.)

    1....Less than one year.

    2....1-4 years.

    3....5-9 years.

    4....10-14 years.

    5....15 years or more.

9. What is your total length of time spent as a full-time instructor and/or senior instructor and/or department head (coordinator) in Manitoba's community colleges?

    1....None.

    2....Less than one year.

    3....1-4 years.

    4....5-9 years.

    5....10-14 years.

    6....15 years or more.

10. What is your total length of time spent as a chairperson or in other administrative positions (not senior instructor or department head) in Manitoba's community colleges?

    1....None.

    2....Less than one year.

    3....1-4 years.

    4....5-9 years.

    5....10-14 years.

    6....15 years or more.

11. What was your occupation immediately prior to your first appointment to the staff of a community college (or to one of the institutions from which the community colleges developed) in Manitoba? Please be specific.

_____

12. To what extent was this previous occupational experience valuable to you as a community college instructor?

1....Very valuable.

2....Moderately valuable.

3....Only marginally valuable.

4....Of no value at all.

13. (a) Which, if any, of the following certificates do you possess? (You may check more than one.)

1....Certificate in Adult Education.

2....Professional Certificate (for teaching in Manitoba's elementary and secondary schools).

3....Vocational Business Education Certificate.

4....Vocational Industrial Certificate.

5....Permanent Special Certificate valid in Provincially Operated Schools.

6....Other (please specify) _____

_____

(b) When was the certificate awarded? _____

(c) Where did you do the studies leading to the award of that certificate?

1....In Manitoba.

2....In another Canadian province.

3....In the U.S.A.

4....Elsewhere (please specify) _____

14. Are you currently engaged in a program leading to the award of a certificate for teaching?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If YES, which certificate? _____

15. Prior to your present appointment, had you ever done any teaching, either full-time or part-time?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If YES:

(a) Please indicate where and for how long.

	Full Time	No. of Years	Part Time	No. of Years
Elementary school.	1....	_____	8....	_____
Junior high school.	2....	_____	9....	_____
Senior high school.	3....	_____	10....	_____
Technical secondary school.	4....	_____	11....	_____
University.	5....	_____	12....	_____
Community college.	6....	_____	13....	_____
Other (please specify)	7....	_____	14....	_____

(b) To what extent was this previous teaching experience valuable to you as a community college instructor?

1....Very valuable.

2....Moderately valuable.

3....Only marginally valuable.

4....Of no value at all.

16. Would you prefer to be teaching in some other institution?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If YES, which institution(s), and why?

1....Elementary school.

2....Junior high school.

3....Senior high school.

4....Technical secondary school.

5....University.

6....A different community college.

7....Other (please specify) _____

Why? _____

_____

17. Would you prefer to be doing some other non-teaching job?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If YES, which job, and why? _____

_____

Section 2.

In the development of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors, several issues must be resolved. Some of these issues are presented in this section of the questionnaire. For each question, please give the answer which you feel would be best for the community college system in Manitoba today.

N.B. For the purposes of this survey, a program of professional preparation is defined as a "set of activities which provides the knowledge and skills necessary to be an effective community college instructor". This may, or may not, include activities regarded as "professional development".

18. Should all community college instructors be required to participate in a program of professional preparation?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If NO, who should be exempted, and why?

1....All instructors.

2....Instructors with a specified minimum period of previous formal teaching experience.

3....Instructors with a specified minimum period of successful experience in their trade or profession.

4....Instructors with a teaching certificate.

5....Others (please specify) _____

_____

Why? _____

_____

19. When should the program of professional preparation take place?

1....Entirely before employment as a community college instructor.

2....After being employed as a community college instructor, but before doing any teaching.

3....Both before and during employment as a community college instructor.

4....Other (please specify) _____

_____

20. If any part of the program is to be in-service in nature, i.e. undertaken while the individual is employed as a community college instructor, how should it be scheduled to fit in with teaching duties?

1....Concurrent with teaching duties, e.g. participation in a day or evening program of professional preparation during the regular teaching sessions.

2....In between teaching terms or semesters, e.g. participation in a program of professional preparation during the summer session.

3....Other (please specify) _____

_____

21. Should instructors in different instructional areas within a college have the same type of professional preparation program?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If NO, in what ways should the programs differ, and why?

_____

_____

_____

22. How much of the total time in the preparation program should be devoted to core (compulsory) subjects or activities?

1....None - it should be completely elective.

2....Less than one-third.

3....One-third to two-thirds.

4....More than two-thirds.

5....All - there should be no electives.

23. What percentage of the total time in the preparation program should be devoted to each of the following major emphases?

Subject matter expertise or technical upgrading. _____ percent.

Teaching techniques and skills. _____ percent.

Other (please specify) _____

_____

_____ _____ percent.

24. In the instructional area with which you are most familiar, what combination of qualifications and experience do you think an individual should have when first appointed as a community college instructor?

_____

_____

_____

25. The following is a list of instructional procedures which might be employed in a program of professional preparation for community college instructors. Please indicate, by checking (✓) the appropriate column for each procedure, the importance of each in such a program.

	Very important. Must be included.	Moderately important. Should be included.	Unimportant. Could be excluded.	Undesirable. Should be excluded.
1. Independent study.	___	___	___	___
2. Individualized instruction using standardized materials.	___	___	___	___
3. Lectures and seminars.	___	___	___	___
4. Micro-teaching.	___	___	___	___
5. Observation of other community college instructors in their classrooms.	___	___	___	___
6. Supervised classroom teaching.	___	___	___	___
7. Visits to other community colleges.	___	___	___	___

26. Are there any other instructional procedures which you feel should be used?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If YES, please list them. _____

_____

_____

27. Please indicate the importance of each of the following topics in a program of professional preparation for community college instructors by checking (✓) the appropriate column for each topic.

	Very important. Must be included.	Moderately important. Should be included.	Unimportant. Could be excluded.	Undesirable. Should be excluded.
1. Adult Psychology.				
2. Audio-Visual Materials.				
3. Characteristics of Community College Students.				
4. Classroom Management.				
5. Communication Skills.				
6. Computer Applications.				
7. Counselling Techniques.				
8. Course Planning.				
9. Curriculum Development.				
10. Evaluation of Student Performance.				
11. Financial Aspects of Community Colleges.				
12. General Mathematics.				
13. General Science.				
14. Goals of the Community College.				
15. History of the Community College.				
16. Individualization of Instruction.				
17. Innovative Teaching Techniques.				
18. Laws Relating to Community Colleges.				
19. Learning Theory.				
20. Methods of Reporting Student Performance.				
21. Motivation of Students.				
22. Philosophy of the Community College.				
23. Psychology.				
24. Remedial Education.				
25. Role of the Community College in Post-Secondary Education.				
26. Test Construction.				

28. Are there any other topics, not on this list, which you feel should be included in a program of professional preparation for community college instructors?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If YES, please list them. _____

_____

_____

29. Where should instruction for the program be carried out?

1....University.

2....Your own college.

3....Some other community college.

4....Nearby industrial plant.

5....Nearby commercial organization.

6....Other (please specify) _____

30. Where should instructional staff for the program come from?

1....The Teacher Education Section at Red River Community College.

2....Other sections of the community colleges.

3....Manitoba's universities.

4....Universities in other provinces.

5....Universities in the U.S.A. or overseas.

6....Community colleges in other provinces.

7....Community colleges in the U.S.A. or overseas.

8....Local industry, business, or government.

9....Anywhere, as long as they are competent.

10....Other (please specify) _____

31. At the completion of the program, what type of credential should be awarded, and why?

1....No credential.

2....Certificate.

3....Bachelor of Arts or Science.

4....Master of Arts or Science.

5....Diploma.

6....Bachelor of Education.

7....Master of Education.

8....Other (please specify) _____

Why? _____

32. Should this credential, if any, be permanent, or should it be of an interim or temporary nature, with periodic renewal of it depending on participation in further professional development activities?

1....Should be permanent.

2....Should be renewable.

33. Should the award of the final credential, if any, depend upon the completion of a period of satisfactory teaching in a community college (e.g. an internship or a period of probationary employment)?

1....Yes.

2....No.

If YES,

(a) How long should this probationary period be? _____

(b) Who should decide whether the teaching was satisfactory?

_____

34. Who should be responsible for the organization and administration of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors?

1....A university Faculty of Education.

2....The provincial Department of Education.

3....One of the community colleges.

4....Each community college, separately.

5....The three community colleges, together.

6....A joint university-community college effort.

7....Other (please specify) _____

_____

Why would you make this particular choice? _____

_____

_____

35. (a) Who should monitor and evaluate the professional preparation program?

1....The Teacher Education Section at Red River Community College.

2....Those who are responsible for the organization and administration of the program.

3....The Planning and Evaluation section of the Community Colleges Division of the Department of Education.

4....Impartial external consultants.

5....Others (please specify) _____

_____

35. (b) How often should it be evaluated?

1....Every year.

2....About every 3 to 5 years.

3....Only when required.

36. How much of the cost of the program should be borne by the individual instructor?

1....The instructor should not have any financial expense.

2....The instructor should pay all normal expenses of the program, e.g. tuition, books, laboratory fees, etc.

3....The instructor should make some financial contribution.

Why would you make this particular choice? _____

_____

37. How much of his/her own time should the instructor be required to devote to the program of professional preparation?

1....The instructor should do the entire program in his/her own time.

2....The instructor should get some release from teaching duties but should also use some of his/her own time for the program.

3....The instructor should be released from sufficient of his/her teaching duties so that the entire program can be completed in the employer's time.

Why would you make this particular choice? _____

_____

38. In the design of a program of professional preparation for community college instructors are there other issues which need to be resolved? If so, what are they, and how would you resolve them?

_____

_____

_____

Section 3.

39. Have you ever taken, or are you currently taking, a program designed to prepare you for teaching?

1....Yes. Please go to Question 40.

2....No. Please go to Question 44.

40. If you answered YES to Question 39:

Was the program which you took, or which you are currently taking, designed to prepare you for teaching adults (e.g. the Certificate in Adult Education program) or for teaching school-children (e.g. a teacher education program in one of Manitoba's universities)?

1....Teaching adults. Please go to Question 41.

2....Teaching children. Please go to Question 41, but phrase your comments in terms of the suitability of the teacher education program as a means of preparation for teaching in a community college, even though this was not its intended aim.

41. Which subjects and/or activities in your program do you regard as being the most valuable to you as a community college instructor?

_____

_____

42. What changes would you like to see made in your program as preparation for community college teaching, and why?

_____

_____

43. Please rank the following in order of the value of their contribution to your preparation for teaching in a community college. Place 1 beside the most valuable, 2 beside the next most valuable, and so on. Please rank only those experiences which you have had - mark the others with an X.

*....Previous teaching experience.

*....Previous occupational experience other than teaching.

*....Formal program of preparation for teaching.

*....On-the-job community college teaching.

44. Do you care to make any general observations or suggestions about preparation for community college teaching, or to elaborate on your answers to any of the previous questions? If so, please use this space.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your cooperation and assistance are greatly appreciated.

Appendix B

THE TESTS

DATA ANALYSIS: THE TESTS

Two different tests were used in the analysis of the questionnaire data. First, a chi-square test was used to determine whether the respondents' answers to most of the issue questions were independent of the respondent attributes. Second, a one-way analysis of variance was used to identify statistically significant differences between subgroups of the respondent population with respect to those questions on which respondents were asked to state their opinion of the importance of a topic or an instructional procedure in a program of professional preparation.

1. The Chi-Square Test

An examination of a hypothetical set of data will help to illustrate the use of this test in the present study. Suppose that 60 people -- 40 males and 20 females -- were asked the question "Should a program of professional preparation emphasize content or methods?" and that overall, 30 answered "methods." If the variable Sex was independent of the issue of program emphasis, it would be expected that the Males and Females would answer, separately, the same way as the group as a whole answered -- half of the males would answer Content, the other half Meth-

ods, and similarly for the females. That is, under a null hypothesis of independence between Sex and Program Emphasis, the expected results would look like those in Table 32.

TABLE 32

Hypothetical Data: Expected Frequencies

	Male	Female	Total
Content	20	10	30
Methods	20	10	30
Total	40	20	60

If, however, the actual results were as in Table 33, it might be suspected that Sex and Program Emphasis are not independent, and that Males favour Content while Females favour Methods.

TABLE 33

Hypothetical Data: Observed Frequencies

	Male	Female	Total
Content	30	-	30
Methods	10	20	30
Total	40	20	60

The Chi-square test measures the extent to which the observed results differ from the expected results under the null hypothesis. If the difference is significant the researcher can claim that Sex and Program Emphasis are not independent. That is, he can reject his null hypothesis. (Notice that, in rejecting the null hypothesis, the researcher may be wrong, if Sex and Program Emphasis are independent. The probability of making this error is determined by the significance level which he has set).

2. The Analysis of Variance Test

In some of the questions on the questionnaire respondents were asked to place a value on the importance of a particular topic or instructional procedure in a program of professional preparation. These values ranged from 1 to 4, representing "Very Important" and "Undesirable" respectively. For each topic or procedure, the means of the values assigned to that topic or procedure by respondents in various subgroups were compared. For example, for the topic "Counselling Techniques," 102 Females assigned an average value of 1.62, while 248 Males assigned an average value of 2.05. This difference was significant at the 0.05 level and it was concluded that Females considered this topic to be more important in a program of preparation than did Males.

In this report, only relationships which proved to be statistically significant at the 0.05 level are presented. However, in order that the reader may apply a stricter significance level if he so desires, probability levels are reported for each case. The probability figure presented represents the probability of obtaining the actual

observed results, given that the null hypothesis is true. Thus, a reported p=0.0200 indicates that, if the variables are independent, then the chances of obtaining the particular observed results are 2 in 100, a result which is regarded as statistically significant at the 0.05 level (but not at the 0.01 level). It also indicates that in rejecting the null hypothesis the researcher has a two percent chance of being wrong.